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REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES

In this chapter relevant studies made earlier have been reviewed and some tentative generalizations have been drawn therefore. It is divided in to three sections. viz.

2.1 STUDIES MADE ABROAD:

The most influential pioneering work on social mobility was published in 1927. viz. Sorokin’s "Social Mobility". This work opened the vast domain of social mobility for subsequent explorations. For this reason a somewhat detailed review of this study is necessary.

At the heart of Sorokin’s study(Sorokin 1927) is a theory of stratification, which might have found favour with Plato, as he argues that there are certain permanent and universal bases of occupational inequality. At least two conditions seem to have been fundamental in Sorokin’s view. He writes, “First, the importance of an occupation for the survival and existence of a group as a whole; second, the degree of intelligence necessary for a successful performance of an occupation”. According to Sorokin the successful performance of those occupations which deal with the tasks of social organization and control demand a considerably greater
degree of intelligence than that of routine work and that the strategic nature of these occupations in society enables the occupants of these occupations secure for themselves the maximum privileges and power. “Hence”, writes Sorokin, “we may say that in any given society, the more the occupational work consists in the performance of the functions of social organization and control, and the higher the degree of intelligence necessary for its successful performance, the more privileged is that group and the higher the rank does it occupy in the inter-occupational hierarchy, and vice versa”. This theory looks very like the functional theory of Stratification’ proposed by Davis and Moore in 1945. However, Sorokin does not believe in the inevitability of the correlation between the functional importance of an occupation and intelligence and argues “that the correlation may be broken down in periods of decay, although such periods usually lead to an upheaval, after which, if the group does not perish, the correlation is reestablished”. Thus, in other words, social mobility is necessary to secure the appropriate allocation and reallocation of talents to occupations and failure to achieve it ends in inefficiency and disorder.

Sorokin holds that the actual distribution of talents between occupations is determined by the specific character and functioning of the various “channels of vertical circulation” and wrote, ‘varying in their concrete forms and in their size, the channels of vertical circulation exist in any stratified society, and are as necessary as channels for blood circulation
in the body”. These channels of mobility include the army, the church, the school, political organizations, professional organizations, wealth making organizations, and the family last in the sense of intermarriage between the members of different strata. According to Sorokin, the channels of vertical mobility not only permit movement up and down the social strata, but they also act as mechanisms of testing, selecting and placement – sifting individuals into their places in the society. Despite this functionalist line of thinking, Sorokin has cast doubt on the perfection of the channels of mobility as mechanisms of testing, selecting and placement. He wrote that there has scarcely existed any society in which the distribution of individuals has been in complete accordance with the rule ; “Everybody must be placed according to his ability”. In this regard Sorokin’s comments on the role of school as an agency are interesting. He wrote “At the present moment, it is certain that the school, while being a training and an educational institution, is at the same time a of piece of social machinery which tests the abilities of the individuals, sifts them, selects them, and decides their prospective social position … From this standpoint the school is primarily a testing, selecting and distributing agency”. However, he argues that the functional fit between the channels of vertical circulation and the needs of society is far from being perfect. As such the educational system may select for inappropriate characteristics, with the result the upper strata “display a pretty intellectual ability and pretty conspicuous moral
slackness”, or again, there may be an over – or under – production of suitable recruits for the elite – “by increasing the rapidity of production of university graduates. Our universities are preparing dissatisfied elements out of these graduates, under emergency conditions capable of supplying leaders for any radical and evolitional movement”.

Sorokin also enumerates a fairly thorough list of positive and negative consequences of mobility. Thus, on the positive side, mobility leads to a better distribution of talents, which in turn increases living standards and raises economic efficiency and innovation. It gives the more ambitious members of the lower strata a chance to rise and thus, “instead of becoming leaders of a revolution, they are turned into protectors of social order”. Sorokin argues that these upwardly mobile recruits to the elite will not have the weak humanitarian traits of the hereditary aristocracy and “having climbed through their personal efforts, they are sure of their rights; they are not soft hearted. If it is necessary, they will not hesitate to apply force and compulsion to suppress any riot. In this way they facilitate the preservation of social order”. Lines of conflict and solidarity also become much more complex and flexible. The mobile individuals’ face-to-face contacts become more numerous and less intense; ‘he becomes like a polygamist who is not obliged and does not invest all his love in one wife, but divides it among many women. Under such conditions the attachment becomes less hot, “the intensiveness of feeling, less concentrated”, and thus
the likelihood of class solidarity and class conflict is reduced. Finally the absence of hereditary and similar privileges decrease the validity of the arguments of the dissatisfied. Instead of being heroes they are regarded as failures”.

On the negative side, Sorokin underlines, increase of mental strain and the likelihood of suicide. Mobility facilitates the disintegration of morals, encourages crass materialism and individualism, Like Durkheim (whom he quotes with approval) Sorokin argues that in a mobile society individuals do not accept their position in life. ‘He who is below wants to go up. He who is in the upper strata wants to climb further or dreads to be put down. Hence, there is a mad rush to put down all obstacles irrespective of whether it leads to social disorder or not. Hence, an increase in the centrifugal tendencies of present society”. In response, there is a search for belonging, a trend ‘conspicuously manifested in the social schemes of communists, revolutionary syndicalists; and guild socialists. They contemplate a complete engulfment of an individual within the commune, or syndicate, or a restored guild. They unintentionally try to re-establish “the lost paradise” of an immobile society, and to make an individual again only a “finger of the hand” of a social body. The greater the loneliness, the more urgent the need”.

Sorokin, however, does not conclude that these contradictory tendencies (positive and negative consequences of social mobility) will lead
to a continual oscillation from mobility to immobility. He claims, empirically, that there has been no consistent trend towards increased mobility. He writes ‘As far as the corresponding historical and other materials permit seeing, in the field of vertical mobility... There seems to be no definite perpetual trend toward either an increase or decrease of the intensiveness and generality of mobility. This is proposed as valid for the history of a country, for that of a large social body, and, finally for the history of mankind’.

He reports data collected by himself and his students on various groups of Minneapolis population which showed that over time there has been considerable increase in the rates of mobility but Sorokin argues that ‘eternal historical tendencies’ cannot be inferred from data covering a mere century or so. At most, then according to Sorokin, there has been only an alternation of periods of greater mobility with those of greater immobility.

Sorokin explains this oscillation by suggesting that ‘like an organism, a social body, as it grows older, tends to become more and more rigid and the circulation of its individuals tends to become less and less intensive presumably as the more privileged strata close their ranks in an attempt to preserve their privileges. There is also a tendency for institutional lag. The mechanisms of selection do not respond quickly enough to changes in the social environment and as a result ‘there almost always is a lag between the “human flour” sifted through this machinery for
different social strata and between the “flour” which is necessary because of the new changed conditions.” Thus, there develops a defective social distribution of individuals, which eventually leads to upheaval and a subsequent increase in mobility as new and more appropriate mechanisms of selection are instituted “The revolutionary policemen of history” then go away and the revolving circle of history starts all over again.

Since the publication of Sorokin’s book theoretical writing on social mobility did not make much progress. Much of the later theory had already clearly been formulated by him and equally refuted by him in his 1927 monograph. ‘Indeed’ says Heath, ‘one is tempted to speculate that if post-war sociologists’ had paid more attention to Sorokin and less to the false gods of their own such as Talcott Parsons, they would have avoided some of the darker blind alleys of the 1950s and 1960s’.

According to Health (Health, 1981, modern sociology has mainly progressed in the collection and analysis of data. He says that before the war, Sorokin had placed great weight on the careful inspection of the data, but the data available to him were neither systematic nor representative. Numerous studies of recruitment to particular occupational groups – social origins of millionaires, men of genius businessmen and even saints had been studied – but there were no representative surveys of the population as a whole or even particular, areas or cities. Notable among the available such studies were F.Galtons 1869, Hereditary Genius. An Inquiry into its
Laws and Consequences, (London), J. Schneider’s 1937 study, ‘Social Class, Historical Circumstances and Fame’, F W Tausig and C S Joslyn’s study of “American Business Leaders”, S J Chapman and F J Marquis, 1912 study ‘The recruiting of the employing classes from the ranks of the wage earners in the cotton industry’, J Wedgewood’s 1929 study, The Economics of Inheritance, S J Chapman and W Abbot’s 1913 study, ‘The Tendency of Children to Enter their Fathers’ Trades, A W Ashby and J M Jones 1926 study, ‘The Social Origins of Farmers in Wales’ Sorokin himself made a beginning with his study of Minneapolis students, Minneapolis Businessmen and some other groups of the Minneapolis population. However, it was only after the war that representative national samples were examined.

In this context studies conducted at the London School of Economics by David Glass and his team is a landmark in the history of social mobility studies. First of these studies carried out by Glass and his team was of a random sample of 10,000 adult civilians aged eighteen years and over in England, Scotland and Wales in the summer of 1949. Although the work has since been heavily criticized. It was a major pioneering study from which many others drew their inspiration. The respondents were asked questions about their age, sex and marital status, the schools they attended and the qualifications they obtained; and about their own and their father’s occupations – the pivotal point of a mobility enquiry. From data on
the occupation of the respondents and that of their fathers, the classic intergenerational occupational mobility tables were constructed. The main conclusions drawn from these tables were that Britain exhibited a considerable amount of relatively short range mobility coupled with a higher degree of rigidity and self-recruitment at the extremes, particularly at the upper levels where there was the strongest tendency for sons to follow in their fathers’ footsteps and enter broadly comparable occupations.

David Glass’s 1949 (Glass’s 1954) enquiry was the only major study made in Europe. The next important milestone was ‘Social Mobility’ in Industrial Society by Lipset and Bendix (Lipset and Bendix 1959). The major reason for their studying social mobility lies in its consequences for the individuals and society. The basic lines of Lipset’s argument have become common knowledge by now: social mobility acts as a safety valve which can reduce the chance of radical collective action which would threaten the regime. Lipset argues, “as long as the ruling group is flexible it will allow talented and ambitious individuals to rise from lower strata; yet an ever present tendency towards the formation of aristocracy tends to restrict such individual mobility in any society. If the restriction is sufficiently tight it can provoke discontent, which may result in efforts by members of deprived groups to achieve collective or group mobility, sometimes through a struggle to subplant the dominant group. However, Lipset does not treat this proposition as a universal truth. Rather, it is clear
that he is concerned with the role of mobility in a modern industrial society and the implication is that lack of mobility does not provide the same threat to stability in a traditional society. This is a major theoretical shift from Sorokin’s work. Sorokin took as his time-span, the role of recorded history while looking for trends in mobility, but the postwar writers have been specially concerned with analyzing the conditions of contemporary industrial society, and so the time-span shortens. While sharing with Sorokin the belief that a certain amount of mobility may contribute to social stability, Lipset contends that too much mobility may had lead to social destabilization and it is on the destabilizing effects of mobility that Lipset comes to place most of his attention. According to him the crucial source of the destabilizing effects of mobility is the problem of status inconsistency. He takes a multidimensional view of stratification, the system containing a number of different hierarchies based on status, class and authority. The status inconsistency is caused due to mobility on one dimension and not on another, or upward mobility on one and downward on the other. Lipset sees these inconsistencies as sources of frustration for the individual or group which predispose them to accept extremist politics. Thus he suggests, ‘the French bourgeoisie in the eighteen century developed its revolutionary zeal when it was denied recognition and social prestige by old French aristocracy’. The converse could also be true. The treat of downward mobility which imperiled the social standing of particular groups could also
be a source of radicalization although in this case the political content may take a different form, threatened social groups turning to antidemocratic ideologies such as fascism rather than communism.

In all this Lipset is in agreement with Michels, who had earlier argued that the Jews' leaning towards socialism could be attributed to the fact that their legal emancipation had not been followed by their 'social emancipation'. To put it in Michels' own words 'Even when they are rich, the Jews constitute, at least in eastern Europe, a category of persons who are excluded from the social advantages which prevailing political, economic and intellectual system ensures for corresponding portion of the gentile population. Besides the sentiment which is naturally aroused in their minds by this injustice, they are often affected by that cosmopolitan tendency which has been highly developed in the Jews by the historical experiences of the race and this combines to push them into the arms of working-class party... For all these reasons the Jewish intelligence is apt to find a shorter road to socialism than the Gentile'.

It is clear from the above that Lipset and Bendix's theoretical interests demonstrate that there is historical continuity in mobility studies. However, their work is most famous for their attempt at comparative empirical research. Lipset and Bendix carried out a secondary analysis of the results available on nine industrialized societies, France, Japan, Great Britain, Denmark, Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, U.S.A. and Italy. They
reclassified the occupations of the subjects of these surveys and their fathers as best as they could into manual, non-manual and farm categories since the finer occupational classifications used by the original studies varied considerably from one country to another then. They concentrated on upward and downward mobility across the manual/non-manual line, adding together the figures for upward and downward mobility to measure the total vertical mobility between the middle and working classes. Lipset and Bendix found that virtually all the nine countries as exhibited similar, high rates of total vertical mobility and contrary to their expectations, they found no evidence that America was more open than the traditional societies of Europe. For instance, they report that in America total vertical mobility across the manual/non-manual line amounted to 30%, but in Germany 31%, in Sweden and Britain 29% and in Japan and France 27% had been mobile.

The striking feature of these results being the similarity of the total vertical mobility rates, to explain their results, Lipset and Bendix had to seek factors universal throughout industrial societies as the factors which varied between societies, such as historical background, cultural patterns and national values could not be used to explain the rates since the rates appeared to be more or less the same. Thus they argued, 'several different processes inherent in all modern social structures have a direct effect on the rate of social mobility, and help account for the similarities in rates in different countries: (1) changes in the number of available vacancies; (2)
different rates of fertility; (3) changes in the rank accorded to the occupations; (4) changes in the number of inheritable status-positions; and (5) changes in the legal restrictions pertaining to potential opportunities.

These five processes seem to imply that modern industrial societies are characterized by their openness, high rates of mobility and universalism. In this connection, the first and fourth processes are perhaps the important ones. The first, implies that industrial societies are the ones with expanding economies which need increasing number of higher level workers in managerial and administrative positions which in turn creates an ‘upward surge of mobility’ The fourth indicates that the declining influence of family on the occupational status and the emergence of bureaucratic enterprise with its formalized method of selection or in other words the occupational status is dependent on individual’s own merit rather than on his personal connections.

In emphasizing the similarities of inherent features in the working of all modern industrial societies Lipset and Bendix were in line with a great deal of sociological thinking of post-war period during which the ‘convergence thesis and technological functionalism’ held sway. The convergence thesis and technological function thesis held that advanced industrialism required small, nuclear, geographically and socially mobile families; mass education; a pluralistic power structure; a mixed economy with a measure of government regulation.
Miller's Comparative Social Mobility (Miller, 1960) provides a comprehensive bibliography on the social mobility studies that were conducted after the publication of Lipset and Bendix's Book 'Social Mobility in Industrial Society'. This report reanalyses the data on various industrialized nations to compare the rates of upward and downward mobility internationally and deduces the trend in these rates.

In Miller's view, "... all societies have some Mobility. No society, has no mobility (not even the Indian caste society); no society has complete mobility or interchange of positions from generation to generation. Between these two boundaries stand all societies and it becomes necessary consequently to attempt to study closely the actual amount of mobility". comparing the results of mobility studies conducted in nineteen nations, Australia (Melbourne), Belgium (St. Martins-Latin and Mout –St. Gilbert), Brazil, Denmark, Finland, France, Great Britain, Hungary, India (Poona), (Sao) Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Puerto Rico, Sweden, Switzerland, USA, USSR (émigré's) and west Germany – across the globe Miller arrived at a brief profile of each nation. These profiles are reproduced below:

"Great Britain has a high up-mobility of the manual, high down-mobility of the non-manual, low long-range up mobility of the manual, low, long-range up-mobility of the non-manual, high movement out of the elites, high downward mobility of the middle classes (relative to the up-mobility
of the same strata), high long-run down mobility of the elites and low indices of association for various strata”. A close parallel was found in the finding for USA, USSR (Emigre’s) and Brazil (Sao Paulo). It is an interesting pattern of high upward, short and long distance manual mobility; high upward mobility of the middle classes and relatively low downward movement; low downward motion of the non-manual and the elites; low occupational inheritance with variation among the three in extent of long range downward mobility of the elites. It is thus a general pattern of upward mobility with limited downward mobility”.

A somewhat similar pattern of high rates of movement have been found for Great Britain and India(Poona), but with downward and limited upward movement than in USA and USSR.

Italy, Japan, Netherlands and Puerto Rico have been found to be less clear as a group. “The tendency (however) seems to be downward mobility, although in Japan and Puerto Rico access to the elites is relatively high.

Due to the difficulties inherent in all international comparative studies and the specific weaknesses of this study, as pointed out by the author himself, Miller suggests that the results of the comparison should not be “viewed as adequate description of nations” but as “suggestive of trends”, these profiles, the culmination of the data of this report, must be taken as no more than suggestive of possibilities”.
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Weighing the relative advantages and disadvantages (dangers) of a cross national approach Miller points out that such an approach to social mobility contributes effectively to our understanding of society; it becomes possible, with comparative data, to discover the benchmarks for highest and lowest levels of mobility with which the rates in other societies can be compared. It can possibly lead to the isolation of significant variables affecting social mobility; such as the relationship of the economic development of a nation rates of social mobility, and may finally develop a general theory of social mobility. Comparative study may also help in analyzing the consequences of mobility; such studies also clarify the kind of most useful data for analysis.

Difficulties such as the classification and ranking of occupations; class or strata; geographical units of study, time period of study, sex of the population studied, ethnicity, the problem of boundary, crudities of data available in documents and documentary records etc., are inherent in mobility studies; Miller points out that "these difficulties get compounded in comparative analysis for the results of rather disparate investigations have to be molded (Sic) into a form permitting them to be compared with one another. (Therefore) distortion is inevitable. One must operate with the hazardous assumption that the distortion does not destroy the product".
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Miller points out the following limitations of the study.

i) The research reported in the monograph is not primary research.

ii) Though the unit of comparison is basically the nation, but for four nations data are reported on a city- Australia (Melbourne), Belgium (two cities of St. Martins- Latin and Mout – St. Gilbert), Brazil (Sao Paulo) and India (Poona) with hope that they may be to some degree representative for the respective nations. For the Soviet Union data on Émigré’s has been used. For Hungary the national census data are employed.

iii) Only two-step intergenerational mobility (father-son) has been studied. Only outflow from a stratum is analyzed.

iv) For purpose of comparison strata or occupational categories have been combined.

v) The time of studies varies although all except that of the USSR are post-World War II studies. The USSR study is of 1940 while others range from 1946 to the mid fifties.

vi) Although the attempt was made to gain similarity in the ages of some studies in different nations by using data on a cross section of all sons, complete success was not achieved in this regard.

vii) The age for which father’s occupation was ascertained was not uniform in all studies and in some it was unreported.
viii) Even the age profiles of sons are not claimed to be the same for all the nations. And

ix) Only three basic strata of elite, middle class and working-class or manual strata were used for comparison, although the individual national studies differ in the number of strata into which the sons and their fathers were classified.

In view of these limitations Miller points out that the monograph should be treated only as offering a rough indication of the mobility in a number of industrial nations taken as a whole.

Among the implications of the data (used in the study) he points out that mobility is an asymmetrical metrical phenomenon. A nation can be high in one measure of mobility and low in another, as pointed in profiles for the nations under study. The links between mobility of one kind and mobility of another kind are unclear. There is no single measure of mobility, there are many measures tapping different dimensions of mobility and therefore, while making comparisons the measure on which comparison is based must be clearly specified. However, in Miller’s opinion the one clear result of the comparisons is that on both the simple comparison of working classes into manual and non-manual into elite strata, the Soviet Union (Émigré’s) has the highest rate on the other hand Soviet Union had a rather low rate of downward movement out of the non-
manual categories generally and out of the elite strata specifically. Thus, the upward manual movement is not due to the decline of the middle classes and the elite, but to the expansion of these strata. The United States has a high rate of manual movement into non-manual occupations, but not one that is distinctively higher than that of France or USSR (Émigré’s). On the other hand it is distinctively higher in the manual movement into the elite strata than all nations other than the Soviet Union (Émigré’s).

Miller, while comparing the conclusion drawn from his study with the results of the earlier such study made by Lipset – Bendix – Zetterberg (L-B-Z) using the data from nine industrialized nations of France, Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, USA, Japan, Great Britain, Denmark and Italy, is in a general agreement with the latter. Although he concedes to Lipset’s conclusion that all the industrialized nations exhibit the same rates of social mobility, he points to the following divergences from such a contention…

(i) The rates of manual into non-manual occupations seem to be closest together only if the low Italian and Finish figures and high Soviet figure are disregarded. Even then the range is not narrow, from 14% in Hungary and Puerto Rico to 30% in France and if the former two are disregarded as not being very industrialized, the lower limit is about 20% in the Netherlands and West Germany.
(ii) The rates of non-manual into manual occupations show a spread between 20% of USA and USSR (Émigré’s) on the one hand and the more than 30% of several other nations.

(iii) The rates of movement of manual strata into elite strata also reveal a considerable range.

(iv) The rates of movement out of elite strata are widely varying.

Thus, he concludes that while there appears to be more convergence in the rates of mobility among industrialized nations than most people had believed, the kind of divergences that have occurred cannot be ignored and the attention must be focused on the reasons of such divergences. Thus, Miller casts some doubt on Lipset’s contentions that all modern industrial societies are characterized by their openness, high rates of mobility and universalism.

Finally, Miller makes the following suggestions for future research in social mobility.

(v) Studies of smaller units (e.g. Regions) of a nation should be made.

(vi) Data should be refined along the lines of Goldhamer Rugoff and the Hutchinson procedure to isolate structural change from fluidity (circulation mobility or exchange mobility).
(vii) Adequate attention should be paid to inflow data to understand the differences in social origins of members of different strata and their relations to differences in attitudes of the strata.

(viii) Instead of employing two or three categories it would be useful to employ larger number of classifications to be able to understand the mechanics of short and long range mobility.

(ix) Historical changes in the rates of mobility in a nation should be studied.

(x) Age cohort data should be analyzed.

(xi) Study of particular population like university students, elites, and unskilled labourers should be made.

(xii) A heavy emphasis on the cause of different rates of mobility is needed. Blau and Duncan’s, The American Occupational Structure (Blau and Duncan, 1966) is another important, rather the final, landmark in the history of social mobility studies.

The American Occupational Structure is not a broad overview of existing research in the area of social mobility, nor is it a secondary analysis of data collected for some earlier study. It is not even an international comparison of rates of mobility. In all these respects it differs
from the important earlier studies like those of Sorokin, Lipset and Bendix and Miller.

This study lies in the tradition of national surveys of occupational mobility that began with David Glass study ‘Social Mobility in Great Britain’. Blau and Duncan’s survey was carried out as an adjunct to the current population survey of the US bureau of census and was based on a sample of 25000 men aged between twenty and sixty-four and representative of the forty-five million men in this age Cohort in the civilian non-institutional population of the United States, in March 1962. Each respondent was asked to give information about his present occupation, his occupation on his first entry into the labour force; the occupation of his father when the respondent was sixteen years of age, the educational attainment of the respondent and his father, the number of siblings and so on. No information was gathered on attitudinal or psychological data, but was restricted to relatively ‘factual’ biographical information because this could be conducted reasonably efficiently on national scale.

The novelty that Duncan introduced into mobility studies, with The American Occupational Structure, was not in theory nor in data collection but in techniques of analysis. The technique, which had made Duncan famous, is known as ‘Path Analysis’ a relatively simple extension of multiple regression first used in 1918, by Swell Wright who applied it to
his studies in population genetics and animal breeding. This technique is not only statistically sophisticated but is also sociologically informative.

Path analysis enables a sociologist to estimate the relative importance of different determinants of individuals’ occupational attainment. Earlier analysis of mobility was made to estimate the rates of upward or downward intergenerational mobility. The American Occupational Structure too has a plenty of this kind of analysis, but with the help of path analysis Duncan was able to analyze efficiently the process of occupational attainment. Thus Duncan introduced two shifts in the nature of mobility studies: one, there was a shift from mobility itself to attainment, and second, there was a shift from rates of mobility to the determinants of attainments. Thus Duncan, unlike the earlier sociologists, did not address himself only to the question, ‘How much mobility is there in a particular society?’ But he also attempted to find an answer to the question, ‘what is the relative importance of factors such as social origins and education as determinants of individuals’ eventual occupational attainment?’

Explaining the reasons for this shift Blau and Duncan explain, ‘the main reason for this reformulation is that the likelihood of upward mobility depends, of course, greatly on the level from which a man starts; this makes the finding, that a given factor is associated with mobility, ambiguous’. Therefore, the basic question which Blau and Duncan address is how the status individuals’ achieve in their careers is affected by the statuses
ascribed to them earlier in life, such as their social origin, ethnic status, region of birth, community and parental family’. They conceive of occupational status in 1962 (the survey date) as the outcome of a life long process in which ascribed status position of birth, intervening circumstances, and earlier (educational and occupational) attainments determine the level of ultimate achievements. A formulation in terms of a simple mathematical model (Path Model) permits an appropriate assessment of the relative importance of the several measured determinants’.

Although the precise questions Blau and Duncan ask and try to find answers to differ in important ways from the ones asked by their predecessors their theoretical concerns exhibit a marked community with those of the earlier researchers like Lipset and Bendix. The two passages quoted above from the American Occupational Structure illustrate the link with the broader issues raised earlier. Both the passages reflect a contrast between ascription and achievement, between the ascribed statuses with which an individual starts life and occupational status, which he eventually achieves. This reflects Blau and Duncan’s faith in the post-war functionalist view that a stable industrial society requires to place greater emphasis on a man’s achievement and lesser on his ascribed characteristics; and that achievement be judged by universalistic criteria, such as educational attainment, which can be applied to all and be empirically verified.
Nepotism and connection must give away to demonstrable merit. In accordance with this view, Duncan and Blau claim that, as they expected to find, they found that the importance of ascription has declined whereas that of achievement has increased over time. Formulating this claim explicitly in functionalist terms they argue that industrial society is characterized by ‘a fundamental trend towards expanding universalism which has profound implications for the stratification system. The achieved status of a man, what he has accomplished in terms of some objective criteria, becomes more important than his ascribed status, who he is in the sense of what family he comes from. This does not mean that family background no longer influences careers. What it does imply is that superior status cannot any more be directly inherited but must be legitimated by actual achievements that are socially acknowledged. Education (therefore) assumes increasing significance for social status in general and for the transmission of social standing from fathers to son in particular’.

Blau and Duncan see this ‘fundamental trend’ as having been brought about by the needs of industrial society. They argue that in the pre-industrial society class barriers and immobility did not present any great problems since there were few positions that required search for knowledge and skills: ‘In previous periods the knowledge and skills the society was able to utilize were severely limited, which made this waste of talent regrettable from the standpoint of individuals but unavoidable from the
perspective of social order. (Today, however) technological progress has created a need for advanced knowledge and skills on the part of a large proportion of the labour (sic) force and not merely a small professional elite. Under these conditions society cannot any longer afford the waste of human resources, a rigid class structure entail, universalistic principles have penetrated deep into the fabric of modern society and have given rise to high rates of occupational mobility in response to this need’.

Another important empirical study conducted in the USA since the publication of Blau and Duncan’s book is the one reported in the book ‘Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect Family and Schooling in America, by Christopher Jencks (Jencks et al, 1972) and his team of investigators. This study is based on a reanalysis of data reported in James Coleman’s report on Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey (popularly known as Coleman Report), and supplemented by data collected for earlier studies of Project Talent, NORC data on veterans, etc.

Jencks and his colleagues reanalyzed the said data using the technique of path analysis, which was earlier used by Blau and Duncan. Jenck’s study is a more compressive study as far the range of variables involved in explaining the inequalities in educational attainment, occupational status and income, is concerned. The major conclusions reported by Jencks and his colleagues are outline below:
(i) The most important determinant of educational attainment is family background. The impact of family background is accounted for partly by measurable economic differences between families and partly by more elusive non-economic differences. Besides the family background, the next important determinant is probably cognitive skill, but the precise effect of cognitive skills is hard to determine.

(ii) Qualitative differences between the high schools attended do not explain more than 2% of the variation in the students' eventual educational attainment.

(iii) Occupational status is strongly related to educational attainment. While family background and cognitive skill influence educational attainment and as such influence occupational status indirectly, they have no direct impact on educational attainment. However, despite a strong relationship between occupational status and educational attainment, enormous status differences exist among people with the same amounts of education. This remains true even when people who have not only the same amounts of education, but the same family background and I.Q., test-score are compared. To quote Jencks, ‘Anyone who thinks that a man’s family background, test-scores, and educational
credentials are the only things that determine the kind of work he can do in America, is fooling himself. At most these characteristics explain about half the variation in occupational statuses'. Jencks attributes the unexplained variation partly to the variation in the status of the same individual at different times in his life, and partly but "presumably" to unmeasured character traits, like alcoholism, mental health and drive to succeed, but the extent of explanation by such traits is thought to be insignificant. As such, much of the variation is attributed to chance' and some due to 'choice'.

(iv) As far as income is concerned none of the factors among family background, cognitive skills, educational attainment and occupational status, explains much of the variations in men's income. In the absence of any measured influence on income variation. Jencks comes down to 'luck' as the explanation. "Income also depends on luck": Chance acquaintances which steer you to one line of work rather than another, the range of jobs that happen to be available in a particular community when you are job hunting, the amount of over time work in your plant, whether bad whether destroyed tour strawberry crop, whether the new super
highway has an exit near your restaurant and a hundred other unpredictable accidents”.

(v) To remedy the inequalities in educational attainments, occupational statuses and income Jencks et al. reviewed a large number of proposals, but conclude that no proposal other than 'political control over economic institutions' is feasible. They argue, “As long as egalitarians assume that public policy cannot contribute to economic equality directly but must proceed by ingenious manipulations of marginal institutions like the schools, progress will remain glacial. If we want to move beyond this tradition, we will have to establish political control over economic institutions that shape our society. This is what other countries usually call socialism”.

Similar results have been reported by Boudon in his Education, Opportunity and Social Inequality (Boudon, 1972) has attempted to synthesize the main findings accumulated by empirical research on two closely related points. One, a society is characterized by a certain amount of Inequality of Educational opportunity (IEO). If the probability of going to college is smaller for a worker’s son for a lawyer’s son. Second, “a society is characterized by certain amount of Inequality of social opportunity (ISO)
If the probability of reaching a high social status is smaller for former child than for the latter”. Boudon has attempted to develop a theory leading to some specific conclusions on a number of questions related to IEO, such as “Is IEO likely to decrease? To what extent? Is the probability that a worker’s son will go to college likely to be equal in a more or less remote future to the same probability for a lawyer’s son? Then, he has related to IEO the change over time in IEO and in other factors, such as overall average increase in level of educational attainment. In this way he examines, “the effects on social mobility of the tremendous increase in rates of school attendance that has occurred in most societies since 1945”. The numerous consequences of the model so developed have been checked against data, he has . . . “tried to confront the numerous consequences of the model as systematically as possible with the existing body of empirical data, both survey finding and school book keeping data”.

The major conclusion drawn from this study includes, that as long as societies are stratified, inequality of educational opportunity will continue to operate. Boudon goes to the extent of proving that “Even if grade school education were so effective that achievements at its completion were independent of social background, the probability of lower class youngster attending college and a for trot of a attending a prestigious institution of higher education would probably remain much lower than that of an upper-class youngsters”. Therefore, changes in the educational system (like
expanding the facilities for higher education) will reduce the inequality of educational opportunity only marginally. Again, even if the inequality in the levels of educational attainment are reduced, the curriculum differentiation as response to the needs of the industries would offset this reduction and “the trend in all Western Societies is toward differentiation of curricula and institution rather than toward uniformity”. Although as a result of technological progress and economic growth social status is becoming increasingly dependent on cognitive skills and as such as an educational attainment, this only leads to the growth in demand for education and not necessarily to the reduction in economic inequality and consequent change in social structure. Boudon has found, “no uncontestable empirical evidence that economic inequality, one of the major dimensions of stratification, is necessarily decreasing as a result of technological and industrial development”.

Regarding the trends in social mobility in industrial societies Boudon concludes that mobility in industrial societies does not appear to change over time according to any definite general pattern toward increase or decrease”. The explanation for this lies in the proposition “that although IEO decrease over time, the overall increase in demand for education causes the expectations associated with a given level of education to be non-constant over time”, in fact these expectations lower down.
Another outcome of the study is the weak relation between education and mobility in industrial societies, “Even with a high level of IEO and a strong influence of educational level on social status, the relation between education and mobility is normally very weak. Attainment of the highest level of education is often followed by social demotion, whereas social promotion quite frequently occurs, a poor level of education notwithstanding”.

The doubt about the relationship of education and social mobility was cast first by Anderson and is often referred to as ‘Anderson’s Paradox’ (Anderson, 1961). Although, quite a few studies showed positive correlation between educational and social and occupational status but all of them showed only a weak relationship. Boudon explains this paradox by the argument that, “Except under very special conditions, which are unlikely to be met, a highly meritocratic society will not necessarily give to those who have reached a high level of education more chances of promotion or fewer chances of demotion than those whose level of education is lower. This apparent paradox derives from two circumstances. First, since those who obtain a high level of education more frequently have a higher background, they have to climb still higher in hierarchy of social statuses in order not to experience demotion. Second, one consequence of the discrepancy between educational and social structure is that even under
a high degree of meritocracy, people with the same level of education will reach different social statuses”.

Thus, Boudon emphasizes stratification as the principal factor responsible for inequality of educational opportunity as well as inequality of social opportunity and suggests that “any lessening of the rigidity of stratification” such as through a reduction of economic inequality is more likely to reduce inequality of both educational and social opportunity. Although he does not, unlike Jencks, say that socialism is the key to eliminating inequality but argues that the greater equality of educational opportunity and social opportunity in Eastern European Societies is due to the nature of their political economy than the anything else. Thus he remarks, “... It can be stated that differences with respect to IEO as between Norway and Sweden on the one hand and most other Western European countries on the other, are probably due in great part to the deliberate policy of equality conducted by these countries over the last decades. Probably, too, the comparatively low amount of IEO in Eastern European countries is attributable not only to the authoritarian quota system (which fixed the proportion of students from various social backgrounds who could obtain higher education) but also in part to the political organization of these countries. Even if this type of organization has clearly been unable to build up ‘class-less societies’, it has beyond doubt had
equalitarian effects on the previously existing stratification systems of these countries”.

Thus both Jencks et al and Boudon’s conclusions are in consonance with the hypothesis advanced by Parkin who propounds the thesis that East European nations as also the West European countries where left-wing parties were in power for long periods, exhibit lower extent of inequality of educational opportunity and higher rates of social mobility. The argument underlying this thesis is that such governments use the educational system as a tool for social reform. Education being under the direct control of the government, a close link between the educational attainment and occupational status has been established, and such measures as free secondary education and maintenance grants for students at the university have enabled a larger number of working class students to obtain the educational qualifications required for entry into elite occupations.

By reforming the educational system the state has widened opportunities both educationally and socially, however, to prevent the privileged from taking more than their share of the opportunities political action has been taken to increase the equality of opportunity and consequent increase in upward social mobility. Parkin argues that the “range and extent of upward mobility” is the most significant difference in the reward system of the socialist and capitalist societies. A number of reasons have been given for the socialist societies’ more openness, one is
that some of the Eastern European nations have been transformed from largely peasant and agricultural societies to modern industrial economics, achieved within a couple of generations (faster than the most Western societies). This has rapidly transformed their occupational structure and therefore, their ‘upward surge of mobility’ has been large. Another reason could be, that having realized the relevance of scarcities of formal education, technical skill and their concomitants to the industrial development, the socialist regimes transformed the educational system and linking it to the reward system and, as expected, the totalitarian government could promote equality of opportunity in the distribution of education as well as in the allocation of the outcome there-from the reward system, by enshrining the performance principle as against ascription or even need. Connor attributes higher rates of upward mobility in the social statuses to rapid expansion of non-manual strata as a result of revolution and rapid industrialization and “... their (non-manuals) source of recruitment could be only external, proletarianization, demographically at least, of the non-manual strata was the result. The generally humble origin of the political elite in socialist states, is attributed to the “demands of insecurity and uncertainty if such a career” as being its attractiveness for many a children of political and non-political elite, who are well-equipped (with education and other cultural inheritance) to seek comfortable careers outside the political main line, and as such leaving greater room for the members of the
lower strata, with some initial advantage, to enter such an elite group "... currently politics seems a particularly mobility channel that few choose, but that remains open to persons of worker and peasant origin who have less initial disadvantage, because of that origin, in this than in other careers requiring deeper, but perhaps narrower, technical expertise". Another reason given by Connor is the elimination of ownership of private property in the means of production and as such the elimination of the chances of inheritance of upper class membership. "All, under socialism, must sell their labour, manual or non-manual to the state (private peasantry remaining a partial exception)" and: . . "The dictate, 'he who does not work, neither shall he eat'. Socialism has (also) broken, in a rather decisive way, with whatever automatic particularistic advantages sons might have in inheriting their father's profession of engineer, doctor, etc., through specific preferential access to the requisite training, etc., and that meritocracy has taken hold, with certain lapses and inconsistencies".

Connor arrived at these conclusions on the basis of a reanalysis of data from six socialists countries of Eastern Europe- Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia II-- and the comparison of the outcomes of this reanalysis with those of data from Capitalists Societies of – Australia, Denmark, Finland, France, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Sweden, USA and West Germany.
However, while accepting the gains of socialism, Connor believes that socialism has not been able eliminate stratification but has succeeded only in replacing the old pre-socialist stratification by a new one as chances of inheritance of status continue although to a lesser degree than is exhibited in capitalist societies. He argues that socialism has not achieved equality but equity”. Socialism asserts that its object for the present and foreseeable future is equity, rather than equality, ‘a fair’ but not equal distribution of goods”. Thus ranking himself more with “neo conservatives than with the equalitarian Connor is troubled by “the implications of equality of result” for individual liberty, were it to become the basis of government programmers”. He advocates individual freedom and achievement through effort as worthy of appropriate reward and as such has distaste for socialism.

Dy house in his study Family pattern of social Mobility through higher education in England in the 1930s’ (Dy house, 1930) made a survey of the social background, educational careers and life histories of a sample of women who graduated from six English universities or university colleges before 1939...

This studies found that mothers as well as fathers played an important role in family decisions about whether to encourage and support children through higher education. Very few of the mothers of the graduates in his sample had had the benefit of a university education;
indeed for many of them, schooling had ended at fourteen. However, these mothers’ ambitions for their children’s education as a route to social betterment might be at least as powerful as fathers, and sometimes more so. In middle class families, fathers were likely to take the lead in decisions about their sons’ education and careers. Lower down the social scale it is striking that mothers often played a more decisive role. The evidence suggests that middle class fathers, as well as mothers, might encourage and influence daughters, and that there was little difference between fathers and mothers in their support for girls going to university in families lower down the social scale.

There can be little doubt of the fact that those male graduates in his sample whose family backgrounds were working or lower middle class experienced upward social mobility during their lifetimes: they themselves were very conscious of this. The question of whether parental investment in a daughter’s education "paid off" in this period is more complex. It certainly did so in terms of personal and cultural enrichment. A very large number of the women in his sample judged that their education had "made all the difference in the world" to their lives. The occupational and economic benefits for women, and outcomes in terms of their own social betterment, were somewhat less clear. However, social mobility has to be seen as an inter-generational as well as a lifetime process. There is no reason for supposing that graduate mothers were any the less ambitious for their
children's success than their own mothers had been for theirs. Indeed, amongst the women graduates, one of the most commonly perceived benefits of higher education was that they felt able to support and encourage the education of their own children. This idea of "cultural capital" bequeathed to the next generation lies at the root of perceptions of the demand for higher education as spreading like a "virus" or "infection" in society, or as "snowballing" through successive generations of the population.

The paper also examines the role of higher education in producing social mobility in England in the 1930's. A higher proportion of women than men appeared to come from middle class backgrounds, partly because of the exclusion of Oxbridge. Men appeared to have stronger career aspirations than women, targeting professional careers partly as an escape from the conditions of the 1930's Depression. Yet most women saw their university education as linked to a need to earn a living, though teaching was the main prospect. The view of certain sociologists that fathers supported sons and mothers supported daughters has some substance, but mothers were also important support for sons, especially from lower classes. Upward social mobility occurred for virtually all men, but the pay-off to women from university education was more ambiguous, and often rested on the university as a place for meeting their spouse. Probably the
main effect for women was a 'snowballing' of encouragement to their offspring to attend university, through successive generations of women.

Cristinan Iannelli and Lindsay Paterson (Iannelli and Paterson, June 2005) examined the link between parental social class (ie individuals’ social class of origin), educational attainment and individuals’ own class position (ie class of destination). It analyses whether educational expansion and the development of a comprehensive educational system have reduced inequalities and led to greater social fluidity. The key questions are: Has the association between class of origin and education changed over time?

This studies shows that educational attainment has grown considerably over time. The percentage of people who did not acquire any qualification has sharply declined from 40% in the oldest cohort to 12% in the youngest cohort. With the exception of the youngest cohort, a decline is also visible in the percentage of those who achieved lower-secondary education (O grades and Standard grades and similar qualifications). On the other hand, the proportions of people acquiring the highest educational qualifications have increased remarkably. Thus, the percentage of people with degrees has risen from 15% to 26%.

The analysis showed that, over time, class effects have been increasingly mediated by educational attainment but this trend seems to have stopped in the youngest cohorts. Thus, for entry to the professional class, it was found that the intermediary role of education grew from the
first cohort to the second cohort but then fell in the final cohorts. In light of these results one could say that apparently meritocratic recruitment to the professional and managerial classes (in the sense of being based on acquired credentials) may indeed have been growing for people entering the labour market between the 1950s and the 1980s but we might now be seeing a reduction in this.

Education indicates the relationship between the individuals’ social class of origin and their current social class position, analyses showed that education plays an intermediary role between origin and destination but it does not account for most of the association between class of origin and class of destination. The effect of individuals’ social class background on entry into the professional and managerial social classes is strong and significant. The highest educational attainment of people originating from middle class families only explains part, not all, of their advantage in entering occupations with the greatest prestige. This means that there is still a strong direct effect of social class of origin on people’s class of destination - even after taking educational attainment into account.

Intergenerational social mobility in urban Mexico

Fernando Cortés, Agustín Escobar Latapi, (April 2005) assessed changes in absolute and relative opportunities of access to the upper strata of the urban social and occupational structure in Mexico, drawing on data from the
largest retrospective social mobility survey carried out in the country, which covers all the largest cities and some medium-sized ones. It analyses intergenerational mobility in three periods: before 1982, from 1982 to 1988, and from 1988 to 1994. The results show a striking decline in opportunities of access to the stratum of professionals, managers and executives and large employers. This decline has not been linear but has affected first and foremost those from the lowest strata, than those from privileged strata, while leaving the intermediate strata of the socio-occupational structure virtually unaffected. The article also analyses the evolution of absolute and relative opportunities by gender.

Jo Blanden and Professor Stephen Machin, (Blanden and Professor Stephen Machin, 2007) Found that Social mobility in the UK remains low for those born in 1970, with recent generations of children’s educational outcomes still overwhelmingly tied to their parents’ income, according to the latest Sutton Trust research released (December 13, 2007). The study, from the London School of Economics and the University of Surrey and funded by the Sutton Trust, reviews evidence related to children born between 1970 and the Millennium, to determine whether the decline in social mobility between previous generations has continued. The main findings of the work show that:
Intergenerational income mobility for children born in the period 1970-2000 has established, following the sharp decline that occurred for children born in 1970 compared with those born in 1958.

However, the UK remains very low on the international rankings of social mobility when compared with other advanced nations.

Parental background continues to exert a very powerful influence on the academic progress of children. Those from the poorest fifth of households but in the brightest group drop from the 88th percentile on cognitive tests at age three to the 65th percentile at age five. Those from the richest households who are least able at age three move up from the 15th percentile to the 45th percentile by age five. If this trend were to continue, the children from affluent backgrounds would be likely to overtake the poorer children in test scores by age seven.

Inequalities in obtaining a degree persist across different income groups. While 44 per cent of young people from the richest 20 per cent of households acquired a degree in 2002, only 10 per cent from the poorest 20 per cent of households did so.

Nunn, Johnson, Monro, Bickerstaffe and Kelsey reviewed the literature available on factors influencing social mobility. They found some evidence that traditional working class social capital has declined, which may have weakened its assumed negative effects on social mobility, while other ‘negative’ forms of social capital have
emerged such as cultures of worklessness, anti-social behaviour and
drug abuse. A lack of positive role models, peer pressure, poverty of
ambition and risk aversion may serve as barriers to social mobility. By
contrast middle-class families tend to have access to a wider range of
social networks that are more advantageous from the point of view of
enabling upward mobility and protecting against downward mobility.

Cultural capital can also help middle-class families to confer social
advantages on their children, increasing their potential to move upwards
and protecting them from downwards movement in the social hierarchy.

Early years influences are seen as key to influencing later life
chances. Convincing evidence shows that early experiences such as the
quality of the home environment, family structure, pre-school care and
relationships with caring adults produce a pattern of development in later
life that is hard to reverse even through schooling.

Education appears to be one of the most important factors
influencing social mobility. However, there is considerable evidence that
the introduction and expansion of universal education systems in the UK
and Western Europe have not led to increasing levels of relative social
mobility. This is due to a range of factors including the ability of middle
class families to take advantage of educational opportunities.

Recent decades have seen the emergence of important labour market
trends with implications for social mobility. First, substantial levels of
worklessness and long-term economic inactivity have emerged in some areas and/or among specific population groups. Second, research has identified the emergence of a prominent ‘low-pay – no-pay’ cycle for some groups. There is also evidence that specific groups face particular disadvantages in the labour market and that women who take career breaks often have difficulty re-entering the labour market in the same position and therefore frequently experience downward social mobility after having children.

Ill-health results from social and environmental factors identified with lower socio-economic status, and ill-health and caring responsibilities can lead to declining socio-economic status.

Localised environmental problems appear to combine with socio-economic disadvantage to produce negative area-based influences on potential for social mobility. For example, inequalities in access to private transport combined with poorer quality provision in some important public services in deprived areas may mean that lower socio-economic classes are unable to exercise effective choices over access to these services. Combating worklessness and helping people to progress within work would be key elements of a strategy to promote both intergenerational and intragenerational social mobility.

Gonzalez Alvarez, Lissette, Studies the relation between education and social mobility in Venezuela (Alvarez... 2007) Gonzalez Alvarez,
Lissette for this purpose, they used the Cultural Determinants of Poverty Survey, undertook by the Institute of Social and Economic Research, Universidad Católica Andrés. Although its purpose was not to measure social mobility, it provides information of respondent's and his parents's education and occupation in a nationwide sample. Both of them begin with an exposition of the theoretical argument among different perspectives on social classes and stratification, and the main conceptions of association between education and inequality, showing Latin-American and Venezuelan perspectives. They continue by exposing the main economic and demographic changes occurred in Venezuela along the 20th Century. They focus on labor market and educational system and its impact on population. This is the context for their following analysis of social mobility.

This analysis takes into account influence of variables: sex, birth cohort, urbanization level, school and occupation sector. Results show that upward mobility relates to education, increases in education level, to high school education and working in public sector. College education relates, instead, to stability in non manual occupations across generations and to enrollment in private elementary schools. Superior education appears not as a channel for upward mobility, but more as a way by which middle and upper classes maintain their own advantage positions.
Viviane Azevedo, César P. Bouillon Studies the Social Mobility in Latin America (Viviane Azevedo, César P. Bouillon... 2009) reviewed evidence on social mobility in Latin America. Several studies have used data sets that collect intergenerational socio economic information. The data, though limited, suggest that social mobility is low in the region, even when compared with low social mobility in developed countries like the United States and United Kingdom, with high levels of immobility at the lower and upper tails of the income distribution. While Latin America has improved education mobility in recent decades, which may have translated into higher mobility for younger cohorts, the region still presents, except for Chile, lower education mobility than in developed countries. The paper also reviews studies on the main determinants of the region’s low levels of social mobility, including social exclusion, low access to higher education, and labor market discrimination.

In this paper the authors have reviewed the existing evidence in the region on social mobility and its determinants. Even though the absence of long-run panel data in the region precludes a rigorous analysis of social mobility, the combination of data sets with information on son-parents socioeconomic information, short-run panel data and studies on the dynamics of income inequality in the region allow them to infer some possible trends and determinants of social mobility. The main conclusions include the following:
• Social mobility seems to be low in the region, even when compared with the developed countries with the lowest levels of mobility, the United States and United Kingdom.

• There seems to be high levels of immobility at the lower and upper tails of the income distribution. The analysis of intergenerational income transition matrices by income groups suggests that lower tail immobility, which may be associated with poverty traps, is more prevalent across excluded populations (such as Afro-descendants in Brazil) and poorer regions. Upper tail immobility seem to be associated with “traditionally” more privileged groups, such as whites in Brazil, and more developed regions, linked probably with barriers to access to high education or to labor market segmentation and positive discrimination for these groups.

• In rigorous studies on the determinants of social mobility in developed countries, education mobility and access to higher education are found to be the main determinants of social mobility. Even though the region has improved education mobility in recent decades, which may have translated into higher mobility for younger cohorts, the region (except for Chile) still displays lower education mobility than in developed countries, including the United States and the United Kingdom. As previously mentioned, these higher 43% levels of immobility seem to be associated with low levels of access to higher education.
• Labor market dynamics alter the level of social mobility as the returns of human capital vary with changes in the supply and demand for certain groups of workers, either strengthening or weakening the effect of greater education opportunities on mobility. With the exceptions of Brazil and Colombia, the increased gap in returns to skills in the region seems to be associated with increased wage inequality. In countries with low progress in educational mobility these may also translate into lower social mobility, as they translate into increasing income-earning advantages for highly educated child-parent pairs.

• Discrimination and labor market segmentation can lower social mobility— even in countries with ample access to education opportunity— by reducing the labor returns of educated but excluded groups.

The urbanization process and the increased opportunities for migration from poorer areas should promote higher mobility. On the other hand, regional development that is concentrated in certain regions and is not accompanied by adequate migration opportunities into these regions from poorer areas should be associated with decreased social mobility. There is consensus among most politicians and researchers in the region that one of the key roles of the market system and of government action is ensuring equality of opportunities. Difficulties for policy design arise when societies try to define which public policies and regulations are needed to ensure equality of opportunity. Measures and analysis of the determinants
of social mobility are key for shedding light on which factors in society limit equal opportunities. It is important to note, however that even the most mobile societies show persistence of income advantages.

The studies reviewed above have mainly been conducted in the context of Eastern and Western Europe and the USA although Connor’s data includes Japan and Miller’s includes of that of Poona (India). No prominent studies in social mobility of Asian Societies were reported. However, an available study of social mobility of Chinese Society is briefly reviewed here. Julia Kwong. (Kwong, 1970) Examines the relationship between Social background and opportunities in communist China. Kwong finds a positive link between social background and the success in the three tiered examination, instituted in 1977, to chose students for junior high school, senior high school and the university, although the examination itself was found to be fair and free from “much of the corruption which undermined the system in the early 1970’s.” Kwong considered the system even “more fair than the public examinations in the West” as the “aptitude tests, and specially IQ tests in the west have been shown to favour children from the middle class” . . . whereas in China, since the said entrance tests are based only “on the information incorporated in a set of text-books used uniformly all over the country”, the tests are free from the bias that enters aptitude and IQ tests.
However, despite the impartiality of the system the social class bias is still reflected in the selection. “Workers’ children are more likely to succeed in the examinations than the peasants’ children and those from the intellectual/cadre families are more privileged than those from the workers’ families”. This is, according to Kwong because like the West Chinese Society is also stratified and as such “life chances differ according to the person’s location in the social hierarchy. The advantages accrue to particular groups whose positions profoundly influence the academic achievements of their children”.

However, the influence of social background operates in ways which are “similar yet different from the west”. Unlike West the influence of income differentials is much weaker. The obvious reasons for this are nationalization of private property, a direct involvement of government in the provision of higher education, and a more egalitarian distribution of wealth. However, the education and occupation of parents affects a student’s performance in the examination. While education shapes the attitudes and ability of the parents to so direct their children’s socialization, their occupation determines the area of residence and thus the quality of school available. Hence, as the workers, intellectuals/cadres live in cities their children have the advantage of attending better equipped schools compared with the poorly equipped rural ones available to peasants’ children and as such they (the former) outperform the latter. The workers’
and intellectual/cadres’ children’s better performance is partly accounted for by the closely-knit family and peer group influences.

Thus, ‘through its reputation of judging ability impartially on the individuals’ performance, the examination system helps the disadvantaged to be reconciled to their fate. And together with its emphasis on exonerating the successful, it is not onlylegitimizes the advantages the children of the intellectual/cadres enjoy but increases them by showering on them more attention and better facilities and teachers. While the examination is not the root of the inequalities, it certainly reflects, maintains and exaggerates them”.

Thus, study of the opportunity structure in China also leads to the conclusions that are in consonance with Boudon’s thesis, that school reform does not lead to the elimination of the inequalities, but the reduction in inequality in the distribution system can lead to the reduction of inequality of educational opportunity. If the Chinese, provide a quota for the peasants’ children in the enrolment to the institutions of higher education, they shall be able to eliminate the inequality that the examination system reflects and strengthens.

**MOBILITY STUDIES IN INDIA**

Barber has reviewed the results of studies in social stratification and social mobility within the caste system of Hindus. He reports that most of
the earlier sociologists and anthropologist who studied the Indian caste system analysed their data only in reference to the possibility of upward and downward caste mobility and concluded that the Indian society is as closed today as it was in the ancient time, and as such neither there was nor is any possibility of mobility. Referring to his own earlier study of doctrines of Dharma and Karma and the immobilizing effects of these ideas of Hindu society, he says even he represented the same older views, “To the Hindu, consequently, social mobility is both impossible and immoral in this worldly life”.

However, now it is explicitly recognized that “Caste” refers only to ranking along the religious-and ritual behaviour dimension among a host of dimensions of stratification and interaction patterns. Although the ritual ranking is more or less fixed throughout an individual’s life- but “it can be altered under certain conditions” through the processes of “symbolic justification” which Srinivas has termed ‘Sanskritization’. Apart from the ritual basis of stratification, economic and power dimensions are also relevant to the understanding of Hindu society. Barber points out that although it is not possible to know exactly how much mobility occurred in India, but evidence shows that “more mobility occurred in India than was granted in the older picture of its stratification system, social mobility . . . is not just a recent phenomenon in India”, on the contrary it occurred even during the Vedic age when Vaisya and Sudras were also assimilated.
Barber identified two major classes of sources of such social mobility. One, effects of the ‘outside’ forces i.e. factors arising in physico-biological elements or those that are the product of social systems other than the Indian one. Second of these two sources is, various internal socio-structural pressures for mobility that are effective despite ‘cultural’ disapproval or opposition. “One important ‘outside’ factor that had consequences for Indian social mobility, both upward and downward, was successful military invasion and conquest. Such conquest affected the native Hindus as well as providing higher social class positions for many of the invaders. Sometimes lower-caste Hindus would unite their armed forces with those of the invaders and thus ensure a rise in their own positions”. Similarly there would be downward mobility when the ‘Rajas’ fell and were replaced by members of the community of lower-castes than that of Raja’s. “A series of unusually good harvests or a famine, both resulting from uncontrolled forces of weather or natural pests, was other kinds of outside factor that contributed to upward and downward mobility in Hindu Society”.

Population changes, such as migration, may also lead to the change of occupation and as such of the caste rank; success or failure in the market among the members of the same caste may also lead to upward or downward occupational mobility and give rise to new caste groups. These changes are both external and socio-structural in nature. Changes in the
demands of economy might force some individuals or families change their occupation and as such lead to their upward and downward occupational mobility and also changes in the caste rank. “Another internal socio-structural factor that led to upward and downward mobility in Hindu society was concentration and dispersion of property that occurred, depending on whether single or multiple heirs inherited from the older generation. Technological changes leading to new occupations, although less common in India than the West during the modern times, has nevertheless been a source of some social mobility in Hindu society. Quoting Srinivas, Barber says that castes changed their occupations in the recent past, and perhaps in the remoter past as well social mobility was sometimes also achieved through hyper or hypo gamy, although hyper gamy was more widespread than hypo gamy.

Again, from time to time, there was some explanation of the whole opportunity structure, which provided another socio-structural source of mobility.

All this mobility, upward or downward, occurred within an essentially stable or relatively unchanging system. “The religious values and ideologies, the kinship system, the localism, the occupational structure, community organization, all these and other essentials features of Hindu caste society were able to remain fundamentally the same despite the mobility which occurred and unlike the West, the (caste) structure did not
rupture with this mobility. Thus, to gain acceptability the new entrants into a higher occupational group engaged in what Srinivas calls “Sanskritization” to gain acceptance by those whose caste occupation they had entered upon. Some succeeded in this but not all. Although a different type of society and different stratification system are emerging with different patterns of social mobility based on the values of egalitarinism and competence and expressing themselves through new and modern social roles (Westernization), the old system has emerged as stable too.

Thus, Barber suggests that while studying social mobility in India account should be taken of both the process of “Sanskritization” and “Westernization”.

Sovani and Pradhan made an occupational mobility survey of Poona city in 1955 (Sovani and Prodhan, 1955) this study attempted only to measures the rates of upward and downward occupational mobility and immobility and did not inquire into the question whether caste mobility was taking place or not. The survey was conducted on a four percent random sample of families selected from the rationing registers in the Poona corporation area and the Poona and Kirkee cantonments, covering 5601 families.

This study led to the finding that only about four percents of the heads of the families surveyed, improved their positions continuously through the three generations, while only about one percent experienced a
continuous decline. As against this, about 38 percents remained in the same position over the three generations. The proportions in complementary pairs of movement or ‘inertia’ (immobility) between grandfather – father; and father – respondent showed no definite pattern.

Thus, there were 35.8% families that indicated inertia between grandfather – father (first – second) generations but ‘ascent’ (upward mobility) between father- respondent (second – third) generations; 7.6% showed inertia between first and second, but descent (downward mobility) between second and third generations; 5.4% showed ascent, followed by descent; 1% indicated descent followed by inertia; 6% indicated ascent followed by descent; and 1.7% indicated descent followed by ascent.

Commenting on their findings the authors say that very large proportions (35.8%) in the category of inertia – ascent, and the unidirectional ascent (37.7%) indicate that the movement upward has been significantly more than downward. However, while the percentage of ascending considerably outweighs that those descending, the overwhelming importance of those who are stable is too plain.

On the whole, the authors claim that the urban community of Poona has been stationary. However, in the younger generations the tempo of change seemed to have been quickened, which is reflected in the declining proportion of those engaged in unskilled manual work and among clerks and shop assistants in the total occupational pattern; “Urbanization would
thus seem to bring about the transformation of unskilled manual workers into other types of skilled, highly skilled, etc., workers, even in centers like Poona, where the process of urbanization is not based on industrial development. Miller while reanalyzing Sovani and Pradhan’s data shows that 27.3% respondents had moved from manual to non-manual category; 26.9% from non-manual to manual; and 73.1% had retained their non-manual status; while 1.4% had moved from manual into elite, within an elite comprising 5.1% of the population. Miller concludes, that the pattern indicates a high rate of movement, but with downward and limited upward movement much more pronounced, than in industrialized nations except Britain.

Dubey, reports the results of a survey of the intergenerational and career mobility of professionals in an ‘industrializing’ city – Gorakhpur (U.P. India) (Dubey…). The major findings reported by Dubey are:

(i) The proportions of professionals from rural and urban background is almost equal. The highest degree of spatial mobility has taken place among the doctors and engineers and the least among lawyers with college teachers in the middle.

(ii) Income and intelligence play an important role both in nature of migration and mobility of the group.

(iii) Those who have received special professional training and technical education have come from very large distances to
Gorakhpur. They have come from as far as Burma, East and West Pakistan.

(iv) The proportion of traditional elite (big agriculturalists, landlord, and businessmen), shows a decline through the three generations of grandfather, father and respondents, while the proportions of white collar workers shows a constantly increasing trend.

(v) Sons of non-manual, white collar and professional fathers have greater chances of entering professions. Among those of the sons of agriculturalist fathers, sons of big farm families with highest origins have the greater chances of entering professions.

(vi) Low income, poverty and inability to meet the expenses of higher professional education reduce the chances of sons of agricultural labourers and caste occupation workers to enter professions, and even their aspirations to do so.

(vii) Increased education has lessened the interest in agricultural occupations and more and more people are inclined to enter urban occupations.

(viii) Scheduled castes and O.B.C. are very highly underrepresented (4.33% and 2.66% respectively) among the professionals. However, Dubey argues that caste alone does
not limit the chances of entering a profession but educational attainment plays a more important role.

(ix) The rates of upward occupational mobility was highest (52.6%) for the sons of middle class and white-collar fathers while for those of the sons of working class fathers it was the lowest (1.66%).

(x) Salaried professionals are more likely to shift to private practice.

(xi) Men with ‘liberal’ education are more likely to change their occupations than those with technical and professional education.

(xii) Men from white-collar occupations find it somewhat easier to enter professions, but not a single manual worker had risen to professions.

(xiii) No downward career mobility was noticed among the professionals.

Among the factors influencing the rates of upward mobility, Dubey lists, urbanization, industrialization expansion of educational facilities, father’s education and occupation as the most important.

Jayaram, reviewing the role of higher education in the context of social stratification in India (Jayaram, …) concludes that the system of
higher education has been strengthening the stratification system as it accelerates the process of status retention by members of the middle class and as such instead of acting as an instrument of establishing an egalitarian society, its expansion has resulted in rigidifying stratification and fostering inegalitarian tendencies. Even after twenty years of independence, during which there has been a tremendous growth of higher education, it has not broken the system of inbreeding into occupations. Although a few (negligible) persons from the lower classes and caste have acquired higher education and enter the professions like that of physicians, the weaker sections suffer from discrimination both in access to higher education as well as in entry to higher status jobs even if they succeed in acquiring higher education.

Similar results have also been reported by Barkar and Kurulkar on the basis of study of post – graduate employment experience of the scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, and denotified nomadic tribes' students in Maharashtra. (Barkar and Kurulkar...) They report that a close relationship exists between low status and low caste, low paid jobs and between high caste and high status – high paid jobs; low caste graduate take much longer time to obtain jobs after finishing their education than is the case with the high caste graduates. The academic performance of low caste students is very low on an average compared to that of high-caste average. The participation of low caste women in higher education is meagre (2.7%)
compared to that of the women from high castes (14%). The major benefits of wage-employment and self-employment has gone to Mahar community (in Maharashtra) among to the low castes as a group and to Brahmins among the high castes as a group. The authors of this study report that the major reasons given by the low castes students for their plights were nepotism, corruption and casteism, in selection of candidates for various posts.

Gogate (...) reports that in district Marathwada (Maharashtra) higher education had helped raise the socio-economic status of scheduled castes but their status continued to be lower compared to that of upper castes with similar levels of educational attainment.

However, Pandey reports that the growth of modern education and the changing socio-economic status among the scheduled-castes in U.P. were closely related to each other. He also reports that protective discrimination and democratic secular values were helpful and that the schedule caste members were more achievement oriented than ascriptive oriented. They also rejected ‘Sanskritization’ but accepted Westernization as useful to raise their status. The schedule caste elite recognized their obligations towards their fellows (caste-fellows) who were still weak. They would emulate elite of any caste, culture, or region in life style.

However, Pandey’s findings seem to contradict the results of another later study from the same state made by Prakash. Prakash reports that
protective discrimination benefited only the children of the scheduled caste elite and the scheduled caste masses were not even aware of the facilities and concessions provided for them by the state and Central Governments.

The bias in Pandey’s study is obvious, in the light of Prakash’s Study. While the latter studied a purely random sample, the former sampled his respondents only from the amongst the educated schedule caste employees in Varanasi City.

Shah and Patel’s (Shah and Patel, ...) studies of schedule caste/tribe Post-metric scholars in Gujarat reveals results similar to those of Prakash. They found that the largest proportion of Post-metric Scholars, about two thirds, belonged to only three castes of Mahyavanshi, Vankar and Dhed groups. The next largest proportion (25%) belonged to Garo/Garoda group and about 3% belonged to Bhangi group and the remaining 5% belonged to fifteen different castes. “Thus almost 96% post-metric scheduled caste scholars belonged to only four major groups” They also noted that in 1971-72 there was not a single post-metric scholar from as many as 28 scheduled caste groups out of a total 68 such groups.

Singh (singh...) made a study of intergenerational social mobility on the population of Union Territory of Chandigarh. The sample was drawn from fathers in the age range of 45-65 and the sons from 26-45 years. Singh concluded that (i) the educational level of the old and ‘new’ generation was positively and significantly related to the income,
occupational prestige, SES, job satisfaction and parental aspirations; (ii) Scheduled Castes and Backward classes were backward in education as compared to higher classes; their (SC and OBC’s) number was very small at higher educational level; (iii) 79% of the population had experienced upward intergenerational mobility, 10% downward and 11% had no intergenerational social mobility; (iv) the vertical social mobility consistently decreased with the increase in the educational level.

Kaplan (Kaplan...) concludes the results of his study of social mobility among the Christians in Madras city with the finding that Christians in Madras metropolitan area, despite their association with the lower castes, from which they were converted to this faith, have managed to become mobile. The reasons for their mobility listed by Kaplan are access to mission schooling and the strong education oriented values held by the community. The other important reason was the anti-Brahmin movement in the region; reasons given by Kaplan are: one, exodus of the colonial power and the removal of Europeans from dominant positions in society: second, the dramatic growth of industry and a complementary infrastructure in the Madras metropolitan region following independence.

The other conclusion reported by Kaplan is that caste in a metropolis is by no means the all-pervasive expression of individual’s status, and that caste promotion does not invariably follow class mobility. However, the church continues to play a significant role in the allocation of ritual merit.
Bhattacharya (Bhattacharya...) made a study of social mobility through three generations in four different areas of West Bengal. The study leads to the findings that (i) inequality of educational opportunity (IEO) has been in existence for a long time; (ii) the educational system itself is stratified; (iii) the lower classes remain immobile while the middle classes, although not experiencing long range upward mobility, experienced short ranged mobility from lower middle class to middle –middle class, downward mobility was also observed among them; (iv) members of the upper class could not only protect and maintain their status in society, but also enhanced these attributes over the years.

Bhattacharya suggests that it is not only higher education, as reported by Jayaram, which stabilizes the structure of status, but it is also the system of education which does that through intricate mechanism generating a different type of IEO emanating primarily from a stratified system of education. Bhattacharya also contradicts Boudon’s thesis that the impact of a system of education on inequality of social opportunity (ISO) is negligible. His study on the contrary reveals that although ISO is a self-generating and propagating process, the system of education is seen to be quite in its role as a reinforce of social stratification and Inequality. Although Bhattacharya apparently disagree with Boudon, but it appears that he is actually supplementing Boudon’s thesis. While Boudon believes that a reduction in IEO will not necessarily reduce ISO, Bhattacharya adds that
IEO instead increases ISO. This is quite in keeping with Boudon’s thesis. In line with Boudon’s observations Bhattacharya also suggests that IEO and ISO can be reduced only by reducing the economic inequality or, in other words, lessening the rigidity of the social stratification alone can reduce IEO and ISO. He also suggests that the system of education also should be reformed and made uniform by abolishing the stratified educational system.

Kumar’s (Kumar...) study of social mobility in four villages around Bhilai Steel Plant (Madhya Pradesh) reveals that although industrialization of rural areas uproots the inhabitants initially, but they get rehabilitated as the large scale industries themselves and through the growth of ancillary (smaller) units which have a great employment potential. Not only this, whatever, impact it may have on agriculture but it helps the agricultural workers experience upward vertical and horizontal occupational mobility as opportunities for unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled and professional employment are opened up by the industrial development. In consonance with the ‘techno-functionalism’ Kumar also finds that the rural agricultural population experienced not only upward occupational mobility but the younger generation’s experienced upward educational mobility too. The income of both the younger generations and the older one’s increased. Not only this, apart from changing the lifestyles of the people, mobility aspirations were heightened and hence demand for education has also increased. Kumar also notes that with these changes consumption and
saving patterns also have changed and importance of caste as a determinant of social status has diminished considerably.

U.A. Attar, (Attar, 1983), in his study, Teachers': A study in social mobility examined a scarified random sample of 400 teachers in Mysore to find out various aspects of mobility, socio-economic and demographic composition of teachers and their educational attainments, aims and aspirations. He found that the teaching profession was dominated by males and that there were no female teachers in engineering colleges. Most of the teachers belonged to Muslim religion and from middle class, upward mobility was found in the study.

D.N. Jena, (Jena, 1988) in her study an Occupational Mobility among the Artisan castes, examined all artisan castes of the Kendrapara area, a middle class town in Orissa, and found that the incidence of migration was greater in higher castes than the lower artisan castes. Urbanization, mass-media, education, political support and financial assistance were positively associated with mobility, Artisans were in favour of providing jobs to women.

V.K. Pandey (Pandey, 1988) in his study Social Mobility among Women in the Transitional city of Raipur in Madhya Pradesh, analyzed trends directions and consequences of social mobility among women as well as factors responsible for it. He found that the present changes in
social position of women and women’s education had unproved and that education can only play an important role their children’s careers.

Malati Sinha, (Sinha1, 989) in her attempt to study the relations between various levels of education and Social Mobility among women in Bangalore City. She drew a stratified random sample from twenty one divisions within Bangalore city. She found secondary education amongst women had a positive effect on their Occupational Mobility.

R.K. Mujoo, (Mujoo, 1992) in his study, Higher Education and social Mobility. An Interdisciplinary Study of the Impact of University Education on the Career and Attitudes of Graduates in Jammu and Kashmir, examined a 17% sample of boy’s and girl’s who had passed standard XII in 1957 and in 1967. The study aimed at investigating the major beneficiaries of the expanding higher educational facilities in Jammu and Kashmir as also the role of higher education in social mobility. He found that higher education was dominated by urban upper caste Hindu men and the weaker section had not utilized the facilities of free higher education. He also founded that mobility had occurred towards non-manual occupations from manual ones. However, he found that education alone does not have a significant bearing on occupational placement.

S. Biseria, (Biseria, 1991) attempts to examine Mobility Patterns and Professional Commitments of Higher Secondary teachers in Delhi. He developed a tool and administered it among all the teachers in higher
Secondary classes in a sample of 50 higher Secondary school selected randomly. Distance was correlated negatively to commitments in case of women teachers.

Vandana Upadhaya, (Upadhaya...) in her study, Mobility of Plantation Sector Labour in Assam: Determinants and implications'. The main objective of the study was to examine the extent, types and implications of inter-generational occupational mobility among tea garden labourers in Assam. More specifically, the objectives of the research projects were to investigate into the extent of intergenerational occupational mobility and occupational diversification among the tea garden labour communities in Assam, the pattern of occupational faced by the tea garden labour households in diversifying their sources of earning and employments, the determinants of occupational mobility and immobility at the household level.

Factors Influencing the Educational Achievements of the Scheduled Cast and General Caste Students of Cuttack Municipality Corporation, Orissa Tulasi Acharya and Deepak Kumar Behera (Acharya and Behera,...).

The article makes an attempt to set forth some of the prime factors influencing the educational achievement of Schedule Caste vis-à-vis General Caste in order to have a comprehensive understanding of the
dynamics of the process for the end purpose of policy formulation. The study has the following objectives:-

(a) To find out the reasons of varying educational achievements between Scheduled Caste students and students from General Category; and

(b) to identify various socio-economic barriers to educational development among Scheduled Caste students and students from General Category. Of the 29 schools situated in the study area, only 5 M.E. and 5 High schools were selected on the basis of high enrolment of Scheduled Caste students. All those Scheduled Caste students (above 10 years of age) who were reading in Class-VI and above were consulted for data collection. As many as 259 Scheduled Caste students fulfilling all our requirements were identified in our sample schools. However, data could be collected only from 250 Scheduled Caste students as six were not available throughout the fieldwork and three other did not co-operate with us despite our best possible effort. Accordingly 250 General Caste students from the same educational grades with the same gender break-up were selected on a random basis for a comparative analysis. The study shows that both in case of General Caste and Scheduled Castes, the families where both
the parents are literate produce comparatively more “A” grade and ‘B’ grade performances than other categories of families. Also, it reveals on comparison that “A” grade and ‘B’ grade students of first category (i.e. where both parents are literate) of General Castes stand much ahead of the students of first category of Scheduled Castes.

SOME TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS:

The studies, reviewed in the foregoing pages, lead to the following tentative hypothesis:

(i) There is positive relationship between socio-economic background and educational attainment.

(ii) Educational attainment is positively related to the occupational attainment.

(iii) Reduction in Inequality in educational opportunity does not lead to the reduction in the Inequality of Social opportunity or reduction in Inequality in educational opportunity does not automatically lead to upward social mobility.

(iv) Industrialization increases the opportunities of occupational mobility and consequently leads to an increase in the demand for higher education.
(v) Urbanization, like Industrialization. Opens up the chances of upward occupational mobility through the expansion of the service sector.

(vi) Industrialization and urbanization diminish the role of caste in determination of social status.

(vii) Inequality of social opportunity cannot be reduced, not to speak of eliminated, without lessening economic inequality or breaking the rigidity of stratification system.

Although the present study looks into those hypotheses, but being a social survey, it is not addressed to testing these hypotheses as such. But these hypotheses have a bearing in setting the objectives of the present study, which are given in the previous chapter (1.4.1)

The present study may be viewed as exploratory in nature and scope.