STATUS POSITION
STATUS AS CONCEIVED

The term 'status', as used by modern social scientists, has received greater attention by them, themselves and wide acceptance by the concerned public. When residents of any locality of Calcutta tell a new comer that a family has status, they may perhaps mean many things but primarily they might be referring to the social honour of that group. As used by sociologists and social anthropologists and also political scientists, concept of status not only reveals much about the basic nature of society and social change, but also explains many things about social life of human beings in a modern society (Birenbaum, 1978). Status has been defined and described in various ways and a comprehensive but brief account may be helpful to understand the significance of 'status' in a human society or in a human group.

Linton (1949) has made much of the use of the concepts of status (i.e. position) and role. He has illustrated the multiple positions a person may occupy during the course of a day and the many roles he may play. In a not too different way Lenski (1966) illustrated status and role in American society.

Earlier Linton (1936) argues that there are two types of status: ascribed and achieved. In the former form of status, the individual is devoid of any choice; it is totally ascribed
at birth, independent of difference with gender, family type, ethnic group. The child is enrolled in the membership of the society with a specified place in the system of status of the parents. In such a system, some statuses are permanent and some temporary, but all are ascribed in nature. Later the child may achieve a new status or even a series of new statuses through time and experiences which are achieved. Ascribed status derives from uncontrolled attributes, as age, sex, or membership in a group, family, religion, nationality. With ascribed status the person is expected to acquire a distinct role and performance. Achieved status is gained by some direct and/or positive actions. "Ascription limits access to status positions. "... an Indian untouchable can never be a member of the Brahmin caste" (Elychiroy 1967: 39). Such transferance is not absolutely absent nowadays. But the process is complicated with good deal of formality and spatial movement is a must to escape the encounters.

'Socio-economic' status has been defined as "the position an individual or a family occupies with reference to the prevailing average standards of cultural possession, effective income, material possessions, and participation in the group activities of the community" (Chapin, 1936; cited by Young 1982: 369). Definition of status may be quoted "the rank or position of an individual in the prestige hierarchy of a group or community" (Kretch et. al., 1962: 338). Max Weber (1978: 540) argued that the term 'social status' implies "typical
effective claims to position or negative privilege with respect to social prestige" concerned with mode of living, formal process of education, prestige of birth or/and occupation. "By status we understand the relative position occupied by man or group within any established hierarchy. This position is dependent not simply on personal qualities or achievements but on the recognition a man or group receives within same scheme of social evaluation. Various grounds may be cited for the recognition, such as wealth, power, function or birth" writes Maciker (1948 : 114). On this issue Mukherjee, 1965 : 250) points out that in caste, status is "limited by birth and kinship to groups, and remain fixed for life irrespective of individual effort", in case of class, status "acquires as a result of individual achievement that throws the door open to a larger ... range of values which the culture emulates".

Emphasizing the role of birth as a factor in determining status of a person in a caste ridden society, it is observed that "from the point of view of the individual member of a caste the system provides him from birth with a fixed social milieu from which with wealth nor poverty, success nor disaster can remove him, ..." (Hutton, 1977 : 111). "Every Hindu necessarily belongs to the caste of his parent, and in that caste be inevitably remains. No accumulation of wealth and no exercise of talent can alter his caste, status, and marriage outside his caste is prohibited or severely discouraged" (Maciver and Page, 1962 : 356). Such extreme condition does not prevail now in the strict sense.
In a caste based society, men enjoy corporate status without activities or achievements. Each integral group has a set line of opportunity, vocation, and social role. In a class ridden society, status is variable and social classes are not demarcated by clear-cut lines. Individuals are not identified, and assumed exclusively by his social rank (Maciver, 1948).

In the class ridden society of America "if a man's education, occupation, wealth, income, family, intimate friends, clubs and fraternities, as well as his norms, speech, and general onward behaviour were known, it was not difficult for his fellow citizens to give a fairly exact estimate of his status" (Warner and Lunt, 1941 : 82).

On the other hand, in the configuration of caste and culture Majumdar (1958 : 19) points out, "entry into a social status is a function of heredity, individual achievements, personal quality or wealth". In such circumstance strict traditional prescription is followed. Discrepancy is met with between theory and practice (Shukla, 1976). The role of status among the Hindus in post-independent India is making a concerted move for rearrangement of backward classes on a horizontal plane, instead of pressing for accommodation in the hierarchical order. Status differentials are not acceptable to them (Majumdar, 1984).
In connection with the present work, only on the Hindus, and moreso of Bengalis, social status in the Hindu caste system may be examined. Among the Hindus there are two kinds of status, viz. secular, determined by criteria like wealth, education, skill etc. and ritual, determined by the concepts of purity and pollution. The former kind of status is universal and the latter is an exclusive character of the Indian caste system. Stevenson (1954) has elaborately described and analysed the concept of ritual status and the 'Hindu pollution concept'. It has also been pointed out that Indian caste system consists of segmented division in which "the different segments are kept apart by complex observance emerging from an all-pervading concept of ritual pollution and hierarchy and social distance manifest and express themselves in rules and regulations that are calculated to avoid ritual pollution and maintain ritual purity" (Dube, 1984: 202).

Away from the concept, the status is found to be in a condition of change in rural tribal circumstance. In a study of the process of status improvement of the Bhumij tribe in Manbhum, Sinha (1963) observed that both Sanskritization and Hinduaisatan played a great role in the attempt to improve social status in the caste hierarchy. Quoting Sinha (1963) "the largest among the Bhumij landholders in south Manbhum with the zamindars of Grahmans and Baghmundi or the Taraf Sardar of Satrakhani (a field covering more than 100 villages) found it more convenient to leave the bulk of their Bhumij brethren
behind and to aspire for recognition as Kshatriya, exclusively for their own lineages, backed by their economic and political powers. "During prolonged contact with Hindu castes over centuries, the upper strata of the Bhundij were among the earliest to become Hinduized... The lower strata gradually imitated the ritual symbols of the upper strata". Giving an example of Sanskritization from West Bengal, Datta Gupta (1963: 114) points out that the leaders of the paundra community tried "to prove that once they were kshatriya and that as they belonged to that varna or order, they should perform rituals such as putting on the sacred thread".

In analysing the role of ritual status among the Bengali Hindus, Sarma (1980: 128) points out that "the position of each caste depends on its degree of purity or impurity. The difficulty faced by all scholars is that there are no scales for measuring purity or impurity". In this context, Bailey's (1959) observations in Bisipara, Orissa may be mentioned. Economic and political achievements by a caste of low ritual rank was able to improve its social status in the ritual hierarchy of castes, ... and on the whole successful efforts to raise their ritual status and their political status within the village".

Among many studies on ritual status, it would be worthwhile to mention that in the analysis of the role of ritual status in undivided Bengal, Marriott (1965: 74) observed that the "degree of occupational specialization and the amount of
ritualization of their function seem to be minimal in the Bengal delta region. Though Broomfield (1968) found that caste status is valued by the upper caste Hindus of Bengal.

Close correlation between status and occupation has been found in USA (Warner et al., 1949, 1960). Such studies have given rise to an index of status characterized upon occupation, source of income, house type, and place of residence. In a study of New Haven, Hollingshed Redlich (1958) utilised occupation, education and residence to locate people within the status hierarchy. It is revealed from many other studies in the United States that "the middle class and the nouveaux riches are particularly status conscious and far more anxious about their position than other groups" (Warner and Lunt, 1941; Dollard, 1957; Mills, 1951; Baltzel, 1958). Other studies on the same format have revealed the above results with further confirmation (Dimhoff, 1967).

Dube (1955) noticed that though the status continued by caste plays a vital role, yet other factors such as education, government services and leadership position in the village community provide sufficient scope for an individual to reform his initial status and to achieve a new one. According to him there is a swing from ascribed status system to achieved status system in rural Andhra Pradesh (cited by Chauhan, 1980: 55).
"In both the United States and India", according to Be Berreman (1964 : 217), "high castes maintain their superior position by exercising powerful sanctions, and they rationalize their status with elaborate philosophical, religious, psychological or genetic explanation". "... The caste system in India and in the United States has secured gains for the group established at the top of the hierarchy. Their desire to retain their position for themselves and their children accounts for their efforts to perpetuate the system".

Citing example of modern operation of improving social status in the Hindus caste hierarchy from North Bengal; Risley (1981 : XVII) points out that "the great majority of the Koch inhabitants of Rangpore now invariably describe themselves as Rajbansis or Bhanga Kshatriyas"; It may further be annexed with the case of the Tills (oil man), they still retain old family titles. Wealth and prosperity have made them to give up the manufacture of oil, and led them to become Amdawalah, or traders buying goods wholesale and selling them by retail" (cited by Mukherjee, 1957 : 108).

Citing another example of status improvement by 'Saha caste' from undivided Bengal, Risley (1981 : 275) observes that "Sunri, Saundika, Sundoka, Shaha, a large and widely diffused caste, found in most districts of Bengal and Bihar, whose original professions is believed to be the manufacture and sale of spirituous liquors. Many of its members have now taken
to mercantile pursuits, call themselves by the title Shaha, and disown all connexion with those who still follow the characteristic occupation. Their striving for social advancement has as yet not been entirely fall; successful, and in spite of their wealth and enterprise ancient association still hold them down". Many more such acts of social mobility is found among a number of castes and groups of lower order. It is true that in course of such attempt, their status has been elevated.

In an analysis of role of status in Calcutta, Mohan and Eames (1980 : 120) observed that "lower caste men obtain employment in a variety of labouring occupations varying from the unloading of ships in Calcutta to earth moving in various cities, many of the middle caste men obtain jobs as peddlars and in constructions". Marriott (1959, 1968) has drawn attention on several problems concerned with measurement of status. Systematic principle for ranking the occupational group associated with them (the leather worker and the sweeper) are not always found. There is seldom any way of scoring the aggregate of one's caste attributes against another and so of ranking.

Many scholars have drawn attention to the role of caste association in improving social status of castes. Belonging of a person to a caste only does not automatically make a voluntary member of the association, Functions of caste associations cover education, social work, economic welfare and other objects.
For the lower castes they are instrumental in mobilising support for a higher status (Hartman, 1982; Churye, 1979). "To speak of caste association, reforms movement and/or effects of status mobility are strictly urban phenomena" (Conlon, 1977 : 134). In order to improve their social status the Nadars of Tamil Nadu organized a caste association to secure economic opportunities (Hardgrave, 1969). In Bombay the Chitrapur Saraswat Brahmins organized a caste association to secure economic benefits. Emphasizing the role of castes association in improving social status of different castes in Indian society, Srinivas (1989 : 50) observed: "The coming into existence of caste sabhas or associations was an important factor in the spread as well as the acceleration of mobility. Initially, their aims were to reform caste customs in the direction of Sanskritization, to lay claim to high rank, to undertake ... welfare activities for caste fellows ...".

There are various factors of determining the status of an individual. Social status is related to social prestige. The prestige of an individual can be measured in terms of factors like education, occupational prestige, wealth, standard of living, community participation etc. The prestige dimension of occupation can be assessed by the objective result of rating, as the social grading of individuals occupation is based on the community's evaluation as well as on the social interaction among members who rank one another (Ernest, 1962).
PRIOR TO EXPOSURE WITH DATA

Immediately earlier in the present chapter status has been dealt in comprehensive manner. At this juncture it is perhaps worthwhile to make a few comments in the conceptual arena. Status is definitely different from power. But in a broader dimension both of them are close to each other. On the basis of experience in carrying out the present work, it appears that identification of power is easier than recognition of status, of course to a degree of strict sense.

For an individual or even for more, as in a group, status is recognised without much variation by the members of the concerned group. In case of status, this appears to be in a somewhat fluid state. For a single individual acquisition of a number of characters is required for gaining status. It is not fixed in the same scale of status sequence in case of other individual of the concerned group. With change of group, the evaluation may also be jeopardised.

It may be pointed out that everything, characters and achievements, connected with status is relatively more flexible than the counterparts connected with power. Without going into the definition part which is still both somewhat complicated and still enigmatic, some more observations have been included here. On the basis of the author's own experience during carrying out the present work, it is found that
status is perhaps the final product of a number of character units. These include family background, education, profession or occupation, wealth, political association and/or affiliation, muscle power etc. All the above mentioned basic characters on status have been pulled from exploratory work. Only those characters have been included which have the score of more than 50%.

It is not always possible to arrange these characters in terms of fixed priority ordering. Rather each way of ordering varies in terms of total condition, in the dimension of both space and time. Ordering position of characters related to status in urban and rural areas is neither exact nor similar. Even it differs within the urban context between areas, like slum and posh locality. The kind of ordering on status which was present during pre-independent time changed almost immediately during post-independent period, and further change has taken place through time. Such shift may be explained as the effect of change of society with alteration in the value system of constituent characters.

In this connection an example may be set forth. The scoring value of education connected to status was high a few decades back, especially up to 1950s. Later, valuation of the same went down. Again in furtherance, the score on education was revalued. Importance was only paid to education of very high
level. Political affiliation concerned with status, was viewed in one way four decades back. In modern times, politics does not play the same role as it had earlier. With regard to status some other attributes may be taken in, as age and sex. In hypothetical sense, if all other characters are exactly equal between two individuals, age is definitely a factor which generally makes enhancement in case of higher status. About sex, differences are there on status between two individuals with gender difference. But like age concrete result is not always exactly the same. In cases, male gets higher score in other cases it is just the reverse, indicating higher values on females. Although in the dimension of status a kind of conservatism is still retained, with dominance on males. Exceptions may be put forward and in those instance females must have come up with the achievement of a number of characters with higher values.

It is commonly thought of and even some authors consider that the other associated attributes of status are honour, respect, prestige etc. The present worker does not completely agree with the same. Instead of fixing these as attributes, such characters are practically synonymous reflections. With honour, status cannot always be elevated. A person with honour is also a man of status. This is true with other issues. For gaining or enhancing honour, respect, prestige etc, the already mentioned characters are important. It requires to be painted
out that scoring arrangements of the forementioned characters in different forms depend on the evaluation of status or honour or respect or prestige. All these issues are not exactly similar to one another but the difference among them is very minimum, or there is overlapping both in concept and understanding. Moreover the members or the individuals who pay respect or give honour or put prestige or even endorse status, cannot be the same and thereby differences appear to be inevitable. A teacher is generally considered as honourable by his students but the same person does not get the same honour by his colleagues. The most conspicuous illustration in this regard may be given from a family set up of an individual. For all the required characters, a person is considered as honourable or respectable or prestigious and even having higher status by the member of his own group or society. But from his family members, he does not always achieve the same form, especially in expressive part. Illustration of similar nature has been put forward by Linton (1949) in western context.

In terms of comparison there is a discrete difference between power and status. In case of power, a person terms powerful with his own expressive behavioural characteristics. In other words, he tries to go up in power scale. The status is somewhat different. In case of the person possessing the required characters there is the involvement of a good deal of labour, energy and financial inputs. Instead of his own
elevation, he is elevated by the member of his group or society. In simple terms for acquiring power, self-motivation is essential. While in case of status, motivation in elevation is rendered by others.

In the present context, it may be said that at times power and status are found to be present in the form of an equation. In other cases, a man of status may not be powerful and a man of power may not be of high status. It is also true that power elevation the number of required characters is less compared to the counterparts on status. Again, the stability of status is relatively stable and consolidated than power.

It may also be pointed out that power acquisition is comparatively easier as it is set in relatively lesser number of characters. Elevation of status is quite hard because it requires acquisition of a number of characters. In case of power, the individuals are possessing a number of necessary characters in combination, primarily for circumstantial condition of favour. Characters like politics and wealth may be achieved in many ways, direct and indirect possession of one character may include other attribute, as in case of economy and politics. If a man is elevated in power structure with political enforcement, he also turns wealthy in majority of the cases. In connection with status there are distinct classes based on academics, creativity, family background and in
cases wealth with traditional aristocracy without any leaning on politics. These characters are difficult to achieve and it is only possible, at least in majority of the case in direct manner.

DATA AND RESULT

On the basis of works already carried out on status, it has been found out that a number of characters act as the essential elements for the possession of status. Seven such characters have been identified on the basis of preliminary exploration through pilot survey. The characters are: education, wealth, family background, profession, political possession and prestige. The surveyed populations have been asked to set the above characters in priority orders. It may be mentioned that besides the above seven characters, all additional attributes have been lumped together.

ATTRIBUTES OF STATUS

Despite this, the cumulative product is very low and set in the levels of 5 and 8 (Table-16). On the basis of scoring the total of which is 6023, it has been observed that first three characters i.e. education, wealth and family background possess the position of first priority level. The extension of all the three characters goes further down to level 3 and even for wealth and family background the level further goes
Table 16: ORDERING OF CHARACTERS ON THE BASIS OF SCORING WHICH CONSTITUTE STATUS (n=6023)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family background</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political position</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 227 257 551 277 603 389 245 146 537 432 419 384 486 334 441 213

7. Prestige; 8. Other. (Male = M; Female = F)
to 4. It is interesting to note that in case of education, despite its position on high level the scores are relatively less compared to other 2 characters. This is also revealed from the total aggregate. In both the cases males score higher figures than females. On the basis of case studies it is revealed that political position is provided with an important bearing. In the data part the results are compatible with the same. The difference lies in the fact that though the scores are high, the priority is slightly low, never on the first level. It is further confirmed with the score related to power. It is placed on a lower level than political position but the scores are quite close to those of political positions. The position is almost same with the character related to prestige. In the total score, family background has the highest frequency (992, 16.50%; males 603, 10.0% and females 389, 6.50%).

With the forementioned results, it may be concluded that status is provided with a bearing on a number of characters of which family background is most conspicuous. During present days, family background is not always related to the traditional aristocracy but other characters especially education, wealth and profession are very much involved. It may further be pointed out that in such case prestige automatically comes in. In no way, either political position or power are directly related.
It is perhaps a general trend of desire of all individuals, irrespective of sex, economy, education etc., to elevate the individual status. The data have been collected with help of questionnaire, participant observation and case study methods. Prior to the beginning of data collection, it was observed that some amount of discrete distance on this point is present in differential nature between two age groups: younger generation (20-39 years) and older generation (40 years and above). To test this hypothetical viewpoint, initial analysis was framed both with gender and generation bases. The maximum number (167, 22.10%) belongs to males of younger generation. The female counterparts are relatively less (98, 13.0%) and lesser with males of older generation (92, 12.20%). The figure pose the result that desire to elevate the status is more among younger generation males than the females of the same generation (Table - 17). In case of old generation, the desire is much less. The results are confirmed in both ways with affirmative and negative responses. The above results exclude 93 individuals (males 16, female 37). During the earlier days of the present older generation such desire of elevation of status was not as marked as that of the younger generation of the present day. In addition, the level of elevation was limited to an appreciable extent. This attitudinal phenomenon was most conspicuous among females of the present day older generation.
Association between individuals and persons of status is another factor of relation. Excluding 128 informants, the rest 637 informants responded on this aspect. The responses were collected both by questionnaire and participant observation methods. Similar to the previous point, in the present case, younger generation is more prone to make association with persons of status; the figure are 121 (15.80%) in case of males and 69 (9.01%) in case of females. The figures drop down with older generation (males 81, 10.50% and females 32, 4.18%). The negative responses are just opposite, though differences between age and gender based categories are not same (Table - 18).

It has been found that the option for association with persons of status has a bearing with the type characters of the informants. Informants with academic likings are close to education oriented status. The case is more or less same with other characters viz. profession and political position. It is the common belief with people that the success in achieving status is accelerated with association. More so, the concept of status is conceived as a kind of syndrome. In this case, education is the foremost. Higher education brings greater opportunity in greater profession which fetches wealth and finally prestige. All the components also give rise to status and in cases power.
Table 17: ATTITUDE TOWARDS ELEVATION OF STATUS (n= 755)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Age-group</th>
<th>20-30 years</th>
<th>40+ years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>25.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>30.46</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>15.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: DIFFERENTIAL RESPONSES ON ASSOCIATION WITH A PERSON OF STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Age-group</th>
<th>20-39 years</th>
<th>40+ years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>16.02</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>10.72</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>40.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>14.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>334</td>
<td>44.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In deciphering the choice of the individual for persons of status, the results show there are seven categories in terms of profession. These are orientation of status with politics, education, business, administration, art, profession and social work. The grading has been made with a total score of 1551. Among male informants the choice was on person with political status or status gained through political position. The figure in this case is maximum (277, 17.85%) with dominance of males (223, 14.37%). Almost similar choice is met with person with educational status (279, 17.99%) with higher frequency of males (209, 13.47%). In fact the association of relation criterion is of slightly higher value with education than politics. In case of females politics oriented status is less important (54, 3.48%) than of educational status (70, 4.51%). The other characters of status are found on a lower scale varying between 78 (5.02%) and 126 (8.12%). Such selection among females is much less. The figures have been found out on the basis of adding score for each character connected with status (Table-19). Selection of artists (230, 14.83%) and of professionals (182, 11.73%) in the framework of status has the next grade. In both the cases, the distance between males and females samples is close to each other.

STATUS DETERMINATION ON POSITIONS AND PERSONS

From the earlier pilot survey, a number of positions have been identified to which status is attributed. Out of such 26 positions, 8 positions have been selected which
Table 19: CUMULATIVE SCORES ON TYPES OF STATUS TO WHICH THE INFORMANTS ASSIGNED (n=1551)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of status</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>17.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>17.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>14.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>15.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>8.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>11.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

received the credit up to 50%. These 8 positions are: Chief Justice of Calcutta High Court, Mayor of Calcutta Municipal Corporation, Vice-Chancellor of a University situated in Calcutta (in this case the name of the University was intentionally avoided), Chief Minister of West Bengal, Governor of West Bengal, Inspector General of Police of West Bengal, Chief Secretary of Government of West Bengal and Editor of the Statesman - an English daily of repute. All the positions are coveted and respected. At the same time, with each position one or more characters are linked. Positions like Chief Justice, Mayor, Governor, Inspector General of Police and Chief Secretary are primarily administrative in nature. The position of Chief
Minister, though administrative in form but there is good deal of political flavour. The position of Vice-Chancellor is more considered within the domain of education than administration. Editor of the newspaper is also a position of respect and it is added with educational stress.

Like previous scoring method, the same principle has been applied here. The total score has turned to be 9370. Information, direct and indirect were sought for priority ordering position in terms of status. High scores, paid by males, are present with the status-oriented positions of Chief Minister (734, 7.83%), Chief Justice (580, 6.18%), Vice-Chancellor (438, 4.67%), Governor (430, 4.58%). Females consider the position of Chief Minister (494, 5.27%) and Vice-Chancellor (406, 4.33%) as of high status (Table- 20).

With regard to priority order, the score is highest with the position of Chief Minister (males 223, 2.37%; females 168, 1.79%). Positions of Chief Justice, Mayor and Chief Secretary are included in the first priority but the score is too low, with maximum of 97, 1.03%, as with Mayor. In the second priority position of status, highest score has been awarded to Chief Justice (198, 2.11%) by males and to Vice-Chancellor (139, 1.42%) by females. Both in third and fourth levels of priority, the score of Vice-Chancellor is appreciable. On the other hand, from bottom of the priority
Table - 20 : PRIORITY ORDERING OF POSITION WITH STATUS EXPRESSED IN TERMS OF SCORES (n = 9370)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority order</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 n</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 n</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 n</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 n</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 n</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 n</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 n</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 n</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>7.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(M = Male; F = Female)

1. Chief Justice;
2. Mayor; GMC;
3. Vice-Chancellor;
4. Chief Minister;
5. Governor;
6. Inspector of Police;
7. Chief Secretary.
levels the score are higher with Chief Secretary and Governor. The middle level priority is not very marked with any position.

The above results point to the fact that education and politics, as with Vice-Chancellor and Chief Minister are of highest order priority. In the same way, administrative position, as revealed from the status position of Chief Secretary and Governor, are ranked in the lower level of status. This concludes the fact that education and politics are the characters of importance for determination of status.

Another attempt has been made to determine the status on the basis of person, obviously with the characters in his/her possession. Here also, the final list for the actual survey work and collection of data by other methods, a total number of 10 persons by names have been selected out of original number of 32. The criterion of selection is primarily on the basis of minimum value of 50 scored by the individuals for selection. The names are: Mr. Jyoti Basu - a renowned leader of the political party known as Communist Party of India (Marxist), and the present Chief Minister, holding the same position for the last 13 years; Mr. Satyajit Ray - a film maker of international repute; Mr. P. K. Banerjee - a famous soccer player who has led the Indian soccer delegation for a number of times and at present one of the national soccer
coaches; Dr. Bhupen Hazarika - a great composer and singer originally hails from Assam; Mrs. Kanan Devi, a veteran actress of old films; Mrs. Ashapurna Devi, one of the leading novelist and woman of literature; Mrs. Padma Khastagir - one of the too few women judges of Calcutta High Court; Mr. Barun Sengupta - a leading journalist, at present the editor of a Bengali daily and political analyst of high order; Mr. Somnath Chatterjee - a leading barrister and front level leader of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) and Member of Parliament; Mr. Siddhartha Ray - provided with high family background being grandson of Late C.R. Das, Mr. Ray is an ex-Chief Minister of West Bengal and ex-Governor of Punjab, he also famous for his original and present profession as barrister. Out of these ten persons, seven are males and three are females. When the data are collected from both the genders, this higher numerical proportion to males with status may signify the domination of males in the domain of status. It may be noted that despite 30% occurrence of females in the list, indication of higher status in the societal level of Bengali population of West Bengal is noteworthy.

Like the positions, in this case the persons have been attempted to place in order of priority with regard to status. The total score from the computation turns to 6904. The table (Table- 21) shows that highest score in the first priority level is with Mr. Jyoti Basu (males 208, 3.01%; females 103,
Table 21: PRIORITY ORDERING OF PERSON OF STATUS EXPRESSED IN SCORES (n = 6904)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority order</th>
<th>M 1</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M 2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M 3</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M 4</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M 5</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(M = Male; F = Female)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mrs. Ashapurna Devi; 7. Mrs. Padma Khastagir; 8. Mr. B. Sengupta; 9. Mr. S. Chatterjee; 10. Mr. L.S. Ray.
1.99%). Next to this is Mr. Siddhartha Sankar Ray (only males 192, 2.78%). Mr. Jyoti Basu's priority is extended into the levels of lower priority in decreasing manner and so also with Mr. Siddhartha Sankar Ray. In the second priority level Mr. Satyajit Ray is found to be provided with highest score (males 197, 2.88%; females 101, 1.46%). In the next, third level, the highest score is with Mr. Siddhartha Sankar Ray (female 103, 1.48%). This is interesting in observing the dichotomy of genders' attitude with this person in different levels.

Considering the lower most level (10), Mr. Bhupen Hazarika has the highest score (males 141; 2.04%; females 71, 1.62%). The position in the immediate upper level (9) is same with Mr. P. K. Banerjee, only by males (142; 2.05%). Level of priority at eighth stage is hardly of any consideration due to low scores. In middle stages from levels 4 to 7, no significant high score is found with any person, except the continuation of status in such levels paid to Mr. Jyoti Basu and Mr. Siddhartha Sankar Ray.

In case of total score the highest orders are with Mr. Jyoti Basu (males 571, 28.28%; females 309, 4.47%) and Mr. Siddhartha Sankar Ray (males 539, 7.80%; females 312, 4.91%). Male samples are attributing status to Mr. Somnath Chatterjee (498, 7.21%), Mr. Bhupen Hazarika (447, 6.47%)
and Mr. Satyajit Ray (406, 5.38%). With females the persons of status of next order are Satyajit Ray (420, 6.08%) and Mr. Somnath Chatterjee (357, 5.17%). As a matter of fact both these persons' total scores, including males and females come to above 800. For Mr. Somnath Chatterjee the score is 855 (12.36%) and for Mr. Satyajit Ray, it is 820 (11.96%).

On the basis of the results, it may be concluded that in case of status marked to a person his characters in totality are of important consideration. In their professions they are also very high up. At the same time their background is taken into consideration. All the above persons are provided with education, prestige and above all the family background. In case of others, away from these few persons, other characters being equal, the family background is not very conspicuous. The former group of persons with status are known for themselves and also on their family background. In the second group, their own characters being almost equal, they are not known in terms of their family.

Family background is a traditional character of importance. The status is being achieved by a person with the recognition and declaration by others. In this case the status is emblazoned with the family background in the traditional set up.