DOI: 10.2478/v10051-008-0021-7

Social Classes and Social Mobility in Slovenia and Europe

Eva Jereb, Marko Ferjan

University of Maribor, Faculty of Organisational Sciences, Kidriceva 55a, 4000 Kranj, Slovenia, eva.jereb@fov.uni-mb.si, marko.ferjan@fov.uni-mb.si

In closed social systems the social position of an individual is determined by the social position of the family into which he or she was born, whereas in open social systems mobility from one social class to another is possible. This paper concerns the relationship between the class position an individual actually occupies and the class into which he or she was born. First the concept of social class is described and different types of social mobility are presented. Than the research methodology is described and the results are presented and discussed. At the end of the paper certain comparisons to other European countries are made.

Key words: social class, social mobility, gender, education, Slovenia, Europe

1 Introduction

For a long time people have dreamt of an egalitarian society where everyone is equal and where there would be no classification according to reputation. No one would enjoy the privileges of high society. Everybody would have the same share in property. But these ideas remain a dream. Inequality is part of all human societies, both the simple and the complicated ones. According to Haralambos and Holborn (1999) these inequalities refer to power, reputation and fortune.

Inequalities in the social positions occupied by individuals and families are of several types – we can speak of the distribution of income, differences in status, and so forth. Class differences according to Breen (2005) are widely spoken of, but there is often little agreement about of concept of class, what it refers to and how it should be used. By starting from a particular definition of class, sociologists can assess the extent to which such aspects as inequality in life opportunities among individuals and families are structured on the basis of class. According to Kotler (1996) social classes are proportionally uniform and permanently hierarchically classified classes of a society. Their representatives have similar values, desires and behaviours.

Life opportunities have important influences on the individual's position in society. Haralambos (1999) defines these opportunities as the possibilities in a society for acquiring desired things and avoiding undesired ones. We differentiate between biological inequalities such as age, health, physical strength, intelligence and social inequalities created by society. Bottomore (1966) claims that social inequalities exist in the different priorities that some individuals enjoy to the detriment of others. They are richer, more respectable and so on.

British sociologist David Lockwood (Scott and Marshall, 2005) introduced an influential view of class that distinguishes between the market situation ("the economic position narrowly conceived, consisting of source and size of income, degree of job-security, and opportunity for upward occupational mobility") and the work situation ("the set of social relationships in which the individual is involved at work by virtue of his position in the division of labour". He also identified the status situation ("the position of the individual in the hierarchy of prestige in the society at large"). It was the particular combination of experiences originating in class and status situations that, according to Lockwood, constituted the principal determinants of class consciousness among clerks.

1.1 Social classes

The concept of social class was developed by Karl Marx (1848), who suggested that there were three class categories: (1) *the capitalist class,* comprising the owners and controllers of the means of production, distribution and exchange; (2) *the middle class,* which includes managers, small businesses, professionals and middle ranks of the state apparatus; and (3) *the working class,* which includes the great majority of the population who sell their labour power, their capacity to work, in return for a wage or

salary and who work under the direction of the owners of the means of production and their agents.

Many different class categories are described in the literature. For example, the Glass schema from 1949 where Glass (1954) defines seven class categories in Britain: (1) professionals and high managers, (2) managers and directors, (3) supervisors and other non-manual employees (higher grade), (4) supervisors and other non-manual employees (lower grade), (5) qualified manual and routine non-manual workers, (6) half-qualified manual workers, and (7) non-qualified manual workers. Kotler (1996) also distinguishes seven social classes in the United States of America: (1) higher upper class, (2) lower upper class, (3) higher middle class, (4) middle class, (5) labour class, (6) higher inferior class, and (7) lower inferior class.

In our study the Goldthorpe class schema was used (Table 1). The original schema proposes eleven classes. Classes I and II are made up of those occupations that most clearly have a service relationship. Class I comprises higher-grade and class II lower-grade professionals, administrative and managerial workers. At the other extreme, members of classes VI (skilled manual workers) and VII (unskilled manual workers) most clearly have a labour contract with their employer. Class VII is divided into: VIIb non-skilled agricultural workers, VIIa non-skilled workers outside agriculture. Class IIIb includes occupations of the lowest grades of employment in offices, shops and other service outlets – machine operators, counter staff, attendants, etc. (Erikson and Goldthorpe 1992). The remaining classes, IIIa (higher grade, routine non-manual occupations) and V (lower technical and manual supervisory occupations), comprise positions with associated employment relationships that would appear characteristically to take on a very mixed form. The Goldthorpe schema is rarely used in its eleven-class version. Goldthorpe collapsed the classes into a seven-class schema comprising I+II, III, IVa+b, IVc, V+VI, VIIa, and VIIb. In part this reflects the need to ensure that numerically important classes were represented and, in part, the difficulties of drawing the necessary distinctions (e.g. between the self-employed with and without employees and between classes I and II) in a consistent fashion across all their national data-

Table 1. The Goldthorpe class schema (Goldthorpe, 1980)

CASMIN version	Goldthorpe class	Description
Service class I+II	I.	Higher-grade professionals, administrators and officials; managers in large industrial establishments; large proprietors
	II	Lower-grade professionals, administrators and officials; higher-grade technicians; managers in small industrial establishments; supervisors of non-manual employees
Routine non-manual class III	IIIa	Routine non-manual employees, higher grade (administration and commerce)
	IIIb	Routine non-manual employees, lower grade (sales and services)
Non-farm petty bourgeoisie IVa+IVb	IVa	Small proprietors, artisans, etc., with employees
	IVb	Small proprietors, artisans, etc., without employees
IVc	IVc	Farmers and smallholders; other self-employed workers in primary production
Technicians, supervisors, skilled manual workers V+VI	V	Lower-grade technicians; supervisors of manual workers
	VI	Skilled manual workers
Semi- and unskilled manual workers (not in agriculture) VIIa	VIIa	Semi-skilled and unskilled manual workers (not in agriculture)
Semi- and unskilled manual workers (in agriculture) VIIb	VIIb	Semi-skilled and unskilled manual workers in agriculture

sets (Breen 2005). This version is sometimes termed "the CASMIN[1] schema" and is the one used here.

Education is also an important determinant of the class position that an individual comes to occupy (see also Ferjan and Jereb 2005). Much mobility researches examine the relationships between, on the one hand, class origins and educational attainment, and, on the other, educational attainment and class destination, which was also a part of our study.

1.2 Social mobility

There are people who do not stay in the same class for their entire lives – they move across social classes or from one occupational level to another. In this case we talk about social mobility (Sociology at Hewett 1997).

Social mobility is defined as the movement of individuals, families or groups within a social space constituted by status, occupation, income and similar variables by which members of a society may be described (Krippendorff 1986). Breen (2005) says simply that mobility is movement between origins and destinations.

In the literature different types of social mobility are noted. Sorokin (1959) distinguishes two principal types of social mobility, *horizontal* and *vertical*. By *horizontal* social mobility, or shifting, is meant the transition of an individual or social object from one social group to another situated on the same level. Transitions of individuals, such as from one citizenship to another, from one family (as a husband or wife) to another by divorce and remarriage, from one factory to another in the same occupational status, are all instances of social mobility. In all these cases, "shifting" may take place without any noticeable change in the social position of an individual or social object in the vertical direction. By *vertical* social mobility is meant the relations involved in a transition of an individual from one social stratum to another. According to the direction of the transition there are two types of vertical social mobility: *ascending* and *descending*, or *social climbing* and *social sinking*, or as we say *upward* and *downward* mobility. According to the nature of the stratification, there are ascending and descending currents of economic, political, and occupational mobility, not to mention other less important types. The ascending currents exist in two principal forms: as an infiltration of the individuals of a lower stratum into an existing higher one; and as a creation of a new group by such individuals and the insertion of such a group into a higher stratum instead of, or alongside, the existing groups of this stratum. Correspondingly, the descending current also has two principal forms: the first consists of a dropping of individuals from a higher social position into an existing lower one, without degradation or disintegration of the higher group to which they belonged; the second is manifested in a degradation of a social group as a whole, in an abasement of its rank among other groups, or in its disintegration as a social unit. The first case of "sinking" reminds one of an individual falling from a ship, the second of the sinking of the ship itself with all on board or of the ship as a wreck breaking itself to pieces. Cases of individual infiltration into an existing higher stratum or of individuals dropping from a higher social layer into a lower one are relatively common and comprehensible. They need no explanation, while the second form of social ascending and descending, the rise and fall of groups, must be considered more carefully.

Lipset (1992) distinguishes following types of mobility: occupational mobility, elite mobility, status mobility, intergenerational mobility and others. The most important mobility in his point of view is occupational mobility. This mobility leads to differences in the structure of society.

The study reported in this paper also investigates *intergenerational* mobility, which concerns the relationship between people's current circumstances and those in which they originated. The focus is on the relationship between parents' and children's earnings or, as here, on the class position an individual occupies and the class in which she or he grew up (father's class). Studies of intergenerational mobility look at the changes in circumstances during an individual's own (working) life. A very common strategy here is the analysis of the relationship between the social class of the first job and of the current job, but many studies of intergenerational class mobility are much more sophisticated than this, seeking a model of detailed career trajectories. The data demands for the study of class career mobility are far greater than for the study of intergenerational class mobility and it is perhaps no accident that the kind of large cross-nationally comparative studies of intergenerational mobility that have been carried out have no counterpart in the study of career mobility.

The study scope was to define class structure in Slovenia. As previously mentioned, the inequalities in human societies refer to power, reputation and fortune. The ambition in our study was not to research all of the social class attributes; we limited it to occupation classification. Measuring reputation, power or fortune would be rather difficult, perhaps even risky. But we will use these elements in our next study where the attributes that determine the social class of an individual will be researched with the help of DEXi (a modelling program based on attributes arranged as a tree structure) (see Jereb, Rajkovič and Rajkovič 2005). Next in this study we compared class structure in Slovenia with the class structure of eleven European countries and examined educational attainment and class destination**.** Intergenerational mobility in Slovenia is presented at the end of the paper.

2 Method

The paper-and-pencil survey was carried out at the beginning of 2006 in all districts of Slovenia. The survey was

[1] CASMIN (Comparative Analysis of Social Mobility in Industrial Nations)

carried out by Faculty of Organisational Sciences, University of Maribor.

2.1 Sample

A sample of 1980 adult employees in Slovenia (937 males (47.3%) and 1043 (52.7%) females) participated in this study. Ages ranged from 18 to 66 years, with a mean of 36 years and 10 months (M=36.84 and SD=9.925). The criteria for sample selection were: (1) the person must be at least 18 years old and (2) the person must be employed or have been employed at least once. The size of the sample, as a percentage of the total population of Slovenia, is comparable with the sample sizes of the aforementioned eleven European countries.

The educational structure of the sample can be seen in Table 2. In Slovenia the education classification from the year 1980 is used and has eight degrees.

Table 2. Educational structure of the sample

Education degree	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VII+
N	28	24	79	340	897	216	354	42
%	1.4	1.2	4.0	17.2	45.3	10.9	17.9	2.1

Note: N=1980. Educational degrees: (I) did not finish primary school, (II) finished primary school (8 years), (III) secondary school (2 years), (IV) secondary school (3 years), (V) secondary school (4 years), (VI) two year study, (VII) higher education and (VII+) master's degree, doctorate degree.

2.2 Instrument

The questionnaire contained 23 closed questions referring to: (i) general data (age, gender), (ii) education (including father's and mother's), (iii) social class appurtenance, (iv) the class in which they originated (father's class), and (v) promotion. The basic questions referred to social class appurtenances. For these classification the Goldthorpe class scheme (Table 1) was used, and later the CASMIN version, for the comparison with the eleven European countries.

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Class structure in Slovenia

As can be seen in Table 3 the prevailing class in Slovenia is the IIIa class (36.0%), that is, the routine non-manual class of higher-grade employees (administration and commerce) followed by IIIb (16.9%), the routine non-manual class of lower-grade employees (sales and services). There is a low percentage (1.6%) of class VIIa+b semi- and unskilled manual workers and (2.4%) of class I higher-grade professionals, administrators, officials, managers in large industrial establishments, and large proprietors.

We also found out that the class to which an individual belongs also depends on his or her educational attainment. The correlation was significant at the 0.01 level and was measured with Pearson's coefficient ($r_{total} = 0.526$; $r_{men} = 0.534$; $r_{women} = 0.528$).

In 2005 a similar study of social mobility in Europe was published (see Breen and Luijkx 2005). The study concerned the relationship between the class position an individual occupies and the class into which he or she was born. Eleven European countries participated: Britain, France, Ireland, West Germany, The Netherlands, Italy, Sweden, Norway, Poland, Hungary and Israel.

Table 4 shows the overall class structures in the eleven countries for men and ten countries for women over three decades and for Slovenia in the year 2006. Comparing the results we found the percentages of men and women in classes I + II quite similar in the European countries. In Slovenia there is a larger percentage of men (20.2%) in classes I + II than of women (16.8%). But the relative size of class III is three times as big for women as for men in the European countries. This balances the under-representation of women, relative to men, in classes V + VI. In comparison to the European countries the percentage of woman in classes IIIa+IIIb in Slovenia is very high (62.2%) as is the percentage of men (42.2%). According to Breen and Luijkx (2005) the trend towards a concentration of women in the white-collar classes is generally evident, which can be seen especially in the 1990s in Norway and The Netherlands, where 80 percent or more of women are found in these classes. In Hungary there are 17.1 percent of women in class IIIa, which is relatively high compared to men (2.5%) (Róbert and Bukodi 2005). In Poland the percentage of women in classes IIIa+IIIb is also high (31.0 %) in comparison with the percentage of men (5.0%) (Mach 2005). In Slovenia there is a very low percentage in classes V+VI and VIIa and VIIb (only 11.2% of the population). In other European countries we find more men than women in these three classes. This also goes for Slovenia. In Poland 29 percent of men are in classes V + VI; in Italy almost 24 percent and in Slovenia 13 percent of all men are in classes V+VI.

Table 3. Class structure in Slovenia

CASMIN class	Goldthorpe class	Total (N=1980)		Men (N=937)		Women (N=1043)	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Service class	I	48	2.4	24	2.6	24	2.3
	II	316	16.0	165	17.6	151	14.5
Routine non-manual class	IIIa	712	36.0	217	23.2	495	47.5
	IIIb	335	16.9	177	18.9	158	15.1
Non-farm petty bourgeoisie	IVa	42	2.1	26	2.8	16	1.5
	IVb	58	2.9	33	3.5	25	2.4
	IVc	246	12.4	160	17.1	86	8.2
Technicians, supervisors, skilled manual workers	V	141	7.1	94	10.0	47	4.5
	VI	49	2.5	28	3.0	21	2.0
Semi- and unskilled manual workers	VIIa and VIIb	31	1.6	12	1.3	19	1.8

Table 4. Aggregate class structures

	The eleven countries by decade			The ten countries by decade			Slovenia	
	Men in percent			**Woman in percent**			**Men in percent**	**Women in percent**
Class	**1970s**	**1980s**	**1990s**	**1970s**	**1980s**	**1990s**	**2006**	**2006**
I + II	23.1	28.6	30.8	22.1	30.5	34.6	20.2	16.8
IIIa + IIIb	8.7	9.0	10.1	32.8	32.3	35.1	42.1	61.6
IVa + IVb	7.9	8.6	10.4	6.5	6.0	6.1	6.3	3.9
IVc	8.6	5.7	4.0	8.6	4.4	2.3	17.1	8.2
V + VI	27.7	27.6	27.1	6.1	6.3	7.1	13.0	6.5
VIIa	20.6	18.3	15.7	21.1	18.6	13.7	1.3	1.8
VIIb	3.5	2.3	2.0	2.8	1.7	1.2		

Note: For women, Ireland was excluded

Classes VIIa+VIIb in Slovenia represent only 1.5 percent of the population. Considering that Slovenia was an industrial country only few years ago, that percentage is very low, indicating big changes in the structure of society. In the last twenty years many people retired in Slovenia. Since 1985 the number of retired people has almost doubled (see Table 5). In the 1990s a huge drop in the number of industrial workers can be seen, which influenced the low percentage of the population in classes V+VI and VIIa and VIIb (Table 5).

The first reason for such a drop in the manufacturing field was the loss of markets in countries of the former Yugoslavia. The second reason was the movement of industry to countries with a cheaper labour force. This is why the number of retired people jumped. These people retired relatively young. At the same time the number of clerks increased (classes IIIa+IIIb), because Slovenia as a new country had to assemble an entire bureaucratic system. Although there are only two million people in Slovenia, all public services must be maintained, which explains the very high percentage in classes IIIa+IIIb. In the case of Slovenia, Lipset's (1992) statement that occupational mobility causes big changes in the structure of society can be confirmed.

Table 5. Employees by field of work in Slovenia (Annual Statistics 1996 and 2005)

	Number of employees		
Field of work	**1985**	**1995**	**2004**
Agriculture	13,658	8840	37,080
Manufacturing	370,134	242,793	232,437
Construction	64,487	29,725	57,877
Trade	55,892	34,325	100,773
Financial intermediation	36,450	20,190	20,419
Real estate	10,802	2204	57,304
Public administration, defence	38,994	18,752	50,255
Education	51,335	34,384	56,959
Health and social work	54,481	44,953	48,536
Pensioner	426,829	608,123	701,848
Active workers	840,836	641,952	782,206

3.2 Social mobility in Slovenia

In this part of the paper, intergenerational mobility between classes in Slovenia is presented.

First we examined the relationship between people's current circumstances and those in which they originated. We took the father's class as the origin class. The basic datum for intergenerational mobility analysis is "the mobility table".

Tables 6, 7, and 8 show movements between origins and destinations. It can be seen that the number of individuals in classes VIIa and VIIb is declining and in IIIa and IIIb increasing according to the father's class. These trends can also be seen in other European countries.

Table 6. Mobility table (N=1980)

			DESTINATION									
			I	II	IIIa	IIIb	IVa	IVb	IVc	V	VI	VIIa,b
ORIGIN	I.	Count		17	19	5	2	1	4	0	1	1
		% within origin		29.3%	32.8%	8.6%	3.4%	1.7%	6.9%	.0%	1.7%	1.7%
	II	Count	15		76	19	6	9	16	8	0	1
		% within origin	6.8%	32.1%	34.4%	8.6%	2.7%	4.1%	7.2%	3.6%	.0%	.5%
	IIIa	Count	7	39		26	3	3	12	3	1	1
		% within origin	3.6%	20.1%		13.4%	1.5%	1.5%	6.2%	1.5%	.5%	.5%
	IIIb	Count	2	39	129		9	4	23	3	3	2
		% within origin	.7%	13.3%	43.9%	27.2%	3.1%	1.4%	7.8%	1.0%	1.0%	.7%
	IVa	Count	2	11	27	11		2	8	5	3	1
		% within origin	2.8%	15.3%	37.5%	15.3%		2.8%	11.1%	6.9%	4.2%	1.4%
	IVb	Count	2	10	22	15	4		11	2	1	0
		% within origin	2.6%	12.8%	28.2%	19.2%	5.1%		14.1%	2.6%	1.3%	.0%
	IVc	Count	6	48	87	44	5	5		11	5	0
		% within origin	2.3%	18.3%	33.2%	16.8%	1.9%	1.9%		4.2%	1.9%	.0%
	V	Count	5	60	167	83	8	15	81		10	14
		% within origin	1.0%	11.8%	32.7%	16.3%	1.6%	2.9%	15.9%		2.0%	2.7%
	VI	Count	1	10	44	32	2	4	17	23		2
		% within origin	.7%	6.9%	30.3%	22.1%	1.4%	2.8%	11.7%	15.9%		1.4%
	VIIa,b	Count	0	15	43	21	1	4	23	19	15	
		% within origin	0	10%	28.6%	14.0%	0%	0.2%	15.3%	12.6%	10%	

Table 7. Mobility table women (n=1043)

			DESTINATION									
			I	II	IIIa	IIIb	IVa	IVb	IVc	V	VI	VIIa,b
ORIGIN	I.	Count		9	10	1	0	0	2	0	0	0
		% within origin	8.3 %	37.5 %	41.7 %	4.2%	.0%	.0%	8.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	II	Count	9		46	12	1	3	6	1	0	0
		% within origin	8.3 %	28.4 %	42.2 %	11.0 %	.9%	2.8%	5.5%	.9%	.0%	.0%
	IIIa	Count	6	10		7	0	2	2	1	1	0
		% within origin	6.8 %	11.4 %	67.0 %	8.0%	.0%	2.3%	2.3%	1.1%	1.1 %	.0%
	IIIb	Count	1	20	90		5	0	6	2	0	2
		% within origin	.6%	12.4 %	55.9 %	21.7 %	3.1 %	.0%	3.7%	1.2%	.0%	1.2%
	IVa	Count	1	7	21	4		0	3	0	0	0
		% within origin	2.7 %	18.9 %	56.8 %	10.8 %	2.7 %	.0%	8.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	IVb	Count	1	2	13	10	4		5	1	0	0
		% within origin	2.4 %	4.9%	31.7 %	24.4 %	9.8 %	12.2 %	12.2 %	2.4%	.0%	.0%
	IVc	Count	3	23	62	25	3	3		3	3	0
		% within origin	2.1 %	16.0 %	43.1 %	17.4 %	2.1 %	2.1%	13.2 %	2.1%	2.1 %	.0%
	V	Count	1	33	125	39	1	7	27		3	10
		% within origin	.4%	12.3 %	46.5 %	14.5 %	.4%	2.6%	10.0 %		1.1 %	3.7%
	VI	Count	0	8	40	13	0	3	7	10		0
		% within origin	.0%	9.2%	46.0 %	14.9 %	.0%	3.4%	8.0%	11.5 %	6.9 %	.0%
	VIIa,b	Count	0	8	30	12	1	2	9	5	5	
		% within origin	0	10.3 %	38.9 %	15.6 %	0.1 %	2.6%	11.7 %	7.0%	7.0 %	

Table 8. Mobility table men (n=937)

			DESTINATION									
			I	II	IIIa	IIIb	IVa	IVb	IVc	V	VI	VIIa,b
ORIGIN	I.	Count		8	9	4	2	1	2	0	1	1
		% within origin		23.5%	26.5%	11.8%	5.9%	2.9%	5.9%	.0%	2.9%	2.9%
	II	Count	6		30	7	5	6	10	7	0	1
		% within origin	5.4%	35.7%	26.8%	6.3%	4.5%	5.4%	8.9%	6.3%	.0%	.9%
	IIIa	Count	1	29		19	3	1	10	2	0	1
		% within origin	.9%	27.4%		17.9%	2.8%	.9%	9.4%	1.9%	.0%	.9%
	IIIb	Count	1	19	39		4	4	17	1	3	0
		% within origin	.8%	14.3%	29.3%	33.8%	3.0%	3.0%	12.8%	.8%	2.3%	.0%
	IVa	Count	1	4	6	7		2	5	5	3	1
		% within origin	2.9%	11.4%	17.1%	20.0%		5.7%	14.3%	14.3%	8.6%	2.9%
	IVb	Count	1	8	9	5	0		6	1	1	0
		% within origin	2.7%	21.6%	24.3%	13.5%	.0%		16.2%	2.7%	2.7%	.0%
	IVc	Count	3	25	25	19	2	2		8	2	0
		% within origin	2.5%	21.2%	21.2%	16.1%	1.7%	1.7%		6.8%	1.7%	.0%
	V	Count	4	27	42	44	7	8	54		7	4
		% within origin	1.7%	11.2%	17.4%	18.3%	2.9%	3.3%	22.4%		2.9%	1.7%
	VI	Count	1	2	4	19	2	1	10	13		2
		% within origin	1.7%	3.4%	6.9%	32.8%	3.4%	1.7%	17.2%	22.4%		3.4%
	VIIa,b	Count	0	3	13	9	0	2	14	13	7	
		% within origin	0%	4.7%	20.7%	14.3%	0	3.2%	22.2%	20.7%	11.1%	

Analyzing the regression for the whole population we determined that, regardless of the origin class, children are 2.702 classes higher than their fathers. Looked at separately, men are 2.855 and women 2.487 classes higher than their fathers.

Several useful measures of absolute mobility can be derived from the mobility tables. The cases that fall in the cells on the main diagonal of the table, running from top left to bottom right, reveal the proportion or percentage of individuals whose destination class is the same as their class of origin. This is a measure of total immobility.

In Table 9 the total vertical mobility (TVM), total upward (TU) and total downward (TD) mobility rates for men (M) and women (W) are presented.

Table 9. Vertical mobility rates

	Slovenia (2006)		Germany (1999)		Italy (1997)		Poland (1994)		Hungary (2000)	
	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W
TVM	76.5	81.9	46.0	48.8	49.7	53.7	52.0	57.0	50.3	57.3
TU	54.5	67.8	32.0	32.5	37.7	34.6	37.0	44.0	33.2	40.1
TD	22.0	14.1	14.0	15.9	12.0	19.1	15.0	13.0	17.1	17.2

Note: Data for Germany were taken from Müller and Pollak (2005), for Poland from Mach (2005), for Italy from Pisati and Schizzerotto, (2005), and for Hungary from Robert and Bukodi, (2005).

High vertical mobility is not unique to Slovenia, but is also found in other European countries like Germany, Italy, Poland and Hungary (Table 9). The total vertical mobility rate for Slovenia is very high, for women for instance almost 82 percent. This high vertical mobility rate is the result of the outflow into classes IIIa and IIIb. In Germany in 1990s the female pattern in the rates of upward and downward mobility becomes increasingly similar to the pattern for men, and in the last period it hardly differs from it (see Müller and Pollak 2005). Women, however, experience more non-vertical mobility than men, and as a consequence their total mobility is greater than men's. This is also true for Slovenia, Italy, Poland and Hungary and is most likely due to gender segregation in labour markets, which leads women more often than men into a class position different from their fathers', even though it tends to be at the same hierarchical level. In Italy downward mobility is somewhat more likely among women than among men. Women's higher risk of being downwardly mobile again clearly reflects the presence of a certain degree of occupational segregation by sex (see Chiesi 1997). In fact, while the distribution of social origins (i.e. father's occupational class) is basically the same for men and women, the distribution of social destinations is largely affected by sex. In this regard, as far as downward mobility rates are concerned, it is worth noting that women in Italy turned out to be decidedly overrepresented in the unskilled industrial and service working class (VIIa+IIIb) (Pisati and Schizzerotto 2005). The pattern of female mobility in Poland also differs from that of men. According to Mach (2005) rates of total and of upward mobility were increasing under conditions of late state socialism between 1972 and 1988 as well as after the socio-political changes of 1989. The total mobility rates are quite high in Hungary. Compared to women, we can be more concerned about men's mobility chances – at least on the basis of the decreasing trend of upward and the increasing trend of downward vertical mobility (Robert and Bukodi 2005).

As seen in Table 10 a very high percentage of individuals in Slovenia who originate in class III also stays there (76.6% of women and 60.0% of men). This could be a result of the unsuitable labour market. For instance 46 percent of all participants got their jobs through acquaintances. In Germany 48 percent of women stay in the same class they were born in, with almost a four-times lower percentage among men (13.0%). We find almost the same percentage of outflow of women into class of origin in Poland (48.6%) and more than a ten-times lower percentage of men.

Some neighbouring countries of Slovenia are undergoing a full economic boom. In Italy for instance there is a growth of small trades. Classes IIIa (routine non manual employees), and V+VI (skilled working class) have expanded. There is a relative high percentage of men (20.8%) and women (16.6%) in classes IVa+IVb. On the contrary, the two agricultural classes and the unskilled working class have shrunk. This pattern of change is basically the same for both men and women (Pisati and Schizzerotto 2005). In Slovenia this percentage is very low. Only 6 percent of men and 4 percent of women can be found in classes IVa+IVb. Looking at the total labour class in Slo-

Table 10. Percentage of individuals remaining in the origin class

	Poland 1994		Germany 1990		Slovenia 2006		
Class inheritance	Man	Women	Man	Women	Total (n=1980)	Man (n=937)	Women (n=1043)
I + II	60.0	48.6	63	59	39.8	41.1	38.3
IIIa + IIIb	3.7	48.6	13	48	74.5	60.0	76.7
IVa + IVb	22.8	8.5	18	15	12.7	12.5	12.8
IVc	32.0	27.4	27	10	24.1	27.1	13.1
V + VI	42.1	27.4	50	10	16.7	22.7	15.2
VIIa,b	43	21.3	21	24	6.4	2.8	6.0

Note: Data for Poland were taken from Mach (2005) and for Germany from Müller and Pollak (2005).

venia there are 5 percent and in Italy 19 percent of the population in classes IVa+IVb. We expected a higher percentage of individuals in Slovenia in these classes owing to the liberalization of small enterprises after 1989. Table 11 shows the vertical mobility from classes IVa+IVb for the total population of Slovenia.

Table 11. Vertical mobility in Slovenia from origin classes IVa + IVb (n=1980)

Origin	Destination	%
IVa + IVb	I + II	16.6%
	IIIa in IIIb	50.0%
	IVa + IVb	12.6%
	V-VII	0.6%

4 Conclusion

The study results indicate huge changes in the structure of society in Slovenia during the period of transition. But the transition was not the only cause for these changes. In Slovenia the attainment of independence also played an important part in society building. We noted big changes in vertical mobility. The total vertical mobility rate is higher for women (81.9%) than men (76.5%). Compared to other European countries, the total vertical mobility rate in Slovenia during transition was higher. For instance in Poland 52 percent of men and 57 percent of women moved from one class to another. In Italy the total vertical mobility rate for men was almost 50 percent and for women 54. In Germany the total vertical mobility rate was over 48 percent for women and 46 percent for men.

We are concerned about the high percentage of individuals in classes IIIa+IIIb in Slovenia. This is not typical for other European countries. We think that the problem in Slovenia is the enormous bureaucratic system, which leads to high expenses resulting in high taxes. The question is: how long "the economy" will be able to finance this bureaucracy?

There is no doubt that classes IVc, V and VI lost a very high percentage of their members because of the high rate of retiring during the period of transition in Slovenia. The highest percentages are represented in classes IIIa and IIIb. The majority of individuals in these classes are employed in public services, largely due to the economic and social security they had during the transition.

5 References

Annual Statistics of the Republic of Slovenia (1996). Ljubljana: Statistični urad RS.

Annual Statistics of the Republic of Slovenia (2005). Ljubljana: Statistični urad RS.

Bottomore, T. B. (1966). *Elites and Society*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Breen, R. (2005). The Comparative Study of Social Mobility, in: R. Breen (Ed) *Social Mobility in Europe*, Oxford: University Press Oxford, 1-16.

Breen, R. & Luijkx, R. (2005). Social Mobility in Europe between 1970 and 2000, in: R.
Breen (Ed) *Social Mobility in Europe*, Oxford: University Press Oxford, 37-74.
Chiesi, A. M. (1997). *Lavori e professioni* [*Work and Profession*]. Roma: La Nuova Italia Scientifica.
Erikson, R. & Goldthorpe, J. H. (1992). *The Constant Flux: A Study of Class Mobility in Industrial Societies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ferjan, M. & Jereb, E. (2005). Education of employees in Slovenian companies. in: J. Florjančič & B.W. Paape, Björn Willi (Eds). *Personnel and Management : Selected Topics*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 145-159.
Glass, D. V. (1954). *Social Mobility in Britain*, London: Routledge&Kogan Paul.
Goldthorpe, J. (1980). *Social Mobility and Class Structure in Modern Britain*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Haralambos, M. & Holborn, M. (1999). *Sociologija* [*Sociology*], Ljubljana: DZS.
Jereb, E., Rajkovič, U., Rajkovič, V. (2005). A hierarchical multi-attribute system approach to personnel selection. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment,* 13 (3), 198-205.
Kotler, P. (1996). *Marketing Management*, Ljubljana: Slovenska knjiga.
Krippendorff, K. (1986). *A Dictionary of Cybernetics*, Retrieved March 31, 2006, from http://pespmc1.vub.ac.be/asc/SOCIAL_MOBIL.html
Lipset, S. M. & Bendix, R. (1992): *Social Mobility in Industrial Society*, New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
Mach, B. W. (2005). Intergenerational Mobility in Poland: 1972-88-94, in: R. Breen (Ed) *Social Mobility in Europe*, Oxford: University Press Oxford, 269-286.
Marx, K. & Engels, F. (1948) *The Communist Manifesto*, London.
Müller, W. & Pollak, R. (2005). Social Mobility in West Germany: The Long Arms of History Discovered? in: R. Breen (Ed) *Social Mobility in Europe*, Oxford: University Press Oxford, 77-114.
Pisati, M. & Schizzerotto, A. (2005). The Italian Mobility Regime: 1985-97 in: R. Breen (Ed) *Social Mobility in Europe*, Oxford: University Press Oxford, 77-114.
Robert, P. & Bukodi, E. (2005). Changes in Intergenerational Class Mobility in Hungary, 1973-2000, in: R. Breen (Ed) *Social Mobility in Europe*, Oxford: University Press Oxford, 287-314.
Scott, J. & Marshall, G., (2005) *A Dictionary of Sociology*, Oxford: Oxford University
Press, Oxford Reference Online. Retrieved 5 April 2006 from http://www.oxfordreference.com
Sociology at Hewett (1997). *Social Mobility*, Retrieved March 31, 2006, from http://www.hewett.norfolk.sch.uk/CURRIC/soc/class/socmob.htm
Sorokin, P. (1959). *Social and Cultural Mobility*. New York: The Free Press.

Eva Jereb is an associate professor in the Department of Education – Personnel and Information Science at the Faculty of Organisational Sciences, University of Maribor, Slovenia. She holds a Ph.D., M.A.Sc. and B.Sc. degrees in the field of Organising of Information Systems at the University of Maribor. She is currently researching personnel expert systems, education and distance education (particularly e-learning and e-examination), office automation (particularly electronic document management systems) and the phenomenon of telework. She has introduced her work at several international and national professional and research conferences. She is the author or co-author of scientific and professional articles published in national and international journals, and the author of the book: Office Automation – Web Technology and Dynamic HTML, and co-author of the books: (i) Up-to-date Forms and Methods in Organising Enterprises and other Organisations, (ii) Office Organisation and, (iii) DEXi – a Computer-based System for Multi-attribute Decision Making. She collaborated in several projects like the Phare Multi-country Programme for Distance Education, DIGI-Q – Quality and On-line Confidence in SMEs e-Business Processes and others.

Marko Ferjan is a full professor at the University of Maribor's Faculty of Organizational Sciences. He received his master's degree and doctorate at the University of Maribor. The topic of his master's thesis was business communication, and his doctoral dissertation addressed educational planning. His areas of research include HRM, communication processes in organizations and educational planning. His articles have appeared in Slovenia and abroad, and he has published research in the Journal of Economics (ISSN 0013-3035). He has authored a number of books on business communication and educational planning, with his latest book appearing in October 2005. His very first book, Skrivnosti vodenja šole k znanju, uspehu in ugledu (The Secrets of Leading a School towards Knowledge, Success and Reputation, 1996) met with an international response and was reviewed in the International Journal of Lifelong Education (vol. 16, no. 4).

Družbeni razredi in družbena mobilnost v Sloveniji in Evropi

V zaprtih družbenih sistemih je družbeni položaj posameznika določen s položajem družine že ob človekovem rojstvu. V odprtih družbah pa prihaja do vertikalne in horizontalne družbene mobilnosti, katera je predstavljena v prispevku. V Sloveniji je v času tranzicije mnogo ljudi, zaposlenih v industriji izgubilo službo, po drugi strani pa so se mnogi zaposlili v storitvenih dejavnostih. Stopnja družbene mobilnosti je bila zato zelo velika. V prispevku predstavljamo družbene razrede, različne vrste družbene mobilnosti ter raziskavo družbenih razredov v Sloveniji. Na koncu rezultate primerjamo tudi s stanjem v Evropi.

Ključne besede: družbeni razred, družbena mobilnost, spol, izobrazba, Slovenija, Evropa