CHAPTER-2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Some important studies having a bearing on the present work are reviewed in this chapter. The chapter has two sections. 2.1, Studies made abroad, and 2.2, Studies made in India.

2.1. STUDIES MADE ABROAD

Pitrim Sorokin (1927) in his pioneering work “Social mobility” observed that there are certain permanent and universal bases of occupational inequality. He proposed two fundamental conditions – first, the importance of an occupation for the survival and existence of a group as a whole and secondly, the degree of intelligence necessary for a successful performance of an occupation. Sorokin has also pointed out positive and negative consequences of social mobility. In its positive aspect mobility leads to a better distribution of talents which again helps increasing living standards and boosts economic efficiency and innovation. Thus it provides the more ambitious members of the lower strata a chance to rise and thus create a new social order. This new social order is protected and preserved even with applying force in order to facilitate class solidarity. Thus the lines of conflict and solidarity also become much more complex and flexible. On negative side, Sorokin argues that mobility increases mental strain and the likelihood of suicide. Mobility facilitates the disintegration of morals and encourages materialism and individualism which in turn makes people to
climb further up in a social hierarchy even at the cost of social disarrangement, and it is happened only because people suffer from fear of failure of losing their present ranks or positions in a contending society. Sorokin thus opened up the vast catchment area for the study of social mobility. However, Sorokin’s theoretical writings on social mobility did not make much progress.

From the theoretical work of Sorokin, a gradual shift was witnessed in the works of David Glass (1954) and his team at the London School of Economics titled “Social Mobility in Britain.” The Glass team looked at a sample of 10,000 men who were 18 and over and lived in England, Scotland or Wales in 1949. Among the data collected were the respondents’ age, marital status, schools attended, qualifications obtained and details of their own and their fathers’ occupation. Such data were used to address two major questions. First, how open was British society? Second, was there equality of opportunity for those of equal talents? In addressing these questions, Glass looked at inter-generational mobility by comparing the respondents’ occupational status with those of their fathers. On the basis of this study, Glass found that there was a high degree of self-recruitment at the two ends of the social scale. Secondly, most mobility was short range as individuals moved mainly between lower white collar and skilled manual positions in both directions.

Regarding inter-generational mobility, Glass found that less than a third of the men were in the same job as their fathers. Glass’s data shows that inequality is not fixed at birth and there is a fair degree of fluidity of circulation. Although children from high status may be downwardly
mobile compared, with their fathers, they may still have a better chance
than their working class peers of getting to higher level jobs.

His important findings were summarised as (a) mobility in Britain
was mostly short range and long range of movement from rags to riches or
riches to rags was seldom found. (b) There was a barrier to movement
across the manual /non-manual line. (c) There was a high self-recruitment
at the top of the social scale. Moreover, it was associated with the element
of inheritance.

In their study J.E. Floud, A.H. Halsey and F.M. Martin (1957), Social
class and Educational Opportunity- Writing on Social Class and Chances of
Admission to Grammar Schools in Certain Parts of Britain during the 1950’s
say: In general, the sons of manual workers had a chance below the
average, and the sons of non- manual workers a chance above the average,
of being selected for grammar schools. The sons of clerks had four or more
times as good chance as the sons of unskilled manual workers and two to
three times the chances of sons of skilled workers. The differences in
chances at the extremes of the occupational scale were still greater.

The next important milestone achieved in the field of mobility
studies is S.M. Lipset and R. Bendix’s (1959) work on, “Social Mobility in
Industrial society.” Lipset and Bendix carried out a secondary analysis of the
results available on nine industrialised societies, France, Japan, Great
Britain, Denmark, Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, U.S.A. and Italy. They
emphasised the consequences of social mobility for the individual and
society. They found that all the nine countries exhibited similar high rates of
total vertical mobility. This implies that modern industrial societies are
characterised by their openness, high rates of mobility and principle of
universalism. As growing industrialised economies need huge number of higher level workers in managerial and administrative positions so it creates an ‘upward surge of mobility’. The emergence of a highly formalized bureaucratic structure debases the role of family and personal connections in occupational choice and thereby giving individual merit upper hand over other traits. However, keeping faith in Sorokin’s belief that a certain amount of mobility may contribute to social stability Lipset goes further by saying that too much mobility may lead to social destabilisation. Thus the prime issue of his study is social destabilisation which generates the status inconsistencies; which again creates frustration for the individual or a group. Lipset and Bendix (1959, P. 13, 24-26 & 73) have pointed out that “the social mobility of societies becomes relatively high once their industrialisation, and hence their economic expansion, reaches a certain level.” They have further asserted that “mobility patterns in Western industrialised societies are determined by the occupational structure” rather than by political institutions, historical legacies, and other such factors. They concluded by saying that the industrialised societies are characterised by high degree of mobility. A quarter to a third of the non-farm population moves from working class to middle class or vice versa from one generation to another.

S.M Miller’s (1960) Comparative Social Mobility provides a comprehensive bibliography on the social mobility studies that were conducted after the publication of Lipset and Bendix’s book ‘Social Mobility in Industrial Society’. This report reanalysed the data on various industrialised nations to have an international comparisons of the rates of upward and downward mobility.
According to Miller all societies have some mobility even the Indian caste society experiences social mobility.

Comparing the results of mobility studies conducted in nineteen nations Australia (Melbourne), Belgium (Sint - Martens – Latem and Mont – Saint -Guibert) Brazil (Sao Paulo) Denmark, Finland, France, Great Britain, Hungry, India (Poona), Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Puerto Rico, Sweden, Switzerland, USA, USSR (Émigrés) and West Germany – across the globe Miller arrived at brief profile on social mobility of each nation. These profiles are summarised below:

Great Britain has a high upward mobility of the manual and high downward mobility of the non-manual. Low long-range upward mobility of the manual, low long-range upward mobility of the non-manual, high movement out of the elites, high downward mobility of the middle classes (relative to the upward mobility of the same strata) and high long-run downward mobility of elites and low indices of association for the various strata.

A close parallel was found in the findings for USA, USSR (Émigrés) and Brazil (Sao Paulo). The patterns of mobility of these nations were high upward(short and long distance) manual mobility; high upward mobility but relatively low downward mobility of the middle classes; low downward mobility of the non-manual and the elites; low occupational inheritance with variation among the three in extent of long-range downward mobility of the elites. The trend of mobility of these countries were thus characterised by general pattern of upward mobility with limited downward mobility.
A somewhat similar pattern of high rates of movement was found for Great Britain and India (Poona), but had limited downward and upward movement than that of in the USSR and the USA.

Italy, Japan, Netherlands and Puerto Rico were found to be a less downward mobility, although in Japan and Puerto Rico access to the elite class is relatively high.

Due to the difficulties inherent in all international comparative studies, Miller suggests that the results of the comparison should not be viewed as adequate description of nations but as suggestive of trends. These profiles culminated with empirical data of this report must be taken as no more than suggestive possibilities.

Conceding to Lipset’s conclusion that all the industrialised nations exhibit the same rates of social mobility, Miller further points out divergences from such a contention such as (i) the rates of mobility from manual into non-manual occupations seemed to have a wide disparity among these nations. The rates of non-manual occupations showed a spread between 20% of USA and USSR (Émigrés) on the one hand and the more than 30% of several nations; (ii) the rates of movement of manual strata into the elite strata also revealed a considerable range; (iii) the rates of movement out of elite strata were widely varying across the nations.

Thus, he concludes that while there appears to be more convergence in the rates of mobility among industrialised nations but at the same focus should be made on finding reasons of the above stated divergences. Thus, Miller casts some doubt on Lipset’s contention that all modern industrial societies are characterised by their openness, high rates of mobility and universalism.
Unlike Sorokin’s or Lipset and Bandix’s works which are nothing but the critical overviews of existing research, Blau and Duncan’s (1967) survey is an original empirical work that followed the national survey made by David Glass, a trend-setter of new approach of studying social mobility. Blau and Duncan’s work “American Occupational Structure” (1967) was neither a theory nor a mere data collection; on the contrary, it was both statistically sophisticated and sociologically informative which set new parameters for the sociologists to study social mobility. The technique which had made Duncan famous is known as ‘Path Analysis’ a relatively simple extension of multiple regressions first used by Sewell Wright (1934) who applied it to his studies in population genetics and animal breeding. This technique is not only statistically sophisticated but is also sociologically informative. Path analysis enables the Sociologists to estimate the relative importance of different determinants of individuals’ occupational attainments.

In their analysis of education and occupational mobility, Blau and Duncan found that while the benefits of education (in the sense of improved chances for social ascent) were relatively uniform for men of different family backgrounds, the risks of skidding were differentially distributed. The likelihood of upward mobility rather systematically increased with increasing levels of schooling; and general, downward mobility negatively correlated with educational attainment. But men who had college experience short of degree requirements exhibited disproportionate rates of skidding. That is, compared with their fathers’ occupational position, these men were more likely to have skidded in status to their present jobs than either those who had more education or those who had less. The reason, Blau and Duncan suggest, is that they in effect
failed to acquire the educational prerequisites typical of their own social origins. Inasmuch as their fathers could afford to send them to college in the first place, they generally came from higher-status families. And their one, two, or three years of college was not enough to overcome the greater risks of downward mobility that inhere in a high origin status. Not only did they fail to “inherit”; they were unable to regain their origin status through career striving.

Educational opportunity structures are still governed in fairly large measure by social inheritance, especially in the developing economies but certainly also in the advanced industrial societies such as the United States (Blau & Duncan, 1967, P. 152-161). The child of high-status parentage has significant advantages, both material and intangible, with respect to his educational possibilities, and thus he will more likely ‘achieve’ a high-status career entry.

In their study Blau and Duncan show the contrast between ascription and achievement. The importance of ascribed statuses has declined whereas that of achievement has increased over time. They argue that industrial society finds a trend which paves the way for the attainments of achieved statuses in the society. In this context education plays a vital role to lift the social status in general. In the age of industrialisation and technological progress a society can no longer afford the waste of human resources a rigid class structure entails. Rather universalistic principles have penetrated deep into the fabric of modern society and given rise to high rates of occupational mobility in response to the need.

Another important empirical study conducted in the U.S.A. since the publication of Blau and Duncan’s book is the one reported in the book
‘Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect Family and Schooling in America’ by Christopher Jencks and his team of investigators.

Christopher Jencks (1972) and his colleague used the technique of Path analysis, which was earlier used by Blau and Duncan. Jencks study is a more compressive study as far the range of variables involved in explaining the inequalities in educational attainment, occupational status and income, is concerned. The major conclusions reported by Jencks and his colleagues are (i) the most important determinant of educational attainment is family background. Besides the family background, the next important determinant is cognitive skill however the precise effect of cognitive skill is hard to determine; (ii) qualitative differences between the high schools attended do not explain more than two percent of the variation in students’ eventful educational attainment; (iii) occupational status is strongly related to educational attainment. While family background and cognitive skill influence educational attainment and as such influence occupational status indirectly, they have no direct impact on occupational status. However, despite a strong relationship between occupational status and educational attainment, enormous status differences exist among people with the same amounts of education. This remains true even when people who have not only the same amounts of education, but the same family background and I.Q test-scores are compared. Jencks attributes the unexplained variation partly to the variation in the status of the same individual at different times in his life, and partly but “presumably” to unmeasured character traits, like alcoholism, mental health and drive to succeed, but the extent of explanation of such traits is thought to be insignificant. As such, much of the variation is attributed to chance and some due to choice; (iv) as per income is concerned none of the factors among family background,
cognitive skill, educational attainment or occupational status, explains much of the variation in men’s income. In the absence of any measured influence on income variation, Jencks comes down to ‘luck’ as the explanation. “Income also depends on luck”. For instance he cites that if a new super highway has an exit near one’s restaurant his or her income may suddenly go up owing to such unpredictable incidents or one may suffer huge loss due to natural calamities; (v) to remedy the inequalities in educational attainment, occupational statuses and income Jencks et al. conclude that only ‘political control over economic institutions’ is the best device only the establishment of this device could shape the society. This is what is called socialism.

Similar results were reinforced by Raymond Boudon (1974) who has attempted to synthesise his main findings accumulated by empirical research in two closely related points. One, a society is characterised by a certain amount of Inequality of Educational Opportunity (IEO) such as equal opportunity of the probability of going to college is smaller for a worker’s son than for a lawyer’s son. Second a society is characterised by a certain amount of Inequality of Social opportunity (ISO) if the probability of reaching a high social status is smaller for the former child than for the latter. Boudon has attempted to develop a theory leading to some specific conclusions on a number of questions related to IEO - such as ‘Is IEO likely to decrease and to what extent?’ and ‘Is the probability that a worker’s son will go to college likely to be equal in a more or less remote future to the same probability for a lawyer’s son?’. After contemplating on these questions he has related ISO to the change over time in IEO and in other factors such as overall average increase in the level of educational attainment. In this way he examined the effects on social mobility owing to
the tremendous increase in the rates of school attendance occurred in most of the societies since 1945. The major conclusions drawn from his study include that as long as societies are stratified, inequality of educational opportunity will continue to operate. Even changes in the educational system (like expanding the facilities for higher education) will reduce the inequality of educational opportunity only marginally. Although as a result of technological progress and economic growth social status is becoming increasingly dependent on cognitive skills and as such on educational attainment, this only leads to the growth in demand for education and no necessarily to the reduction in economic inequality and consequent change in social structure.

Another important outcome of the study is the weak relation between education and mobility in industrial societies. Even with a high level of IEO and a strong influence of educational level on social status, the relation between education and mobility is normally very weak.

Thus, Boudon emphasises stratification as the principal factor responsible for inequality of educational opportunity as well as inequality of social opportunity and suggests that reduction of economic inequality is more likely to reduce inequality of both educational and social opportunity. Like other scholars he too has understood that a society based on strictly meritocratic principles would not necessarily be a more equal society. Both Boudon and Jencks have a common line of thought that more equal society is achievable through equality of economic opportunity rather than through equality of educational opportunity. Although Boudon does not, unlike Jencks, say that socialism is the key to eliminating inequality but argues that the greater equality of educational opportunity and social opportunity in
Eastern European Societies is due to the nature of their political economy than to anything else.

Arnold C. Anderson (1965) in his work ‘A Skeptical Note on Education and Mobility’ expressed similar doubt about the relationship between education and social mobility which is often referred to as ‘Anderson’s Paradox’. He argued that strong association between education and occupation is in fact misleading and factors other than education such as background factors like family background, father’s occupational status etc., are much more important in determining mobility. After examining data from the United States, Britain and Sweden Anderson concluded that while sons who had high levels of education had a good chance of attaining occupational levels higher than their fathers, education was only one of the many factors responsible. So there is an over-emphasis on education as an instrument in bringing about a more egalitarian society. In simple words an example can be drawn to clarify this paradox. Suppose two persons with same level of educational attainments may not land upon same occupational ranks although that amount of education is a prerequisite for the attainment of that job in particular but it cannot guarantee them to provide same ranks with same earnings.

Another important study called the Oxford mobility study was conducted by Goldthorpe and his associates (Goldthorpe, Llewellyn & Payne, 1987). It consisted of a small sample of 10,000 adult men aged 20-64 who were residents in England and Wales in 1972. Here, the respondents were required to provide data on their own occupational and educational biographies as well as those of their fathers, mothers, wives, brothers and friends. This study was primarily conducted to examine the impact of the
post war reform and economic change on the degree of openness in British society. Furthermore, the team also examined the impact of post-reform education policy and the degree of movement between generations of individuals from the same family. The prime focus was therefore on patterns of intergenerational mobility. The Glass team used a status classification based on the occupational prestige to categorise respondents, while the Oxford team used a seven-fold classification based on social class. These seven classes were grouped into three broader categories as follows:

(i) Classes I and II of professionals, administrators and managers are a service class.

(ii) Classes III, IV and V of clerical, self-employed artisans and supervisors are an intermediate class.

(iii) Classes VI, VII of manual workers and vice versa.

The main trends that can be derived from this evidence concern patterns of social mobility among men. First, there has been a considerable pattern of self-recruitment (follow in father’s footsteps). Second, there has been upward mobility as the upper socio-economic groups have recruited individual from those of manual origins.

Apart from the above landmark studies on social mobility modern scholars have substantially contributed in recent social stratification researches in relation to the changes, trends and patterns of inequality as well as mobility in the areas of education, occupation and income across the boundaries of the Nations. A summary of a few such research works is outlined below.
Shavit and Blossfeld’s (1993) made a seminal study of inequality in educational attainment and summarised its results in the title, ‘Persistent Inequality: Changing Educational Attainment in Thirteen Countries.’ In this study they included the cross national analyses which are enriched by the contributions of the native scholars who were intimately aware of the cultures and institutions of their own nations and had deeper understanding on the complex national data sets that speak about social stratification system of the respective nation. Summarising all the research studies of the different scholars of those countries with ample empirical evidences the authors concluded that In spite of dramatic educational expansion during the 20th century, most of the thirteen countries included in their study exhibited stability of educational inequalities. Among the thirteen countries studied in their project, all but two, Sweden and the Netherlands, “exhibit stability of socio-economic inequalities of educational opportunities”. Thus, whereas the proportions of all social classes attending all educational levels have increased, the relative advantage associated with privileged origins persists in all except the afore-mentioned two of the thirteen societies.”

Heath and Payne (2000) have found the complexity of relative social mobility in their research evidences. They noted the changing social position of specific occupations within the six class categories they used. Nevertheless, they identified the highest patterns of stability (or lack of mobility) being for higher grade professionals (Class I) at the top and among the working classes at the bottom of their schema. By contrast, men originating from the classes in the middle of the schema, particularly routine white collar occupations were much less likely to stay in the same class as their fathers. Their findings also show that ‘short-range mobility is
more common than long-range movement’. They also observed that there were weaker correlations between women’s destinations and their father’s occupational class origin, implying the gender differences in employment.

Peter Saunders (2002) concludes that the limited evidence of upward social mobility among working-class children is exactly what should be expected in a meritocratic society where social position is achieved by ability and effort. This is because able parents (who in a meritocracy will be recruited into top positions) will be more likely to produce relatively able children (because of the genetic and environmental advantages that they can pass on), and these children will often, therefore, emulate the achievements of their parents.’ Saunders also points out one limitation to his meritocracy model, conceding that middle class parents may be able to protect their children from downward social mobility.

However Breen and Goldthorpe (2002) have added a new dimension in this debate augmented by Saunders and they have acknowledged that a range of factors, including ability and effort but also environmental and societal factors explain the relationship between social origin in childhood and social destination in adulthood. They, therefore, accept that merit is an important factor determining social mobility but that the patterns in the data suggest that this alone is not sufficient and that other class-based social factors are also important. As such, it is not possible to conclude that Britain is a properly functioning meritocratic society but instead there are a range of social factors which mediate the effects of merit-based factors in determining opportunities for social mobility.

R. Breen and R. Luijkx (2004) in their study have some findings which suggest that patterns of absolute social mobility have converged
across Europe, with all countries facing a shift from manual and particularly unskilled manual labour toward more service sector and administrative occupations. While this pattern is demonstrable in all countries in the survey, it is relatively more complete in Britain and the Netherlands than elsewhere and relatively incomplete in countries such as Ireland, Poland and Hungary where the transition from agriculture has not yet fully taken place. By contrast, relatively little convergence in the rate of fluidity is identified though across most countries there is a trend toward greater openness. For Britain there is no evidence of significant changes in social mobility and social mobility is relatively low.

Latter on an international review of research on educational attainment and social mobility undertaken by Breen and Jonsson (2005) have identified a mixed pattern, with some countries (e.g. Sweden and Germany) exhibiting a declining relationship between class and education attainment and others (including England) showing little change over time. It is also clear that social class is more strongly associated with educational attainment at younger ages, but that class effects persist into higher education. In most countries, education does play a ‘mediating’ role between class of origin and class of destination but many studies continue to find ‘origin effects’ that, to some extent, counteract the influence of education on social mobility. The study highlights the continued potential role of higher education in promoting absolute and relative social mobility, in the context of issues raised in this section regarding the impact of social class background on school choice, school level attainment, the decision to enter higher education, choice of institution attended and subjects studied.
R. Breen, R. Luijkx, W. Muller, and P. Pollak (2009) in a recent work have found that over the 20th century, inequalities between men and women in their educational attainment declined markedly. More importantly, changes in class inequalities in educational attainment have been similar for both men and women, although, in some countries, women displayed greater inequality at the start of the 20th century and have shown a somewhat greater rate of increase in equality. Patterns of class inequality were also largely similar for both sexes, though in some countries daughters of farmers and the petty-bourgeoisie did relatively better than their brothers. While some of these results reinforce what has long been believed, our central finding of a decline in class inequality in educational attainment for both men and women contradicts the ‘persistent inequality’ in education that Shavit and Blossfeld’s claimed existed.

In the context of income mobility Miles Corak (2006) concludes that income mobility varies widely between rich countries. His data suggests that among the countries included in the study (Denmark, Norway, Finland, Canada, Sweden, Germany, France, the US and the UK), the UK ranks as having the least social mobility with somewhere between 43 percent and 55 percent of fathers ‘earnings advantage being passed on to their sons. The US ranks only slightly behind the UK. The same data indicates that northern European countries such as Denmark, Norway, Finland and Sweden as well as Canada all have much higher levels of apparent social mobility.

In relation to occupational mobility of women in labour market a recent study conducted by Hadas Mandel (2011) who documented his findings in an article entitled, “Occupational mobility of American women:
Compositional and structural changes, 1980–2007”. In this article he has documented trends in women’s occupational mobility between 1980 and 2007 in the U.S. labour market, and linked them to two different sources. The first source, compositional changes, refers to changes in the distributions of men and women in the occupational wage hierarchy over time. The second, structural changes, relates to trends in the relative standing of occupations in the wage hierarchy over time.

The major findings of the author indicate that (a) First, over the period studied and especially between 1980 and 1990 there was an impressive upward occupational mobility of women. American women increased their relative representation in highly rewarded occupations and reduced their representation in low wage occupations. Thus women’s representation has declined among occupations at the lower rungs of the occupational hierarchy while it has improved impressively in upper occupational ranks caused by either gender compositional changes or structural changes in American Society; (b) Secondly the expansion of education such as rapid increase of college education among women, promoted women’s entry into professional and other previously male occupations at the higher end of the wage hierarchy; and (c) Thirdly the changes in the occupational structure also favoured women. The sharp rise in the premium for education has benefited women to have an entry into highly rewarded occupations, in which they were previously absent.

2.2. STUDIES MADE IN INDIA

Among the Indians, the notable contributions on social mobility are made by S.M. Dubey (1975). In his work on ‘Social Mobility among Professions’, Dubey made certain important observations such as (a) the
proportions of professionals of rural urban background is almost equal; 
(b) income and intelligence play an important role both in nature of 
migration and mobility of the group; (c) Sons of non-manual white collar 
profession fathers have greater chances of entering professions. Even the 
sons of agriculturalist fathers, sons of big farm families with highest origins 
have the greater chances of entering professions; (d) Those who have 
received special professional training and technical education have come 
from very large distances to Gorakhpur; (e) The proportion of traditional 
elite such as big agriculturalists, landlord, and businessmen are declining 
through the three generations of grandfather, father and respondents on the 
other hand the proportions of white collar workers shows a constant rise; 
(f) Low income and poverty reduce the chances of sons of agricultural 
labourers and the workers of traditional caste-based occupations to enter 
professions; (g) The rising trend of education has led the rural people of 
aricultural origin enter in white collar jobs usually located in urban areas; 
(h) SCs and OBC are very highly underrepresented among the professions; 
(i) The rates of upward occupational mobility is the highest among the 
middle class it is the lowest among the working class; (j) Salaried 
professionals are more likely to shift to private practice and the last but not 
the least (k) No downward career mobility is noticed among the 
professionals.

Moreover Dubey has listed the influential factors of upward social 
mobility, which are urbanisation, industrialisation, expansion of 
educational facilities, father’s education and occupation.

N. Jayaram (1978, 1979), in his works on Higher Education: 
Inequality and Social Change in India’ and ‘Higher Education Status
Stabilizer’, made two important perceptions. First, expansion of higher education has been working as the maintenance of status quo in relation to the occupation among the members of the middle class. Secondly, it has been glorifying inegalitarian tendencies as the people of lower classes and castes have seldom received higher education and entered the professions on which the middle class has absolute monopoly. He has further added that even after twenty years of independence, during which there has been a tremendous growth of higher education, it has not broken the system of inbreeding into occupations. Except a few persons from the lower classes and castes, the weaker sections suffer from discrimination both in access to higher education as well as in entry to higher status jobs even if they succeed in acquiring higher education.

P.N. Pandey (1979) in his work “Education and Social Mobility among Scheduled Castes” has reported that the scheduled castes have more inclinations towards attaining achieved statuses rather than sticking themselves to ascribed statuses. They embraced westernisation rather than sanskritisation as signs of achieving social mobility. He has found that protective discrimination and democratic secular values were helpful and for that the schedule castes were more achievement oriented rather than ascriptive oriented.

However, findings of Pandey seem to contradict the results of another later study from the same state made by N. Prakash. Prakash (1989) has reported that protective discrimination benefited only the children of the scheduled caste elite and the scheduled caste masses were not even aware of the facilities and concessions provided for them by the state and central governments.
S. K Bhattacharya (1986) in his study “Social mobility through three generations in four different areas of West Bengal” came out with the findings that (i) inequality of educational opportunity (IEO) has been in existence for a long time; (ii) the educational system itself is stratified; (iii) the lower classes remain immobile while the middle classes, although not experiencing long range upward mobility, experienced short ranged mobility from lower middle class to middle –middle class, downward mobility was also observed among them; (iv) members of the upper class could not only protect and maintain their status in society, but also enhanced these attributes over the years. Bhattacharya suggests that it is not only higher education, as reported by Jayaram, which stabilises the structure of status, but it is also the system of education which does that through intricate mechanism generating a different type of inequality of educational opportunity emanating primarily from a stratified system of education. He also suggests that the system of education should be reformed and made uniform by abolishing the stratified educational system.

Suresh Kumar (1986) on the other hand, in his work “Social Mobility in Industrialising Society” has made us acquainted with that industrialisation and urbanisation diminish the role of caste in determination of social stratification. Moreover without diminishing economic inequality, the social inequality cannot be eliminated. His study of social mobility in four villages around Bhilai Steel Plant (Madhya Pradesh) reveals that although industrialization of rural areas uproots the inhabitants initially, but they get rehabilitated as the large scale industries themselves and through the growth of ancillary (smaller) units which have a great employment potential. Not only this, whatever, impact it might
have on agriculture it helps the agricultural workers experience upward vertical and horizontal occupational mobility as opportunities for unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled and professional employment are opened up by the industrial development

J.P. Naik (1978) in his book “Equality, Quality and Quantity- the Elusive Triangle in Indian education”, asserted that the benefits of the educational system, especially at the secondary and the university stages, go mostly to the well-to-do classes who use it to strengthen and perpetuate their privileges. It is equally true that poor people do get some marginal benefits and that a varying proportion of individuals from deprived social backgrounds are co-opted into the system every year. But one cannot also ignore the negative aspects of this phenomenon that it serves to legitimize a basically inegalitarian structure.

R.P. Singh (1982), in his study “Educational Backwardness of Scheduled Caste Students and a Need - Oriented Plan for their Development,” found that (i) nearly 50 percent of the rural respondents were casual labourers while 10 percent were regular labourers. Twenty three percent respondents were engaged in service occupations. Only twenty seven heads of households were engaged in the traditional caste professions and (ii) 4% guardians of the students studying at higher levels were illiterate implying a trend of intergenerational educational mobility.

Punjab Raj (1990), in his study, ‘Educational and occupational mobility among scheduled castes in HiranagarTehsil’, pointed out that (i) although considerable upward intergenerational educational mobility (among scheduled castes) had taken place, although a negligible proportion of scheduled castes even in the younger generation was able to
acquire education beyond the school stage; (ii) a vast majority of those fathers who had completed the high school education or beyond could not succeed in preventing their off-springs from skidding into semi-literacy or literacy; (iii) scheduled caste women were illiterate in general and had not made even a beginning. The most important causes of this low participation in education reported by him were poverty, followed by uncertainty of a regular monthly income. The poverty condition was further aggravated by landlessness or very small holdings and lack of paid work through a large time period of every year. Migration to urban areas for work only fulfilled their needs at a subsistence level. Further, the rural power structure, dominated by the upper caste better off sections used to prevent these scheduled caste people from acquiring education and even when they could acquire the requisite educational level this power structure used to prevent their entry into non-manual or white collar occupations; (iv) lack of high schools and the prejudicial attitude of the teachers from urban, middle class, upper caste background discouraged these people from getting education which could enable them to get white collar job; (v) people who succeeded in coming out of the shell of manual work even could not prevent their offspring slipping back into manual work (vi) for scheduled caste manual labourers, the chances of upward occupational mobility from manual to non-manual work were low and at the same time the chances of increasing the real income was also bleak because in rural economy wages of manual workers did not grow like the workers who used to work in non-manual occupations. Besides, the policy of the landlords to employ cheap labourers from other states, particularly, from Bihar and Uttar Pradesh created a tough competition for the local labourers in the manual job market and as such the local labourers were forced to work at a lower
wage; (vii) among the reported six scheduled caste communities only one caste called the *Ramdasias* made a beginning in acquiring higher education and were able to enter into white collar occupations and received an assured income and this educational and occupational mobility also derived benefits for their offspring too; and lastly (vii) the Policy of Protective Discrimination had not proved so effective in raising the educational, occupational and income status of those scheduled castes.

R.K. Mujoo’s (1992) observations in his work ‘*Higher Education and Social Mobility : An Interdisciplinary Study of the Impact of the University Education in the Career and Attitudes of Graduates in Jammu & Kashmir*’ (1990) are worthy to be mentioned here. Among his findings the major ones are: (a) The Upper Caste Hindus are the major recipients of Higher Education; (b) Inequality is observed between the rural and the urban residents in the reception of Higher Education; (c) The children of educated fathers are the recipients of Higher Education; (d) There is a diminishing trend for the children of illiterate fathers in the reception of Higher Education; (e) Intergenerational occupational mobility across the manual — non-manual line has virtually been absent in Jammu and Kashmir; (f) The data of intergenerational or intragenerational mobility found through three generations are only short range and restricted within the non-manual class of jobs and the last but not the least (g) The acquisition of higher education has not brought about significant changes in the life styles, attitudes and interests of its recipients.

R.K. Mujoo (2005), in his paper “Correlates of Access to Higher Education in Jammu and Kashmir,” states that in Jammu and Kashmir the participation of Muslims in education in general and in higher education in
particular remains low in comparison to that of their Hindu counterparts even in Kashmir valley where Muslims constitute about ninety five percent (95%) of the population. In regard to the differential access of different caste group among Hindus, the said author says that the Brahmins are the only caste group among the Hindus in Kashmir whereas in the Jammu region where the Hindus maintain elaborate caste system the scene of higher education is disproportionately dominated by upper Caste Hindus. He also reports that the beneficiaries of Free Higher Education in the state were mainly urban residents who form a very small proportion of the population compared to the population of rural areas. He also found that the scene of higher education in Kashmir is dominated by the members of the middle classes and therefore the Provision of Free Higher Education has not been proven a boon to the weaker sections of the society.

Meenakshi Mate (2005), in her study on “A study of female participation in secondary education in Silchar urban area,” concluded that (i) a vast majority of girls going to secondary schools belong to upper caste families; (ii) Girls from Muslim families avail of the features of secondary education to a very low extent, (iii) scheduled caste girls among the Hindus and girls from other backward communities, (OBC, both Hindu and Muslims) have a limited access to secondary education (iv) daughters of educated parents have the greatest access to secondary education while daughters of illiterate parents have limited access to it, (v) daughters of fathers in non-manual occupations have a greater chances of going to secondary school while daughters of fathers in manual occupations have almost no chances (vi) mother’s occupation does not have any significant effect on a girl’s chances of attending secondary school and (vii) secondary education is accessible to girls from financially well to do families. Girls
from families living below poverty line have no chances of going to secondary school and the ones from families with a per capita income below that of the national average have restricted chances.

Harmohan Das (2006), in his study, “Occupational Mobility and Pattern of Socio-economic Change in Rural areas of Hajo Block, Assam” examined the process of occupational mobility and pattern of socio-economic change as a result of occupational mobility. He reported that (i) a sizeable proportion of population experienced the occupational mobility as people left their traditional agricultural and allied practices and shifted to either secondary or tertiary occupations. The reason behind that was the increasing pressure of population on agricultural land which further aggravated the chronic problem of disguised unemployment; (ii) intergenerational occupational mobility was very high as the highest percentage of primary sector workers belonged to older age groups and the young populations were largely employed in secondary or tertiary occupations; (iii) both horizontal and vertical mobility were taken place as manual workers in primary sector shifted to secondary and tertiary sectors retaining equal occupational statuses and hence these people experienced horizontal occupational mobility on the other hand the educated ones could be able to elevate their positions in the government and non-government institutions and thus experienced upward vertical occupational mobility and lastly (iii) the rising trend of intergenerational occupational mobility had sharply declined the participation of workers in primary sector by 40 percent while it was increased in secondary sectors by 10 percent and tertiary sectors by 30 percent through three generations.
Meenakshi Mate (2010) in her study “Inequality in Access to Higher education: A study of Barak Valley in South Assam”, reports that (i) Higher education, in Barak valley, is predominantly accessible to urban residents and the rural residents continue of suffer from disadvantage in his respect (ii) there is a predominance of males over females in college attendance in general. However while in the urban areas there seems to be almost equal access to both the sexes, in the rural areas the females are grossly under represented (iii) the courses such as engineering and technology, computer science, medicine, BCA, Law, social work etc. with greater potential for employment in key sectors of modern Indian industry, are dominated by urban males and the rural males and females both have very limited access to such courses(iv) Hindus have several times greater access to higher education as compared to the Muslims despite the fact that the latter constitute about 46% of the population of this region.

Among the Muslims only the elite sections seem to have access to higher education but even they have restricted access to courses with greater employment potential, (v) among the various categories of general, OBC, SC, and ST, general category families have greater access to higher education especially to the courses with greater employment potential while the other categories especially the SC’s and ST’s have, whatever little access, to the liberal arts courses only, (vi) the scene of higher education is dominated by the persons whose fathers are highly educated. (vii) facilities of higher education are almost completely accessible to the children of fathers in non- manual occupations. (viii) higher education is found be accessible to the children of families with high per capita income and despite the provision of highly subsidized higher education system and the provision freeships, financial assistances, etc., children from the poor
families are not able to avail the opportunities especially those from the weaker sections of scheduled castes, scheduled tribes etc. (xi) majority of the college students aspired to obtain postgraduate degrees in their subjects of study, some did not want to continue beyond the first degree while a very small proportion aspired to continue till a research qualification. (xii) occupational aspiration of the college students indicate that business, employed professional work, school teaching and clerical work are the most preferred occupations among the young people and very few of them seem to be inclined to take up responsibilities of superior administration and independent professional work.

Ruba Phukan (2012) in her study, “Education and Social Mobility in an Urban Setting: A Case Study of Nagaon District, Assam” has reported that: (i) in the absolute terms there has been a very high rate of educational mobility between fathers and sons generations, but the data shows a lot of inheritance of educational attainments when relative mobility is considered; (ii) educational attainments of a person are determined by not only fathers educational attainments, but also by the socio-economic background factors such as religion, category, parents and grandparents, educational and occupational attainments and income. On the whole Hindus have highest educational attainments and the Muslims have the lowest; (iii) The higher the levels of educational attainments of parents and grandparents, higher the educational attainments of the respondents. Similarly the sons of parents employed in non-manual work have higher educational attainment compared with the sons of parents employed in manual work; (iv) The chances of inheritance of non-manual occupations are very high, the chances of downward mobility from non-manual to manual and the chances of upward mobility from manual to non-manual are very low. Thus
there has been a high rate of occupational mobility in absolute terms, but
the data shows a lot of inheritance of occupational attainments when
relative occupational statuses of sons and fathers are considered; (v)
occupational attainments of a person are determined by not only fathers’
occupational attainments but also by the other socio-economic background
factors such as religion, category, parents and grandparents occupational
and educational attainments and income and (v) most of the upward
occupational mobility observed is only short range and long range mobility
is very rare. In other wards the democratic ideals of equity and fair play
largely remain unachieved. Again, most of the occupational mobility and
consequently income mobility is due to the changes in occupational
structure and skill requirements of the economy and not due to the
circulation of positions among the groups at different rungs of occupational
ladder.

The studies reviewed above lead to some serious inferences with
regard to the relationship between background factors and educational and
occupational attainments and income. Although some studies show a
strong relationship between educational and occupational attainments, Ande
son’s Paradox supported by data from other studies casts a shadow
of doubt on such a relationship. Again the chances of acquiring high
education are restricted for the members of lower working class and lower
caste groups especially women and those from rural areas and as such high
education and the associated occupations are accessible only to the elite.
These studies also show that there is a lot of inheritance of educational
attainments as well as occupational attainments and there is very little
mobility across manual – non-manual divide in occupations. Whatever
mobility has taken place has been between the highest levels of manual and lowest levels of non-manual categories.