			rgsc00 (Approximate) Registrar-General's Social Class								
msex Sex	· ·		1.0 I Professional, etc. occupations	2.0 II Managerial and Technical occupations	3.1 IIIN Skilled occupations - non-manual	3.2 IIIM Skilled occupations - manual	4.0 IV Partly skilled occupations	5.0 V Unskilled occupations	Total		
1 Male	mjbrgsc RG Social Class: present job	1 Professional occ	239	72	0	0	0	0	311		
		2 Managerial & technical occ	30	1129	61	83	28	0	133		
		3 Skilled non-manual	0	49	463	54	3	2	57		
		4 Skilled manual	0	56	26	1111	44	7	124		
		5 Partly skilled occ	0	22	30	96	350	97	59		
		6 Unskilled occ	0	6	2	22	32	88	15		
		7 Armed forces	0	4	13	0	0	0	1		
	Total		269	1338	595	1366	457	194	421		
2 Female	mjbrgsc RG Social Class: present job	1 Professional occ	114	18	0	0	0	0	13		
		2 Managerial & technical occ	13	1187	67	57	37	0	136		
		3 Skilled non-manual	1	41	1230	88	8	2	137		
		4 Skilled manual	0	15	55	173	81	0	32		
		5 Partly skilled occ	0	24	28	44	518	11	62		
		6 Unskilled occ	0	1	0	14	35	119	16		
		7 Armed forces	0	2	0	0	0	0			
	Total		128	1288	1380	376	679	132	398		

mat1 * msex Sex Crosstabulation

1			msex		
			1 Male	2 Female	Total
mat1	.00	Count	839	642	1481
		% within msex Sex	19.9%	16.1%	18.1%
	1.00	Count	3380	3341	6721
		% within msex Sex	80.1%	83.9%	81.9%
Total		Count	4219	3983	8202
		% within msex Sex	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

----Original Message----

From:

Sent: 10 February 2006 16:01

To: Paul Lambert

Subject: SOC 2000-RGSC accordance

.. be able to help with a query I have, concerning the link between SOC 2000 and RGSC displayed on the UK section of the CAMSIS web-site.

I understand that this link is only an approximation, but I was wondering if you have any information on how reliable an approximation it is and whether other studies have used this mapping before.

Conversely, if you can put me in touch with someone that can answer or help answer this question, I would be most grateful.

Any information on this matter would be greatly appreciated.

I'm not aware unfortunately of anyone who has used the CAMSIS index file which links RGSC with SOC2000 in a published article, or a formal study of the reliability of the approximate coding.

The approximations were actually made by Ken Prandy, circa 2001, who manually re-aligned an existing database linking soc90 with rgsc, to try to fit with soc2000. I don't believe there is an easy reference to make for this, other than the CAMSIS project webpages.

After Ken did this, there has since been at least one major British survey - the BHPS - that I know of that has de facto linked RGSC and soc2000. This is because the BHPS codes some occupations to both soc90 and soc2000 in its most recent waves - so for many cases, the rgsc, egp and other classifications available from the soc90 coding schemes (CAMCOM programme running via CASOC) can also be linked to an rgsc scheme. Thus, it would be possible to use the BHPS database to create a more reliable soc2000 to rgsc, egp etc linkage - I don't believe anyone has done this yet, though it is something that we on the 'GEODE' project would like to try and do at some stage (www.geode.stir.ac.uk).

Because of this BHPS data however, its now quite a quick exercise to check the validity of the CAMSIS index file rgsc-soc2000 approximation - which I've just done the now. The answer is that the approximation is 82% accurate (or 80% for men and 84% for women), in terms of the number of people from a national sample who are correctly classified by the approximation (see also attached). This may not sound that high, but on the plus side, almost all of the mis-classifications are only to an adjacent category (as in attached). Thus for instance, the aggregate association between other variables and rgsc measured in the two ways

would be expected to be virtually equivalent. (I've tried it just now for ghq measures of health - its a weak association but I get an eta statistics of 0.070 and 0.068 respectively).

I hope that's helpful.

best wishes, Paul

--

Dr Paul S. Lambert
Department of Applied Social Science (Rm 3S16)
Stirling University

10th Feb 2006