CHAPTER-9
DYNAMICS OF SOCIAL MOBILITY PROCESS

In this chapter extent of effect of each determining factor on educational attainments, occupational attainments, and income is discussed. For this the technique of path analysis is used. Thus, this chapter has three parts, viz. 9.1- Dynamics of Social Mobility Process for Haflong Town, 9.2- Dynamics of Social Mobility Process for Umrangso Town and 9.3 – Inter-town Comparison of Dynamics of Mobility Process. First two parts are further sub-divided into three units as follows:

a) Determinants of Educational Attainment Process
b) Determinants of Occupational Attainment Process
c) Determinants of Income Process

Each of this above units is divided further into three sections: i) Whole group, ii) Male group and iii) Female group. Each unit ends with a comparison between male and female. In part – 9.3, a comparison between the two towns with regard to dynamics of mobility process is presented. However this part has also been divided into three units, 1, Inter-town comparison of determinants of educational attainment process, 2, Inter-town comparison of determinants of occupational attainment process and 3, Inter-town comparison of determinants of income process.

The relative importance of various background factors or determinants of educational, occupational attainment and income of the respondents are analysed in this chapter. The basic model of the Path Diagram is shown in figure 2. The various variables used in the diagram are
arranged in the possible temporal order of their occurrence. The variables that occur temporally earlier are treated as casual factors for the variables that occur later. The arrows indicate the direct effect of the casual factors on the dependent (caused) variables. There are three correlated variables (T, R and C) linked by curved, double-headed arrows indicating correlation between them but they are not causally related. However, a curve and an arrow line between the variables (R and C) indicate a relationship that is partly causal and partly spurious or non-causal.

Based on the conceived causal relationships among the various dependent and independent variables a set of ten regression equations using the standardised sets of observations were used to determine the relative importance of the various explanatory (independent) variables in determining the dependent (explained) variable. This technique helps to compare the positions of father and child relative to their respective generations. Although this method does not help in predicting the actual status of dependent variable from that of the independent variable, but it does help us to understand how much would be the change caused in the dependent variable by a change of one standard deviation in the independent variable.

Each of the ten regression equations gives us the direct effect of each independent (casual) variable in the equation shown in the diagram by arrows. The direct impact of the independent variables occurring immediately prior to the dependent variables and also the indirect impact of the independent variables occurring temporally prior to the other independent variables occurring temporally later are also measured by path diagrams drawn for each of the towns as well as for both the sexes.

The co-efficient of multiple correlations for each equation gives a measure of the combined effect all the independent variables together have on the corresponding dependent variable.
The independent variable(s) with a standard deviation of zero have been dropped from the regression programme as the value of such a factor is constant and as such cannot be expected to bring about any change in the dependent variable.
Figure 2: Basic Path Diagram Used
The path diagrams exhibit only those paths which have significant ‘t’ values (significant at least at 0.05 level of significance) of the path co-efficient (regression coefficient for the standardised scores or ‘β’ coefficient). The path coefficients of those paths which are not significant at above mentioned level of significance have not been shown in the diagrams in the interest of making the diagrams neat and clear. Insignificant variables shown in the tables are also excluded for the same reason. The regression analysis is conducted through linear regression computer procedures by using SPSS computer programme and the output of the regression analysis in the forms of model summaries and tables are appended in appendix section (refer to appendices - 1, 1.1, 1.2, 2, 2.1 and 2.2).

The regression equations and associated abbreviations are presented below:

**Regression Equations:**

1. \( RI = f(RO+RE+RQ+FI+FO+R+T) \)
2. \( RO = f(C+RL+RQ+RE+FO+RO_1+R+T) \)
3. \( RL = f(RO_1+RE+FS+R+T) \)
4. \( RO_1 = f(RE+C+FE+FS+FO+RQ+R+T) \)
5. \( RE = f(RQ+FI+C+FE+FO+FS+R+T) \)
6. \( RQ = f(C+FI+FE+FO+FS+R+T) \)
7. \( FS = f(FI+C+FE+FO+R+T) \)
8. \( FI = f(C+FE+FO+R+T) \)
9. \( FO = f(C+FE+R+T) \)
10. \( FE = f(C+R+T) \)
Abbreviations used in the path analysis, path diagram and equations
C= Caste
FE= Father’s Educational Attainment
FO= Father’s Occupational Attainment
FI= Father’s Income
FS= Size of Father’s Family
RQ= Quality of School Attended by the Respondent
RE= Respondent’s Educational Attainment
RO₁= Respondent’s First Job
RL= Length of Respondent’s Service or Working Life
RO= Respondent’s Occupational Attainment
RI= Respondent’s Income
R= Religion
T= Social Category.

9.1 DYNAMICS OF SOCIAL MOBILITY PROCESS (HAFLONG)

9.1.1 Educational Attainment Process

9.1.1.1 Educational Attainment Process (Whole Group)
Figure 3: Path Diagram of Haflong Town (Whole Group)
Figure 3 gives the path diagram for the whole group. The direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on respondents’ educational attainments are summarised in Table 61.

### Table 61: Determinants of Educational Attainment Process (Whole Group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory Variables</th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Total Effects (Direct + Indirect)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Category (T)</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (R)</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Through FS and RQ</td>
<td>0.003154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cast (C)</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>Through RQ</td>
<td>0.267 + (-0.0786) = 0.1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Educational Attainment (FE)</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>i) Through FO</td>
<td>0.259 + 0.1653 = 0.424273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.657x0.089 = 0.0584</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Through RQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.273x0.279 = 0.0761</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Through FO and RQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.657x0.168x0.279 = 0.0307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Total Indirect Effects: 0.0584 +</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0761 + 0.0307 = 0.1653</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Occupational Attainment (FO)</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>Through RQ</td>
<td>0.089 + 0.0469 = 0.1359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.168x0.279 = 0.0469</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Schooling (RQ)</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a perusal of figure 3 and table 61 following inferences can be drawn:

(i) Social category of the respondents has a direct effect on their educational attainments but the negative value in path coefficient indicates that belonging to tribal category reduces the opportunity of receiving higher levels of education. The path co-efficient $\beta = -0.216$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in social category produces a
decrease of 0.216 standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments. It can be inferred that about 22% of variation in educational attainments is explained by belonging to tribal or non-tribal social category. In other words being a tribal reduces the chances of acquiring higher education by about 22% in comparison to a non-tribal.

(ii) Religion of the respondents has no direct effect on respondents’ education but it has indirect effect through the size of fathers’ family and respondents’ quality of schooling. The path co-efficient $\beta= 0.0031$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in religion produces an increase of 0.0031 standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments. However this low level of path coefficient (0.3% cases) indicates that religion has very little effect on the educational attainment of a respondent.

(iii) Caste has direct effect on respondents’ educational attainments. The path co-efficient $\beta= 0.267$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in caste produces an increase of 0.267 standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments. Caste has also indirect effect on respondents’ educational attainments (-0.0786) through respondents’ quality of schooling. Thus the total effect of caste is 0.188. Thus the total effect of caste is 0.188. This implies that caste explains about 19% of variation in educational attainments. Alternatively it can be said that higher the caste status, higher are the educational attainments.

(iv) Fathers’ educational attainments have direct effect on educational attainments of the respondents. The path co-efficient $\beta= 0.259$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produce an increase of 0.259 standard deviation in
respondents’ educational attainments. Fathers’ educational attainments have also indirect effects through

a) fathers’ occupational attainments;

b) respondents’ quality of schooling; and

c) fathers’ occupational attainments and respondents’ quality of schooling.

Thus, total effect on respondents’ education through the above stated intervening variables is 0.424. It means a variation of one standard deviation causes a total variation of 0.424 standard deviations in respondents’ educational attainments. It can be inferred that father’s educational attainment is a significant factor determining a respondent’s educational attainment as it explains a total of about 42% of the variation in educational attainments of the respondents.

(v) Fathers’ occupational attainments have direct effect on educational attainments of the respondents. The path co-efficient $\beta=0.089$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produce an increase of 0.089 standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments. Fathers’ occupational attainments have also indirect effect (0.046) through the intervening variable of respondents’ quality of schooling. Thus, total effect on respondents’ educational attainments is 0.135. It means a variation of one standard deviation causes a total variation of 0.135 standard deviations in respondents’ educational attainments. It can be inferred that a total of about 14% of variation in educational attainments is explained by fathers’ occupational attainments.
(vi) Respondents’ quality of schooling has direct effect on their educational attainments. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.279$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ quality of schooling produce an increase of 0.279 standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments. Thus about 28% of the variation in educational attainments is directly explained by respondents’ quality of schooling.

9.1.1.1 (A) Educational Attainment Process (Male Group)
Figure 3.1: Path Diagram of Haflong Town (Male Group)
Figure 3.1 gives the path diagram for the male group. The direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on male respondents’ educational attainments are summarised in Table 61 (A).

### TABLE 61(A): DETERMINANTS OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT PROCESS (MALE GROUP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL EFFECTS (DIRECT+INDIRECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASTE (C)</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>Through RQ -0.299 x 0.317 = -0.09478</td>
<td>0.244 + (-0.09478) = 0.1492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER’S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FE)</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>i) Through RQ 0.304 x 0.317 = 0.0963</td>
<td>0.223 + 0.1934 = 0.4164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Through FO 0.555 x 0.137 = 0.0760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Through FO and RQ = 0.555 x 0.120 x 0.317 = 0.0211</td>
<td>The total indirect effects: 0.0963 + 0.0760 + 0.0211 = 0.1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER’S OCCUPATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FO)</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>Through RQ 0.120 x 0.317 = 0.0380</td>
<td>0.137 + 0.0380 = 0.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE OF FATHER’S FAMILY (FS)</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Through RQ -0.145 x 0.317 = -0.04596</td>
<td>-0.04596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALITY OF SCHOOLING (RQ)</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>0.317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a perusal of figure 3.1 and table 61 (A) following inferences can be drawn:

(i) Caste has direct effect on male respondents’ educational attainments. The path co-efficient $\beta= 0.244$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in caste produces an increase of 0.244 standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments. Caste has also indirect effect on (-0.094) through respondents’ quality of schooling. Thus the total effect of caste is 0.149. This implies that caste explains about 15% of variation in educational attainments. Alternatively it can be said that a
higher caste male has a greater chance of receiving higher levels of education.

(ii) Fathers’ educational attainments have direct effect on educational attainments of their sons. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.223$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produce an increase of 0.223 standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments. Fathers’ educational attainments have also indirect effects through

a) fathers’ occupational attainments;

b) respondents’ quality of schooling; and

c) fathers’ occupational attainments and respondents’ quality of schooling.

Thus, total effect on respondents’ education is 0.416. It means a variation of one standard deviation causes a total variation of 0.416 standard deviations in respondents’ education. It can be inferred that father’s educational attainment is a significant factor determining a son’s educational attainment as it explains a total of about 42% of the variation in educational attainments of sons.

(iii) Fathers’ occupational attainments have direct effect on their sons’ educational attainments. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.137$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produce an increase of 0.137 standard deviation in sons’ educational attainments. Fathers’ occupational attainments have also indirect effects (0.0380) through respondents’ (sons’) quality of schooling. Thus, total effect on sons’ educational attainment is 0.175. It means a variation of one standard deviation causes a total variation of 0.175
standard deviations in respondents’ educational attainments. It can be inferred that a total of about 18% of variation in educational attainments of sons is explained by fathers’ occupational attainments.

(iv) Size of fathers’ family has no direct effect but it has indirect effect on sons’ educational attainments through respondents’ (sons’) quality of schooling. The path co-efficient $\beta = -0.045$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in father’s size of family produce an decrease of -0.045 standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments. Thus it can be inferred that a total of about 5% of variation in educational attainments of sons is explained by fathers’ size of family. In other words, it can be said that greater the size of father’s family lower the chances available for each son of attaining higher levels of education.

(v) Male respondents’ quality of schooling has direct effect on their educational attainments. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.317$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in males’ quality of schooling produce an increase of 0.317 standard deviation in their educational attainments. Thus about 32% of the variation in educational attainments is directly explained by male respondents’ quality of schooling.

9.1.1.1 (B) Educational Attainment Process (Female Group)
Figure 3.2: Path Diagram of Haflong Town (Female Group)
Figure 3.2 gives the path diagram for the female group. The direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on female respondents’ educational attainments are summarised in Table 61 (B).

**TABLE 61 (B): DETERMINANTS OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT PROCESS (FEMALE GROUP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL EFFECTS (DIRECT+INDIRECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL CATEGORY (T)</td>
<td>-0.325</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-0.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTE (C)</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER'S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FE)</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>i) Through RQ</td>
<td>0.337+0.08508=0.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.179x0.220=0.03938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Through FO and RQ=0.753 x 0.276 x 0.220 = 0.0457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Total Indirect Effects: 0.03938+0.0457= 0.08508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER'S OCCUPATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FO)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Through RQ</td>
<td>0.0607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.276x0.220=0.0607</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALITYOF SCHOOLING (RQ)</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a perusal of figure 3.1 and table 61 (B) following inferences can be drawn:

(i) Social category of the female respondents has direct effect on their educational attainments. However, the negative value in path coefficient indicates that belonging to tribal category reduces the opportunity of receiving higher levels of education. The path co-efficient $\beta=-0.325$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in social category produces a decrease of 0.325 standard deviations in female respondents’ educational attainments. It can be inferred that about 33% of variation in
educational attainments is explained by belonging to tribal or non-tribal social category. In other words in case of women, being a tribal reduces the chances of acquiring higher education by about 33% in comparison to a non-tribal.

ii) Caste has direct effect but no indirect effect on female respondents’ educational attainments. The total effect i.e., path co-efficient $\beta = 0.323$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in caste produces an increase of 0.323 standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments. This implies that caste explains about 32% of variation in educational attainments of women. Alternatively it can be said that higher the caste status of women, higher are their educational attainments.

(iii) Fathers’ educational attainments have direct effect on their daughters’ educational attainments. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.337$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produce an increase of 0.337 standard deviation in daughters’ educational attainments. Fathers’ educational attainments have also indirect effects through

a) respondents’ (daughters) quality of schooling; and

b) fathers’ occupational attainments and quality of schooling.

Thus, total effect on female respondents’ (daughters) educational attainments including direct and indirect effects (through the above stated intervening variables) is 0.422. It means a variation of one standard deviation causes a total variation of 0.422 standard deviations in female respondents’ education. It can be inferred that father’s educational
attainment is a significant factor determining a daughter’s educational attainment as it explains a total of about 42% of the variation in educational attainments of the daughters.

(iv) Fathers’ occupational attainments have no direct effect on their daughters’ educational attainments. Fathers’ occupational attainments have indirect effects (0.060) through respondents’ (daughters’) quality of schooling. Thus, the total effect of fathers’ occupational attainments on their daughters’ educational attainments is 0.060. It means a variation of one standard deviation causes a total variation of 0.060 standard deviations in respondents’ educational attainments. It can be inferred that a total of about 6% of variation in educational attainments of daughters is explained by fathers’ occupational attainments.

(v) Female respondents’ quality of schooling has direct effect but no indirect effect on their educational attainments. The path co-efficient β= 0.220 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ quality of schooling produce an increase of 0.220 standard deviation in females’ educational attainments. Thus about 22% of the variation in educational attainments is directly explained by respondents’ quality of schooling.

Sex-wise comparison in relation to educational attainment of Haflong town reveals that in about 33% of variation in educational attainments of women is explained by their social category which implies that tribal women could not access to higher levels of education. It further implies that women on an average are married off at earlier age compared to that of men. Besides many parents still hesitate sending their daughters away from home for higher education as the district lacks in quality
institutions of higher learning. However tribal men do not have such problem. Caste explains 33% of variation in women’s educational attainments which implies that women of higher castes among the non-tribals get access to higher levels of education. It has been observed that caste status of a person plays a considerable role in relation to educational attainment for both the sexes but in case of women (33%) the effect is much higher than that of their men (15%) counterparts. Persons and most specifically women belonging to lower caste groups have a little access to higher levels of education.

A total of about 42% of variation in educational attainments of children is explained by fathers’ educational attainments. It implies that higher the educational statuses of the fathers higher are the chances of children receiving higher levels of education. Besides, in 18% cases sons’ educational attainment is explained by fathers’ occupational attainments but in case of daughters the proportion has come down to only 6%. It implies that occupational status of father is not a strong determinant in relation to the educational attainment of his daughter though it exerts a considerable influence on the educational attainment of his son. In about 5% of variation in sons’ educational attainments is explained by size of fathers’ which implies large family size has reduced the chances of their sons attaining quality education but in case of daughters such effects are not noticed. Thus it can be said that larger families reduce the chances of their offspring receiving good quality education in good educational institutions. Almost in 32% of variation among the men and 22% of variation among the women quality of schooling has an influence on their educational attainments implying that quality of schooling has considerably
affected the attainment of higher levels of education though it has affected women less than that of men.

9.1.2 Occupational Attainment Process

9.1.2.1 Occupational Attainment Process (Whole Group)

Figure 3 gives the path diagram for the whole group. The direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on respondents’ occupational attainments are summarised in the Table 62.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL EFFECTS (DIRECT+ INDIRECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL CATEGORY (T)</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>Through ROₙ₁</td>
<td>-0.200x0.888=-0.1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGION (R)</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>Through ROₙ₁</td>
<td>-0.106x0.888=-0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Through FS,RQ,RE and ROₙ₁</td>
<td>-0.119x-0.095x0.279x0.393x0.888=0.0011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total indirect effects: -0.094 + 0.0011 = -0.0929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.0929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTE (C)</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>Through ROₙ₁</td>
<td>-0.267x0.393x0.888=0.0931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Through RQ,RE and ROₙ₁</td>
<td>-0.282x0.279x0.393x0.888=-0.0274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total indirect effects: 0.0931+(-0.0274)= - 0.06564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER’S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Through ROₙ₁</td>
<td>0.259x0.393x0.888=0.0903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Through RQ,RE,ROₙ₁</td>
<td>0.273X0.279X0.393X0.888=0.0265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Through FO, RQ, RE and ROₙ₁</td>
<td>0.657x0.168x0.279x0.393x0.888=0.0107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total indirect effects: 0.0903 + 0.0265 + 0.0107 = 0.1275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE OF FATHER’S FAMILY (FS)</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>Through RQ, RE, ROₙ₁</td>
<td>-0.095x0.279x0.393x0.888=-0.00924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.00924</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From a perusal of figure 3 and table 62 following inferences can be drawn:

(i) Social category of the respondents has no direct effect on their occupational attainments but it has an indirect effect on their occupational attainments through their first jobs. However the negative value in path coefficient indicates that belonging to tribal category reduces the opportunity of getting high status occupations. The path co-efficient $\beta = -0.177$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in social category produces a decrease of 0.177 standard deviation in respondents’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that about 18% of variation in occupational attainments is explained by belonging to tribal or non-tribal social category. In other words being a tribal reduces the chances of acquiring higher status jobs by about 18% in comparison to a non-tribal.

(ii) Religion of the respondents has no direct effect on their occupational attainments but it has indirect effect through

(a) respondents’ first jobs; and
(b) the size of father’s family, respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and their first jobs.

The negative value of path co-efficient $\beta=-0.092$ can be interpreted as a difference of one standard deviation in religion produces a change of -0.092 standard deviation in respondents’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that about 9% of variation in occupational attainments is explained by religion. In other words being a member of a minority religious community reduces the chances of acquiring higher status jobs by about 9% in comparison to being a member of a major religious community.

(iii) Caste has no direct effect on respondents’ occupational attainments but it has indirect effect through:

(a) respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs;

(b) and through respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and first jobs.

The negative value of path co-efficient $\beta=-0.065$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in caste produces a decrease of 0.065 standard deviation in respondents’ occupational attainments. This implies that caste explains about 7% of variation in occupational attainments. Alternatively it can be said that a higher caste respondent has a greater chance of getting a higher status occupation.

iv) Fathers’ educational attainments have no direct effect on children’s occupational attainments. However, fathers’ educational attainments have indirect effect through

(a) respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs;
(b) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and first jobs;

(c) fathers’ occupational attainments, respondents’ quality of schooling and their educational attainments, and their first jobs.

Thus, the total effect 0.127 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainment produces an increase of 0.127 standard deviations in respondents’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that father’s educational attainment determines a respondent’s occupational attainment to a considerable extent as it explains a total of about 13% of the variation in occupational attainments of the respondents.

(v) Size of fathers’ family has no direct effect on children’s occupational attainments. But it has an indirect effect through respondents’ (children’s) quality of schooling, their educational attainments and their first jobs. The beta (β) co-efficient (-0.009) implies that as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produces a decrease of 0.009 standard deviation in respondents’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that larger families reduce the chances of their offspring receiving good quality education in good educational institutions which ultimately affects the attainment of a higher status occupation though this effect is very little (less than 1%) in this town.

(vi) Fathers’ occupational attainments have no direct effect on children’s occupational attainments. However, Fathers’ occupational attainments have indirect effects through

(a) respondents’ (children’s) educational attainments and their first jobs; and
(b) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and their first jobs.

Thus, the total effect on respondents’ occupation through indirect effect of the above stated intervening variables is 0.184. It means a variation of one standard deviation causes a total variation of 0.184 standard deviations in respondents’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that a total of about 18% of variation in children’s occupational attainments is explained by fathers’ occupational attainments.

(vii) Respondents’ quality of schooling has no direct effect on their occupational attainments. But it has indirect effect on their occupational attainments through the combine effect of respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta$= 0.097 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ quality of schooling produce an increase of 0.097 standard deviation in respondents’ occupational attainments. Thus about 10% of the variation in respondents’ occupational attainments is explained by their quality of schooling.

(viii) Respondents’ educational attainments have no direct effect on their occupational attainments. However, respondents’ educational attainments have indirect effect on their occupational attainments through their first jobs. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta$= 0.455 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ quality of schooling produces an increase of 0.455 standard deviation in respondents’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that a total of about 46% of variation in respondents’ occupational attainments is explained by their educational attainments.
Respondents’ first jobs have a direct effect on their occupational attainments. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta = 0.888$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ quality of schooling produces an increase of 0.888 standard deviation in respondents’ occupational attainments. Thus it can be inferred that a total of about 89% of variation in respondents’ occupational attainments is explained by their first jobs. It also implies that in most of the cases the respondents have remained in their first jobs.

9.1.2.1 (A) Occupational Attainment Process (Male Group)

Figure 3.1 gives the path diagram for the male group. The direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on male respondents’ occupational attainments are summarised in Table 62 (A).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL EFFECTS (DIRECT+INDIRECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASTE (C)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Through RE</td>
<td>0.1545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i) $0.244 \times 0.101 = 0.02464$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Through RE and $R_Q$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii) $0.244 \times 0.405 \times 0.877 = 0.08666$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Through $R_Q$ and RE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii) $0.299 \times 0.317 \times 0.101 = -0.00957$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Through $R_Q$, RE and $R_O$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv) $-0.299 \times 0.317 \times 0.405 \times 0.877 = -0.03366$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The total indirect effects: $0.02464 + 0.08666 + (-0.00957) + (-0.03366) = 0.1545$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER’S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FE)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>i) Through RE $0.223 \times 0.101 = 0.02252$</td>
<td>0.15904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Through $R_Q$ and RE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.304 \times 0.317 \times 0.101 = 0.0097$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From a perusal of figure 3.1 and table 62 (A) following inferences can be drawn:

(i) Caste has no direct effect on male respondents’ occupational attainments. But it has indirect effect on their occupational attainments through

a) respondents’ educational attainments;

b) respondents’ quality of schooling and their first jobs;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SIZE OF FATHER’S FAMILY (FS)</strong></th>
<th>---</th>
<th><strong>0.02096</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Through RQ and RE</td>
<td>-0.145x0.317x0.101= -0.00464</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Through RQ, RE, RO1</td>
<td>-0.145x0.317x0.405x0.877 = -0.01632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The total indirect effects:</td>
<td>-0.00464+(-0.01632)=- 0.02096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FATHER’S OCCUPATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FO)</strong></th>
<th>---</th>
<th><strong>0.07981</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Through RE</td>
<td>0.137x0.101= 0.0138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Through RE and RO1</td>
<td>0.137x0.405x0.877=0.04866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Through RQ, RE</td>
<td>0.120x0.317x0.101=0.00384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Through RQ, RE and RO1</td>
<td>0.120x0.317x0.405x0.877=0.01351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The total indirect effects:</td>
<td>0.0138+0.04866+0.00384+0.01351= 0.07981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>QUALITY OF SCHOOLING (RQ)</strong></th>
<th>---</th>
<th><strong>0.14460</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Through RE</td>
<td>0.317x0.101= 0.03201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Through RE and RO1</td>
<td>0.317x0.405x0.877=0.11259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The total indirect effects:</td>
<td>0.03201+0.11259=0.14460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **RESPONDENTS’ EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (RE)** | 0.101 | Through RO1= 0.405x0.877=0.35518 | **0.101+0.3551=0.4561** |

| **RESPONDENTS’ FIRST JOB (RO1)** | 0.877 | ------- | **0.877** |
c) respondents’ quality of schooling and their educational attainments;

d) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and first jobs.

Thus the total effect 0.154 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produces an increase of 0.154 standard deviations in respondents’ occupational attainments. This implies that caste explains about 15% of variation in occupational attainments. Alternatively it can be said that higher the caste status of men, higher are their chances of occupational attainments.

(ii) Fathers’ educational attainments have no direct effect on their sons’ occupational attainments. However these have indirect effect through:

a) respondents’ (sons’) educational attainments;

b) respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs;

c) respondents’ quality of schooling and their educational attainments;

d) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and first jobs;

e) respondents’ father’s occupational attainments and respondents’ educational attainments;

f) respondents’ father’s occupational attainments, respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs;

g) respondents’ father’s occupational attainments, respondents’ quality of schooling and their educational attainments;
h) respondents’ father’s occupational attainments, respondents’ quality of schooling and their educational attainments, and their first jobs;

The total effect 0.159 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainment produces an increase of 0.159 standard deviations in sons’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that father’s educational attainment is a significant factor determining a son’s occupational attainment as it explains a total of about 16% of the variation in occupational attainments of the sons.

(iii) Size of fathers’ family has no direct effect on sons’ occupational attainments. But it has indirect effect through

a) respondents’ (sons’) quality of schooling and their educational attainments; and

b) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and first jobs.

The total effect i.e., beta co-efficient ($\beta = -0.020$) implies that as an increase of one standard deviation in size of father’s family produces a decrease of 0.020 standard deviation in respondents’ occupational attainments. Only in 2% cases father’s size of family reduces the chances of their sons in the attainment of higher status occupations.

(iv) Fathers’ occupational attainments have no direct effect on their sons’ occupational attainments. However, fathers’ occupational attainments have indirect effects through

a) respondents’ (sons’) educational attainments;

b) respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs;
c) respondents’ quality of schooling and their educational attainments; and

d) respondents’ quality of schooling and their educational attainments.

Thus, total effect of fathers’ occupational attainments (only the indirect effects) of above stated intervening variables is 0.079. It means a variation of one standard deviation causes a total variation of 0.079 standard deviations in sons’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that father’s occupational attainment has a little effect on determining a son’s occupational attainment as it explains only a total of about 8% of the variation in sons’ occupational attainments.

(v) Male respondents’ quality of schooling has no direct effect on their occupational attainments. But it has indirect effect on respondents’ occupational attainments through their (a) educational attainments; and (b) educational attainments and their first jobs. The total effect i.e., the path coefficient $\beta = 0.144$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ quality of schooling produce an increase of 0.144 standard deviation in their occupational attainments. Thus about 14% of the variation in occupational attainments of men is explained by their quality of schooling.

(vi) Male respondents’ educational attainments have direct effect (0.101) on their occupational attainments. Moreover, respondents’ educational attainments have also indirect effect on their occupational attainments through their first jobs. The total effect i.e., the path coefficient $\beta= 0.456$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments produce an increase of 0.456
standard deviation in their occupational attainments. Thus about 46% of the variation in occupational attainments of men is directly explained by their educational attainments.

(vii) Male respondents’ first jobs have direct effect on their occupational attainments. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta = 0.877$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ first jobs produce an increase of 0.877 standard deviation in their occupational attainments. Thus about 88% of the variation in occupational attainments of men is directly explained by their first jobs. It also implies that in most of the cases the male respondents have remained attached with their first jobs.

9.1.2.1 (B) Occupational Attainment Process (Female Group)

Figure 3.2 gives the path diagram for the female group. The direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on female respondents’ occupational attainments are summarised in the Table 62 (B).
### TABLE 62 (B): DETERMINANTS OF OCCUPATIONAL ATTAINMENT PROCESS (FEMALE GROUP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL EFFECTS (DIRECT+INDIRECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SOCIAL CATEGORY (T)    | i) Through RE \(0.325 \times 0.079 = 0.02567\)  
                        | i) Through RE and RO \(0.325 \times 0.425 \times 0.900 = -0.12431\)  
                        | The total indirect effects: \(0.02567+(-0.12431)+(-0.00617) = -0.15615\) | -0.15615 |
| RELIGION (R)           | -0.061        |                 | -0.061                          |
| CASTE (C)              | i) Through RE \(0.323 \times 0.079 = 0.02551\)  
                        | ii) Through RE and RO \(0.323 \times 0.425 \times 0.900 = -0.12434\)  
                        | iii) Through RE and RL \(0.323 \times (-0.145) \times (-0.131) = -0.00613\)  
                        | The total indirect effects: \(0.02551+(-0.12434)+(-0.00613) = 0.15518\) | 0.15518 |
| FATHER'S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FE) | i) Through RE \(0.337 \times 0.079 = 0.02662\)  
                                         | ii) Through RQ and RE \(0.179 \times 0.220 \times 0.079 = 0.00311\)  
                                         | iii) Through RQ, RE and RO \(0.337 \times 0.425 \times 0.900 = 0.12890\)  
                                         | iv) Through RQ, RE and RL \(0.337 \times (-0.145) \times (-0.131) = 0.00640\)  
                                         | v) Through FO and RO \(0.753 \times 0.274 \times 0.900 = 0.18568\)  
                                         | vi) Through FO, RQ, RE and RO \(0.753 \times 0.276 \times 0.220 \times 0.079 = 0.00361\)  
                                         | vii) Through FO, RQ, RE, and RO \(0.753 \times 0.276 \times 0.220 \times 0.079 = 0.00361\)  
                                         | viii) Through FO, RQ, RE and RL \(0.753 \times 0.276 \times 0.220 \times 0.900 = 0.18568\)  
                                         | The total indirect effects: \(0.02662+0.00311+0.12890+0.00640+0.18568+0.00361+0.01748 + 0.00086 = 0.37266\) | 0.37266 |
| FATHER'S OCCUPATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FO) | i) Through RO \(0.274 \times 0.900 = 0.2466\)  
                                           | ii) Through RQ and RE \(0.276 \times 0.220 \times 0.079 = 0.00479\)  
                                           | iii) Through RQ, RE and RO \(0.276 \times 0.425 \times 0.900 = 0.023225\)  
                                           | iv) Through RQ, RE and RL \(0.276 \times 0.220 \times (-0.145) \times (-0.131) = 0.00115\)  
                                           | The total indirect effects: \(0.2466+0.00479+0.023225 + 0.00115 = 0.27576\) | 0.27576 |
| QUALITY OF SCHOOLING (RQ) | Through RE \(0.220 \times 0.079 = 0.01738\)  
                                     | Through RE and RO \(0.220 \times 0.425 \times 0.900 = 0.0973\)  
                                     | Through RE and RL \(0.220 \times (-0.145) \times (-0.131) = 0.004178\)  
                                     | The total indirect effects: \(0.01738+0.0973+0.004178 = 0.11885\) | 0.11885 |
| RESPONDENTS' EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (RE) | 0.079  
                                               | i) Through RO \(0.425 \times 0.900 = 0.3825\)  
                                               | Through RL \(-0.145 \times (-0.131) = 0.01899\)  
                                               | The total indirect effects: \(0.3825+0.01899 = 0.401495\) | 0.401495 |
| RESPONDENTS' FIRST JOB (RO) | 0.900  |                 | 0.900                           |
| RESPONDENTS' LENGTH OF SERVICE (RL) | -0.131 |                 | -0.131                          |
From a perusal of figure 3.2 and table 62 (B) following inferences can be drawn:

(i) Social category of the respondents has no direct effect on female respondents’ occupational attainments but it has indirect effect on their occupational attainments through

a) respondents’ educational attainments;

b) respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs;

c) respondents’ educational attainments and their length of service.

However the total effect is - 0.156 (negative value) which indicates that belonging to tribal category reduces the opportunity of receiving high status occupations. The path co-efficient $\beta= -0.156$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in social category produces a decrease of 0.156 standard deviation in female respondents’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that about 16% of variation in occupational attainments of women is explained by belonging to tribal or non-tribal social category. In other words being a tribal woman reduces the chances of acquiring high status jobs by about 22% in comparison to a non-tribal.

(ii) Religion has direct effect (-0.061) on female respondents’ occupational attainments but it has no indirect effect. The negative value of path co-efficient $\beta= -0.061$ can be interpreted as a variation of one standard deviation in religion produces a variation of -0.061 standard deviation in respondents’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that about 6% of variation in occupational attainments of women is explained by religion. In other words being a woman of minority religious community reduces the
chances of acquiring high status jobs by about 6% in comparison to a women belonging to major religious communities.

(iii) Caste has no direct effect on female respondents’ occupational attainments but it has indirect effect through

a) respondents’ education;

b) respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs; and

c) respondents’ educational attainments, their first jobs and their length of service.

The total effect (β = 0.155) can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in caste produces a decrease of 0.155 standard deviation in respondents’ occupational attainments. This implies that caste explains about 16% of variation in occupational attainments of women. Alternatively it can be said that a member of a higher caste has greater chance of getting higher status occupation.

(iv) Fathers’ educational attainments have no direct effect on their daughters’ (female respondents’) occupational attainments. However fathers’ educational attainments have indirect effect through:

a) respondents’ educational attainments;

b) respondents’ quality of schooling and their educational attainments;

a) respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs;

b) respondents’ educational attainments and length of their service;

c) fathers’ occupational attainments and respondents’ first jobs;
d) fathers’ occupational attainments, respondents’ quality of schooling, respondents’ educational attainments;

e) fathers’ occupational attainments, respondents’ quality of schooling, respondents’ educational attainments and respondents’ first jobs; and

f) fathers’ occupational attainments, respondents’ quality of schooling, respondents’ educational attainments and their length of service.

The total effect 0.372 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produces an increase of 0.372 standard deviations in daughters’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that father’s educational attainment is a significant factor determining daughter’s occupational attainment as it explains a total of about 37% of the variation in occupational attainments of the daughters.

(v) Fathers’ occupational attainments have no direct effect on their daughters’ occupational attainments. Fathers’ occupational attainments have indirect effects through

a) respondents’ first jobs

b) respondents’ quality of schooling and their educational attainments;

c) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and their first jobs; and

d) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and their length of service.
Thus, the total effect on daughters’ occupational attainments through the indirect effects of above stated intervening variables is 0.275. It means a variation of one standard deviation causes a total variation of 0.275 standard deviations in daughters’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that father’s occupational attainment is a significant factor determining daughter’s occupational attainment as it explains a total of about 28% of the variation in occupational attainments of the daughters.

(vi) Female respondents’ quality of schooling has no direct effect on their occupational attainments. It has indirect effects through

a) respondents’ educational attainments;

b) respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs;

and

c) respondents’ educational attainments and their length of service.

The total effect i.e., path co-efficient $\beta = 0.119$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in female respondents’ quality of schooling produce an increase of 0.119 standard deviation in female respondents’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that female respondents’ quality of schooling determines their occupational attainments to a considerable extent as it explains a total of about 12% of the variation in their occupational attainments.

(vii) Female respondents’ educational attainments have a direct effect (0.079) on their occupational attainments. Moreover educational attainments have also indirect effect on their occupational attainments through (i) respondents’ first jobs and (ii) respondents’ length of service. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta = 0.480$ can be interpreted as an
increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ quality of schooling produce an increase of 0.480 standard deviations in respondents’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that a total of about 48% of variation in occupational attainments of women is explained by their educational attainments. It further implies that female respondents’ educational attainments have a great effect on their occupational attainments.

(viii) Female respondents’ first jobs have a direct effect on their occupational attainments. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta=0.900$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ first job produce an increase of 0.900 standard deviation in female’s occupational attainments. It can be inferred that a total of about 90% of variation in occupational attainments of women is explained by their first jobs. It also implies that in most of the cases the female respondents have remained in their first jobs.

(ix) Female respondents’ length of service has a direct effect on their occupational attainments. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta=-0.131$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ length of service produces a decrease of 0.131 standard deviation in respondents’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that a total of about 13% of variation in occupational attainments of women is explained by their length of service. It also implies that in most of the cases women’s length of work in relation to their first job had reduced the chances of entering their present jobs.

Sex-wise comparison of the effect of each determinant on the respondents’ occupational attainments in Haflong town reveals that in case
of women about 16% variation in occupational attainments is explained by their social category of being tribal or non-tribal. It has been found that social category of being a tribal woman reduces her opportunity of attaining higher status occupations. However in case of male respondents, social category of being a tribal man does not show any effect in his occupational attainment. Tribal women owing to their tribal status, to a considerable extent, face relatively a tough situation in labour market compared to their men counterparts, as for the latter tribal category has not come on the way of their occupational attainments. Religion has no effect on men’s occupational attainment but in case of women religion explains only 6% of variation which implies that women of minority religious communities are in disadvantage of attaining higher status occupations. Caste has a considerable effect (15% to 16% of total variation) on the occupational attainments of both the sexes and it implies that higher caste people irrespective of sex have better chance of attaining higher status occupations than those of the lower caste people. Fathers’ educational attainment has a significant effect on occupational attainments of both the sexes although the effect is much higher on women (37% of variation) than that of men (16% of variation) which imply that fathers with higher levels of education influence and support their daughters in attaining higher status jobs. It can be inferred that male members of the family have much more open access to labour market than that of their female counterparts as females are largely confined to perform domestic work.

Size of fathers’ family explains only 2% of variation in occupational attainments of children which reduces the chances of a male child in entering higher status occupation. It implies that bigger the size of a family lower is the chances of a male child in entering higher status occupation.
However effect of this determinant is not found in females. Fathers’ occupational attainments have greater effect on the females (28% of variation) than that of their male (8% of variation) counterparts. Higher the occupational status of a father higher is the chance of a daughter entering in higher status job. It can be said that occupational statuses of fathers determine their children’s occupations and it affects more in cases of daughters. Quality of schooling more or less (12% to 14% of total variation) has effect on the occupational attainments of both the sexes. Quality of schooling through the educational attainment affects both the sexes in occupational attainment.

Respondents’ own educational statuses largely determine their occupational statuses. Almost 46% of variation in males and about 48% of variation in females in relation to their educational attainments is explained by their occupational attainments. Thus it can be inferred that education is necessary for occupational attainment especially for non-manual jobs but it cannot guarantee to provide job to everyone with same level of education and it has been observed that a little more than 50% of variation has remained unexplained which implies that person’s occupation is largely independent of his or her educational attainment. For both the sexes their first jobs determine their present jobs or occupations (88% of variation in males and 90% in females) which imply that the members of both the sexes have retained their first jobs and in some rare situations they have left their first jobs and entered into present jobs.

Apart from the above stated determinants, a total of 13% of variation in female respondents’ occupational attainments is explained by their length of service which implies that their first jobs have reduced their chances of entering into present occupations. Thus, it can be inferred that
females do not usually prioritize their occupations over their families. However this effect is not noticed in case of males.

9.1.3 Income Process

9.1.3.1 Income Process (Whole Group)

Figure 3 gives the path diagram for the whole group. However, the direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on respondents’ income are summarised in the table 63

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL EFFECTS (DIRECT+ INDIRECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASTE (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Through F1 0.225 x .389 = 0.0875</td>
<td>0.0875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER’S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FE)</td>
<td></td>
<td>i) Through FO and FI 0.075 x 0.250 x 0.389 = 0.0656 ii) Through F1 0.147 x 0.389 = 0.0571 The total indirect effects: 0.0656 + 0.0571 = 0.1227</td>
<td>0.1227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER’S OCCUPATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FO)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Through FI 0.250 x 0.389 = 0.09725</td>
<td>0.09725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER’S INCOME (FI)</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From a perusal of figure 3 and table 63 following inferences can be drawn:

(i) Caste of the respondents has no direct effect on respondents’ income but it has an indirect effect on income through fathers’ income. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.087$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in caste produces a increase of 0.087 standard deviation in respondents’ income. This implies that caste explains about 9% of variation in income of the respondents. Alternatively it can be said that higher the caste status, higher are the income.

(ii) Fathers’ educational attainments have no direct effect on children’s (respondents’) income. However educational attainments have indirect effect through

(a) fathers’ occupational attainments and their income; and

(b) fathers’ income.

The total effect 0.122 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produces an increase of 0.122 standard deviations in children’s income. It can be inferred that father’s educational attainment determines child’s income to a small extent as it explains a total of about 12% of the variation in income of the children.

(iii) Fathers’ occupational attainments have no direct effect but have indirect effects through fathers’ income on their children’s income. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.097$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ occupational attainment produce an increase of 0.097 standard deviation in their children’s income. It can be inferred that a total of about 10% of variation in income of children is explained by fathers’ occupational attainments.
(iv) Fathers’ income has a direct effect on their children’s (respondents’) income. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.389$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ income produces an increase of 0.389 standard deviation in children’s income. It can be inferred that father’s income is a significant factor determining child’s income as it explains a total of about 39% of the variation in income of the children. In other words fathers with high earnings have children who have too high income.

9.1.3.1 (A) Income Process (Male Group)

Figure 3.1 gives the path diagram for the male group. However, the direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on male respondents’ income are summarised in the Table 63 (A).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL EFFECTS (DIRECT + INDIRECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CASTE (C)              | ----          | i) Through RE, RO: $0.244 \times 0.101 \times 0.200 = 0.00492$
                        |               | ii) Through RQ, RE and RO: $-0.299 \times 0.317 \times 0.101 \times 0.200 = -0.00191$
                        |               | iii) Through RQ, RE, RO, and RO: $-0.299 \times 0.317 \times 0.405 \times 0.877 \times 0.200 = -0.006733$
                        |               | The total indirect effects: $0.00492 + (-0.00191) + (-0.006733) = 0.01356$
                        |               | 0.01356 |
| FATHER’S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FE) | ---- | i) Through RE and RO: $0.223 \times 0.101 \times 0.200 = 0.0045$
                        |               | ii) Through RE, RO, RO: $0.233 \times 0.405 \times 0.877 \times 0.200 = 0.01655$
                        |               | iii) Through FO and FI: $0.555 \times 0.327 \times 0.457 = 0.08293$
                        |               | 0.12159 |
From a perusal of figure 3.1 and table 63 (A) following inferences can be drawn:

i) Caste of the respondents has no direct effect on their income but it has indirect effect on income through

a) respondents’ educational attainments and their occupational attainments;
b) respondents’ educational attainments, their first jobs and present jobs (occupations);

c) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments, and their present occupational attainments; and

d) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments, first jobs and present occupational attainments.

The total effect i.e. path co-efficient \( \beta = 0.013 \) can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in caste produces an increase of 0.013 standard deviation in respondents’ income. This implies that caste only explains about 1% of variation in income. This further implies that membership of a higher caste does not necessarily ensure a higher income.

(ii) Fathers’ educational attainments have no direct effect on their sons’ (respondents) income. However educational attainments have indirect effects through

a) respondents’ educational and occupational attainments;

b) respondents’ educational attainments, their first jobs and present jobs or occupational attainments;

c) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and their present occupational attainments;

d) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments, first jobs and respondents’ present jobs or occupational attainments;
e) respondents’ fathers’ occupational attainments and their income;

f) respondents’ fathers’ occupational attainments, respondents’ educational and their occupational attainments;

g) respondents’ fathers’ occupational attainments, respondents’ educational attainments, their first jobs, and their present jobs or occupational attainments;

h) respondents’ fathers’ occupations, respondents’ quality of schooling, respondents’ education and respondents’ occupations; and

i) respondents’ fathers’ occupational attainments, respondents’ quality of schooling and their educational attainments, respondents’ first jobs and their present jobs or occupational attainments.

Thus the total effect 0.121 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produce an increase of 0.121 standard deviation in sons’ income. It can be inferred that father’s educational attainment determines the income of their sons to some extent as it explains a total of about 12% of the variation in income of the sons. In other words it implies that higher the educational attainments of fathers higher are the chances of sons’ income.

(iii) Fathers’ occupational attainments have no direct effect on sons’ income. However fathers’ occupational attainments have indirect effect through
a) fathers’ income;
b) respondents’ (sons’) educational attainments, and their occupational attainments;
c) respondents’ educational attainments, their first jobs and their present jobs or occupational attainments;
d) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and present jobs or occupational attainments;
e) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments, first jobs and their present jobs or occupational attainments; and

The total effect i.e., path co-efficient $\beta = 0.015$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ occupational attainments produce an increase of 0.015 standard deviation in sons’ income. It can be inferred that only a total of about 2% of variation in sons’ income is explained by fathers’ occupational attainments.

(iv) Fathers’ income has direct effect on their sons’ income. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.457$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ income produces an increase of 0.457 standard deviations in sons’ income. Thus about 46% of the variation in sons’ income is directly explained by their fathers’ income.

(v) Size of fathers’ family has no direct effect but has indirect effect on sons’ income through

a) respondents’ (sons’) quality of schooling, their educational and occupational attainments; and
b) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments, their first jobs and present jobs or occupational attainments.

The total effect i.e., beta co-efficient (-0.004) implies that as an increase of one standard deviation in size of fathers’ family produces a decrease of -0.004 standard deviation in sons’ income. Thus about 0.4% of the variation in sons’ income is directly explained by the size of fathers’ family. It implies that bigger size of a father’s family lower is the income of a son. Size of fathers’ family influence sons’ income indirectly through quality of schooling which affects educational attainments and entering a certain occupations on which income of the sons depend.

(vi) Male respondents’ quality of schooling has no direct effect on their income. But it has indirect effect on their income through

a) respondents’ educational attainments and present occupational attainments; and

b) respondents’ educational attainments, their first jobs and present jobs or occupational attainments.

The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient β= 0.045 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in male respondents’ quality of schooling produce an increase of 0.045 standard deviation in their income. Thus about 5% of the variation in male respondents’income is explained by their quality of schooling.

(vii) Male respondents’ educational attainments have no direct effect on their income. However their educational attainments have indirect effect on income through
(a) respondents’ present occupational attainments, and

(b) respondents’ first and present occupational attainments or jobs.

The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta=0.095$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in male respondents’ quality of schooling produce an increase of 0.095 standard deviation in their income. Thus it can be inferred that a total of about 10% variation in male respondents’ income is explained by their educational attainments. It implies that in a certain situation higher education ensures higher income although in remaining 90% unexplained situation it can be inferred that a man’s income is independent of his educational attainment.

(viii) Male respondents’ first jobs have no direct effect on their income. However first jobs have indirect effect on their income through respondents’ present occupational attainments. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta=0.175$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ first jobs produces an increase of 0.175 standard deviation in their income. Thus about 18% of the variation in male respondents’ income is explained by their first jobs.

(ix) Male respondents’ present jobs or occupational attainments have only direct effect on their income. The total effect (direct effect) i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta=0.200$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ first jobs produces an increase of 0.200 standard deviation in their occupational attainments. Thus it can be inferred that about 20% variation in male respondents’ income is directly explained by their present occupational attainments. It further implies that in remaining
unexplained situation male respondents’ income is independent of their occupational attainments.

9.1.3.1 (B) Income Process (Female Group)

Figure 3.2 gives the path diagram for the female group. However, the direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on female respondents’ income are summarised in the Table 63 (B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL EFFECTS (DIRECT+INDIRECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FATHER'S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FE)</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>(i) Through F10.320x0.404=0.12928</td>
<td>0.12928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER'S INCOME (FI)</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>0.404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a perusal of figure 3.2 and table 63 (B) following inferences can be drawn:

(i) Fathers’ educational attainments have no direct effect on their daughters’ income. However fathers’ educational attainments have indirect effect through their Income. The total effect 0.129 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produces an increase of 0.129 standard deviations in daughters’ income. It can be inferred that father’s educational attainment determines the income of their daughters to some extent as it explains a total of about 13% of the variation in income of the daughters. In other words it implies that higher the educational attainments of fathers higher are the chances of daughters’ income.
(ii) Fathers’ income has direct effect on their daughters’ income. The path co-efficient \( \beta = 0.404 \) can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ income produces an increase of 0.404 standard deviation in daughters’ income. It can be inferred that in about 40% variation in daughters’ income is directly explained by their fathers’ income. It further implies that higher the fathers’ income higher is the chances of daughters’ income.

Sex-wise comparison of the effect of each determinant on the respondents’ income in Haflong town reveals that a negligible (1%) variation in income of men is explained by caste implying that a man belonging to a higher caste has better chance of attaining higher income than that of a men belonging to lower cast. In case of females the effect of caste is not noticed. Fathers’ educational attainment has a significant and almost similar effect on income of both the sexes (13% for women and 12% for men), which imply that fathers with higher levels of educational attainments have children who have the chances of earning high.

Fathers’ occupational attainments have a little effect on their sons (2%) income. Higher the occupational status of a father higher is the chances of a son earning high. The effect of this determinant is not found among the daughters. Fathers’ income has a significant effect on both the sexes and this effect is a little higher among their sons (45%) than that of their daughters (40%). It implies that higher the fathers’ income higher is the chances of their children’s income. Thus it can be inferred that children from the well-to-do classes have higher prospects of earning high than that of the children of the poor classes.
Apart from the above stated determinants, a few significant other determinants have effect only on male respondents, which are stated below.

In a very insignificant situation (0.4%) size of a father’s family reduces the chances of a son’s earning high, which implies that bigger the size of a family lower is the chances of income of a son. In about 5% variation of male respondents’ income is explained by their quality of schooling. Moreover, in about 10% variation in male respondents’ income is explained by their educational attainments. Thus it can be inferred that education is necessary for higher earnings but it cannot guarantee to provide high income to everyone with same level of education and it has been observed that most of the cases a man’s income is independent of his educational attainment. Moreover, in about 18% variation in men’s income is explained by their first jobs which implies that men have generally retained their first jobs and a very few cases they have left their first jobs and entered into present jobs. Besides 20% variation in men’s income is explained by their present occupations or jobs implying that in remaining unexplained circumstances their income is independent of their present occupations.

9.2. DYNAMICS OF SOCIAL MOBILITY PROCESS (UMRANGSO)
9.2.1 Educational Attainment Process
9.2.1.1 Educational Attainment Process (Whole Group)
Figure 4: Path Diagram of Umrangso (Whole Group)
Diagram 4 gives the path diagram for the whole group. The direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on respondents’ educational attainments are summarised in the Table 64

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL EFFECTS (DIRECT+INDIRECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL CATEGORY (T)</td>
<td>-0.291</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-0.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGION (R)</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>i)Through RQ .232 x.307 =0.0712</td>
<td>0.0712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTE (C)</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>ii)Through FE .317x.360 =0.1141</td>
<td>0.210+0.13716=0.34716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii)Through FE and RQ 0.317x0.237x0.307=0.02306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The total indirect effects: 0.1141+0.02306 =0.13716</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER’S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FE)</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>Through RQ 0.237x0.307=0.0727</td>
<td>0.360+0.0727=0.4327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALITYOFSCHOOLING (RQ)</td>
<td>0.307</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>0.307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a perusal of figure 4 and table 64 following inferences can be derived

(i) Social category of the respondents has direct effect on their educational attainments but the negative value in path coefficient indicates that belonging to tribal category reduces the opportunity of receiving higher levels of education. The path co-efficient \( \beta = -0.291 \) can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in social category produces a decrease of 0.291 standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments. It can be inferred that about 29% of variation in educational attainments is explained by belonging to tribal or non-tribal social category. In other words being a tribal reduces the chances of acquiring higher education by about 29% in comparison to a non-tribal.
(ii) Religion of the respondents has no direct effect on their educational attainments but it has indirect effect through the respondents’ quality of schooling. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.071$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in religion produces an increase of 0.071 standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments. As only 7% cases religion has an effect on educational attainments of the respondents so it can be inferred that religion has a very little effect on the educational attainment of a respondent.

(iii) Caste has direct effect on respondents’ educational attainments. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.210$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in caste produces an increase of 0.210 standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments. Caste has also indirect effect through

a) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments; and

b) fathers’ educational attainments and respondents’ quality of schooling.

Thus the total effect of caste is 0.3241. This implies that caste explains about 32% of variation in educational attainments. Alternatively it can be said that higher the caste status, higher are the educational attainments.

(iv) Fathers’ educational attainments have direct effect on their children’s (respondents’) educational attainments. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.360$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produce an increase of 0.360 standard deviation in children’s educational attainments. Fathers’ educational attainments have also indirect effects through respondents’ quality of schooling. Thus, total effect on children’s educational attainments is 0.432. It means a variation of
one standard deviation causes a total variation of 0.432 standard deviations in children’s educational attainments. It can be inferred that father’s educational attainment is a significant factor determining a respondent’s educational attainment as it explains a total of about 43% of the variation in educational attainments of the respondents.

(v) Respondents’ quality of schooling has direct effect on their educational attainments. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.307$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ quality of schooling produce an increase of 0.307 standard deviation in their educational attainments. Thus about 31% of the variation in educational attainments is directly explained by respondents’ quality of schooling.

9.2.1.1 (A) Educational Attainment Process (Male Group)
Figure 4.1: Path Diagram of Umrangso (Male Group)
Diagram 4.1 gives the path diagram for the male group. The direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on male respondents’ educational attainments are summarised in the Table 64 (A)

**TABLE 64 (A): DETERMINANTS OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT PROCESS (MALE GROUP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL EFFECTS (DIRECT + INDIRECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL CATEGORY (T)</td>
<td>-0.331</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-0.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGION (R)</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>Through RQ 0.248 x 0.215 = 0.05332</td>
<td>0.05332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CASTE (C)                                  | -------       | i)Through FE 0.340 x 0.381 = 0.12954  
ii)Through FE and RQ 0.340 x 0.314 x 0.215 = 0.02295  
The Total Indirect effects: 0.12954 + 0.02295 = 0.15249 | 0.15249                          |
| FATHER’S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FE)       | 0.381         | Through RQ 0.314 x 0.215 = 0.06751   | 0.381 + 0.06751 = 0.44851        |
| QUALITY OF SCHOOLING (RQ)                  | 0.215         | -------         | 0.215                            |

From a perusal of figure 4.1 and table 64 (A) following inferences can be derived

(i) Social category of the male respondents has direct effect on their educational attainments but the negative value in path coefficient indicates that belonging to tribal category reduces the opportunity of receiving higher levels of education. The path co-efficient $\beta = -0.331$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in social category produces a decrease of 0.331 standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments. It can be inferred that about 33% of variation in educational attainments is explained by belonging to tribal or non-tribal social category.
In other words being a tribal reduces the chances of acquiring higher education by about 33% in comparison to a non-tribal.

(ii) Religion of the male respondents has no direct effect on their educational attainments but it has indirect effect through quality of schooling. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.053$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in religion produces an increase of 0.053 standard deviation in male respondents’ educational attainments. As only 5% cases religion has an effect on educational attainments of the males so it can be inferred that religion has a very little effect on the educational attainment of a male.

(iii) Caste has no direct effect on male respondents’ educational attainments. But it has indirect effect through (a) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments; and (b) fathers’ educational attainments and respondents’ quality of schooling. Thus the total effect of caste is 0.152. This implies that caste explains about 15% of variation in men’s educational attainments. Alternatively it can be said that higher the caste status, higher are the educational attainments of men.

(iv) Fathers’ educational attainments have direct effect (0.381) on educational attainments of their sons. Fathers’ educational attainments have also indirect effects through sons’ quality of schooling. Thus, total effect on sons’ educational attainments is 0.448. It means a variation of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments causes a total variation of 0.448 standard deviations in sons’ education. It can be inferred that father’s educational attainment is a significant factor determining a son’s educational attainment as it explains a total of about 45% of the variation in educational attainments of the sons.
(v) Male respondents’ quality of schooling has direct effect on their educational attainments. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.215$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in males’ quality of schooling produces an increase of 0.215 standard deviation in their educational attainments. Thus about 22% of the variation in educational attainments of males is directly explained by their quality of schooling.

9.2.1.1 Educational Attainment Process (Female Group)
Figure 4.2: Path Diagram of Umrangso (Female Group)
Diagram 4.2 gives the path diagram for the female group. The direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on female respondents’ educational attainment are summarised in the Table 64(B)

**TABLE 64 (B): DETERMINANTS OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT PROCESS (FEMALE GROUP)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL EFFECTS (DIRECT+INDIRECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caste (C)</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>i) Through FE: 0.478x0.358 = 0.17112 ii) Through FO and FI: 0.334x0.541x0.182 = 0.03288 iii) Through FE, FO and FI: 0.478x0.639x0.541x0.182 = 0.03007 The Total Indirect effects: 0.17112 + 0.03288 + 0.3007 = 0.23407</td>
<td>0.23407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Educational Attainment (FE)</td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>Through FO and FI: 0.639x0.541x0.182 = 0.06291</td>
<td>0.358 + 0.06291 = 0.42091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Occupation (FO)</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>Through FI: 0.541x0.182 = 0.09846</td>
<td>0.09846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Income (FI)</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>0.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Schooling (RQ)</td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>0.479</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**From a perusal of figure 4.2 and table 64 (B) following inferences can be derived**

(i) Caste of the female respondents has no direct effect on their educational attainment but it has indirect effect through

a) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments;

b) respondents’ fathers’ occupational attainments and fathers’ income; and
c) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments, respondents’ fathers’ occupational attainments and fathers’ income.

The total effect i.e., path co-efficient $\beta = 0.234$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in caste produces an increase of 0.234 standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments. This implies that caste explains about 23% of variation in women’s educational attainments. Alternatively it can be said that higher the caste status of women, higher are their educational attainments.

(ii) Fathers’ educational attainments have direct effect on educational attainments of their daughters. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.358$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produce an increase of 0.358 standard deviation in their daughters’ educational attainments. Fathers’ educational attainments has also indirect effects through the combine effects of respondents’ fathers’ occupational attainments and fathers’ income. Thus, total effect on respondents’ educational attainments is 0.420. It means a variation of one standard deviation causes a total variation of 0.420 standard deviations in respondents’ educational attainments. It can be inferred that father’s educational attainment is a significant factor determining daughter’s educational attainment as it explains a total of about 42% of the variation in educational attainments of the daughters.

(iii) Fathers’ occupational attainments have no direct effect but have indirect effect on their daughters’ educational attainments through fathers’ income. The total effect i.e., path co-efficient $\beta = 0.098$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ fathers’ occupational
attainments produce an increase of 0.098 standard deviation in their daughters’ educational attainments. It can be inferred that a total of about 10% of variation in educational attainments of daughters is explained by fathers’ occupational attainments.

(iv) Fathers’ income has direct effect but no indirect effect on their daughters’ educational attainments. The total effect i.e., path co-efficient $\beta=0.182$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ income produces an increase of 0.182 standard deviation in their daughters’ educational attainments. It can be inferred that a total of about 18% of variation in educational attainments of daughters is explained by fathers’ income.

(v) Female respondents’ quality of schooling has direct effect on their educational attainments. The path co-efficient $\beta=0.479$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ quality of schooling produce an increase of 0.479 standard deviation in their educational attainments. Thus about 48% of the variation in educational attainments of women is directly explained by their quality of schooling.

Sex-wise break up in this town (Umrangso) shows about 33% of variation in educational attainments of men is explained by their social category which implies that tribal men are in disadvantageous position in the attainment of education but in case of females this social category of being tribal has not affected at all.

Religion has a little (5% of total variation) effect on educational attainment of the males but it is not at all significant in case of females. Caste plays as a significant determinant in the attainment of education for both the sexes and higher caste women (23% of variation explained by
caste) are in advantage of receiving education and the proportion is higher than that of their men counterparts. Moreover, fathers’ educational attainment is a significant determinant affecting educational attainment of males (45%) and of the females (42%). Thus it can be inferred that education receives prime importance in the families and most importantly in those families where education has a legacy. Besides in 10% of variation in daughters’ educational attainments are explained by fathers’ occupational attainments and in case of sons such effect is not noticed. Lastly, fathers’ income has too affected educational attainment of the females (18% of variation) and such effect was not noticed in case of males. It implies that higher the income of the fathers higher is the chances of educational attainments of the daughters.

9.2.2 Occupational Attainment Process

9.2.2.1 Occupational Attainment Process (Whole Group)

Figure 4 gives the path diagram for the whole group. The direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on respondents’ occupational attainments are summarised in the Table 65.
**TABLE 65: DETERMINANTS OF OCCUPATIONAL ATTAINMENT PROCESS**
*(WHOLE GROUP)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL EFFECTS (DIRECT + INDIRECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL CATEGORY (T)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>i) Through RE</td>
<td>-0.292x0.085 = -0.247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Through RE and RO₁</td>
<td>-0.291x0.510x0.852 = -0.12644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The total indirect effects = -0.247 + (-0.12644) = -0.37344</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGION (R)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>i) Through RQ</td>
<td>0.232x0.59 = 0.13688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Through RQ and RE</td>
<td>0.232x0.307x0.085 = 0.00605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Through RQ, RE and RO₁</td>
<td>0.232x0.307x0.510x0.852 = 0.03094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The total indirect effects = 0.13688 + 0.00605 + 0.03094 = 0.17387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTE (C)</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>i) Through RE</td>
<td>0.210x0.085 = 0.01785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Through RO₁</td>
<td>0.237x0.852 = 0.20192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii) Through RE and RO₁</td>
<td>0.210x0.510x0.852 = 0.09124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv) Through FE and RE</td>
<td>0.371x0.360x0.085 = 0.01135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v) Through FE, RQ and RE</td>
<td>0.371x0.237x0.307x0.085 = 0.002294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vi) Through FE, RQ, RE and RO₁</td>
<td>0.371x0.237x0.307x0.510x0.852 = 0.011729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The total indirect effects = 0.01785 + 0.20192 + 0.09124 + 0.01135 + 0.002294 + 0.011729 = 0.33638</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From a perusal of figure 4 and table 65 following inferences can be drawn:

(i) Social category of the respondents has no direct effect on their occupational attainments but it has indirect effect on their occupational attainments through

a) respondents’ educational attainments; and

b) respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs;

However the total effect is - 0.373 (negative value) which indicates that belonging to tribal category reduces the opportunity of getting higher status occupations. The path co-efficient $\beta = - 0.373$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in social category produces a decrease of 0.373 standard deviation in respondents’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that about 37% of variation in occupational attainments is explained by belonging to tribal or non-tribal social category. In other
words being a tribal reduces the chances of acquiring higher status occupations by about 37% in comparison to a non-tribal.

(ii) Religion of the respondents has no direct effect on respondents’ occupational attainments but it has indirect effect through

a) respondents’ quality of schooling;

b) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments; and

c) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and first jobs;

The value of path co-efficient $\beta = 0.174$ can be interpreted as a variation of one standard deviation in religion produces a variation of 0.174 standard deviation in respondents’ occupational attainments. This implies that religion explains about 17% of variation in occupational attainments. It further implies that members of major religious communities have an advantage of attaining of higher status occupations.

(iii) Caste has no direct effect on occupational attainments of the respondents. But it has indirect effect on the respondents’ occupational attainment through

a) respondents’ educational attainments;

b) respondents’ first jobs;

c) respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs;

d) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments and respondents’ educational attainments;
e) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments, respondents’ quality of schooling and their educational attainments; and

f) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments, respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and first jobs.

Thus the total effect 0.336 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in caste produces an increase of 0.336 standard deviations in respondents’ occupational attainments. This implies that caste explains about 34% of variation in occupational attainments. Therefore it can be inferred that members of higher caste persons have greater chances of getting higher status occupations.

(iv) Fathers’ educational attainments have no direct effect on children’s (respondents’) occupational attainments. However fathers’ educational attainments have indirect effect through

a) respondents’ quality of schooling;

b) respondents’ educational attainments;

c) respondents’ quality of schooling and their educational attainments;

d) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and their first jobs;

The total effect 0.082 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainment produces an increase of 0.082 standard deviations in children’s occupational attainments. It can be inferred that father’s educational attainment determines a child’s
occupational attainment to a small extent as it explains only a total of about 8% of the variation in occupational attainments of the children.

(v) Respondents’ quality of schooling has direct effect (0.059) on their occupational attainments. But it has also indirect effect on their occupational attainments through a) respondents’ educational attainments; and b) respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient β= 0.218 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ quality of schooling produce an increase of 0.218 standard deviation in their occupational attainments. Thus about 22% of the variation in respondents’ occupational attainments is explained by their quality of schooling.

(vi) Respondents’ educational attainments have direct effect (0.085) on their occupational attainments. But it has also indirect effect on their occupational attainment through their first jobs. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient β= 0.519 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments produces an increase of 0.519 standard deviation in their occupational attainments. Thus it can be inferred that a total of about 52% variation in respondents’ occupational attainments is explained by their educational attainments. It also implies that respondent’s educational attainment is a significant factor determining his or her occupational attainment.

(vii) Respondents’ first jobs have only direct effect on their occupational attainments. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient β=0.852 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ first jobs produces an increase of 0.852 standard deviation in their occupational attainments. Thus it can be inferred that as much as 85%
variation in respondents’ present occupation is explained by their first jobs. It also implies that in most of the cases the respondents have remained in their first jobs or their first jobs are also their present jobs.

9.2.2.1 (A) Occupational Attainment Process (Male Group)

Figure 4.1 gives the path diagram for the male group. The direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on male respondents’ occupational attainments are summarised in the Table 65 (A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL EFFECTS (DIRECT + INDIRECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL CATEGORY(T)</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>Through RE and RO₁: -0.331x 0.520x0.883 = 0.15198</td>
<td>-0.15198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| RELIGION (R) | .......... | i) Through RQ 0.248 x 0.073 = 0.018104  
  ii) Through RQ, RE and RO1 0.248 x 0.215 x 0.520 x 0.883 = 0.02772  
  The total indirect effects = 0.018104 + 0.02772 = 0.0458 | 0.0458 |
| CASTE (C) | .......... | i) Through FE and RQ 0.340 x 0.314 x 0.073 = 0.00779  
  ii) Through FE, RE and RO1 0.340 x 0.381 x 0.520 x 0.883 = 0.05947  
  iii) Through FE, RQ, RE and RO1 0.340 x 0.314 x 0.215 x 0.520 x 0.883 = 0.010539  
  The total indirect effects = 0.00779 + 0.05947 + 0.010539 = 0.07779 | 0.07779 |
| FATHER'S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FE) | .......... | i) Through RQ 0.314 x 0.073 = 0.02292  
  ii) Through RE and RO1 0.381 x 0.520 x 0.883 = 0.17493  
  iii) Through RQ, RE and RO1 0.314 x 0.215 x 0.520 x 0.883 = 0.030997  
  The total indirect effects = 0.02292 + 0.17493 + 0.030997 = 0.22884 | 0.22884 |
| QUALITY OF SCHOOLING (RQ) | 0.073 | Through RE and RO1 0.215 x 0.520 x 0.883 = 0.09871  
  0.073 + 0.09871 = 0.17171 | 0.17171 |
| RESPONDENT'S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (RE) | .......... | Through RO1 0.520 x 0.883 = 0.45916 | 0.45916 |
| RESPONDENT'S FIRST JOB (RO1) | 0.883 | .......... | 0.883 |

From a perusal of figure 4.1 and table 65 (A) following inferences can be drawn:

(i) Social category of the respondents has no direct effect on their occupational attainments but it has indirect effect on their occupational attainments through respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs. However the total effect is - 0.151 (negative value) which indicates that belonging to tribal category reduces the opportunity of receiving higher status occupations. The path co-efficient $\beta = - 0.151$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in social category produces a
decrease of 0.151 standard deviation in male respondents’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that about 15% of variation in occupational attainments is explained by belonging to tribal or non-tribal social category. It implies that tribal male respondents are in disadvantageous situation in relation to the attainment of higher status occupations.

(ii) Religion of the male respondents has no direct effect on their occupational attainments but it has indirect effect through

a) respondents’ quality of schooling; and

b) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and their first jobs.

The value of path co-efficient $\beta = 0.045$ can be interpreted as a variation of one standard deviation in religion produces a variation of 0.045 standard deviation in male respondents’ occupational attainments. This implies that religion explains only about 5% of variation in occupational attainments. It further implies that persons belonging to major religious communities have derived an advantage in the attainment of higher status occupations.

(iii) Caste has no direct effect on the occupational attainments of the male respondents. But it has indirect effect on their occupational attainments through

a) fathers’ educational attainments and respondent’ quality of schooling;

b) fathers’ educational attainments, respondents’ educational attainments and respondents’ first jobs;
c) fathers’ educational attainments, respondents’ quality of schooling, respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs.

Thus the total effect 0.077 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in caste of the respondents produces an increase of 0.077 standard deviations in their occupational attainments. This implies that caste explains about 8% of variation in occupational attainments. Therefore it can be inferred that male members of higher caste have greater chances of attaining higher status occupations.

(v) Fathers’ educational attainments have no direct effect on their sons’ occupational attainments. However it has indirect effect through:

a) respondents’ quality of schooling;

b) respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs;

c) respondents’ quality of schooling, respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs.

The total effect 0.228 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produces an increase of 0.228 standard deviations in their sons’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that father’s educational attainment is a significant factor determining a respondent’s occupational attainment as it explains a total of about 23% of the variation in occupational attainments of the respondents.

(vi) Male respondents’ quality of schooling has direct effect (0.073) on their occupational attainments. However it has also indirect effect through respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs. The total
effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta= 0.171$ can be interpreted as an increase of
one standard deviation in male respondents’ quality of schooling produces
an increase of 0.171 standard deviation in their occupational attainments.

Thus about 17% of the variation in male respondents’ occupational
attainments is explained by their quality of schooling.

(vii) Male respondents’ educational attainments have no direct effect
on their occupational attainments. However their educational attainments
have indirect effect on their occupational attainments through their first
jobs. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta= 0.459$ can be interpreted as
an increase of one standard deviation in male respondents’ educational
attainments produces an increase of 0.459 standard deviation in their
occupational attainments. It can be inferred that male respondent’s
educational attainment is a significant factor determining his occupational
attainment as it explains a total of about 46% of the variation in his
occupational attainment.

(viii) Male respondents’ first jobs have direct effect on their
occupational attainments. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta= 0.883$
can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’
first jobs produces an increase of 0.883 standard deviation in their
occupational attainments. It can be inferred that male respondent’s first job
is a significant factor determining his occupational attainment as it explains
a total of about 88% of the variation in educational attainments of the
respondents. It also implies that in most of the cases the respondents has
remained in their first jobs and their first jobs are their present jobs too.

9.2.2.1 (B) Occupational Attainment Process (Female Group)
Figure 4.2 gives the path diagram for the female group. The direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on female respondents’ occupational attainments are summarised in the Table 65 (B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL EFFECTS (DIRECT+ INDIRECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASTE (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.134787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i)Through FE and RE 0.478x0.358x0.200= 0.034224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)Through FE, RE and RO 0.478x0.358x0.480x0.783=0.06431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)Through FO, FI and RE 0.334x 0.541x0.182x0.200 = 0.006577</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv)Through FO, FI, RE and RO 0.334x 0.541x0.182x0.480x0.783 = 0.012359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v)Through FE, FO, FI and RE = 0.478x 0.639x0.541x0.182x0.480x0.783 = 0.01130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vi)Through FE, FO, FI, RE and RO = 0.478x 0.639x0.541x0.182x0.480x0.783 = 0.1130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The total indirect effects=0.034224 + 0.06431 + 0.006577 + 0.012359 + 0.0060148 + 0.01130 = 0.134787</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER’S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i)Through RE0.358x0.200 = 0.0716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Through RE and RO 0.358x0.480x0.783=0.13455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii)Through FO, FI and RE 0.639x 0.541x0.182x0.200=0.01258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv)Through FO, FI, RE and RO 0.639x 0.541x0.182x0.480x0.783=0.023646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The total indirect effects=0.0716 + 0.13455 + 0.01258 + 0.023646 = 0.24237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER’S OCCUPATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i)Through FI and RE 0.541x0.182x0.200=0.01969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)Through FI, RE and RO 0.541x0.182x0.480x0.783 = 0.037005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The total indirect effects=0.01969 + 0.037005 = 0.05669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER’S INCOME (Fi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i)Through RE 0.182x0.200= 0.0364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)Through RE and RO 0.182x0.480x0.783= 0.06840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The total indirect effects=0.0364 + 0.06840 = 0.10480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUALITY OF SCHOOLING (RQ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.27582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i)Through RE0.479x0.200=0.0958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii)Through RE and RO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From a perusal of figure 4.2 and table 65 (B) following inferences can be drawn:

(i) Caste has no direct effect on respondents’ occupational attainments but it has indirect effect through

a) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments and respondents’ educational attainments;

b) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments, respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs;

c) respondents’ fathers’ occupational attainments, fathers’ income and respondents’ educational attainments;

d) respondents’ fathers’ occupational attainments, fathers’ income, respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs;

e) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments, respondents’ fathers’ occupational attainments, fathers’ income and respondents’ educational attainments; and

f) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments, their occupational attainments, fathers’ income, respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs.
The total effect ($\beta = 0.134$) can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in caste produces an increase of 0.134 standard deviation in female respondents’ occupational attainments. This implies that caste explains about 13% of variation in female respondents’ occupational attainments. It further implies that a female member of a higher caste has greater chance of getting higher status occupation.

(ii) Fathers’ educational attainments have no direct effect on their daughters’ (respondents’) occupational attainments. However their educational attainments have indirect effect through

a) respondents’ educational attainments;

b) respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs;

c) fathers’ occupational attainments, fathers’ income and respondents’ educational attainments;

d) fathers’ occupational attainments, fathers’ income, respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs.

The total effect0.242 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produces an increase of 0.242 standard deviations in their daughters’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that father’s educational attainment is a significant factor determining daughter’s educational attainment as it explains a total of about 24% of the variation in daughters’ occupational attainments.

(iii) Fathers’ occupational attainments have no direct effect on their daughters’ occupational attainments. However, fathers’ occupational attainments have indirect effects through
a) respondents’ fathers’ income and respondents’ educational attainments; and

b) respondents’ fathers’ income, respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs.

Thus, the total effect on daughters’ occupational attainments through the indirect effects of above stated intervening variables is 0.056. It means a variation of one standard deviation in fathers’ occupational attainments causes a total variation of 0.056 standard deviations in daughters’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that father’s occupational attainment is a significant factor determining daughter’s occupational attainment as it explains a total of about 6% of the variation in daughters’ occupational attainments.

(iv) Fathers’ income has no direct effect on their daughters’ occupational attainments. However, fathers’ occupational attainments have indirect effects through

a) respondents’ educational attainments; and

b) respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs.

Thus, the total effect on daughters’(respondents’) occupational attainments through the above stated intervening variables is 0.104. It means a variation of one standard deviation in fathers’ income causes a total variation of 0.104 standard deviations in daughters’ occupational attainments. It can be inferred that father’s income is a significant factor determining daughter’s occupational attainment as it explains a total of about 10% of the variation in daughters’ occupational attainments.
(v) Female respondents’ quality of schooling has no direct effect on their occupational attainments. It has indirect effects through

a) respondents’ educational attainments; and

b) respondents’ educational attainments and their first jobs.

The total effect i.e., path co-efficient $\beta = 0.275$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in female respondents’ quality of schooling produces an increase of 0.275 standard deviation in their occupational attainments. Thus about 28% of the variation in female respondents’ occupational attainments is explained by their quality of schooling.

(vi) Female respondents’ educational attainments have a direct effect (0.200) on their occupational attainments. However their educational attainments have also indirect effect on their occupational attainment through their first jobs. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta = 0.575$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in female respondents’ educational attainments produces an increase of 0.575 standard deviation in their occupational attainments. Thus about 58% of the variation in female respondents’ occupational attainments is directly explained by their educational attainments.

(vii) Female respondents’ first jobs have a direct effect on their occupational attainments. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta = 0.783$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in female respondents’ first jobs produce an increase of 0.783 standard deviation in their occupational attainments. Thus about 78% of the variation in female respondents’ occupational attainments is directly explained by their first jobs. It also implies that in most of the cases the female respondents have
retained their first jobs and experienced upward mobility on the basis of promotions or incentives within the same occupational structure.

Sex-wise comparison of the effect of each determinant on the respondents’ occupational attainments in this town (Umrangso) reveals that in about 15% of variation in occupational attainments is explained by social category which implies that tribal men are in disadvantageous position in occupational attainment. Social category of being a tribal man reduces his opportunity of attaining higher status occupations as because tribal men to a considerable extent face relatively a tough situation in labour market compared to their non-tribal counterparts. However in case of female respondents, social category of being a tribal woman does not show any effect in her occupational attainment. Religion has no effect on women’s occupational attainment but it explains only 5% variation in occupational attainments of men which implies that men from minority religious communities are in disadvantage of attaining high status occupations. Fathers’ educational attainment has a significant effect on occupational attainments of both the sexes although the effect is a bit higher on women (24%) than that of men (23%) which imply that fathers with higher levels of education influence and support their daughters in attaining higher status jobs. It can be inferred that male members of the family have much more open access to labour market than that of their female counterparts as females are largely confined to perform domestic work.

Fathers’ occupational attainments have effect only on the females (6%). It implies that higher the occupational status of a father higher is the chance of a daughter entering into higher status job. Moreover in this town almost 10% of variation in occupational attainments of daughters is explained by their fathers’ income although this effect is not found in males.
Quality of schooling more or less (17% variation in males and 28% in females) has effect on the occupational attainments of both the sexes. Quality of schooling directly and even indirectly through the educational attainment affects both the sexes in occupational attainment.

Respondents’ own educational attainments largely determine their occupational statuses. In 46% variation in males and about 58% in females in their occupational attainments are explained by their educational attainments. Thus it can be inferred that education is necessary for occupational attainment but it cannot guarantee to provide job to everyone with same level of education. For both the sexes their first jobs determine their present jobs or occupations (88% variation in males and 78% in females) which imply that the members of both the sexes have retained their first jobs and a very few cases persons have left their first jobs and entered into present jobs or occupations.

9.2.3 Income Process

9.2.3.1 Income Process (Whole Group)

Figure 4 gives the path diagram for the whole group. The direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on respondents’ income are summarised in the table 66.
# Table 66: Determinants of Income (Whole Group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory Variables</th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
<th>Indirect Effect</th>
<th>Total Effects (Direct + Indirect)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Social Category (T)   | ........       | i) Through RE and RO: \( -0.291 \times 0.085 \times 0.300 = -0.00742 \)  
                        |               | ii) Through RE, RO, and RO: \( -0.291 \times 0.510 \times 0.852 \times 0.300 = -0.03793 \)  
                        |               | The total indirect effects: \( -0.007420 + (-0.03793) = -0.045353 \) | -0.045353 |
| Religion (R)          | ........       | i) Through RQ and RO: \( 0.232 \times 0.198 = 0.04593 \)  
                        |               | ii) Through RQ, RE, RO, and RO: \( 0.232 \times 0.307 \times 0.085 \times 0.300 = 0.001816 \)  
                        |               | iii) Through RQ, RE, RO, and RO: \( 0.232 \times 0.307 \times 0.510 \times 0.085 \times 0.300 = 0.000926 \)  
                        |               | The total indirect effects: \( 0.04593 + 0.001816 + 0.000926 = 0.04867 \) | 0.04867 |
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From a perusal of figure 4 and table 66 following inferences can be drawn:

(i) Social Category of the respondents has no direct effect on their income but it has indirect effect through

   a) respondents’ educational attainments, their present occupational attainments; and
b) respondents’ educational attainments, their first jobs and present jobs or occupational attainments.

The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta = 0.045$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in social category produces an increase of 0.045 standard deviation in respondents’ income. It can be inferred that about 5% of variation in income is explained by belonging to tribal or non-tribal social category. It further implies that non-tribal respondents are in an advantageous situation in relation to income. However this amount of effect of social category is not a very significant one.

(ii) Religion of the respondents has no direct effect on their income but it has indirect effects on income through

a) respondents’ quality of schooling;

b) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and their present occupational attainments; and

c) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments, first jobs and present jobs or occupational attainments.

The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta = 0.048$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in religion produces a variation of 0.048 standard deviation in respondents’ income. This implies that religion explains about 5% of variation in income. It can be inferred that persons in major religious communities are in an advantageous situation in relation to income. However this amount of effect of religion is not a very significant one.
(iii) Caste of the respondents has no direct effect on their income but it has indirect effect on income through

a) respondents’ educational attainments and their present occupational attainments;

b) respondents’ first jobs and their present jobs or occupational attainments;

c) respondents’ educational attainments, their first jobs and their present jobs or occupational attainments;

d) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments, their educational attainments and their present jobs or occupational attainments;

e) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments, respondents’ educational attainments, respondents’ first jobs and their present jobs or occupational attainments;

f) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments and respondents’ quality of schooling;

g) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments, respondents’ quality of schooling and their present jobs or occupational attainments;

h) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments, respondents’ quality of schooling, respondents’ educational attainments and their present jobs or occupational attainments;

i) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments, respondents’ quality of schooling, respondents’
educational attainments, respondents’ first jobs and their present jobs or occupational attainments;

j) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments, fathers’ occupational attainments and income.

The total effect i.e., path co-efficient $\beta = 0.163$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in caste produces an increase of 0.163 standard deviation in respondents’ income. This implies that caste explains about 16% of variation in respondents’ income. It further implies that the members of higher caste groups have greater chances of earning high.

(iv) Fathers’ educational attainments have no direct effect but have indirect effects on their children’s (respondents’) income through

a) respondents’ quality of schooling;

b) respondents’ quality of schooling and respondents’ present occupational attainments;

c) respondents’ educational attainments and their present occupational attainments;

d) respondents’ educational attainments, their first jobs and their present jobs or occupational attainments;

e) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments and their present jobs or occupational attainments;

f) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments, their first jobs and present jobs or occupational attainments.
Thus the total effect 0.118 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produces an increase of 0.118 standard deviations in children’s income. It can be inferred that father’s educational attainment to some extent determines child’s income as it explains a total of about 12% of the variation in children’s income.

(v) Fathers’ occupational attainments have no direct effect but have indirect effect on their children’s income through fathers’ income. The total effect i.e., path co-efficient $\beta = 0.114$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ occupational attainments produces an increase of 0.114 standard deviation in children’s income. It can be inferred that father’s occupational attainment to a little extent determines child’s income as it explains a total of about 11% of the variation in children’s income.

(vi) Fathers’ income has direct effect on their children’s income. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.236$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ income produces an increase of 0.236 standard deviation in children’s income. It can be inferred that a total of about 24% of variation in children’s income is explained by fathers’ income. It further implies that higher the fathers’ income higher is the children’s income.

(vii) Respondents’ quality of schooling has direct effect (0.198) on their income. Moreover it has also indirect effects on their income through

a) respondents’ present occupational attainments;

b) respondents’ educational attainments and present occupational attainments; and

c) respondents’ educational attainments, respondents’ first jobs and their present jobs or occupational attainments.
The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta=0.263$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ quality of schooling produces an increase of 0.263 standard deviation in their income. It can be inferred that a total of about 26% of variation in respondents’ income is explained by their quality of schooling.

(viii) Respondents’ educational attainments have no direct effect but have indirect effect on income through a) respondents’ present occupational attainments, and b) respondents’ first jobs and their present occupational attainments or jobs. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta=0.155$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ educational attainments produces an increase of 0.130 standard deviation in their income. Thus it can be inferred that a total of about 16% of variation in respondents’ income is explained by their educational attainments. It further implies that higher the levels of education greater are the chances of earning high although in most of the cases income remains independent of educational attainments.

(ix) Respondent’s first job has no direct effect on his or her income. But it has indirect effect through his or her present occupational attainment. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta=0.255$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ first jobs produces an increase of 0.255 standard deviation in income. It can be inferred that a total of about 26% of variation in respondents’ income is explained by their first jobs.

(x) Respondents’ present jobs or occupational attainments have direct effect on their income. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta=0.300$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in
respondents’ first jobs produce an increase of 0.300 standard deviation in their income. It can be inferred that a total of about 30% of variation in respondents’ income is explained by their present jobs or occupational attainments. It further implies in most of cases respondents’ income is independent of their present occupational attainments.

9.2.3.1 (A) Income Process (Male Group)

Figure 4.1 gives the path diagram for the male group. However, the direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on male respondents’ income are summarised in the Table 66 (A).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL EFFECTS (DIRECT+INDIRECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL CATEGORY (T)</td>
<td>Through RE, RO and RO</td>
<td>-0.31x0.52x0.88x0.32= -0.04863</td>
<td>-0.04863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELIGION (R)</td>
<td>i) Through RQ 0.248 x 0.199 = 0.04935 ii) Through RQ and RO 0.248x0.073x0.32 = 0.00579 iii) Through RQ, RE, RO and RO 0.248x0.215x0.52x0.88x0.32 = 0.007834 The total indirect effects: 0.04935 + 0.00579 + 0.007834 = 0.062974</td>
<td>0.062974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASTE (C)</td>
<td>i) Through FE and RQ 0.340x0.314x0.199 = 0.021245 ii) Through FE and FO 0.340x0.610x(-0.176) = -0.03650 iii) Through FE, FO and FI 0.340x0.610x0.510x0.294 = 0.031097 iv) Through FE, RQ and RO 0.340x0.314x0.199 = 0.007335 v) Through FE, RE, RO and RO 0.340x0.314x0.215x0.52x0.88x0.32 = 0.003725 The total indirect effects: 0.021245 + (-0.03650) + 0.021245 + 0.003725 = 0.040740</td>
<td>0.040740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER’S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FE)</td>
<td>i) Through RQ 0.314x0.199 = 0.062486 ii) Through FO 0.61x(-0.176) = -0.10736 iii) Through RQ and RO 0.314x0.073x0.32 = 0.007335 iv) Through FO and FI 0.610x0.510x0.294 = 0.09146 v) Through RE, RO and RO 0.381x0.52x0.88x0.32 = 0.05598 The total indirect effects: 0.062486 + (-0.10736) + 0.007335 + 0.09146 + 0.05598 = 0.109901</td>
<td>0.109901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER’S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FE)</td>
<td>-0.176 Through FI</td>
<td>-0.176 + 0.14994 -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 66 (A): DETERMINANTS OF INCOME (MALE GROUP)
From a perusal of figure 4.1 and table 66 (A) following inferences can be drawn:

(i) Social Category of the male respondents has no direct effect on their income but it has indirect effect on income through their educational attainments, their first jobs and occupational attainments. The total effect i.e., the negative value of path co-efficient $\beta = -0.048$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in social category produces a decrease of 0.048 standard deviation in male respondents’ income. Thus social category explains a total of about 5% of variation in income of the respondents. It can be inferred that tribal respondents are in a disadvantageous situation in relation to income. However this amount of effect of social category on tribal respondents is not a very significant one.

(ii) Religion of the male respondents has no direct effect on their income but it has indirect effects on income through

a) respondents’ quality of schooling;

b) respondents’ quality of schooling and their occupational attainments;
c) respondents’ quality of schooling, their educational attainments, their first jobs and present jobs or occupational attainments.

The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta=0.062$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in religion produces a variation of 0.062 standard deviation in respondents’ income. Thus religion explains 6% of variation of the income of respondents. It can be inferred that men in major religious communities are in an advantageous situation in relation to income. However this amount of effect of religion is not a very significant one.

(iii) Caste of the male respondents has no direct effect on their income but it has indirect effect on income through

a) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments and respondents’ quality of schooling;

b) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments and their fathers’ occupational attainments;

c) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments and their fathers’ occupational attainments and income;

d) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments and respondents’ quality of schooling and respondents’ occupational attainments;

e) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments, respondents’ educational attainments, respondents’ first jobs and their present occupational attainments; and
f) respondents’ fathers’ educational attainments, respondents’ quality of schooling, respondents’ educational attainments, respondents’ first jobs and their present occupational attainments.

The total effect i.e., path co-efficient $\beta = 0.040$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in caste produces an increase of 0.040 standard deviation in respondents’ income. Thus caste explains almost of 4% of variation in income of the male respondents. However this amount of effect of caste is not a very significant one.

(iv) Father’s educational attainment has no direct effect on son’s (respondent’s) income. However it has indirect effects through

a) respondents’ quality of schooling;

b) respondents’ fathers’ occupational attainments;

c) respondents’ fathers’ occupational attainments and their income;

d) respondents’ quality of schooling and their occupational attainments;

e) respondents’ educational attainments, their first jobs and present jobs or occupational attainments;

Thus the total effect 0.109 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainments produces an increase of 0.109 standard deviations in their sons’ income. It can be inferred that father’s educational attainments explain about 11% of variation of sons’ income which implies that higher the fathers’ educational attainments higher are their sons’ income.
(v) Fathers’ occupational attainments have direct effect (-0.176) on their sons’ income. Besides fathers’ occupational attainments have indirect effect on sons’ income through their income. The total effect i.e., the negative value of path co-efficient $\beta = -0.026$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ occupational attainment produce a decrease of 0.026 standard deviation in sons’ income. It can be inferred that a total of almost 2% of variation in son’s income is explained by his father’s occupational attainment. It implies that father occupational attainments have reduced the chances of their sons’ income to a negligible extent.

(vi) Fathers’ income has direct effect on their sons’ (respondents’) income. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.294$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ income produces an increase of 0.294 standard deviation in respondents’ income. Thus fathers’ income explains about 29% of variation of sons’ income and therefore it can be inferred that higher the fathers’ income higher is the sons’ income.

(vii) Male respondents’ quality of schooling has direct effect (0.199) on their income. However it has also indirect effect on their income through a) respondents’ occupational attainments; and b) respondents’ educational attainments, their first jobs and present jobs or occupational attainments.

The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta = 0.253$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in respondents’ quality of schooling produce an increase of 0.253 standard deviation in their income. Thus about 25% of the variation in male respondents’ income is explained by their quality of schooling.
(viii) Male respondents’ educational attainments have no direct effect on their income. But it has indirect effect on income through their first jobs and present occupational attainments or jobs. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta = 0.146$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in male respondents’ educational attainments produce an increase of 0.146 standard deviation in their income. Thus about 15% of the variation in male respondents’ income is explained by their educational attainments. Therefore it can be inferred that educational attainments to a considerable extent have an effect on income.

(ix) Male respondents’ first jobs have no direct effect on their income. However first jobs have indirect effect on their income through their present occupational attainments. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta = 0.282$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in male respondents’ first jobs produce an increase of 0.282 standard deviation in their income. Thus about 28% of the variation in male respondents’ income is explained by their first jobs. It implies that respondents’ first jobs are the major sources of their income.

(x) Male respondents’ present jobs or occupational attainments have direct effect on their income. The total effect i.e., the path co-efficient $\beta = 0.320$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in their present jobs or occupational attainments produces an increase of 0.320 standard deviations in their income. Thus it can be inferred that a total of about 32% of variation in male respondents’ income is explained by their present jobs or occupations. It implies that present occupations of male respondents are the chief sources of their income however in most of the occasions their income is independent of their occupations.
9.2.3.1 (B) Income Process (Female Group)

Figure 4.2 gives the path diagram for the female group. The direct and indirect effects of the various independent variables on female respondents’ income are summarised in the table 66 (B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPLANATORY VARIABLES</th>
<th>DIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT EFFECT</th>
<th>TOTAL EFFECTS (DIRECT+ INDIRECT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CASTE (C)</td>
<td>i)Through FO and FI 0.334 x0.541x0.495= 0.08944 ii) Through FE, FO and FI 0.478x0.639x0.541x0.495= 0.08179 The total direct effects = 0.08944+ 0.8179 = 0.171235</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER’S EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FE)</td>
<td>Through FO and FI 0.639x0.541x0.495=0.171121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER’S OCCUPATIONAL ATTAINMENT (FO)</td>
<td>Through FI 0.541 x 0.495 =0.26779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER’S INCOME (FI)</td>
<td>0.495</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0.495</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a perusal of figure 4.2 and table 66 (B) following inferences can be drawn:

(i) Caste of the respondents has no direct effect on their income but it has an indirect effect on income through

a) fathers’ occupational attainments and fathers’ income; and

b) fathers’ educational attainments, their occupational attainments and their income.

The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.171$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in caste produces an increase of 0.171 standard deviation in female respondents’ income. Thus, caste explains a total of about 17% of variation in income of the female respondents. Moreover this amount of effect of caste is considerably a significant one.
(ii) Father’s educational attainment has no direct effect on daughter’s income. However it has indirect effect through father’s occupational attainment and his income. The total effect 0.171 can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ educational attainment produces an increase of 0.17 standard deviations in daughters’ income. It can be inferred that fathers’ educational attainments explain about 17% variation of their daughters’ income which implies that higher the fathers’ educational attainments higher is their daughters’ income.

(iii) Father’s occupational attainment has no direct effect on daughter’s income. But it has indirect effect through father’s income. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.267$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ occupational attainment produces an increase of 0.267 standard deviation in daughters’ income. It can be inferred that fathers’ occupational attainments explain about 27% variation of their daughters’ income which implies that higher the fathers’ occupational attainments higher is the chances of their daughters’ income.

(iv) Father’s income has a direct effect on daughter’s income. The path co-efficient $\beta = 0.495$ can be interpreted as an increase of one standard deviation in fathers’ income produces an increase of 0.495 standard deviation in their daughters’ income. It can be inferred that fathers’ income explains about 50% of variation of their daughters’ income which implies that higher the fathers’ income higher is the chances of their daughters’ income.

Sex-wise comparison of the effect of each determinant on the respondents’ income in this (Umrangso) town reveals that only 5% of variation of income is explained by social category which implies that tribal
men are in disadvantageous situation in relation to income. However the effect of social category is not found in females. Similarly religion explains variation of 6% in men’s income which implies that men from major religious communities have an advantage in relation to income although the effect of religion is a very little one and such effect however has not been found among the females. Caste explains only 4% of variation in men’s income but it has a considerable effect i.e., 17% of variation in women’s income which implies that persons from higher caste groups has a better chance of attaining higher income than that of the persons from lower caste and in case of women the effect of caste is even higher.

Father’s educational attainment has a significant effect on income of both the sexes although the effect is higher on women (17% of variation in income) than that of men (11% of variation in income).

Fathers’ occupational attainments have an unfavourable effect on the income of their sons (2% of total variation), which implies that to a very little extent father’s occupational attainments have reduced the chances of income of their sons. In case of females the effect of fathers’ occupational attainments is significantly high (27% of total variation) which implies that higher the occupational status of a father higher is the chances of a daughter earning high. Moreover, fathers’ income has a significant effect on both the sexes and this effect is much higher among their daughters (50% of total variation) than that of their sons (29% of total variation). It implies that higher the fathers’ income higher is the chances of their children’s income.

Besides, a few determinants have effect on male respondents of this town only. It has been observed that 25% of variation in men’s income is explained by respondents’ quality of schooling. Similarly men’s own educational attainments considerably determine their income as about 15%
of variation in their income is explained by their educational attainments. Thus it can be inferred that education is necessary for higher earnings but it cannot guarantee to provide high income to everyone with the same level of education and it has been observed that most of the cases a person’s income is independent of his educational attainment. In about 28% of variation in income is explained by first jobs which implies that men have retained their first jobs and a very few cases they have left their first jobs and entered into present jobs. Besides in 32% of total variation is explained by present occupations or jobs which have a direct effect on their income implying that in most of the cases their income is independent of their occupations.

9.3 INTER-TOWN COMPARISON OF DYNAMICS OF MOBILITY PROCESS

9.3.1 Inter-Town Comparison of Educational Attainment Process

In both Haflong and Umrangso towns, tribal respondents are in disadvantageous situation than that of their non-tribal counterparts in receiving higher levels of education however the proportion of tribal respondents in Haflong town (22%) is lower than Umrangso town (29%) and the reasons might be of that Haflong, being the headquarters of the district, offer greater educational opportunities to the people.

Religion is not a significant factor affecting educational attainments of the respondents in both the towns and in Haflong town the proportion is even lower by one percentage than that of Umrangso town.

In both the towns caste of the respondents exert a formidable influence in respondents’ educational attainments. However in Umrangso town caste explains about 32% of variation in respondents’ educational attainments which is much higher than the Haflong town (19% of variation).
In both the towns almost in 43% of variation in educational attainments of the children is explained by fathers’ educational attainments. Thus it implies that educated fathers give utmost importance to their children in the attainment of higher levels of education. Almost in equal proportion respondents’ quality of schooling has a direct effect on respondents’ educational attainments in both the towns. It implies that higher levels of educational attainments to a considerable extent are affected by quality of schooling.

Sex-wise break up shows that in Umrangso about 33% of variation in educational attainments of men is explained by their social category which implies that tribal men are in disadvantageous position in the attainment of education but in case of females this social category of being tribal has not affected at all. This is a sharp contrast to Haflong town where the situation is just opposite. Similar proportion of tribal women in Haflong is in disadvantage in the attainment of higher levels of education.

In Umrangso, religion has a little (5% of total variation) effect on educational attainment of the males but it is not at all significant in case of females. However in Haflong the effect of religion on both the sexes is not observed. Caste plays as a significant determinant in the attainment of education for both the sexes in Haflong (caste explains 32% of variation in women and 15% in men) and in Umrangso (23% of variation in women and 15% in men). This implies that like Haflong higher caste women of Umrangso too are in advantage of receiving higher levels of education and in both the towns the proportion is higher than that of their men counterparts. In Umrangso fathers’ educational attainment is a significant determinant affecting educational attainment of males (45%) and of the females (42%). Almost similar trend is observed in Haflong town too. Thus
it can be inferred that in both the towns, education receives prime importance in the families and most importantly in those families where education has a legacy. In contrast to Haflong town, in about 48% of variation in the educational attainment of the females is explained by the quality of schooling they have received but in case of males this is found only 22%. In Haflong town, fathers’ occupational attainments has affected more or less on educational attainment of both the sexes (18% of variation in sons and 6% in daughters). However in Umrangso almost in 10% of variation in daughters’ educational attainments is explained by fathers’ occupational attainments and in case of sons such effect is not noticed. Moreover, in Umrangso, fathers’ income has affected educational attainment of the females (18% of variation) and such effect was not noticed in case of males. It implies that higher the income of the fathers higher is the chances of educational attainments of the daughters. In Haflong, fathers’ income does not have any effect on either of the sexes.

9.3.2 Inter-Town Comparison of Occupational Attainment Process

Inter-town comparison of data reveals that in Umrangso town almost 37% of variation in respondents’ occupations is explained by belonging to tribal or non-tribal social category implying that tribal respondents were in disadvantageous situation in the attainment of high status occupations. However the proportion was much lower in Haflong (18%). It can be inferred that the job opportunity for tribal people in Haflong is higher as the town is a district headquarters of Autonomous Hills Council, which was constituted to protect the rights of indigenous people. On the other hand, in Umrangso, in order to cater the needs of industries the skilled manpower is generally recruited from the non-tribal population residing outside of the district. In Umrangso, about in 17% of
variation in respondents’ occupational attainments is explained by religion which means members of major religious communities have an advantage of attaining of higher status occupation. In case of Haflong, persons of minority religious communities are in disadvantage in the attainment of occupations although the proportion (9%) is not a significant one. In Umrangso, caste explains 34% of variation in respondents’ occupational attainments. Higher caste respondents have greater chances of getting higher status occupations. On the contrary persons from lower caste groups in Haflong find disadvantage in occupational attainments though the proportion was lower (7%) in comparison to Umrangso. Father’s educational attainment has affected children’s occupational attainments (8% of variation occurred in Umrangso and 13% in Haflong) although the effect is not so significant in both the towns. Almost 22% of variation in Umrangso and 10% of variation in Haflong respondents’ occupational attainments is explained by their quality of schooling. This effect of schooling is also substantiated by their educational attainment in both the towns. In both Haflong and Umrangso more or less 50% of variations in persons’ occupational attainments are explained by their educational attainments. Therefore in both towns educational status of a person plays a key role in occupational attainments. In Umrangso, quality of schooling is also responsible for occupational attainment at least in case of professional work. In these towns, (85% of variation in Umrangso and 88% in Haflong) a person’s first job determines his or her present job or occupation. It implies that in a few cases respondents actually have left their first jobs and entered in present jobs or occupations and they attained higher positions in their jobs only through promotions or incentives.
Besides these above mentioned determinants, fathers’ occupational attainments explain 18% of variation in present occupational statuses of the children. This phenomenon is noticed only in Haflong which implies that occupational inheritance is one of the key issues in determining occupational attainment of a person.

Sex-wise comparison of the effect of each determinant on the respondents’ occupational attainments in Umrangso town reveals that in about 15% of variation in occupational attainments is explained by social category which implies that tribal men are in disadvantageous position in occupational attainment. Social category of being a tribal man reduces his opportunity of attaining higher status occupations as because tribal men to a considerable extent face relatively a tough situation in labour market compared to their non-tribal counterparts. However in case of female respondents, social category of being a tribal woman does not show any effect in her occupational attainment. Religion has no effect on women’s occupational attainment but it explains only 5% of variation in occupational attainments of men which implies that men from minority religious communities are in disadvantage of attaining high status occupations. However in Haflong town the trend is quite different from Umrangso town. In Haflong, men in general have not been affected by either social category or religion in their occupational attainments. On the contrary tribal women and women from minority religious community are in disadvantage of attaining higher status occupations in comparison to their counterparts. Caste has considerable effect (8% of variation in males and 13% in females) on the occupational attainments of both the sexes and it implies that higher caste people irrespective of sex have better chance of attaining higher status occupations than that of the lower caste people. The similar trend is noticed
in Haflong town although the women of Umrangso town are affected more by their caste status than that of their male counterparts. Fathers’ educational attainment has a significant effect on occupational attainments of both the sexes although the effect is a bit higher on women (24%) than that of men (23%) which imply that fathers with higher levels of education influence and support their daughters in attaining higher status jobs. It can be inferred that male members of the family have much more open access to labour market than that of their female counterparts as females are largely confined to perform domestic work.

Unlike in Haflong the size of a father’s family has no effect on both the sexes of Umrangso town. In Umrangso fathers’ occupational attainments have effect only on the females (6%). It implies that higher the occupational status of a father higher is the chance of a daughter entering into higher status job. Moreover in this town almost 10% of variation in occupational attainments of daughters is explained by their fathers’ income although this effect is not found in males. Thus, this can be inferred that in Umrangso town the effect of various background variables has virtually restricted women of this town to get access to the employment market. However the effect of fathers’ income on occupational attainments of their children is not found in Haflong town.

Quality of schooling more or less (17% of variation in males and 28% in females) has effect on the occupational attainments of both the sexes. Quality of schooling directly and even indirectly through the educational attainment affects both the sexes in occupational attainment. In Umrangso, the overall effect of quality of schooling is higher than that of Haflong and the proportion is even higher among the women which imply that Umrangso, being an industrial town demands highly qualified persons and
for women it is relatively a tougher one to get employed in various occupations and some cases the nature of occupation itself discourages women.

Respondents’ own educational attainments largely determine their occupational statuses. In 46% variation in males and about 58% in females in their occupational attainments are explained by their educational attainments. Thus it can be inferred that education is necessary for occupational attainment but it cannot guarantee to provide job to everyone with same level of education. In both the towns like the effect of quality of schooling, respondents’ educational attainments have highly affected their occupational attainment town and in case of women of Umrangso the effect is much higher which implies that women of this town has a limited access to job market and whatever access they have is restricted to highly qualified ones. For both the sexes their first jobs determine their present jobs or occupations (88% variation in males and 78% in females) which imply that the members of both the sexes have retained their first jobs and a very few cases persons have left their first jobs and entered into present jobs or occupations.

Apart from the above stated determinants, in Haflong the effect of length of service of female respondents’ in their first jobs has reduced their chances of entering into present occupations. However the effect of length of service is not found in Umrangso town on either of the sexes.

9.3.3 Inter-Town Comparison of Income Process

Inter-town comparison of data reveals that in Umrangso town almost 5% of variation in income is explained by social category which implies that tribal people of this town, however a little extent, have poor
income because of their tribal origin whereas such variation is not occurred in Haflong. In Umrangso, religion too explains 5% of variation in persons’ income which also suggests that members of major religious communities are slightly in advantage of earning high in comparison to the members of minor religious communities whereas in Haflong religion as a determinant has not affected a person’s income at all. Caste explains persons’ income about 16% of variation in Umrangso and 9% in Haflong which implies higher caste persons have relatively better chances of earning high than that of the persons of lower caste groups although the effect of caste is lower in Haflong than Umrangso. In both towns about in 12% of variation in children’s income is explained by fathers’ educational attainments. It can be inferred that higher the educational statuses of the fathers higher are their children’s income. Almost in 11% of variation in Umrangso and 10% in Haflongfathers’ occupational attainments explain the income of their children, which implies that persons belonging to the higher status jobs considerably influence the income of their children. Moreover in both towns fathers’ income has a direct and dominant influence on their children’s income. Higher is the income of fathers higher are the chances of children earning more although the proportion is much greater in Haflong (39%) than that of Umrangso (24%) town.

Besides persons’ quality of schooling and their educational attainment have significant effects on their income. In Umrangso, 26% of variation in income is explained by persons’ quality of schooling and 16% of variation is explained by their educational attainment. It implies that persons with higher educational attainments woven with quality of schooling have chances of earning high, however the effects of these determinants are not found in Haflong. In Umrangso, persons’ first jobs
explain 26% of variation of their income. It implies that respondents’ are remained in their present jobs or occupations and attained higher positions in their jobs only through promotions or incentives and as a result their earnings have gone up. Over and above, in Umangso, respondents’ present occupations or jobs explain 30% of variation of their income which implies that their income is directly and significantly related to their present jobs and their wage structure. However in Haflong these two determinants i.e., respondents’ first and present jobs have no effect on their income, which imply that their income is independent of their occupations.

Sex-wise comparison of the effect of each determinant on the respondents’ income in Umangso town reveals that only 5% of variation of income is explained by social category which implies that tribal men are in disadvantageous situation in relation to income. However the effect of social category is not found in females. Similarly religion explains variation of 6% in men’s income which implies that men from major religious communities have an advantage in relation to income although the effect of religion is a very little one and such effect however has not been found among the females. On the contrary, the effect of social category and religion is not found in Haflong on either of the sexes. In Umangso caste explains only 4% variation in men’s income but it has a considerable effect i.e., 17% of variation in women’s income which implies that persons from higher caste groups has a better chance of attaining higher income than that of the persons from lower caste and in case of women the effect of caste is even higher. On the other hand in Haflong caste has a negligible effect (1% variation) on persons’ income and it is restricted only to men.
In Umrangso, father’s educational attainment has a significant effect on income of both the sexes although the effect is higher on women (17% of variation in income) than that of men (11% of variation in income). In Haflong this effect is more or less similar on both the sexes (13% of variation among the females and 12% among the females). Thus in both the towns, children of those fathers with higher levels of education have chances of earning higher than that of the children whose fathers have poor educational attainments.

Fathers’ occupational attainments have an unfavourable effect on the income of their sons (2% of total variation), which implies that to a very little extent father’s occupational attainments have reduced the chances of income of their sons. In case of females the effect of fathers’ occupational attainments is significantly high (27% of total variation) which implies that higher the occupational status of a father higher is the chances of a daughter earning high. However the effect of this determinant is not found among the females of Haflong town and in case of males (only 2% of total variation) the effect is too not a significant one. Moreover, fathers’ income has a significant effect on both the sexes and this effect is much higher among their daughters (50% of total variation) than that of their sons (29% of total variation). It implies that higher the fathers’ income higher is the chances of their children’s income. However it has been noticed that both occupational attainments and income of the fathers largely determine the income of their children although in Haflong the effect is more or less similar (45% of total variation in sons and 40% in daughters) but in Umrangso the effect on daughters is almost twice than that of their male counterparts. Thus it can be inferred that children from the well-to-do
classes have higher prospects of earning high than that of the children of
the poor classes.

Apart from the above stated determinants, a few significant other
determinants have effect only on male respondents in both the towns,
which are stated below

In Umrangso 25% of variation in men’s income is explained by
respondents’ quality of schooling however this effect is much lower (5% of
variation) among the males of Haflong. In addition to that men’s own
educational attainments considerably determine their income. In Umrangso
about 15% of variation in their income is explained by their educational
attainments however the effect of this determinant is lower among men
(10% of variation) of Haflong town. Thus it can be inferred that education is
necessary for higher earnings but it cannot guarantee to provide high
income to everyone with same level of education and it has been observed
that most of the cases a person’s income is independent of his or her
educational attainment. This situation can be interpreted as in Umrangso
town, both quality of schooling and educational attainment of the
respondents have greater effect on the income of respondents than that of
Haflong town. In about 28% of variation in income is explained by first jobs
of males which implies that the males have retained their first jobs and a
very few cases persons have left their first jobs and entered into present
jobs. Besides in 32% of total variation in men’s income is directly explained
by their present occupations or jobs implying that apart from the said
variation their income is otherwise independent of their occupations.
However in Haflong the proportion is much lower as income is explained
by only 18% of variation by respondents’ first jobs and 20% of variation by
respondents’ present jobs or occupations which implies that Haflong, being
a district headquarters, provides greater opportunity to the people to earn other than the income derived from their respective occupations showing the poor relation exists between income and occupation.