

## **CHAPTER 2      Literature Review**

### **2.1      Introduction**

This chapter provides a review of studies of mobility patterns in the labour market and of factors affecting such patterns. Section 2.2 discusses the meaning of mobility and Section 2.3 the issues surrounding the measurement of mobility. Section 2.4 provides a discussion of the factors affecting mobility, while Section 2.5 provides a summary of the various factors affecting mobility and the likely effect, that is, whether each factor hinders or encourages mobility.

### **2.2      Meaning of mobility**

#### **2.2.1    Definition of mobility**

The definition of income mobility – the change in income – is clear cut but occupational mobility is subjective and more difficult to measure (Palmer, 1954, quoted in Loveridge and Mok, 1979; and OECD, 1986). The discussion in this section is thus confined to occupational mobility in the labour market.

Occupational mobility is defined as a scenario where an individual changes jobs, either when he leaves the current employer for another or changes occupations or both (Ornstein, 1976). Li (1977) restricted occupational mobility to movement in occupational structure.

There are other circumstances where the definition of mobility is similar to the above but a different name is used. OECD (1986) defines job mobility as in the case of Orstein (1976), but, in addition, there must be a change in employer, as a job is defined as uninterrupted employment with a particular employer. On the other hand, Abbas (1975) defines labour mobility as a change in the occupation 'bundle' of an individual.

### 2.2.2 Types of mobility

Mobility can be grouped into three categories in term of their direction of movement along a scale over time, i.e. the upward, downward and horizontal mobility. Mobility thus may not necessarily mean upward mobility. Displaced workers may suffer downward mobility or horizontal mobility to avoid the destiny of structural unemployment (OECD, 1986).

Different types of occupational mobility may be operationalised in a specific concept according to the context studied. Jayaweera and Sanmugam (1993) categorised upward occupational mobility as movement from mid-level to managerial and executive level, and movement from semi-skilled and unskilled production workers to skilled production workers. Khandker (1992) defined upward movement as movement from unprotected wage work to protected wage work or self-employment, or from self-employed to protected wage sector. Paul-Majumdar and Chaudhuri-Zohir (1993) categorised mobility involving inter-industry and intra-dustry movement as horizontal mobility while mobility from unskilled labour to high-wage labour and from temporary job status to permanent job status is termed as vertical mobility.

Mobility can also be categorised as intergenerational or intragenerational. The mobility measuring the movement between parents and the offspring is termed intergenerational mobility (e.g. Blau and Duncan, 1967; Montagna, 1977; Li, 1977, Carmicheal, 2000). Intrageneration mobility measures movement between the first job and the current job of an individual (e.g., Blau and Duncan, 1967; Li, 1977).

Occupational mobility among young individuals, who are going through the transitional period from school to the working world, is divided into two categories: career mobility and trial-and-error mobility (OECD, 1986).

Career mobility emanates from the will power of an individual to search for a job that suits his education and/or vocational training qualification. The transitional period from school to work is an adjustment period between professional aspiration based on education attainment and labour market conditions. This is a period when an individual is waiting for recognition of his educational achievement.

Trial-and-error mobility is a situation where the education attainment cannot secure a stable position in the labour market (may be due to the labour market condition being less appropriate). In this condition, the transitional period will mainly be mobility between unstable jobs, which usually create job dissatisfaction.

In this study, the focus is intragenerational mobility. Intergenerational mobility could not be studied as not all respondents were able to give a clear description of their parents' occupations during the first stage (Chew et al., 1995). Intragenerational mobility is divided into three categories based on its direction of movement along a scale, i.e. upward mobility, downward mobility and horizontal mobility.

### **2.3 What does mobility measure?**

An individual's occupation is a measure of an individual's economic and prestige status (Blau and Duncan, 1967). Occupational position is neither identical to economic class nor prestige status. Nevertheless, occupational position are closely related to economic class and prestige status, particularly the economic class. Economic class indicates economic resources and interests with occupation being the main determinant. Although occupation cannot fully represent all the attributes in a class, it is one of the best single indicators. Conceptually, a closer relationship can be observed between occupation and economic class than between occupation and prestige status. Nevertheless, the relationship of the latter remains clear because a number of

occupations cannot fit into the lifestyle of a certain prestige group and do not have the honour of a higher prestige status. Furthermore, considerable economic resources are needed to lead the 'proper' lifestyle of the higher socioeconomic strata.

Tumin (1967), as quoted in Montagna (1977), defined social mobility as the movement of individuals, families, groups, stratas or entire societies from one position to another in a social system. In most cases, occupational mobility is used to measure social mobility. OECD (1986) found that occupational mobility is normally linked to mobility in social status. This view is supported by the Davis-Moore theory of stratification because it emphasises that the contribution of an individual is measured by the value of the service performed from the point of view of a society (Lasswell, 1965, quoted in Montagna, 1977). Marxists relate occupation closely to social mobility because occupation is where the productivity of the society rests.

Although occupational mobility can be justified as a measure of social mobility, Lasswell (1965), Tumin (1967) and Peterson (1974) found that occupational mobility is not the only measure of social mobility. Other measures such as education and income have been used in several studies. Lasswell (1965) and Peterson (1974) found that total family income is more accurate in measuring social mobility. Occupation alone may not be able to account for the power, wealth and prestige an individual possesses, and an income generating marital partner or children also play an important part in determining social status. This implies that income mobility is also a measure of social mobility.

## **2.4 Factors affecting career advancement through mobility**

### **2.4.1 Demographic characteristics**

The demographic factors, which are relevant to this study, are gender, ethnicity, age, marital status and location in which an individual lives and grew up.

#### **2.4.1.1 Gender**

The mobility experienced by males and females is different from one another. This is supported in OECD (circa – 1965) and Gasson (1974). Females enjoy less upward mobility, regardless whether it is on occupational rank or income. They move upward in a smaller magnitude than their male counterparts. This is supported by Harris (1966) as quoted in Loveridge and Mok (1979), Loveridge and Mok (1979), Paul-Majumdar and Chaudhuri-Zohir (1993) and Tey (1994). Keith and McWilliams (1999) found that the less upward income mobility experienced by females may be due to females are more likely to resign for family related reasons, which have negative effect on subsequent career advancement.

There is also an interaction effect between marital status and gender. Married females enjoy less upward mobility, compared to their single female and male counterparts. The discontinuous employment due to childbirth and management of household discourages females from gaining working experience, which constraint upward movement. This is supported by the studies of Paul-Majumdar and Chaudhuri-Zohir (1993) and Jacobs (1999).

Khandker (1992) found that there is an interaction effect between human capital investment and gender. Males enjoy higher pay-off in term of upward income mobility, compared to females.

On the other hand, contrary to other findings, OECD (1986) found that the difference of occupational mobility for males and females is small.

#### **2.4.1.2 Ethnicity**

The discussion of the effect of ethnicity on mobility in Malaysia is based on Chattopadhyay (1998). Chinese men enjoy more upward occupational mobility. The economic restructuring in the 1970s resulted in lower job quality. Chinese and Indian men experienced less downward occupational mobility after 1970, compared to Bumiputera.

#### **2.4.1.3 Age**

Upward movement of occupational mobility reduces as an individual becomes older. This is supported by the studies of Gasson (1974), Loveridge and Mok (1979) and OECD (1986).

Rose (1999) found that a young individual is more likely to enjoy upward income mobility as he usually starts his career with entry-level positions and moves upward over time.

The upward income mobility enjoyed by a young individual is more, compared to an older individual. As an individual ages, the benefit of mobility declines while the cost of mobility increases. An older individual may find it harder to adapt to new environment and the job security in the current employment reduces his initiative to move. Besides, the skills acquired by the individual are most likely to be specific and not transferable. So, a change of job may involve retraining. The firm will try to keep him by offering competitive packages. In addition, there is more financial commitment and higher psychological cost, such as housing requirement and pension arrangements.

This discourages mobility. This is found by the studies of Gasson (1974) and Loveridge and Mok (1979).

Leigh (1978) found that less upward occupational mobility is observed for the older individual as less human capital investment, which is important for upward mobility, is accumulated. The return from the investment drops as age increases.

#### **2.4.1.4 Marital status**

Gasson (1974) found that mobility is affected by marital status. A married individual has more responsibility and has different expectation in a job, compared to an individual who is single. However, Blau and Duncan (1967) found that the characteristics of a wife for a husband's occupational success are not so important.

#### **2.4.1.5 Location in which an individual grew up**

The effect of the place in which an individual grew up is discussed in detail in Blau and Duncan (1967). They found that the larger the place in which an individual grew up, the greater the chance for occupational success as the community in which an individual grew up affects his career in adulthood through the effect of the occupational structure in the community. In turn, the occupational structure depends on the degree of urbanisation of the community.

The socioeconomic structure of the community is a determinant for an individual's behaviour in life. He is more exposed to the various career options available around the area in which he grew up and at the same time more interested in jobs for which the role models exist before in his life experience.

The labour market in urban area is more diversified. This probably provides young individuals who grew up there with more exposure and knowledge about the

possible career choices and employment conditions. This helps them to be in a better position in their career later on. Having been brought up in an urban area gives an individual occupational advantages. More urbanised environments prepare young people better for higher status occupations.

The larger the community in which an individual grew up, the greater the educational achievement he tends to obtain. Besides, he also has wider educational choices. In turn, this may affect the mobility an individual experiences.

#### **2.4.1.6 Location in which an individual lives**

The better occupational opportunities in urban area have a positive effect on upward mobility. Individuals from urban area experience significant improvements in socioeconomic position. This is supported by the studies of Blau and Duncan (1967), Abbas (1975) and Chattopadhyay (1998).

#### **2.4.2 Family background**

Mobility is influenced by family background. However, most of the influences of family background work through education attainment. This is found by Blau and Duncan (1967) and Gasson (1974). Blau and Duncan (1967) found that most of the influence of family structure is mediated by education. The occupational success of an individual depends on his human capital investment and his human capital investment depends on his family. However, there is no interaction effect between an individual's family background and success in his career. A short summary regarding the effect of family background from the Blau and Duncan (1967) is presented below.

The socioeconomic status of father's occupation and his education level affect occupational mobility. The level of education for an individual depends positively on



his father's socioeconomic status and education level. In turn, his education affects the mobility he achieved. This may be due to the lower propensity of poorer parents to invest in their offspring's human capital, as suggested in the model in Becker and Tomes (1986, quoted in Carmicheal, 2000). However, level of education and father's status and education does not interact in determining occupational mobility. This is supported by the studies of Orstaein (1976) and Li (1977).

The effect of family size is mainly due to the difference in human capital investment. An individual from a large family has less opportunity to further his education in general. This may be due to the financial constraint imposed by the large family to be supported. Hence, this impedes his occupational achievement since his education level is lower. This is also supported by Orstein (1976).

The effect of sibling position on mobility is mediated through human capital investment. Older brothers are often asked to sacrifice their own occupation prospects and given responsibility for younger siblings. This is done by joining the work force earlier. This limits the human capital investment accumulated by the older brothers. The assistance of the older brother given to the younger brother introduces a certain asymmetry into the influence of number of siblings on education. Having younger siblings is more disadvantageous than having older siblings, as the eldest generally have to help out to support the younger in a family. The effect of large families on older brothers is greater than on the younger. So, being the eldest in a family affects an individual's career advancement.

The education climate in a family, how conducive the climate is to learning and achievement, is important. Blau and Duncan (1967) argued that the family climate affects the educational attainment of the younger sons even when background factors that affect education are controlled. The education advantage that is enjoyed by the

sons of small families is greater if the families have a conducive environment for education. Positive orientation to education in the family affects educational attainment and occupational achievement. Without such orientation, the objective advantages of small families are negligible.

Being brought up in a broken family impedes subsequent status achievement. However, the entire amount of this handicap can be virtually attributed to the educational disadvantage of such up bringing.

Kelley (1973), as quoted in Montagna (1977), found that family background has only a marginal effect on an individual's future occupation status after the important first job is obtained. The effect of family background operates through the factors of education and occupation.

### **2.4.3 Human capital investment**

Human capital investment can take the form of education, training and experience (e.g. Paul-Majumdar and Chaudhuri-Zohir, 1993, Leigh, 1978). In a study of female workers in Bangladesh in the manufacturing industry, Paul-Majumdar and Chaudhuri-Zohir (1993) found that human capital investment is one of the more important factors affecting mobility.

The discussion of the effect of various types of human capital can be divided into two categories: (a) formal education and vocational training and (b) training provided by employers and job tenure.

#### **2.4.3.1 Formal education and vocational training**

In general, education and training enhance mobility (Gasson, 1974). Education is found to be the single most important factor affecting the occupational status achieved in the

process of occupational mobility. Education helps an individual to move upward. This is supported by the studies of Blau and Duncan (1967), Orstein (1976), Li (1977), Khandker (1992) and Chattopadhyay (1998). Education is also important to help an individual to gain upward income mobility. This is supported by the studies of OECD (circa – 1965) and Parent (1999).

Formal education and training increase an individual's learning capacity to acquire on-the-job training and his adaptability to new environments. They encourage the individual to accept jobs, which offer such training, and to start to accumulate marketable skills after he enters the work force. In turn, this helps in subsequent upward movement in the occupational rank. On the other hand, a low level of education implies a low level of learning capacity. This impedes the incentives to invest in jobs offering on-the-job training as the additional cost offset the value of the skills learned. This may in turn become an obstacle to move upward. This is supported by the studies of Abbas (1975), Leigh (1978) as well as Rosen (1972) and Welch (1973) as quoted in Leigh (1978).

Education functions as pre-requisite qualification to move upward to certain position in the occupational structure. It is one of the constraints imposed upon upward movement. The barrier of qualification is becoming greater due to the growth in demand for individuals with specific education and training. In addition, education is often required by institutions if an individual were to obtain additional skills and qualifications. So, low level of education denies an individual upward mobility and opportunity to accumulate more human capital investment. This is supported by the studies of Abbas (1975) and Tomkins and Twomey (2000).

OECD (circa – 1965) found that quality and type of human capital investment is also an important aspect influencing mobility. Low quality of human capital

investment impedes mobility. On the other hand, upward occupational mobility of workers in labour intensive and low status occupations may have little to do with amount of education given that these workers would exhibit low variation in educational level. This is found in a study of female workers in manufacturing industry in Sri Lanka by Jayaweera and Sanmugam (1993)

#### **2.4.3.2 Training provided by employers and job tenure**

Training provided by employer affects mobility. It upgrades and diversifies an individual's skill. This encourages upward mobility in an occupational structure. This is supported by the studies of Abbas (1975) and Jayaweera and Sanmugam (1993).

Besides, this type of training plays a significant role in affecting income mobility. There is a positive effect on income mobility. This is supported by studies done by Booth (1993) as quoted in Dolton and Kidd (1998) and Parent (1999).

Khandker (1992) found that the effect of training provided by employer is different for male and female. It discourages upward mobility for male but encourages upward mobility for female.

For job tenure, there is a positive effect on mobility (Leigh, 1978). The longer an employee works in a specific firm, the more experience he gains. This may enhance his chances of upward mobility. Job tenure has a strong effect on young people's advancement from first job to current job.

Dolton and Kidd (1998) found that length of tenure is a blunt and poor barometer for human capital investment. The positive correlation between earning and tenure dictates the quality of the match between employer and employee rather than capital investment. In the same article, a review of some papers (e.g. Topel, 1986; Topel, 1991; Altonji and Shakoto, 1987; Abraham and Faber, 1987) suggested that the

role of this type of human capital investment has been overemphasised, using the tenure as a measure.

#### **2.4.4 Employment**

Li (1977) found that the type of occupation affects occupational mobility. The proportion who stay in the same occupational group is highest in the professional group, followed by service workers. The white-collar and blue-collar workers were categorised in the moderate-change group and the proprietors are most likely to change occupations. For service workers, they usually move up to proprietor and blue-collar occupations.

The socioeconomic index of the current occupation affects occupational mobility. The current socioeconomic index has a significant adverse effect on the propensity to change occupations. However, it has a significant positive effect on the occupational status achieved after the change. Individual in higher status occupations experiences upward occupational mobility but at a slower rate compared to individuals with lower socioeconomic index (Chattopadhyay, 1998).

Tey (1988) found that occupational mobility is considerably higher among those who started their careers in agricultural and sales sectors as compared to those who started their careers in the professional, administrative and clerical jobs. In addition, the highest retention rate is observed among those who worked in administrative occupation, followed by the professional, service, clerical, transportation, sales and agricultural sectors.

Paul-Majumdar and Chaudhuri-Zohir (1993) found that the type of industry and level of technology utilised affect upward occupational mobility. Besides, discriminating employer is also an important factor that hinders upward mobility.

Different promotion policies are practised in different types of industry. Female workers in the metal and equipment industry enjoy mobility through promotions. Chemicals, petroleum and coal manufacturing industries have promotion policies for most of the female workers, but very few are promoted. Promotion policies are not common among food, beverages and tobacco industries. On the other hand, there is little scope of moving up for female labour in low technology industries.

#### **2.4.5 Motivation**

Motivation is defined as a relatively general and enduring internal personal quality and an inclination to strive for something to achieve a particular kind of satisfaction. Motivation is viewed as an important requirement of occupational advancement. This has been found in studies by Crockett (1961) and Jayaweera and Sanmugam (1993).

Crockett (1961) related the theory of achievement motivation to the study of occupational mobility because of the difference in the prestige accorded to occupations in a society. Occupations with higher prestige are perceived as having greater incentives and more hard work is needed to achieve (implying that the success rate is lower) than lower prestige occupations.

Strong achievement motivation leads to more 'realistic' striving, to greater effort, and to greater persistence than weak achievement motivation. Those with greater achievement motivation accomplish more in the occupational sphere. In terms of intragenerational occupational mobility, the general hypothesis must be modified according to an individual's first job (adapted and modified from Crockett, 1961).

Strong motivation leads to more career advancement. Individuals who have lower or middle rank first jobs achieve more upward mobility if they have strong motivation. On the other hand, upward mobility is limited for those individuals who

have high rank first jobs due to ceiling effect. Individuals with strong motivation are more likely to maintain their status and do not suffer downward mobility.

Furthermore, as explained by Morgan (1952), Atkinson and Reitman (1958) and Lowell (1952), the academic grade of an individual is affected by the achievement motivation he possesses (quoted in Crockett, 1961). There is a significant positive relationship between motivation and academic performance.

#### **2.4.6 Other factors**

Other relevant factors on career advancement are information on the labour market, labour market conditions and geographical mobility.

##### **2.4.6.1 Information on the labour market**

According to Stigler (1962), theoretically speaking, having information on the labour market helps people to receive a higher than average wage (quoted in Abbas, 1975). Information can be considered a capital. It opens the horizon of jobs to the individuals.

The availability of information depends on the geographical location of an individual. Information is more accessible in urban areas. As a result, less uncertainty is involved in decision making as economic information is more complete (Schultz, 1953, quoted in Abbas, 1975). On the other hand, Paul-Majumdar and Chaudhuri-Zohir (1993) found that the duration of stay in the urban area is also important in determining the information collected. The longer an individual stays in the city, the greater the chance of knowing all avenues of searching for jobs. So, he has a greater possibility of enjoying mobility. The completeness of information is important in determining mobility decision.

#### **2.4.6.2 Labour market condition**

Occupational mobility is affected by the economic development of a country (OECD, circa - 1965). Mobility is more possible when the labour market is tight and the economic is growing steadily. This environment reduces the uncertainty arising from job change as individuals are certain that they can easily get another job and employers are willing to pay more under this condition.

#### **2.4.6.3 Geographical mobility**

Blau and Duncan (1967) found that careers of migrants are clearly more superior, relative to the nonmigrants. Occupational opportunities increase as the place becomes more developed. Urbanised places have better occupation opportunities, which attract individuals from suburban places. The achievement of nonmigrants in various community depends on the differences in opportunity structures. Nevertheless, the achievement of migrants is independent of that.

Blau and Duncan (1967) found that migration is a process of selection of men with high potential. Migrants enjoy greater chances of upward movement than nonmigrant, but the superior chances of success are not so much produced by migration. It is produced more by the initial advantages migrants have. A migrant is trained in the place he comes from. So, this place affects his human capital investment and has greater effect on his mobility. It is his ability that matters most.

Chattopadhyay (1998) found that migration is a means for an individual to improve his career prospects, particularly in developing countries where economic opportunities is uneven. The urban area is expected to have better opportunities than the rural area because the urban area is more developed.



However, Tey (1988) found that there is no firm evidence suggesting that migrants have fared better than non-migrants in the moving up along the occupational ladder.

## 2.5 Summary

This study mainly aims to explore factors affecting career advancement through mobility and this section summarises some of the relevant studies on this issue.

Occupational mobility and income mobility are commonly used as a measure of social mobility. Occupational mobility and income mobility are good measures for changes in the economic and prestige status. They measure the changes of economic status, working environment, living condition and social position. The intrageneration mobility, from first to current job, measures the career advancement an individual achieves.

Table 2.1 summaries the various factors that research has found to affect occupational mobility and income mobility. For occupational mobility, being female, Bumiputera or older has negative effect on mobility. Growing up or living in an urban area has a positive effect on occupational mobility. Being brought up in a big family, in a not conducive environment, in a broken family or being the eldest in a family has negative effect on occupational mobility. Having more academic education, vocational training, training provided by employer, high quality human capital investment or longer job tenure has positive effect on occupational mobility. Having jobs with high socioeconomic status or working in the agricultural or sales industry has positive effect on occupational mobility. Having parent with high education level, occupation socioeconomic status or income has positive effect on occupational mobility. Strong motivation has positive effect on occupational mobility. Having more information on

the labour market, good economic development or being a migrant has positive effect on occupational mobility.

For income mobility, being female or older has negative effect on mobility. Formal academic education and vocational training as well as training provided by employer have positive effect on income mobility. Having more information on the labour market has positive effect on income mobility.

**Table 2.1: Review of the effect of various factors on career advancement through mobility**

Factors	Occupational mobility	Income mobility
<b>Demographic characteristics</b>		
<b>- Gender</b>		
Being a female, effect is	Negative	Negative
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Loveridge and Mok (1979), Jacobs (1999), Paul-Majumdar and Chaudhuri-Zohir (1993), Tey (1994)</i>	<i>Keith and McWilliams (1999), Loveridge and Mok (1979).</i>
Being a female, effect is	Limited difference	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>OECD (1986)</i>	
<b>- Ethnicity</b>		
Being Bumiputera, effect is	Negative	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Chattopadhyay (1998)</i>	
<b>- Age</b>		
Being young, effect is	Positive	Positive
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Gasson (1974), Leigh (1978), Loveridge and Mok (1979), OECD (1986)</i>	<i>Loveridge and Mok (1979), Rose (1999),</i>
<b>- Location in which an individual grew up</b>		
Being in urban, effect is	Positive	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Blau and Duncan (1967)</i>	
<b>- Location in which an individual lives</b>		
Being in urban, effect is	Positive	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Blau and Duncan (1967), Chattopadhyay (1998), Abbas (1975)</i>	
<b>Family background</b>		
<b>- Parent's education level</b>		
Higher education, effect is	Positive	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Orstein (1976)</i>	
<b>- Parent's occupation socioeconomic status</b>		
Higher status, effect is	Positive	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Orstein (1976), Li (1977), Blau and Duncan (1967)</i>	

<b>- Parent's income level</b>		
Having higher income, effect is	Positive	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Carmicheal (2000)</i>	
<b>- Family size</b>		
Bigger family, effect is	Negative	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Blau and Duncan (1967), Orstein (1976)</i>	
<b>- Birth order in family</b>		
Being eldest, effect is	Negative	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Blau and Duncan (1967)</i>	
<b>- Education climate</b>		
Not conducive environment, effect is	Negative	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Blau and Duncan (1967)</i>	
<b>- Broken family</b>		
Being reared in broken family, effect is	Negative	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Blau and Duncan (1967)</i>	
<b>Human capital investment</b>		
<b>- Formal education and vocational training</b>		
Having more, effect is	Positive	Positive
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Leigh (1978), Blau and Duncan (1967), Orstein (1976), Li (1977), Khandker (1992), Tomkins and Twomey (2000), Chattopadhyay (1998)</i>	<i>OECD (circa – 1965), Parent (1999)</i>
Having more, effect is	Limited effect	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Jayaweera and Sanmugam (1993)</i>	
<b>- Quality of human capital investment</b>		
High quality, effect is	Positive	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>OECD (circa – 1965)</i>	
<b>- Training provided by employers</b>		
Having more, effect is	Positive	Positive
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Abbas (1975), Jayaweera and Sanmugam (1993)</i>	<i>Booth (1993), Dolton and Kidd (1998), Parent (1999)</i>
<b>- Job tenure</b>		
Having longer, effect is	Positive	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Leigh (1978)</i>	
<b>Employment</b>		
<b>- Occupation socioeconomic status</b>		
Higher occupational status, effect is	Positive	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Chattopadhyay (1988)</i>	

<b>- First occupational group</b>		
Different industry, different effect.	Agricultural and sales, higher occupational mobility	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Tey (1988)</i>	
<b>Motivation</b>		
<b>- Motivation</b>		
Having strong motivation, effect is	Positive	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Crockett (1961), Jayaweera and Sanmugam (1993)</i>	
<b>Other factors</b>		
<b>- Information on the labour market</b>		
Having more information, effect is	Positive	Positive
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Paul-Majumdar and Chaudhuri-Zohir (1993)</i>	<i>Stigler (1962)</i>
<b>- Labour market condition</b>		
Good economic development, effect is	Positive	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>OECD (circa – 1965)</i>	
<b>- Geographical mobility</b>		
Being migrant, effect is	Positive	
<i>Supporting studies</i>	<i>Blau and Duncan (1967), Chattopadhyay (1998)</i>	

In addition, some factors are inter-related in affecting occupational and income mobility. A summary is shown in Table 2.2. Married females enjoy less upward mobility. Females have less human capital investment as the pay-off is lower. So, they have less upward income mobility. For female individuals, training provided by employer has a positive effect on occupational mobility. Family background affects the human capital investment an individual has. In turn, human capital investment affects occupational mobility.

**Table 2.2 Factors (that are inter-related) affecting career advancement through mobility**

Factors involved		Inter-relationship	Studies
Gender	Marital status	Married women enjoy less upward mobility than their male and single counterparts.	Paul-Majumdar and Chaudhuri-Zohir (1993), Jacobs (1999)
Gender	Human capital investment	Females invest less in human capital than males as the pay-off is lower for females. So, females have less upward income mobility.	Khandker (1992)
Gender	Training provided by employer	Male – reduces occupational mobility Female – increases occupational mobility	Khandker (1992)
Family background	Education	Low education attainment for parents, low prestige for parent's occupation, poor parents, large family size, being eldest in a family, poor education climate and being reared in a broken family have negative effect on education attainment, which in turn impedes upward occupational mobility. There is no interaction effect between family background and education.	Blau and Duncan (1967), Orstein (1976), Li (1977)

Factors that are found to affect both occupational and income mobility are gender, age, formal education and training, training provided by employers and information on the labour market. They have a same effect on occupational and income mobility.