*Annals of Human Sciences*
Vol. 6, February 1985
1-25

# The Status Attainment Process: Results from the Japanese Data

ATSUSHI NAOI

published
by
Department of SOCIOLOGY,
ANTHROPOLOGY AND PHILOSOPHY
Faculty of Human Sciences
Osaka University

# The Status Attainment Process: Results from the Japanese Data*

ATSUSHI NAOI

## 1. Introduction

The original purpose of Blau and Duncan's basic path model on status attainment was to make a quantitative measure of the relative importance of ascriptive and achievement principles in the process of occupational attainment. The initial model was composed of five variables, in temporal sequence, of father's education, father's occupational status, respondent's education, respondent's first job and current occupation (Blau and Duncan 1967; 164).

This basic model was applied to the various kinds of Japanese data as follows, the 1960 SSM Survey (Tokyo sample), the 1965 SSM Survey (National sample), the 1967–1969 Japan–U.S. Comparative Survey of Occupational Mobility (Tokyo and Chicago samples), the 1975 Education and Occupation Survey (Tokyo sample), and the 1975 SSM Survey (National sample).[1)]

The findings of these analyses from Japanese data indicated that there were overall similarities among them, even though there were some differences in the survey times, the populations of sample and variable measurements. The path coefficients have shown that the direct effects of respondent's education and status of first job are greater than the effects of father's education and father's occupational status. On these points, the Japanese data are similar to those of the 1962 OCG data of U.S. There was, however, a striking difference in that the effect of respondent's first job to current occupational attainment was greater than that of educational attainment in Japan, which was not the case with the 1962 OCG data of U.S. (Blau and Duncan 1967: 170). Our previous analysis of the comparative survey of Chicago and Tokyo also revealed the same result (Tominaga and Naoi 1978: 222).

We have had believed, for long years, that this difference could be explained in terms of the general thesis about the relation of industrialization to stratification, that is, "as industrialization proceeds, the mechanism for allocation of resources and personnel turns from ascription to achievement and from particularism to universalism.", and Japan is

1) The main results from the Japanese data are the following. The 1960 SSM Survey: Maeda (1956): cited in Yasuda (1971) The 1965 SSM Survey: Tominaga (1969): revised in Tominaga (1979) Cummings and Naoi (1974; 1975) The 1967–1969 Japan–U.S. Comparative Survey of Occupational Mobility: Tominaga (1971): Tominaga and Naoi (1974–75): Tominaga with Naoi (1978). The 1975 Education and Occupation Survey: Naoi and Fujita (1981) The 1975 SSM Survey: Tominaga (1979)

(*) An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the U.S.-Japan Conference on Social Stratification in Hawaii, January 1980. I acknowledge gratefully the helpful comments of Donard J. Treiman, Ken'ichi Tominaga, Robert M. Hauser, and Carmi Schooler.

less industrialized than the U.S. This explanation seemed consistent with the widely believed characteristic of "life-time" employment system in Japan (Tominaga and Naoi 1978: 223–229).

But now, we can confirm that the characteristic feature shown by the Japanese data is not unique only for Japanese society and it can not be interpreted as the peculiar characteristics of Japanese "life-time" employment system. On the contrary, it may be only due to the ambiguity with respect to the measurement of respondent's first job in the U.S., as Blau and Duncan had already mentioned (Blau and Duncan 1967: 167).

The 1975 Wisconsin Study based on data from an 18 years old follow-up survey of Wisconsin high school seniors, revealed that in the U.S. just as same as in Japan, the direct effect of respondent's first job, defined as first full-time civilian job held after completing the highest grade of regular schooling, to current occupational attainment is much greater than that of educational attainment (Featherman and Hauser 1978; chap. 5)[2].

Table 1 Comparison of Standardized Regression Coefficients in the Basic Model: U.S. and Japan

| Status Variables | Casual Variables V | X | U | W | R |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Education | | | | | |
| U: U.S. | .211* | .226* | | | .145 |
| U: JAPAN | .209* | .410* | | | .119 |
| First Job | | | | | |
| W-1: U.S. | .164* | .255* | | | .135 |
| W-1: JAPAN | .167* | .245* | | | .234 |
| W-2: U.S. | .009 | .089* | .731* | | .592 |
| (a) | (.155) | (.166) | | | |
| W-2: JAPAN | .004 | .162* | .398* | | .234 |
| (a) | (.163) | (.083) | | | |
| Current Occupational Status | | | | | |
| Y-1: U.S. | .130* | .260* | | | .119 |
| Y-1: JAPAN | .153* | .245* | | | .112 |
| Y-2: U.S. | .019 | .142* | .524* | | .354 |
| (a) | (.111) | (.118) | | | |
| Y-2: JAPAN | .023 | .179* | .315* | | .183 |
| (a) | (.130) | (.066) | | | |
| Y-3: U.S. | .015 | .101* | .194* | .452* | .438 |
| (b) | (.004) | (.017) | (.330) | | |
| Y-3: JAPAN | .022 | .114* | .155* | .402* | .307 |
| (b) | (.001) | (.065) | (.165) | | |

NOTE.—Variables are; V=Father's education, X=Father's occupational status, U=Respondent's education, W=Respondent's first job, Y=Respondent's current occupational status.
(a) (b): (a) is indirect effect via education, and (b) is indirect effect via first job. The coefficients on W-1 and Y-1 are total effects of V and X on W or Y.
(*): Significant at .05 level.
(Source) For correlation matrix of U.S. and Japan, see Sewell, Hauser and Wolf (1980), Appendix, and also, Table 2 on this paper.

(2) From the comparative analysis of the U.S. and Australia by Featherman, Jones and Hauser, we can find that Australia is another society where the effect of respondent's first job on his current occupational attainment is greater than that of his educational attainment (Featherman, Jones and Hauser 1978: 93).

In order to compare the direct effect of first job to current occupational attainment, we calculated path coefficients of basic model using the 1975 SSM data in Japan and the 1975 Wisconsin data. Table 1. presents the results of analysis. Even though the path coefficients can not be compared directly, because of the difference of populations and variable measurements, the relative importance of variables that affect the successive status attainment processes are surprisingly similar. Not only the direct effects but also the indirect effects and total effects of variables are remarkably similar. There is only a few difference in the relative importance of father's education and father's occupational status for son's current occupational attainment. Therefore, we can confirm that in both of the U.S. and Japan, there exist a common structure of occupational stratification and occupational attainment, but there are some differences with respect to the effects of social antecedents. This evidence suggests that it is more useful to examine the effects of social antecedents of Japanese society for the comparative study of social stratification and social mobility. The first purpose of present paper is to examine more closely the effects of social antecedents to successive status attainment processes and the effects of intervening variables such as education and occupation, which are mediating the social antecedents to current status attainment.

The second purpose of present paper concerns the concept and measurement of social status. After Blau and Duncan's great work, most western researchers of social mobility have conceived of social status as occupation and social mobility as process of occupational achievement However, on the contrary, most Japanese researchers of social mobility and social stratification have considered of social status as multi-dimensional one, and also social mobility as more various processes in stratification system. It is for the reason that there are huge status inconsistencies in Japanese social stratification system (Tominaga, ed. 1979: chap. 1)

In the 1975 SSM Survey, it is assumed that today's Japanese social stratification is composed of various status system, and data were collected not only the three basic status variables of occupation, education, and income used in the past studies, but also on the four subsidiary status variables of property, life style, power, and influence. The study of status inconsistencies in Japanese stratification system revealed that 41% of men are grouped as a consistent group of status, and the other 52% of men are grouped as the inconsistent group of status (Imada and Hara 1977).[3] It means that the Japanese stratification system is not unidimensional, but multidimensional one. Therefore, on present paper, I would like to extend the basic model for multidimensional status attainments.

---

(3) Imada and Hara used six status variables, occupation, education, income, property, life style, and social influence. The variable of social influence is composed by the variables of influence and power. A cluster analysis was made of these variables on a five-point scale. From their analysis, six clusters were revealed. Two of them are consistent, one is Upper consistent group (11% of samples), and another is Lower consistent group (30%). Other four clusters are inconsistent groups. Type 1 is characterized by higher education, and occupation, but other lower status (9%). Type 2 is higher life style, but other lower status (15%). Type 3 is higher income, but other lower status (19%). Type 4 is higher social influence, but other lower status (9%). The miscellaneous is 7%. Also, they found that inconsistency of status does not generate status anxiety (Iamad and Hara 1977).

At first, I will present the framework of analysis and measurement of variables (Section 2). Then, I will examine the assumption that occupational status is the fundamental core of social status by using canonical correlation analysis (Section 3). And analyzing the process of eight status attainment using linear recursive model of path analysis, I will examine the effects of the social antecedents to the processes of status attainment, and the effects of intervening variables which are mediating between social antecedents and current status attainment (Section 4). At last section, we will propose a new hypothesis of Japanese status attainment processes, and discuss with it (Section 5).

## 2. Extended Status Attainment Process Model

Assumptions and Framework of Analysis

To begin with, it will be useful to review the assumptions and to present the framework of analysis for Japanese status attainment processes.

In modelling the processes of the Japanese status attainment, it is assumed that the contemporaly social status is made up of the following six dimensions. These concepts are defined as follows.

Occupation: In Japan, the concept of occupation is defined as the job which individual performs constantly for pay in the workplace. This conception is fairly different from such that of the U.S. as Horan defines. According to his definition, occupation is conceived as "a distinct social position defined in terms of characteristic activities in the socioeconomic realm" (Horan 1978: 534). However, the Japanese conception of occupation does not include the explicit idea of socioeconomic realm. The standard Japanese occupational titles are grouped by the homogeneities of jobs and functions in the workplace. Therefore, we define the occupational status as the social grading of occupation by the heterogeneities of job in the workplace (Naoi 1979).

Income: By the term of income, we mean the annual money flow received by an individual or a household.

Property: By the term of property, we mean the possession of money stocks, real estate, and various kinds of durable goods occupied by an individual and a household.

Life style: By the term of life style, we mean the level of living such as individual's expenditure and leisure activities.

Influence: By the term of influence, we mean the individual's ability to affect members' opinion in social groups, outside of his family and kinship.

Power: By the term of power, we mean the individual's accessibility to elite and social decision-makings in his community. Thus, in this analysis, the concepts of influence and power are assumed as the local properties of individuals in their communities.

There will be many mechanisms regulating for their status attainment processes. In this analysis, we keep with Duncan's idea of "socioeconomic life cycle model". Duncan assumes that, in the career of an individual, family background provides a set of "initial conditions" whose effects are transmitted through subsequent stages in his status attainment and provide the casual relationship from family background to schooling, from com-

pleting schooling to job entry, and from job to income gain, at last, from income to it's expenditures (Duncan 1967: 87). In general, such a temporal ordering in the causal chain of status attainment is assumed as a one directional causal relationship.

As before mentioned, the status attainment of intermediate life cycle such as education, first job, occupational status have independent effects for subsequent status attainment. On that reason, I would like to distinguish three sets of variables affecting the current status attainment.

Social antecedent status: By the term of social antecedent status, we mean the set of variables which provide initial conditions for individual's status attainment. This term covers not only most of variables of family background but also other ascriptive variables such as race, sex, age, and nationality. Social antecedent status affect the status attainment both as privileged status and as discriminated status.

Educational status. By the term of educational status, we mean the variables concerning with the formal educational status which individual's have achieved, and it does not cover all kinds of schooling that individuals have attended in their life career. In today's Japan, the role of extra-curriculum schooling for promoting formal educational attainment and also the role of vocational education for developing skills within firms are widely recognized.[4] However, we concentrate to the effects of the formal educational status on successive status attainment. Educational status that men have had achieved, affects to the successive status attainment directly, and simultaneously, it mediates the effects of social antecedents to current status attainment.

Occupational status: By the term of occupational status, we mean the variables concerning with the occupational status which individual's have achieved in his life career. As mentioned above, occupational status has direct effects to other status attainment such as income, power and authority. In general, it is assumed that in the industrialized societies, the occupational status are conceived as the core of social stratification system. In this paper, we will use this conventional assumption of social mobility research as one of hypothesis of status attainment processes. We distinguish the status of first job from current occupational status, because there is clear boundary between the status of first job for newcomers and the current occupational status for general experienced workers. Therefore, it is assumed that the status of first job has independent effect to successive status attainment.[5]

Our basic hypothesis is the same as that of conventional status attainment study, that is, the socioeconomic life cycle of occupational attainment is the fundamental core

---

(4) Our previous analysis of the process of educational attainment, based on the 1975 Education and Occupation Survey, has revealed that respondent's extra preparation education has significant effect on educational attainment (Naoi and Fujita 1981).

(5) The importance of status of first job in explaining subsequent occupational attainment has been recognized in the U.S. (Duncan, Featherman, and Duncan 1972: chap. 8, Featherman and Hauser 1978: chap. 5). However, we want emphasize that the status of first job is important in explaining not only occupational attainment, but also other status attainment, because the temporal ordering between respondent's education and entry of first job is strictly clear for Japanese workers, and almost none of them returns to school after leaving school.

of status attainment in present Japaneses stratification system. Featherman and Hauser, also coraborating with Jones, have confirmed that "the fundamental core of occupational inequality in the U.S. and other capitalist, industrialized societies is socioeconomic status, and not occupational prestige. Furthermore, across capitalist industrial (and possibly other) societies, the common structure of socia lmobility is occupational socioeconomic status". (Featherman, Jones and Hauser 1975: 357).[6] In this paper, we will attempt to apply their hypothesis to our status attainment model, and examine the validity and limitedness of socioeconomic life cycle model of status attainment.

Data and Measurement of Variables

The analyses to be reported here are based on 1975 SSM Survey data for national representative sample of Japanese adult men between the ages of 20 and 69 years old. 2,724 valid responses were obtained. From them, we selected samples who have regular job and between the age of 25 and 64 years old. The number of samples is 2,319.[7]

As the measurements of variables in this analysis, at first, I will explain the measurement of occupational status and then interpret the measurement of other variables.

Occupation: In this survey, respondent's occupational status was coded by the Japanese standard occupational classification and then measured by the Japanese occupational prestige scores. In order to assign prestige scores to all occupational titles included in the Japanese occupational classification, the national wide survey of occupational prestige was formulated in 1975, and we have now the Japanese prestige scores for all standard occupational titles (Tominaga, ed. 1979). On the other hand, we do not have any socioeconomic index of occupation such as Duncan's SES (1961), because in Japan the data on income of the standard occupational classification have not yet been available.

However, it will not become the defects for our analysis to use the prestige score for measuring occupational attainment. It is for the reason that in Japan, occupational status and also occupational attainment are not only connected with socioeconomic aspects such as education and income, but also connected with the prestigeous aspects such as the functional importance of job and social grading of occupations by people (Naoi and Suzuki 1977).[8]

Income: The individual's annual income (included taxes) were reported by the respondents using a list of equal intervals. We measured the individual's income by the central values of each intervals.

Property: We collected responses of twenty items, including real estate, floating

(6) Featherman and Hauser (1976) has confirmed their thesis by confirmatory factor analysis. However, their confirmation is based on the assumption of the preponderance of occupational status. Therefore, it will be necessary to examine the relationships between occupational status and other social status.

(7) On more detailed information about the data, see Tominaga, ed. (1979).

(8) Using the data based on Nishihira's occupational presige scores (Nishihira 1964), Cummings and Naoi developed the social position index of occupation, taking into consideration with the size of workplace (Cummings and Naoi 1974, 1975). And now the new status index of occupational status, taking into consideration with the complexity of job, is developed (Naoi 1980, 1981).

assets, and consumer durable, and the number of possession among them was used twenty points scale.

Life style: Nine questions about the leisure activities were asked and the number of responses was used nine points ordinal scales.

Influence: The respondents were questioned on their participation in social or recreational activities at work, neighborhood groups, local circles, and communities organizations. The individual's influence was measured by the number of affirmative answers.

Power: This concept was measured by the number of social interaction with members of local assemblies, chairman of neighborhood groups, business executives, and university professors, and the individual's power was scaled by the number of affirmative answers.

Occupational status: As the variable of occupational status, we selected the respondent's status of first job and current occupational status. Both are measured by the Japanese occupational prestige scores.

Educational status: Respondent's educational attainment is classified in terms of the level of formal schooling completed, and measured as the years of regular attendance at school until graduation. Although total number of drop-outs are very rare, many graduated high school students attend special preparatory school for the entrance examinations to gain admission to better university, for one or two years. Thus the exact number of years attended to school is meaningless in Japan.

Social antecedent status: We introduced eight variables as social antecedents into extended model of status attainment.[9]

Age: The age has very important effect to various kinds of status attainment in the Japanese stratification system. Our previous study of the comparative survey of Chicago and Tokyo has revealed that age has more important effect to respondent's educational attainment, occupational attainment and income attainment in Tokyo than in Chicago (Tominaga and Naoi 1978: 224–227). Therefore, we can assume that respondent's age will affect the other processes of status attainments in Japan.

Father's occupation: We selected father's occupation when respondent was 15 years old, and measured by the same occupational prestige scores as respondent's current occupation and first job.

Father's subsidiary status: As the subsidiary status of father's social status, we introduced four variables: father's education (measured by the same way as respondent's

---

(9) It is well known that respondent's religious background, region of the country in which he was raised, and also intactness of his family of origin and race affect his status attainment in the U.S. (Blau and Duncan 1967: Duncan, Featherman and Duncan 1972: Featherman and Hauser 1978). However, these antecedent variables are ommited from this analysis. It is due to the design of survey and the difficulties of linearization of variables, that is, race and intactness of family are ommited due to the small samples, and religious background and region are due to the difficulties of linearization of variables. Schooler has proposed the idea of linearization in terms of the complexity of environment (Schooler 1972). However, these are remaining for the future analysis.

education). Father's managerial status (measured on four ordinal scales),[10] size of organization of father was affiliated with (measured on eight ordinal scales), and economic condition of family when respondent was 15 years old (the respondent was asked if his household was "very rich," "rich," "ordinary," or "power" and scored on ordinal scales of four).

Other variables: We introduced other four variables: mother's education (measured by the same way as respondent's education), the number of siblings in his raised-family (measured by actual number when respondent was 15 years old), respondent's birth order (measured by actual order), and size of the community where respondent had raised until 15 years old (measured by five ordinal scales).

It should be emphasized that all of these measurements of variables are subject to various limitations, but they are nonetheless useful in examining our hypothesis of the status attainment processes in Japan.

## 3. Canonical Structure of Social Status

In this section, we will examine the basic hypothesis that the occupational status is the fundamental core of stratification system in Japan, just same as in every industrialized society.

Table 2 gives the simple correlation between the variables constituting current social status and causal variables affecting the current social status, with their means and standard deviations.

In this correlation matrix, we assume that the current six status variables compose a set of individual's social status, and also, assume that respondent's education, status of first job, and his antecedent variables including from his age and father's occupational status to size of raised-community compose a set of socioeconomic life cycle. Thus, we may have two sets of variables. Then, we assume that there will be strong relationship between a composite of variables in a social status and another composite of variables in a socioeconomic life cycle. Our problem is formulated as examining how the variables constituting the Blau and Duncan's basic model are representing for the relationship between social status set of variables and life cycle set of variables.

The canonical correlation analysis is address to this problem. Because, the canonical correlation model makes two linear composites simultaneously, one from a set of social status variate and another from a set of life cycle variate, with the requirement that the two linear composites are maximally correlated with each other, and reveals the structure of the relationships by selecting linear functions that maximally reproduce correlations between two sets of measurement. This is called the first canonical variates. Thus, the first canonical correlation is the maximum correlation between linear functions of two composites of variables. After having isolated the first pair of variates that maximally

10) The scale of managerial status is the following: 4-Manager and executive of the firm, more than 5 employees, 3-Self-employed owner of the firm between 2 and 4 employees, 2-Self-employed owner, no employee, 1-employee.

correlates, the procedure derives successive variates from each set of variables until residual become zero (Anderson 1958: chap. 12, Morrison 1967: chap. 6).

The results of the canonical correlation analysis are presented in Table 3. From this analysis, a maximum of six canonical variates can emerge, and all canonical correlations are statistically significant ($p<.05$). The canonical correlation of first two variates are almost the same degree ( .600 and .512). The status set of variate of the first canonical correlation is made up of respondent's current occupational status. The life cycle set of variate is made up of respondent's status of first job, his educational attainment, father's occupational status, and respondent's age. These variables are just same as those of Blau and Duncan's basic model. On this reason, it is confirmed that the socioeconomic life cycle of occupational attainment is the fundamental core of the stratification system in Japan.

However, we should recognize that the second canonical correlation also as fairly high as the first one. The status set of variate of the second is made up of individual's life style. The life cycle set of variate is made up of respondent's educational attainment and his age. And the directions of these variables for its variate is the reverse of those for the first variate.

The third and the fourth canonical correlation of variates are about the half of those of first two. But these canonical correlations are moderately high ( .276 and .216). The status set of variate of the third is made up mainly of individual's status of influence and power. The life cycle set of variate is made up of respondent's education, economic condition of raised-family, and mother's education. Most of the coefficients of life cycle set of variate are negative, and their relationships with the status set of variate are fairly different with the first variate.

The status set of variate of the fourth is made up of individual's status of property. And the life cycle set of variate is made up of respondent's first job and his educational attainment, and father's occupational status. As the result, the relationships of life cycle set of variate to the status set of variate of the fourth canonical correlation is alike to the first.

The fifth and the sixth canonical correlations are fairly lower than former four correlations, but they are still significant ( .130 and .094). The status set of variate of the fifth canonical correlation is made up of the status of power and influence. Therefore, the fifth variates is alike to the third. However, the relationships of life cycle set of variate to status set of variate are fairly different from the third. On the fifth canonical variate, the life cycle set is made up of father's occupational status and size of raised-community.

The canonical correlation of the sixth variate is very low. But on this variate, we can find individual's status of income in status set of variate. The life cycle set of variate is made up of number of siblings and birth order, and father's occupational status. This life cycle set of variate is fairly similar to the first.

The results of canonical correlation analysis revealed that the socioeconomic life cycle of occupational attainment is the fundamental core of Japanese stratification system. However, at the same time, it suggests that there will be another relationships of

status set of variables to the life cycle set of variables, especially for the status attainment of life style, influence, and power.

## 4. Linear Recursive Model of Status Attainment

In this section, we will analyze the each status attainment, including his educational attainment and status attainment of first job. Our purpose lies in the construction of linear recursive model of these eight status attainments, using multiple regression analysis and path analysis. The procedures of analysis are based on the general method for the decomposition of effects in path analysis presented by Alwin and Hauser (1975). Their method involves successive computation of reduced-form equations, that is, for each status attainment in the model, obtain the successive reduced-form equations, beginning with that containing only social antecedent variables, then adding intervening variables in sequence from respondent's educational attainment, his status of first job, and his current occupational status to other status attainments. The total effect of variable is its coefficient in the first reduced-form equation in which it appears as a causal variable, and the indirect effect is the difference between its total effect and the direct effect of variable in successive or last model, and the direct effect is its coefficient in the last equation in the sequence. We will call these equations as Model 1, Model 2, and so on. The final model that includes all causal variables will be called as the full model.

Table 4 gives the estimated structural coefficients of each equation in our model, and Table 5 gives reduced-form equations of our extended status attainment, including the decomposition of effects in terms of total effect, indirect effect, and direct effect of each causal variables on eight status attainments. Since the present analysis focuses on current status attainment, we shall only mention briefly the status attainment prior to current status attainment.

### Educational Attainment

The educational attainment model is made up of the variables of the individual's social antecedents. These variables explain 41% of the variance of educational attainment. And surprisingly, all of antecedent variables have significant direct effects to son's educational attainment.

Among antecedent variables, the most contributing variable is the respondent's age. The age has fairly high and negative effect to respondent's educational attainment. This means that the change of educational system, that is, the expansion of years of compulsory school and expanding of higher education attendance have privileged effects for younger generations. The direct effect of age is the greatest and negative (— .242).

Also, father's education, father's occupational status, and mother's education affect respondent's educational attainment. Mother's education has the independent effect of father's education, and it has the same degree of effect as does father's occupational status. The number of siblings and birth order have significant, but small direct effect. The number of siblings has negative effect, on the contrary, birth order has positive effect.

First Job Attainment

The status attainment model of respondent's first job is made up of his educational attainment and all antecedent variables. Model 1 is made up of only the antecedent variables, and Model 2 is composed by adding the respondent's educational status to Model 1. The coefficient of determination of the model for first job attainment is not so high, but it explains 25% of total variance of the full model. Most of antecedent variables have significant total effects to it, except age, number of siblings, birth order, and size of raised-community. However, after controlling the educational status in Model 2, only one of father's occupational status has significant direct effect. The total effects of other antecedent variables have been diminished by the intermediary of respondent's educational attainment.

On the contrary, the effects of age and size of raised-community have been emerged after controlling the educational attainment. These effects have been suppressed by educational status. Thus, on the full model, four antecedent variables have significant direct effects, respondent's age, educational attainment, father's occupational status, and size of raised-community. Age has positive effect and size of raised-community has negative effect.

Comparing direct effects on the full model, respondent's educational attainment has the greatest effect ( .443). This indicates that the status attainment of first job is affected strongly by the formal educational status. Furthermore, it must be noteworthy that all of indirect effects of antecedent variables via educational status are fairly high. It means that the formal educational status has powerful effect mediating between social antecedents and first job attainment.

Occupational Attainment

Explaining the process of current occupational status attainment, we made an extended model composed of all the antecedent variables and educational attainment, and first job attainment. Model 1 and Model 2 are the same as those of first job attainment. Model 3 is composed by adding the status of first job to Model 2. The full model explains 33% of total variance in current occupational attainment.

The total effects of antecedent variables are almost the same as the process of first job attainment. Most of antecedent variables, except number of siblings, birth order, and size of raised-community, have significant total effects. However, as to the indirect effects of these antecedent variables via respondent's educational status, there exist fairly much difference from first job attainment. Only the total effect of mother's education has been diminished by the intermediary of educational attainment. All other antecedent variables that have significant total effects on the Model 1, have still significant effects on the Model 2. The effects of these variables are very similar to the direct effects on first job attainment. This means that the educational status has powerful effect to mediate between social antecedents and current occupational attainment, just same as the process of first job attainment.

Adding the status of first job into the Model 2, and comparing the direct effects of

the variables on Model 3, we can find that the first job status has the highest direct effect on current occupational attainment, as same as previous outcomes from the Japanese data. However, the total effects of social antecedents have not been diminished through the intermediary of status of first job. This evidence indicates that the effect of status of first job mediating between social antecedents and current occupational attainment is remarkably less than that of educational attainment.

Income Attainment

The model of income attainment is made up of the social antecedents and educational attainment, first job attainment, and current occupational attainment. The three models from Model 1 to Model 3 are the same as those of current occupational attainment. Model 4 is composed by adding the current occupational status into Model 3. The coefficient of determination of the Model 4 for income attainment is so low as that of U.S., and it explains only 15% of the total variance of income attainment.

However, from the Model 1, we can find that respondent's age and most of the variables concerning with family background have significant total effects on income attainment. Especially, father's occupational status, economic condition of raised-family, father's education, and mother's education have affected respondent's income attainment. And the number of siblings and birth order have significant, but moderately high effects. By adding the intervening variables in sequences from educational status, the status of first job, and at last current occupational status, those effects have been decreased by the mediating effects of these intervening variables. Nevertheless, even on the full model, those antecedent variables have still significant direct effects to income attainment.

Comparing the direct effects on the full model, the current occupational status has the highest direct effect, and the total effect of first job has been diminished by the intermediary of current occupational status. Respondent's educational status and status of first job have not effects mediating between social antecedents and income attainment. Only the total effect of mother's education has been diminished by the intermediary of respondent's educational attainment.

Property Attainment

Models of property attainment is the same as those of income attainment. The coefficient of determination of the model is as low as income attainment, and it explains 12% of total variance. The variables of social antecedents that have significant total effects on the Model 1 are much the same as those on income attainment. The variables of father's occupational status, economic conditions of raised-family, father's education, mother's education, and father's managerial status have significant and positive effects. Furthermore, number of siblings has positive effect, and birth order has negative effect.

By adding the intervening variables into the model in sequence, from educational attainment, the status of first job, and current occupational status, the total effects of these variables have been decreased slightly. The indirect effects of these variables via educational status is higher than those via status of first job and current occupational status.

However, most of antecedent variables that have significant total effects on Model 1, have still significant direct effects on the full model. Current occupational status has the highest direct effect, and age and educational status have almost the same degree of direct effects. The total effect of first job has been diminished through the intermediary of current occupational status.

From the results of analyses of the three status attainments processes, we can find that both of income attainment and property attainment have a common structure with the socioeconomic life cycle of occupational attainment, and also, that both of them may be treated as the contingent processes of socioeconomic life cycle of occupational attainment.

### Life Style Attainment

On the life style attainment, just same as the educational attainment, all of antecedent variables have significant total effects. The determination of coefficient is slightly higher than that of educational attainment, and it explains 29% of total variance on the Model 4. This suggests that the status attainment process of life style is similar to the educational attainment. The directions of effects of these variables are the same as those on educational attainment. Two variables among social antecedents, respondent's age and number of siblings have negative effects, and other variables have positive total effects.

However, there exist remarkably difference between them. On the life style attainment, respondent's educational attainment has fairly high, but negative total effect (−.207). And by adding the status of first job and current occupational status into the models in sequence, the effect of educational status on life style attainment has become bigger (−.322 on Model 3, and −.373 on Model 4). And also, the effect of respondent's age has become bigger through the intermediary of educational status, status of first job, and current occupational status than the total effect of Model 1 (−.178 on Model 1, −.228 on Model 2, −.255 on Model 3, and −.288 on Model 4). These are not the case with former three attainment processes.

And also, the effects of social antecedents have not been diminished at all by adding the intervening variables into the models. These results suggest that both of educational status and occupational status (including the status of first job) have no effect mediating between social antecedents and current life style attainment. Therefore, it can be said that the process of life style attainment is not emerged on the socioeconomic life cycle, because of negative effects of educational attainment and respondent's age. The achievement of leisure activities is left for the younger generations and the less educated men. We may call this type of status attainment as a cultural life cycle.

### Influence Attainment

The coefficient of determination of influence attainment is very low, and it explains only 7% of the total variance on the full model. There are six variables of social antecedents that have significant total effects on it. These are age, number of siblings, birth order, father's size of organization, economic condition of raised-family, and size of raised-

community. Especially, size of raised-community and age have moderately high total effects. The effect of age is positive, but that of size of raised-community is negative. Other variables such as father's occupational status and father's education have no significant effects.

Those effects of social antecedents have not been diminished through the intermediaries of educational status, status of first job, and current occupational status. On the full model, educational status and current occupational status have significant direct effects, but they are still less than direct effects of social antecedents such as size of raised-community and age. Furthermore, both of educational status and occupational status have no effect mediating between social antecedents and influence attainment. Therefore, the effects of social antecedents are direct. Thus, the status attainment of influence, just same as life style attainment, is not revealed on the socioeconomic life cycle.

There are some common characters between life style attainment and influence attainment. Both of status attainment are left for the less educated men. However, the directions of effects of age and size of raised-community on influence attainment are the reverse of those on life style attainment. While there are more opportunities of life style attainment for the younger generations and urban-raised men, the oppotunities of influence attainment are more better for the elderly and rural-raised men. On these points, the influence attainment is distinguished clearly from the life style attainment.

Power Attainment

Power attainment is quite alike to influence attainment. The variables of social antecedents that have significant total effects on power attainment are much the same as those on influence attainment. Age and economic condition of raised-family have moderately high positive effects. And size of raised-community and father's managerial status have small, but negative effects. However, different from the influence attainment, father's occupational status has positive and moderately high effects.

On the full model, respondent's educational status and current occupational status have fairly high direct effects, and both of them are higher than those of age and economic condition of raised-family. Therefore, it can be said that power attainment is more socioeconomic and more universalistic than the process of influence attainment. Nevertheless, in addition to the negative direct effect of educational status, there is nothing about the effects of educational status and occupational status at all mediating those effects of social antecedents to power attainment. As the result, it can be said that there is a common process of status attainment with respect to influence attainment and power attainment. Both of them are not revealed on the socioeconomic life cycle, and also, they are left for the less educated men and elderly generations, but the men who have achieved prestigeous occupational status. Therefore, we may call these two processes of status attainments as political life cycle.

## 5. Conclusion and Discussion

The present paper has attemped to extend the Blau and Duncan's basic model of occupational attainment for the wider dimensions of status attainment processes in Japan.

The findings of these analyses convince us that Japanese stratification system is multi-dimensional, and Japanese status attainment can not be confined to the socioeconomic life cycle of occupational attainment. On the contrary, these findings convince us as follows:

(1) The basic process of Japanese occupational attainment is the same as that of the U.S. And there is not fundamental difference between them. Educational attainment is the most important determinant of first job attainment, and the first job has most powerful contingent effect to successive occupational attainment.

(2) The socioeconomic life cycle model of occupational attainment is the fundamental core of Japanese stratification system, and there is no doubt on the conventional assumption of social mobility research, that is, the assumption of the preponderance of occupational status in industrialized societies. And both of income attainment and property attainment can be seen as the contingent processes of socioeconomic life cycle of occupational attainment.

(3) However, there exist other types of life cycle of status attainment outside of socioeconomic realm. The status attainment of life style, influence, and power are not revealed on socioeconomic life cycle. These status attainments are achievable without achieved higher education. These status attainment processes have such a common character as the more ascriptive and more particularistic than socioeconomic status attainments such as education, occupation, income and property. We may call these types of status attainment processes as the politicocultural life cycle of status attainment.

(4) On both types of status attainments, the social antecedent variables have fairly high contingent effects to current status attainments. The age also has powerful effect to both types of status attainments.

(5) The educational status has the most powerful effect mediating between social antecedents and current status attainments. However, the mediating effect is limited to the socioeconomic life cycle of status attainments, and it has not any effect for the politicocultural life cycle of status attainment. On the contrary, occupational status, both of status of first job and current occupation, have direct effects to all of current status attainments, but the mediating effects of them are limited to the successive occupational attainment. As the result, the effect of first job has been diminished through the intermediary of current occupational attainment.

These results will be useful to explain the reason why there are huge status inconsistencies in present Japan, and also, why those status inconsistencies have never been related with status anxieties of Japanese people. It is for the reason that there exist the structural compatibility of the socioeconomic life cycle of status attainment and politicocultural life cycle of status attainment. Furthermore, there will be reason to expect that such an alternative life cycle as politicocultural life cycle is not peculiar to only Japanese society, and that in every industrial society, there should be some kind of alternative life cycle of status attainment, because although every industrial society is characterized by the socioeconomic life cycle of status attainment based on meritocratic principle, no society

exist in the pure form.[11]

## References

The books and articles with asterisk (*) are written in Japanese.

Alwin, Durane F., and Robert M. Hauser
1975 "The decomposition of effect in path analysis," American Sociological Review, vol. 40 (February): 37–47.

Anderson, T.W.
1958 An Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis. New York: John Wiley.

Blau, Peter M., and Otis Dudley Duncan
1967 The American Occupational Structure. New York: John Wiley.

Cummings, William K., and Atsushi Naoi
1974 "Social background, education, and personal advancement in a dualistic employment system," The Developing Economies, vol. 12, no. 3 (Spring): 245–273.

———
1975 Organizational size and socioeconomic achievement: The case of Japan. Unpublished manuscript.

Duncan, Otis Dudley
1961 "A socioeconomic index for all occupations," in Albert J. Reiss, Jr. ed., Occupations and Socali Status. New York: Free Press.

———
1967 "Discrimination against Negroes," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, vol. 371 (May): 85–103.

Duncan, Otis Dudley, David L. Featherman, and Beverly Duncan
1972 Socioeconomic Background and Achievement. New York: Seminar.

Featherman, David L., and Robert M. Hauser
1976 "Prestige or socioeconomic scales in the study of occupational achievement," Sociological Methods and Research, vol. 4. no. 4 (May): 403–422.

———
1978 Opportunity and Change. New York: Academic Press.

Featherman, David L., F.L. Jones & R.M. Hanser
1975 "Assumptions of Social Mobility Research in the U.S. : The case of occupational status", Social Science Research, vol. 4, no. 4 : 329–360.

Griffin Larry J. and Arne K. Kalleberg.
1981 "Stratification and meritocracy in the United States: class and occupational recruitment patterns," British Journal of Sociology, vol. 32, no. 1: 1–38.

Horan, Patrick M.
1978 "Is status attainment research atheoretical?," American Sociological Review, vol. 43 (August): 534–541.

Imada, Takatoshi and Junsuke Hara
1977 * "Gendai Nihon no Kaiso Kozo: Chii no itsukansei to hiitsukansei" (Social stratification in contemporary Japan: Structure of status consistency and inconsistency), Gendai Shakaigaku (Review of Contemporary Sociology), vol. 4, no. 2: 59–114. The revised paper is included in Tominaga, (1979: chap. 5)

Maeda, Yutaka
1969 * Shakai ido no keiro bunseki: 1960 Tokyo SSM data ni yoru keiro bunseki (Path analysis of social mobility: path analysis based on 1960 SSM data). Unpublished master dissertation, University of Tokyo.

11) Griffin and Kalleberg have examined the thesis that the status attainment processes in the U.S. is governed by 'meritocratic' criteria as educational qualifications, technical training, ability and skill obtained through work experience. They found that the recruitment of individuals into occupational positions is largely affected by 'meritocratic' criteria, but on the contrary, the recruitment of individuals into class position is only modestly affected by it (Griffin and Kalleberg 1981).

Morrison, Donald F.
1967 Multivariate Statistical Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Naoi, Atsushi
1979 * "Shokugyo-teki chii shakudo no kosei" (Construction of occupational status scales), in Tominaga (1979: chap. 14).

---

1980 * "Nihon hyojun shokugyo-teki chii shakudo no kosei to riyo" (Construction and use of Japanese standard occupational status scales), Nihon Rodo Kyokai Zatsushi (The Monthly Journal of the Japan Institute of Labour), no. 254 (May): 14–23.

Naoi, Atsushi and Tatsuzo Suzuki
1977 * "Shokugyo no shakai-teki hyoka no bunseki" (An analysis of the social evaluation of occupations), Gendai Shakaigaku (Review of Contemporary Sociology), vol. 4, no. 2: 115–156.

Naoi, Atsushi and Hidenori Fujita
1978 * "Kyoiku tatsusei katei to sono chii keisei kouka" (The process of educational attainment and its effect on status attainment), Kyoiku Shakaigaku Kenkyu (Journal of educational Sociology), no. 33: 91–105.

Nishihira, Sigeki
1964 * Shokugyo no shakai-teki hyouka: Shokugyo Rankingu (The social evaluation of occupations: occupational rankings). Tokei-suri Kenkyuzyo kenkyu ripout (Institute of Mathematical Statistics research report), no. 12 (November): 21–40.

Schooler, Carmi
1972 "Social antecedents of adult psychological functioning," American Journal of Sociology, vol. 78, no. 3. (September): 299–322.

Sewell, William H., Robert M. Hauser, and Wendy C. Wolf
1980 "Sex, schooling, and occupational status," American Journal of Sociology, vol. 86, no. 3. (September): 551–583.

Tominaga, Ken'ichi
1969 "Trend analysis of social stratification and social mobility in contemporary Japan," The Developing Economies, vol. 7, no. 4 (December): 471–498.

Tominaga, Ken'ichi and Atsushi Naoi
1974–5* "Shakai-ido no hikaku bunseki: Tokyo to Chicago (A comparative analysis of social mobility: Tokyo and Chicago), Gendai Shakaigaku (Review of Contemporary Sociology), vol. 1, no. 2: 104–138, vol. 2, no. 1: 143–186.

Tominaga, Ken'ichi (in collaboration with Naoi, Atsushi)
1978 "A comparative analysis of social mobility: Tokyo and Chicago," in Wlodzimierz Wesolowski, Kazimierz Slomczynski, and Bogdan Mach, eds., Social Mobility in Comparative Perspective, Warsaw: The Polish Academy of Sciences Press: 201–231.

Tominaga, Ken'ichi, ed.
1979 * Niphon no Kaiso Kozo (Social Stratification in Japan). Tokyo: Univ. of Tokyo Press.

Yasuda, Saburo
1971 * Shakai Ido no Kenkyu (Study of Social Mobility). Tokyo: Univ. of Tokyo Press.

Table 2 Correlations among Variables in the Models of Status Attainment, with Means and Standard Deviations

| | A | S | B | M | X | G | O | V | E | R | U | W | Y | I | P | L | Q | Z |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | .... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S | .197 | .... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | .004 | .619 | .... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| M | −.269 | −.197 | −.159 | .... | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| X | .007 | −.081 | −.032 | .334 | .... | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| G | .009 | .017 | .052 | .145 | .394 | .... | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| O | −.106 | −.144 | −.101 | .303 | .314 | .015 | .... | | | | | | | | | | | |
| V | −.222 | −.162 | −.120 | .648 | .382 | .153 | .325 | .... | | | | | | | | | | |
| E | −.014 | −.061 | .014 | .220 | .223 | .168 | .151 | .203 | .... | | | | | | | | | |
| R | −.172 | −.154 | −.041 | .193 | .203 | −.091 | .219 | .325 | .056 | .... | | | | | | | | |
| U | −.363 | −.177 | −.026 | .468 | .366 | .168 | .320 | .490 | .270 | .278 | .... | | | | | | | |
| W | −.049 | −.049 | −.009 | .238 | .309 | .155 | .164 | .261 | .168 | .102 | .459 | .... | | | | | | |
| Y | .037 | −.015 | −.006 | .211 | .303 | .090 | .189 | .246 | .170 | .112 | .392 | .514 | .... | | | | | |
| I | .041 | .004 | −.050 | .156 | .187 | .059 | .088 | .181 | .153 | .074 | .226 | .223 | .346 | .... | | | | |
| P | .100 | −.016 | −.037 | .199 | .198 | .137 | .101 | .218 | .228 | .055 | .279 | .235 | .366 | .489 | .... | | | |
| L | −.255 | −.139 | −.028 | .287 | .222 | .103 | .184 | .294 | .192 | .208 | .144 | .263 | .292 | .257 | .305 | .... | | |
| Q | .149 | .022 | −.055 | .042 | −.006 | .050 | −.086 | −.006 | .093 | −.157 | −.084 | .002 | .054 | .134 | .269 | .141 | .... | |
| Z | .164 | .031 | −.023 | .060 | .132 | .087 | .006 | .044 | .142 | −.056 | −.025 | .119 | .229 | .239 | .367 | .285 | .534 | .... |
| Mean | 41.11 | 4.57 | 2.64 | 7.10 | 43.35 | 2.93 | 2.64 | 7.77 | 2.73 | 3.43 | 10.72 | 42.13 | 44.77 | 290.2 | 9.83 | 3.43 | 2.22 | 1.63 |
| S.D. | 10.77 | 2.06 | 1.74 | 2.50 | 9.61 | 0.60 | 2.39 | 3.04 | 0.77 | 2.39 | 2.90 | 8.24 | 10.48 | 17.24 | 3.18 | 1.97 | 1.33 | 1.16 |

NOTE.—Variables are; A=Respondent's age, S=Respondent's number of siblings, B=Respondent's birth order, M=Mother's education, X=Father's occupational status, G=Father's managerial status, O=Father's size of organization, V=Father's education, E=Economic condition of raised-family, R=Size of raised-community, U=Respondent's education, W=Respondent's first job, Y=Respondent's current occupational status, I=Respondent's current income, P=Respondent's current property, L=Respondent's current life style, Q=Respondent's current influence, Z=Respondent's current power.

Table 3 Canonical Correlation of Status Set of Variables and Life Cycle Set of Variables

| Sets of Variables | Canonical Variate | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Canvar 1 | Canvar 2 | Canvar 3 | Canvar 4 | Canvar 5 | Canvar 6 |
| Set 1: Status Variables | | | | | | |
| Y | .799 | −.216 | .293 | .558 | .345 | .197 |
| I | .093 | −.092 | .003 | −.074 | −.070 | −1.000 |
| P | .234 | −.324 | −.143 | −.985 | −.200 | .504 |
| L | .164 | 1.000 | −.228 | −.131 | .097 | .018 |
| Q | −.128 | −.170 | −.548 | .029 | 1.000 | −.068 |
| Z | −.053 | −.127 | −.464 | .595 | −.962 | .076 |
| Set 2: Life Cycle Variables | | | | | | |
| A | .167 | −.813 | −.224 | −.085 | −.257 | .322 |
| S | .053 | −.264 | −.015 | .036 | −.101 | −.870 |
| B | −.010 | .220 | .160 | .063 | −.130 | .909 |
| M | .031 | .141 | −.455 | −.120 | .365 | .063 |
| X | .169 | .083 | −.097 | .413 | −.512 | −.510 |
| G | −.061 | .069 | −.173 | −.306 | −.147 | .554 |
| O | .067 | .170 | .197 | .072 | −.271 | .315 |
| V | .103 | .163 | −.185 | −.294 | .111 | −.155 |
| E | .104 | .095 | −.556 | −.264 | −.178 | −.060 |
| R | .060 | .306 | .242 | −.179 | −.574 | −.092 |
| U | .328 | −.870 | .708 | −.662 | .158 | −.034 |
| W | .620 | .242 | −.080 | .727 | .331 | .175 |
| Canonical Correlation | .600 | .512 | .276 | .216 | .130 | .094 |
| Eigen Value | .360 | .262 | .076 | .047 | .017 | .009 |

NOTE.—Variables are; A=Respondent's age, S=Respondent's number of siblings, B=Respondent's birth order, M=Mother's education, X=Father's occupational status, G=Father's managerial status, O=Father's size of organization, V=Father's education, E=Economic condition of raised-family, R=Size of raised-community, U=Respondent's education, W=Respondent's first job, Y=Respondent's current occupational status, I=Respondent's current income, P=Respondent's current property, L=Respondent's current life style, Q=Respondent's current influence, Z=Respondent's current power.

The canonical variates in the table were scaled to make the largest values equal to 1.000 in each set.

Table 4 Estimated Structural Coefficients in the Models of Status Attainment, with Standard Errors

| Status Variables | Casual Variables | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | A | S | B | M | X | G | O | V | E | R | U | W | Y | Constant |
| Education | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| U | −.065 | −.103 | .134 | .172 | .045 | .205 | .122 | .180 | .490 | .101 | | | | 6.34 |
| S.E. | (.004) | (.031) | (.036) | (.026) | (.006) | (.089) | (.022) | (.022) | (.065) | (.022) | | | | |
| First Job | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| W-1 | −.001 | −.036 | .132 | .236 | .175 | .471 | .113 | .289 | .785 | .013 | | | | 26.63 |
| S.E. | (.016) | (.106) | (.123) | (.090) | (.021) | (.308) | (.076) | (.076) | (.224) | (.076) | | | | |
| W-2 | .081 | .093 | −.037 | .020 | .118 | .212 | −.041 | .062 | .168 | −.114 | 1.259 | | | 18.64 |
| S.E. | (.016) | (.099) | (.115) | (.084) | (.020) | (.287) | (.071) | (.072) | (.211) | (.069) | (.071) | | | |
| Current Occupational Status | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Y-1 | .081 | .117 | .104 | .257 | .233 | −.618 | .287 | .381 | 1.142 | .076 | | | | 23.43 |
| S.E. | (.021) | (.135) | (.156) | (.114) | (.027) | (.391) | (.097) | (.096) | (.285) | (.090) | | | | |
| Y-2 | .171 | .258 | −.081 | .021 | .171 | −.900 | .119 | .134 | .470 | −.062 | 1.374 | | | 14.72 |
| S.E. | (.021) | (.128) | (.149) | (.110) | (.026) | (.372) | (.093) | (.093) | (.274) | (.089) | (.092) | | | |
| Y-3 | .131 | .212 | −.062 | .011 | .113 | −1.004 | .139 | .104 | .387 | −.007 | .757 | . 490 | | 5.60 |
| S.E. | (.019) | (.119) | (.138) | (.102) | (.024) | (.344) | (.086) | (.086) | (.254) | (.089) | (.085) | (.026) | | |
| Income | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I-1 | .103 | .717 | −.787 | .363 | .215 | −.696 | −.046 | .548 | 2.375 | .161 | | | | 263.74 |
| S.E. | (.036) | (.230) | (.266) | (.195) | (.046) | (.665) | (.165) | (.163) | (.484) | (.164) | | | | |
| I-2 | .180 | .839 | −.947 | .158 | .161 | −.941 | −.192 | .334 | 1.792 | .041 | 1.191 | | | 256.18 |
| S.E. | (.037) | (.227) | (.264) | (.194) | (.046) | (.658) | (.164) | (.164) | (.484) | (.163) | (.158) | | | |
| I-3 | .160 | .817 | −.938 | .153 | .133 | −.992 | −.182 | .319 | 1.751 | .069 | .886 | .243 | | 251.66 |
| S.E. | (.037) | (.226) | (.262) | (.193) | (.046) | (.654) | (.163) | (.164) | (.482) | (.162) | (.168) | (.049) | | |
| I-4 | .103 | .724 | −.911 | .148 | .084 | −.555 | .243 | .274 | 1.582 | .072 | .558 | .029 | .436 | 249.22 |
| S.E. | (.036) | (.220) | (.256) | (.188) | (.045) | (.638) | (.158) | (.159) | (.469) | (.158) | (.167) | (.051) | (.040) | |
| Property | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| P-1 | .045 | .037 | −.046 | .120 | .019 | .287 | .005 | .129 | .673 | .011 | | | | 2.52 |
| S.E. | (.006) | (.041) | (.048) | (.035) | (.008) | (.120) | (.030) | (.029) | (.087) | (.029) | | | | |
| P-2 | .064 | .067 | −.085 | .070 | .007 | .227 | −.031 | .077 | .531 | −.018 | .289 | | | 0.68 |
| S.E. | (.007) | (.040) | (.047) | (.035) | (.008) | (.117) | (.029) | (.029) | (.086) | (.029) | (.028) | | | |
| P-3 | .061 | .063 | −.083 | .070 | .003 | .220 | −.029 | .075 | .526 | −.014 | .247 | .331 | | 0.67 |
| S.E. | (.007) | (.040) | (.047) | (.035) | (.008) | (.117) | (.029) | (.029) | (.086) | (.029) | (.030) | (.086) | | |
| P-4 | .050 | .047 | −.078 | .069 | −.007 | .300 | −.040 | .067 | .495 | −.014 | .187 | −.006 | .079 | 0.37 |
| S.E. | (.006) | (.039) | (.045) | (.033) | (.008) | (.114) | (.028) | (.028) | (.084) | (.028) | (.030) | (.009) | (.004) | |

Table 4 (Continued)

| Status Variables | Casual Variables | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | A | S | B | M | X | G | O | V | E | R | U | W | Y | Constant |
| Life Style | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| L-1 | −.033 | −.065 | .053 | .069 | .018 | .105 | .033 | .057 | .285 | .077 | | | | 1.78 |
| S.E. | (.004) | (.025) | (.029) | (.021) | (.005) | (.072) | (.018) | (.018) | (.052) | (.018) | | | | |
| L-2 | −.042 | −.079 | .072 | .093 | .024 | .134 | .050 | .082 | .354 | .091 | −.141 | | | 2.67 |
| S.E. | (.004) | (.024) | (.027) | (.021) | (.005) | (.071) | (.018) | (.018) | (.052) | (.017) | (.017) | | | 2.67 |
| L-3 | −.047 | −.085 | .074 | .092 | .017 | .120 | .052 | .079 | .344 | .098 | −.218 | .062 | | 1.52 |
| S.E. | (.004) | (.024) | (.027) | (.020) | (.005) | (.068) | (.017) | (.017) | (.050) | (.017) | (.018) | (.005) | | |
| L-4 | −.053 | −.095 | .077 | .092 | .012 | .166 | .046 | .074 | .326 | .099 | −.253 | .039 | .046 | 1.26 |
| S.E. | (.004) | (.023) | (.027) | (.020) | (.005) | (.068) | (.017) | (.017) | (.049) | (.016) | (.017) | (.005) | (.004) | |
| Influence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Q-1 | .017 | .022 | −.058 | .053 | −.002 | .034 | −.049 | .006 | .165 | −.075 | | | | 1.07 |
| S.E. | (.003) | (.018) | (.020) | (.015) | (.004) | (.051) | (.013) | (.012) | (.037) | (.013) | | | | |
| Q-2 | .016 | .019 | −.054 | .059 | −.001 | .040 | −.045 | .011 | .179 | −.072 | −.030 | | | 1.26 |
| S.E. | (.003) | (.018) | (.020) | (.015) | (.004) | (.051) | (.013) | (.013) | (.038) | (.013) | (.012) | | | |
| Q-3 | .015 | .018 | −.054 | .059 | −.001 | .039 | −.045 | .011 | .179 | −.072 | −.034 | .003 | | 1.20 |
| S.E. | (.003) | (.018) | (.021) | (.015) | (.004) | (.051) | (.013) | (.013) | (.038) | (.013) | (.013) | (.004) | | |
| Q-4 | .014 | .016 | −.053 | .059 | −.003 | .049 | −.047 | .010 | .175 | −.072 | −.042 | −.002 | .010 | 1.15 |
| S.E. | (.003) | (.018) | (.021) | (.015) | (.004) | (.051) | (.013) | (.013) | (.038) | (.013) | (.013) | (.004) | (.003) | |
| Power | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Z-1 | .017 | .023 | −.029 | .028 | .012 | .026 | −.016 | .003 | .175 | −.027 | | | | −0.28 |
| S.E. | (.002) | (.015) | (.018) | (.013) | (.003) | (.045) | (.011) | (.011) | (.032) | (.011) | | | | |
| Z-2 | .016 | .020 | −.025 | .032 | .013 | .031 | −.013 | .007 | .187 | −.025 | −.025 | | | −0.12 |
| S.E. | (.003) | (.016) | (.018) | (.013) | (.003) | (.045) | (.011) | (.011) | (.033) | (.011) | (.011) | | | |
| Z-3 | .015 | .019 | −.025 | .031 | .011 | .028 | −.012 | .006 | .184 | −.023 | −.045 | .016 | | −0.42 |
| S.E. | (.003) | (.015) | (.018) | (.013) | (.003) | (.045) | (.011) | (.011) | (.033) | (.011) | (.011) | (.003) | | |
| Z-4 | .011 | .013 | −.023 | .031 | .009 | .053 | −.016 | .004 | .175 | −.023 | −.064 | .004 | .025 | −0.56 |
| S.E. | (.002) | (.015) | (.018) | (.013) | (.003) | (.044) | (.011) | (.011) | (.032) | (.011) | (.011) | (.001) | (.003) | |

NOTE.—Variables are; A=Respondent's age, S=Respondent's number of siblings, B=Respondent's birth order, M=Mother's education, X=Father's occupational status, G=Father's managerial status, O=Father's size of organization, V=Father's education, E=Economic condition of raised-family, R=Size of raised-community, U=Respondent's education, W=Respondent's first job, Y=Respondent's current occupational status, I=Respondent's current income, P=Respondent's current property, L=Respondent's current life style, Q=Respondent's current influence, Z=Respondent's current power.

Table 5 Standardized Regression Coefficients in the Models of Status Attainment, with the Indirect Effects

| Status Variables | Causal Variables | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | A | S | B | M | X | G | O | V | E | R | U | W | Y | R |
| Education | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| U | −.242* | −.073* | .081* | .148* | .149* | .043* | .101* | .189* | .130* | .083* | | | | .412 |
| First Job | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| W-1 | −.001 | −.009 | .028 | .072* | .204* | .034* | .033* | .106* | .073* | .003 | | | | .131 |
| W-2 | .106* | .023 | −.008 | .006 | .138* | .015 | −.012 | .023 | .016 | −.033* | .443* | | | .247 |
| (a) | (−.107) | (−.032) | (.036) | (.066) | (.066) | (.019) | (.045) | (.083) | (.057) | (.036) | | | | |
| Current Occupational Status | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Y-1 | .083* | .023 | .017 | .061* | .213* | −.035* | .065* | .111* | .084* | .017 | | | | .133 |
| Y-2 | .175* | .051* | −.013 | .005 | .157* | −.052* | .027* | .039* | .035* | −.014 | .380* | | | .217 |
| (a) | (−.092) | (−.028) | (.030) | (.056) | (.056) | (.017) | (.038) | (.072) | (.049) | (.031) | | | | |
| Y-3 | .134* | .042* | −.010 | .003 | .104* | −.058* | .032* | .030* | .028* | −.002 | .210* | .385* | | .329 |
| (b) | (.041) | (.009) | (.003) | (.002) | (.053) | (.006) | (−.005) | (.009) | (.007) | (−.012) | (.170) | | | |
| Income | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| I-1 | .064* | .086* | −.079* | .053* | .120* | −.024 | −.006 | .097* | .106* | .022 | | | | .071 |
| I-2 | .113* | .100* | −0.96* | .023 | .090* | −.033* | −.027 | .059* | .080* | .006 | .200* | | | .095 |
| (a) | (−.049) | (−.014) | (.017) | (.030) | (.030) | (.009) | (.021) | (.028) | (.026) | (.016) | | | | |
| I-3 | .100* | .098* | −.095* | .022 | .074* | −.035* | −.025 | .056* | .078* | .010 | .149* | .116* | | .105 |
| (b) | (.013) | (.002) | (−.001) | (.001) | (.016) | (.002) | (−.002) | (.003) | (.002) | (−.004) | (.051) | | | |
| I-4 | .065* | .087* | −.092* | .022 | .047* | −.019 | −.034* | .048* | .071* | .010 | .094* | .014 | .265* | .152 |
| (c) | (.035) | (.011) | (−.003) | (.000) | (.027) | (−.016) | (.009) | (.008) | (.007) | (.000) | (.055) | (.102) | | |
| Property | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| P-1 | .151 | .024 | −.025 | .094* | .059* | .054* | .003 | .124* | .163* | .008 | | | | .118 |
| P-2 | .215* | .043* | −.046* | .055* | .020 | .043* | −.023 | .074* | .129* | −.013 | .263* | | | .159 |
| (a) | (−.064) | (−.019) | (.021) | (.039) | (.039) | (.011) | (.026) | (.050) | (.034) | (.021) | | | | |
| P-3 | .206* | .041* | −.046* | .055* | .008 | .042* | −.022 | .072* | .127* | −.011 | .225* | .086* | | .165 |
| (b) | (.009) | (.002) | (.000) | (.000) | (.012) | (.001) | (−.001) | (.002) | (.002) | (−.002) | (.038) | | | |
| P-4 | .171* | .030* | −.043* | .054* | −.019 | .056* | −.030* | .064* | .120* | −.010 | .170* | −.014 | .260* | .210 |
| (c) | (.035) | (.011) | (−.003) | (.001) | (.027) | (−.014) | (.008) | (.008) | (.007) | (−.001) | (.055) | (.100) | | |

Table 5 (Continued)

| Status Variables | Causal Variables | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | A | S | B | M | X | G | O | V | E | R | U | W | Y | R |
| Life Style | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| L-1 | −.178* | −.068* | .047* | .088* | .087* | .032* | .040* | .088* | .111* | .094* | | | | .175 |
| L-2 | −.228* | −.083* | .063* | .118* | .118* | .041* | .060* | .127* | .138* | .111* | −.207 | | | .201 |
| (a) | (.050) | (.015) | (−.016) | (−.030) | (−.031) | (−.009) | (−.020) | (−.039) | (−.027) | (−.017) | | | | |
| L-3 | −.255* | −.089* | .065* | .119* | .083* | .037* | .064* | .121* | .134* | .119* | −.322* | .259* | | .251 |
| (c) | (.027) | (.006) | (−.002) | (−.001) | (.035) | (.004) | (−.004) | (.006) | (.004) | (−.008) | (.115) | | | |
| L-4 | −.288* | −.099* | .068* | .116* | .057* | .050* | .056* | .114* | .127* | .120* | −.373* | .165* | .243* | .290 |
| (c) | (.033) | (.010) | (.003) | (.003) | (.026) | (−.013) | (.008) | (.007) | (.007) | (−.001) | (.051) | (.084) | | |
| Q-1 | .142* | .034 | −.076* | .101* | −.018 | .015 | −.088* | .014 | .095* | −.136* | | | | .069 |
| Q-2 | .126* | .029 | −.071* | .111* | −.008 | .018 | −.082* | .027 | .104* | −.130* | −.066* | | | .071 |
| (a) | (.016) | (.005) | (−.005) | (.010) | (−.010) | (−.003) | (−.006) | (−.013) | (−.009) | (−.006) | | | | |
| Q-3 | .124* | .029 | −.070* | .111* | −.011 | .018 | −.082* | .026 | .104* | −.130* | −.074* | .020 | | .072 |
| (b) | (.002) | (.000) | (−.001) | (.000) | (.003) | (.000) | (.000) | (.001) | (.000) | (.000) | (.008) | | | |
| Q-4 | .113* | .025 | −.070* | .111* | −.019 | .022 | −.084* | .024 | .101* | −.129* | −.091* | −.011 | .079* | .076 |
| (c) | (.011) | (.004) | (.000) | (.000) | (.008) | (.004) | (.002) | (.002) | (.003) | (−.001) | (.017) | (.031) | | |
| Power | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Z-1 | .162* | .040* | −.043* | .059* | .100* | .014 | −.033 | .008 | .116* | −.056* | | | | .067 |
| Z-2 | .147* | .036* | −.038* | .068* | .109* | .016 | −.027 | .019 | .124* | −.051* | −.061* | | | .069 |
| (a) | (.015) | (.004) | (−.005) | (−.009) | (−.009) | (−.002) | (−.006) | (−.011) | (−.008) | (−.004) | | | | |
| Z-3 | .134* | .033 | −.037* | .068* | .094* | .014 | −.025 | .017 | .122* | −.047* | −.113* | .115* | | .079 |
| (b) | (.013) | (.003) | (−.001) | (.000) | (.015) | (.002) | (−.002) | (.002) | (.002) | (−.004) | (.052) | | | |
| Z-4 | .104* | .024 | −.035* | .067* | .070* | .027 | −.032* | .010 | .116* | −.047* | −.160* | .029 | .224* | .112 |
| (c) | (.030) | (.009) | (−.002) | (.001) | (.024) | (−.013) | (.007) | (.007) | (.006) | (.000) | (.047) | (.086) | | |

NOTE.—Variables are; A=Respondent's age, S=Respondent's number of siblings, B=Respondent's birth order, M=Mother's education, X=Father's occupational status, G=Father's managerial status, O=Father's size of organization, V=Father's education, E=Economic condition of raised-family, R=Size of raised-community, U=Respondent's education, W=Respondent's first job, Y=Respondent's current occupational status, I=Respondent's current income, P=Respondent's current property, L=Respondent's current life style, Q=Respondent's current influence, Z=Respondent's current power.

(a) (b) (c); (a) is indirect effect of causal variable via education, (b) is indirect effect via first job, and (c) is indirect effect via current occupational status.

(*): Significant at 0.5 level.