Education, Social Inequality and Mobility : A Sociological Study of Their Interrelationship

Dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the award of the Degree of

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

INDU SHEKHAR

/00

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL SYSTEMS
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI - 110067
1989

CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL [SYSTEMS]   New Delhi,

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DECLARATION

Certified that this dissertation titled "Education, Social Inequality and Mobility: A Sociological Study of Their Interrelationship", submitted by Mr. Indu Shekhar is in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the award of the degree of Master of Philosophy of this university. This dissertation has not been submitted for any other degree of this university or anywhere else and is his own work.

We recommend that this dissertation be placed before the examiners for evaluation.

Prof.R.K.JAIN   Prof.K.L.SHARMA
                                              (Supervisor)
(Chairman)

Dedicated To

Dr. K.K. Mandal

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

C O N T E N T S

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION :
CONCEPTUAL PROBLEMATICS

CONCEPTUALISING SOCIAL INEQUALITY AND EDUCATION

Although education has been studied from various points of view, the interest in the study of its relation to social stratification and mobility is comparatively recent.[1] The inter-relationship between education and social stratification has occupied the central place in the sociology of education in particular and in sociology in general, ever since the end of the Second World War. During the last three decades scholars have sought to elucidate the relationship between education and occupation in order to highlight the role of education in the drama of social mobility.[2]

The education system of any society is a part of the total social system. Education being a part of the total social system serves the society in interrelationship with the other subsystems, such as family, religion, economy and politics etc. So, the education process is inseparably a part of the social process. Social life among human beings necessitates some kind of education. Without education in one form or other the social

1. Rao,M.S.A; 'Education, Social Stratification and Mobility' in Gore, Desai, Chitnis(eds.); Papers in the Sociology of Education in India, (NCERT, 1967), p. 127.
2. Banks, C; The Sociology of Education : A Bibliography, (London: Frances Pinter, 1978), p.39.

heritage could not be handed on from one generation to another.
Thus, the education process, like politics, economy and moral proce-
sses forms a part of the whole network of social processes. No
one of them has a separate existence. None is unaltered by others
and each equally affects them all. If economic processes change
they will in some way or other affect politics, moral, art, reli-
gion and education, and if there are changes in the education
processes, these will have their effect upon politics, economics,
moral, art, religion and so forth. The different branches of social
life are interdependent, since the social process is a totality.[3]

/Thus, the need and the aims of a society always get
reflected in its education system. The nature of society deter-
mines the nature of education. In analysing the relationship bet-
ween education and stratification, it is necessary to see education
system as a part of the society. When we analyse the education
system from sociological point of view in general, it demands to
be examined from the totality of the social system. It is because
"education is functionally related to the society in which it
operates".[4]/

The stratification system as an unavoidable feature
of the present social system is always very closely connected with
the education system. Educability is by and large determined by

3. Allaway; 1951: Section 8.
4. Havighurst and Newgusten; 1975: 12.

one's position in the stratification system in all societies in lesser or higher degrees. Education has always been connected with the class status, income, occupational structure etc. There is no society known, writes Inkles[5], "which does not make some distinction between individuals by ranking them on some scale of value".

Now, before we go into the problematics, the two major concepts, 'education' and 'social stratification', have to be clarified at the outset for the sake of departure. Although, we shall deal with the social stratification in greater detail in chapter 3.

(In most sociological analysis of education, the term 'education' refers to the institutionalised pattern of learning, called schooling.[6] Only in some anthropological works which study a simpler society where the formal education of 'schooling' is not present that one finds the term 'education' referring to the total learning process in a given society.) This work uses the term in the sense referring only to the

5. Inkles; 1971: 83.
6. Morish, I; Sociology of Education,(London: Allen and Unwin, 1970).
7. Mead,M: Coming of Age in Samoa : Growing up in New Guinea,(London: Penguin, 1976).

formal education system. Social stratification refers to that process in a society by which status is differentiated in the hierarchy of groups in a system.[8]

K.L.Sharma defines stratification as a system of "a social ranking involving relations of superiority and inferiority.[9] Here, the concept of ranking is relevant for us. Various attempts have been made to rank persons, groups and occupations. A well-known study of ranking of occupation in the United States was

made by the National Opinion Research Centre in accordance with the plan set forth by Paul. K.Hatt and Heil.C.North.[10] Afterwards Inkley and Rossi compared the North-Hatt rank order of occupation in five other industrial countries – Great Britain, Germany, USSR, and Japan.[11] In this context the name of Hutchinson[12] is also important who studied the ranking of occupation in Sao Polo. Thus, ranking or rating of the members of the society in the scale of certain value is a part of social stratification system.

8. Reading,H.F; A Dictionary of Social Science,(New Delhi: Ambika,1977).
9. Sharma,K.L; The Changing Rural Stratification System,(Orient Longman, 1974), p.1.
10. P.K.Hatt; 'Occupation and Social Stratification', American Journal of Sociology, Vol.55, No.6, 1950, pp.536-43.
11. Inkles, A and Rossi, P.H; 'National Comparisons of Occupational Prestige', American Journal of Sociology, Jan 1956, Vol.6, No.4, p.332.
12. Hutchinson,B; 'The Social Grading of Occupation in Brazil', British Journal of Sociology, Vol.8, No.2, 1957, pp. 176-89.

Now our problem is to analyse the **relationship** between education and stratification system. As has already been stated that (one's position in the stratification system determines one's educability and thereby life chances.) Has the much talked about 'equalisation of opportunity' has been achieved or likely to achieve? What is the logical validity of education as a means of mobility for lower classes? Is there any new elite group emerging?

Analysis of education and its relationship with the stratification system is of course not a recent development. The eminent figures of sociology have tried to view education as a part of total society. Spencer, Durkheim, Weber, Passons etc. In India though I.P.Desai, Gore, Shah, Khusro, Kamat and Deshmukh, Naik, Parekh all have tried to reveal some facts, still none of them has made attempt to relate education with the stratification system.

For a systematic, step by step investigation, the whole dissertation has been divided into 5 chapers including theoretical orientation. Besides this, the next chapter entitled 'Educational system in India: Its Historicism' analyses the history and development of education system in India along with various changes in it, right from ancient period via Buddhist era, Muslim period to British period, and post-independence to the rise of rationalism in education. We see that the

the Buddhist period was the most secular period of education in the face of extreme rigidities of the value system in Indian society at that time. But the marked differentiation occured in educational structure with the introduction of British education system. It is this period when indegenous system of education (leaving aside the question of nature and character of it) received a severe set-back. The British period on the whole created a new class which served their interest in their expansionist designs. We see the supreme irony when independent India also could not get rid of those ancient, medieval and British periods' educational hangover. It is necessary here to say that instead of numbering the acts on education, we have tried to see the implications of the system of education and its effects on the population.

The third Chapter tries to analyse the over emphasized equalising effect of education in modern society. It deals the relationship of education with the dimensions of inequality like, caste, class, income group, family status, sex, religion etc., and establishes that it is not the education as such which determines one's position in the social structure, rather it is the different aspects of social reality which determines accessibility to education. With the help of various theoretical and empirical evidences of western as well as Indian we have tried to substantiate this hypothesis.

In essence, this Chapter also tries to analyse the logical validity of the concept of meritocracy. We do not believe this concept enough to analyse the inegalitarian system of the society at least theoretically. We have tried to redefine the concept of meritocracy.

The fourth Chapter entitled 'Education and Mobility' deals with the extent of mobility of various classes by means of education. With some exceptions, both western and Indian experience confirms to what Tawney says "Myth of Mobility and Tadpole Philosophy'. We see the educational system as obstructing social mobility for lower classes by contributing to social closure for them for want of access to other opportunities.

At this juncture it is necessary to point out that a strict theoretical line can not be established since social reality varies from time to time with the changing social structure. There are many exceptions rather a trend regarding the relationship of education with other systems. In many cases it helps equalizing the forces of inequality and migrating the people from one area to another. So, the trend of 'uniform relationship' can not be established.

The discussion presented in this work is based on already published works by scholars. But the purpose of this study is not merely to critically review the available literature on this

topic but an attempt to answer some questions formulated throughout this work. The study is based primarily on secondary sources. This has, therefore, naturally resulted in a serious limitation.

The complete objectivity is almost impossible in social sciences. This is not to say that the methods of the natural sciences are in themselves all that are claimed by the natural scientists. An important critique by Kuhn[13] suggests that natural scientists themselves are limited by their paradigms of scientific knowledge which have an important influence on their choice of problems, research methodology and their analysis of results. For Kuhn the development of scientific knowledge comes largely through scientific revolutions when the old paradigms are discarded and the new ones adopted. In the opinion of many sociologists it is just such a revolution that is now taking place in Sociology.

---

13. Kuhn, J.S; The Structure of Scientific Revolutions,(Chicago: University Press, 1970).

Chapter II

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM :
    ITS HISTORICISM

ANCIENT INDIA

Indian civilization is very old and full of epistemological and philosophical traditions. It is distinct from others in this respect that it accomodated the internal and external pressures within its social system which it came across during the course of its development. The notion of 'dharma' was very much inherent in the ancient tradition of Indian society which dominated almost every sphere of human life. Thus, education in ancient India was concerned with the theory of knowledge and a corresponding scheme of life and values and was based upon epistemological and philosophical traditions. This was the way through which one could enlighten one's mind and soul. The upanishads prescribed three phases of education: 'sravana', 'Manana', and 'Nidhi-dhyanana'.[1] The vedas, upanishads, and the great epic poems, Mahabharata and Ramayana, not only reflected the sophisticated taste of a few Indians with the advantages of wealth and birth, but also embodied a philosophy and religious ethos which were widely accepted among the Indian people. The individual self, the Atman, is related to the Brahma, for the "universe is Brahma, but the Brahma is the Human'. There is thus a unity among all living things - a view in contrast with the dualistic

---

1. Saksena, R.N; 'Traditional System of Education in India', in Papers in the Sociology of Education in India,(Eds.) Gore,M.S, Desai, I.P., and Clituis, S., NCERT, 1967; pp.78-90.

views common in western tradition. Shils has noted that the need
to experience this identity, this quest for a unity of the indivi-
dual and the universal, remains a significant for among Indian
intellectuals today.[2]

More than a religious dogma, Hinduism has been a
way of life with social, economic, and political implications for
the majority of the Indian population. Thut and Adams says,
"Hinduism has viewed the worldly existence and its entrappings as
unimportant in the soul's journey to its ultimate goal of nirvana
in which individuality is lost in a mystical union with Brahma.[3]
Associated with Hinduism, but also reflecting a desire to maintain
cultural stability in the face of successive invasions by different
peoples, is the caste system. Wallbank suggests that in modern times
all castes may be placed in three broad categories. The first
group includes the Brahmins; the Rajputs clans, and the traders, who
claim descent from the vaisyas: all these constitute the twice born.
In the second group are the traditional sudra castes. At the bottom
are the untouchables, also known as the 'depressed classes' or 'S.C'.[4]

---

2. Shils,E; The Intellectual Between Tradition and Modernity: The
   Indian Situation,(The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1961).
3. Thut, J.N and Adams,D; Educational Patterns in Contemporary
   Societies,(New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 1968),p.388.
4. Wallbank,T.W; A Short History of India and Pakistan,(New York:
   New American Library, 1958), p.26.

In order to put this scheme of learning into practice there existed three kinds of institutions, namely, 'gurukula', 'parishada', and 'sammelana'. 'Gurukula' was the institution where students were inspired and they learned to follow the ideal life of the teachers who were considered ideal men. 'Parishada' was the meeting centre of the students of high calibre. It provided a forum for the mutual discussion and discourses. 'Sammelana' was generally organised by kings where scholars, teachers and philosophers were invited for debate.

BUDDHIST PERIOD

In the Buddhist period the system of education was not very much different from the earlier one but, it definitely moved towards formalization. It has contributed a number of concepts such as ahimsa, or love and non-violence towards all living things, yet the absorption of Buddhism by Hinduism cannot be viewed as the wedding of two distinctly different religions. As has been noted by O.L.Chavarria-Aquilar:-

> It cannot be said that the most notable features of the
> Buddhist speculation - its 'rationalism'(....antipathy to
> every kind of ritualism and superstition), its atheism
> (that is, its negation of a God creator and Providence)
> its high morality, its pessimism, its anti-caste tendency,
> its mildness and humanity, and so on are specifically

---

5. Oscar,L.Chavarria-Aquilar(ed.); Traditional India,(N.Y: Prentice Hall, 1964), p.91.

Buddhist....In short Buddhism is only the 'Buddhized'
aspect of contemporaneous Hinduism. [5]

A number of institutions were established to impart
instruction in the languages of Pali and Sanskrit. Besides this,
monastries were set up which later developed into large centres of
education noted as 'vihars' where the monks, nuns and leity
were trained and educated. Education in this period was related to
the Buddhist order or 'sangha'. Admission to this order was thrown
open to persons of all classes and castes. This was a major differe-
nce from the earlier Brahminical system of education. People who
wanted to seek admission to the Sanghas had to leave their homes
and other worldly associations behind. This was 'pabhajja' which
means 'going out' of home for instruction into the 'order'(sagha).
This system was similar to the Brahminical system of studentship
under which the disciple had to go out of his home, leave his parents
and relations and live with his chosen preceptor as an 'antevasi'
in his hermitage.[6]

Yet some education developed outside the main Hindu
tradition. At times, particularly during the first few centuries
A.D., princes, noblemen, and merchants acquired sufficient power
and wealth to develop an education for their young which in
content and purpose was different from the traditional pattern.

5. Oscar,L.Chavarria-Aquilar(ed.); Traditional India, (N.Y: Prentice
   Hall, 1964), p.91.
6. Saksena,R.N;'Traditional System of Education in India', in Papers
   in the Sociology of Education in India(eds.) Gore, Desai and Clitu-
   is, NCERT, 1967. pp. 84-86.

The education provided was a more practical, worldly type and included such areas as administration, warfare, trading, construction, and medicine. Since these specialization required teachers outside the Brahminic tradition, the monopoly of the Brahmins over all education was fractured, if not broken, and a new educated upper stratum began to emerge.[7]

MUSLIM PERIOD

When Muslims established their rule over India, they introduced the Islamic system of education in the country. As a result of this Mosques became the hectic centres of learning and academic activities were Islamic principles based on 'Koran', 'Itadith' and 'sunnah' were taught to students. In that period two kinds of institutions were prevalent. 'Maktabs' and 'Madarsahs'. 'Maktabs' was an institution of education at the primary level where pupils were sent to learn Koran and other ingredients of Islam so that they could perform their devotion and other functions in accordance with the principles of the religion.

The Madarsahs were the higher centres of learning where advanced knowledge of Arabic, Islamic philosophy and Islamic laws were imparted to the students by learned scholars and experts. The Muslim legacy to Indian education was considerable in terms of

---

7. Myrdal, Gunnar; Asian Drama, Vol. III,(New York: Pantheon,1968), pp. 1627-1628.

both the development of new educational institutions and the
provision of an ethos supportive of planning. The curriculum at
the'elementary'level consisted of religious instruction. At the
secondary level, in addition to further religious studies, arith-
matic, algebra, economics, administration, physics, and history
were also taught. Yet, basically, the Muslim culture was an elite
culture and accounts of acomplishments in the field of popular
education believed by many contemporary scholars to be exaggeration.[8]

THE IMPACT OF BRITISH COLONIALISM

Albeit India had been subject to several invasions
throughout its history, none had effects as pervasive as those resu-
lting from its cultural exchanges with European nations. During
the British rule the ancient system of education received a severe
set-back. The British East India Company emrged not only as the
major trading company, but also a political sovereign of India.

The company, however, was slow to concern itself
seriously in educational matters. Moreover, since both the great
traditions of scholarship, Hindu and Muslim, had by the eighteenth
century lost their vitality, the initial involvement in education
by the East India Company, as Ashby points out, was merely to

---

8. Ibid, p.1631.

"fan the embers of these religious systems".[9] Thus, under company leadership a new Madrasa was formed in 1781, and ten years later a comparable institution was created to further the study of the culture of the Hindus.

It was the western missionaries, not the secular authorities, who made the only serious attempts to promote education in India prior to the nineteenth century. At times this effort was obstructed by the East India Company. Myrdal points out that the Protestant missionaries were from lower social strata while the British colonial officials were largely from the upper class, and suggests that such class differences might have affected their relationships.[10] He further comments: "It is interesting to speculate on how the history of Indian education might have turned out if India had been colonized and ruled by a catholic country - or, in more recent times, if the British had been a nation early committed to the ideals of popular government and popular education at home, as were the Americans."[11]

By the early nineteenth century interest in education had grown considerably among both the British officials and the

9. Ashby, Eric; Universities: British, Indian, African - A Study in the Ecology of Higher Education, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), p.48.
10. Myrdal, Gunnar; Asian Drama, Vol.III, (New York: Pantheon, 1968).
11. Myrdal, Gunnar, op. cit., p.1637.

Indian upper strata. With the need to develop an explicit policy regarding the kind of education to be supported, an important controversy emerged. While broad in scope and subtle in detail, the controversy usually has been simplified and described in terms of "orientalist" versus "western" learning. Within India, European missionaries and a few cosmopolitan Brahmins also argued against the exclusive emphasis on traditional learning. As early as 1792 attempts were made by a Member of Parliament to introduce into the charter of the East India Company specific provisions for the encouragement of the work of missionaries and schoolmasters in India. In opposition to this proposal, the directors of the company argued for a hands-off policy and suggested that the Hindus ".....had as good a system of faith and of morals as most people....". Moreover, one Member of Parliament is said to have remarked, "we lost our colonies in America by importing our education there, we need not do so in India, too."[12]

Competing claims as to the advantages of oriental literature and language as compared with the European heritage taught through the medium of English were widely discussed. Several scholars and official insisted that " a policy of making a whole people dependent upon a remote and unknown country for all their ideas

---

12. Quoted in Mukerji,S.N; History of Education in India,(Baroda: Acharya Book Depot),1951, p.32.

and for the very words in which to clothe them must degrade
their character, depress their energies and render them incapable
of aspiring to any intellectual distinction."[13]

Slowly, however, the proponents of western learning
won the day. Macaulay recommended that no support be given to
indigenous studies and that the printing of Sanskrit and Arabic
books cease. Nor was this policy in conflict with the views of
most Indian intellectuals. As Ramanathan observes, "The curious
fact is that the Orientalists were almost all Englishmen in the
service of the company, whereas all Indians of repute were
Anglicists."[14] And, as Ashby notes, to many Indian scholars, "English
was deemed more significant than Sanskrit; Shakspeare more relevant
than the Mahabharata, the reading of Milton and Burke more appropri-
ate than the teaching of Buddha."[15]

The first systematic and comprhensive statement of
English educational policy in India is found in the Educational
Despatch of 1858. The Despatch, which signified, among other things,

---

13. Ashby, Eric; op cit., p.52.
14. Ramanathan, G; Educational Planning and National Integration,
    (London: Asia Publishing House, 1965), p.21.
15. Ashby, Eric, op. cit., p.54.

a long leap into the third stage of educational differentiation,
called for the establishment of a degree-granting university.
Modeled after the university of London, the new universities were
particularly well received by Indian middle classes, who were
lured by the prospects of administrative positions. In 1857 the
Indian universities enrolled 200 students, however by 1882 the
enrollment had grown to approximately 4000. The main functions of
the universities may be identified as (1) the transmission of
European culture and (2) selection for government employment.
Reflecting these functions, Indian students flocked to the faculties
of arts and law; the resulting popularity of these areas persists
and causes much concern to the present day.[16]

Both the Educational Despatch of 1854 and the Hunter
Commission of 1882 recommended the promotion of literacy and
primary education. Yet because of fiscal constraints on govern-
ment's action and a lack of popular demand, such proposals were not
implemented and the spread of popular education had to await the
pressure of the nationalist movement of the twentieth century.

The last century of the colonial period saw a rapid
expansion of facilities for secondary education. At the secondary
level English was appropriately the language of instruction, since

16. Weiner, Myron; 'The Politics of South Asia', in Gariel,A.Almond
    and James,S.Coleman (eds.), The Politics of the Developing
    Areas,(Princeton,N.J: Princeton University Press, 1960),pp.165-
    167.

the function of the secondary schools was to prepare students
for government employments and for further education. Thus, a new
administrative and judicial system reduced the importance of
law by custom. The introduction of the British concept of civil
liberty stimulated new political aim. As has been commented by
Weiner, "John Locke and J.S.Mill provided more effective stan-
dards of governments for educated South Asians than did the
vedas, the Koran, or the Tripitaka."[17]

The British government had limited aims for the
educational system it provided India. The system was designed to
teach the English language and to familiarise selected students
with certain aspects of western learning. In general, the preserva-
tion and cultivation of Indian culture was not promoted. However,
the process of secularization and differentiation fostered throu-
ghout the colonial period. The Indian elite transformed themselves
in terms of British values of humanity and rationality by attending
the new educational institutions, entering professional and bureaucra-
tic jobs, and engaging in commerce in the towns and cities.

It was a segment of this westernized, secular Indian
elite, in combination with more traditional Indian scholars, that
provided leadership for an abortive nationalist movement in edu-
cation early in the twentieth century. The new educational system

---

17. Ibid, p.167.

was to be Indian in every respect. The ancient culture, traditions, ideals, and religions could find a place in the curriculum, and modern Indian languages would replace English as the language of instruction. But this was not merely a movement to herald and romanticize Indian accomplishments, for one of the first aims of the national education was to increase the productive capacities of its citizens.[18] And to all of these proposals eventually were added suggestions for compulsory education and Gandhi's scheme for 'basic education'.

Albeit, a number of 'national' schools were actually created in the twenteith century. In a revised order of priorities the rationality called for political freedom as the first step towards the achievement of their other targets. Regarding education, they concluded: "A rational system of education......must be provided for, financed and controlled by the nation, and in performing that function, the nation must be represented by the state."[19]

At least the educational aspirations articulated by the nationalists were much in keeping with what has been described as the fourth level of educational differentiation.

---

18. Naik, J.P; Educational Planning in India,(Bombay: Allied Publishers, 1965, p.67.
19. Quoted in Naik, J.P; op cit., p.69.

The proposed educational system would not be tied to a small
power-wielding group but, reflecting universalistic norms,
would serve the entire society. The implication follows that
the national curriculum would encompass a wide variety of modern
learning.[20]

From the cultural heritage of a people and the
fabric of their society are derived the objectives, norms, and
roles which give form and direction to the educational system.
This section, then will focus on contemporary India, on the
articulated national aspirations and goals, the nature of social
and cultural change, the magnitude of teacher and student inputs,
and the contemporary national problems which particularly affect
and constrain the educational system.

POST INDEPENDENCE PERIOD

After independence in 1947, India adopted the pattern
of society which enshrines the values of democracy, Socialism and
secularism.[21] The preamble to the constitution of India resolved to
secure for all its citizens: justice - social, economic and politi-

---

20. Naik,J.P; Educational Planning in India,(Bombay: Allied Publishers,
     1965), pp. 73-115.
21. The Constitution of India(Lucknow: Eastern Book Company,1988)
     p.1.

cal; liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship; equality of status and opportunity; and to promote among them fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity of the nation.

Under Article 38 of the Directive Principles, it is laid down, "the state shall strive to promote the welfare of the people by securing and protecting, as effectively as it may, a social order in which justice - social, economic, and political, shall inform all the institutions of national life."

Article 16(1)[22] guarantees equality of opportunity or opportunity to any office under the state, and Article 16(2) forbids discrimination in respect of any employment of office under the state on the ground only of religion, race, caste, sex, descent, place of birth, residence, or any of them.

Article 46 of the Constitution aims at the protection of the weaker sections: -"The state shall promote with special care the educational and economic interest of the weaker sections of the people, and in particular, of the scheduled castes and scheduled Tribes, and shall protect them from social injustice and all forms of exploitation." Article 16, 29(2) and 335 of the Constitution

22. Ibid, pp. 8 - 30.

clearly provide for a better deal for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes both in terms of education and job opportunities.

But, there is, of course, always some distance between the general, frequently politically inspired, national goals and the effective subsystem or institutional policy. India is classified as an economically under-developed nation. Using the common indicator of economic development, gross national product per capita, India ranks in the lower fifth of the Asian nations and in the lower sixth of the nations of the world. The target for annual growth in national income was five percent under the Third Five Year Plan: the actual growth, however, was only two to three percent per year - barely sufficient to keep up with the rate of population growth.[23]

The prime means to the end of economic growth has been identified in the Five Year Plans as the development of India's human resources, and through such development the educational system becomes a major link with the economy. This line of reasoning has led to the belief that the educational system, at least, at the primary level, in general should be related to manpower needs, and each of the series of national Five Year Plans produced by the

---

23. Rosen, George; Democracy and Economic Change in India, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966), p.212.

Planning Commission has devoted a chapter to education. The

Third Plan(1962-1967) called for the extension and improvement

of the teaching of science but offered no specific suggestions

as to how enrollments might be adjusted in keeping with antici-

pated manpower needs. The Fourth Plan has been somewhat more

explicit, as exemplified by its recomendations designed to foster

terminal vocational courses at both the secondary and university

levels.[24]

Year	I-V	Grades VI-VIII	IX-XI
		Enrollment ratio	
1951 base[1]	40.0	10.0^2	10.0^2
1956 target[1]	60.0	15.0^2	15.0^2
1956 base[3]	51.0	19.2	9.4
1961 target[3]	62.7	22.5	11.7
1961 bade[4]	61.1	22.8	11.5
1966 target[4]	76.4	28.6	15.6
		Percentage increase	
1951-56[1]	50.0	50.0	50.0
1956-61[3]	22.9	17.2	24.5
1961-66[4]	25.0	25.4	35.7

Table 1 - Enrollment Ratio Targets of Indian Five Year Plans.

24. Laska,J.A; Planning and Educational Development in India,(New York: Teachers College Press, 1968).

Table 1 suggests something of the magnitude of educational growth during the first two decades after independence. The discrepencies between the goals articulated and the resources allocated e.g., the inputs in terms of expenditures and enrollments, need to be accounted for.

Finally, not until the early 1960s were extensive manpower surveys undertaken which identified the educational attainment of workers in the various sectors. Until this time there was little in the way of available data from which projections is needed educational manpower could be made.[25] Nevertheless, the monetary, and, to a degree, the social, rewards for vocational and technical employment have become increasingly visible. Indeed, as studied by Blang and associates have indicated, engineering and science courses are popular among students aspiring to higher education.[26]

Besides economic development, a second major national aim which influences educational inputs is the achievement of social and national integration. Indian society is too hierarchichal and presents too many social cleavages to satisfy contemporary democratic and socialist goals. Economic, ethnic, linguistic, and social class differences divide the nation. Power and prestige are

25. Naik,J.P; op cit., pp.18-19.
26. Blang,M, Layard,P.R.G and Woodhall,W; The Causes of Educated Unemployed in India. (Quoted in Adam,D.).

concentrated in a few families: it has been estimated, for
example, that two percent of the population commands one-third
of the wealth.[27] The diversity of languages in India is an
important impediment to the unification and integration of the
nation and a constraint on educational development. When indepe-
ndence was attained, the government was faced with the fact that
English was the major language of the educated elite, while 1652
dialects and 14 major languages were spoken with varying freque-
ncy among the people.

In addition to linguistic diversity, the variety of
existing religions and social groups also contributes to the divi-
sive force of communalism. Some writers argue that caste severely
constrains mobility and innovation, thus acting as a brake to econo-
mic development. Shils finds that the caste system leads to pro-
found alienation:

> It inhibits the growth of those sensibilities which are
> required for the perception of the moral quality of other
> human beings. It is the caste system which cuts human
> beings off from each other by denying to them the possi-
> bilities of connubial and commensal intimacy and a more
> basic affinity as moral entities. It is the caste system
> which helps deaden the imagination to the state of mind
> of other human beings.28

Other viewers perceive a weakening of the caste system
in that it no longer has such a limiting effect on vocational and

---

27. Mamoria,C; Social Problems and Social Disorganization in India,
    (Allahabad: Kitab Mahal Private Ltd., 1965),p.105.
28. Shils,E; op cit., p.70.

educational roles. They cite evidence, dating back for decades
or even centuries, which suggests that a sizeable percentage of
sons do not engage in the same occupation as the father.[29] A
partial survey conducted by the census commission of India, for
example, found that only half of the male workers in 1931 were
engaged in occupations traditionally associated with their castes.[30]
A contemporary study in central India, drawing data from interviews
reinforces the conclusions that, while the caste system is not
particularly obstructive to occupational change, such mobility is
generally confined to occupations of similar rank.[31]

In the face of these challenges, education in contem-
porary India is being called on to assist in a socail revolution of
a magnitude which would have mystified or even horrified leaders
of the earlier colonial period. A harsh summary of the constraints
on the contemporary educational system is offered by Naik:

> Educationally, the country has only a small class of
> indifferently educated persons while the masses are still
> illiterate and ignorant. The prevailing technology is
> largely primitive and we still live in, what Pandit Nehru
> called, the "cow-dung era". The very unity of the nation
> ......is now threatened with several fissiparous tenden-
> cies. Social cohesion, never very strong, is now probably
> at its lowest ebb due to an upsurge of parochial or

29. Hutton,J.H; Caste in India,(London: Oxford University Press),
1946.
30. Davis,K; The Population of India and Pakistan,(Princeton,N.J:
Princeton University Press, 1951), p.168.
31. Driver,E.D; 'Caste and Occupational Structure in Central India',
Social Forces, Vol.XLI(1962), No.1, pp.26-31.

casteist considerations and the still unresolved
problems of Hindu-Muslim unity. In the political
field, the only organised party which won the
freedom is now beset with factions, groupism, and
internal squabbles of an unprecedented character
and there is no other well-organised nation-wide
political party to take its place. The greate
creative impulse which the country revealed in showing
up galaxy of great men to fight with British
imperialism now appears to be on the wave and we
do not seem to have any gains in our midst comparable
to those who lived and fought for us between 1860 and
1960. The old faith and values in life are slipping
fast under our feet and their place has not been
taken up by new ones with the result that there is
an immense crisis of character which manifests itself
in irresponsible and disorderly behaviour among
students and incompetence and inefficiency in official
and public life.32

The changing nature of these inputs and the changing

social context impinging on the educational system have also been

reflected in structural and functional changes within the system

itself. Some of the more important changes include those in orga-

nisational arrangements, in teacher, administrator and student roles,

and in curriculum.

The role of the government of India in education has

gone through a number of stages. Prior to 1833 it played virtually

no role. Between 1833 and 1870 the situation was almost completely

reversed. Between 1870 and 1921 five major functions were reserved

for the Government: general policy making, information collecting

---

32. Naik,J.P; op cit., p.77.

and dissemination. From 1921 until 1935 educational policy was again largely divorced from the Government. Since 1935 the involvement of the central Government in educational matters has once again been on the increase.[33]

The Indian Constitution, formally adopted in 1949, gives the State governments almost complete control over education, that is, "education including universities" became a "State subject". The central Government carries out its educational responsibilities through the Union Ministry of Education and a number of advisory bodies. Of the latter, the UGC and the Central Advisory Board of Education are perhaps the most significant.

The structure of the educational system varies somewhat from State to State throughout $I_n$dia. The variation usually represent differences in the length of the cources at one or more of the educational levels. However, the total length of time required to obtain B.A degrees typically does not differ by more than one year.

The primary schools are expected to offer an undifferentiated curriculum designed to prepare for effective citizenship. Hindi is required where it is not the native tongue of the

---

33. Naik,J.P; op cit., pp.116-28.

area. Finally, reflecting an educational view promoted by Gandhi and a number of his followers all primary schools have become "junior basic schools" and offer several periods of arts and crafts.

Contemporary secondary education may be viewed structurally at two levels. The lower secondary schools typically include grades eight, nine and ten. The curriculum at present, however, continues the cources initiated in the primary grades and also includes study in classical European and Asian languages. At the higher level of secondary education, the revised cource of study extends to for two or three years, leading to the Secondary School Certificate. Although the curriculum is in considerable flux, the higher secondary schools offer substantial diversifications. By the mid 1960s the proportion of enrollment at this level in vocational courses had reached 40 percent and Government plan were calling for increased vocationalization.

HIGHER EDUCATION

Higher education in India has probably been subject to even more debate and controversy than education at the lower levels. In viewing the contemporary universities, the Education Commission(1964-66) comments:

> Perhaps the most onerous responsibility which the Indian universities now have is to shake off the heavy load of their early tradition which gives a dominant place to examination, to improve standards all-round, and, by

symbiotic development of teaching and research, to
create at least a few centres which would be comparable
to those of their type in any other part of the world. [34]

Ashby adds his evaluation:

Looking at Indian universities a century after their
foundation, one cannot help but feel that they have
failed to adapt themselves sufficiently to the vast and
unique opportunities which surrounded them; they seem
to have lost enthusiasm and initiative under the
crushing problems which have beset them. Despite three
major commissions, they have not been able to extricate
themselves from their own brief history. With a few
notable exceptions they remain examining bodies and
their students naturally regard success in examinations
as the sole end of a undergraduate career.[35]

By 1966 there were 64 universities and 2565 affili-
ated colleges in India.[36] In between many Commissions like

Kothari Commission and patterns of education like 10+2+3 were

put to test.

The gravity of the contemporary situation and the dif-

ference between the desired and actual roles of teachers may be

seen in the following quotation:

At present, the bringing up of the next generation is
being left more and more to the lesser representatives
of the present generation.......Our expansion has far
outrun our capacity to produce good teachers and this
is the main reason for the dilution of quality. It
would, therefore, be worthwhile to concentrate, for a few

34. India, Ministry of Education; Report of the Education Commission
(1964-66), Education and National Development,(New Delhi: Manager
of Publications, 1966), p.277.
35. Ashby, Eric; 'Adaptation of Universities in India and West Africa',
The Bulletin of the International Association of Universities,
Nov 1962, p.253.
36. U.G.C. Report.

years, on all such measures which improve teachers at
all stages, elementary, secondary, and university.37

Regardless of difficulties, a higher social, economic
and professional status for teachers in primary schools is an
absolute pre-condition for raising the levels of teaching.[38]

NEW EDUCATION POLICY

Before we go into the problems of relationship bet-
ween education and politics, it is but natural to deal critically
with the New Education Policy passed recently by the Indian
Government.

The Ministry of Human Resources Development had, in
his Lok Sabha sppech initiating the discussion on the paper 'Chal-
lenge of Education - A Policy Perspective', committed the Government
to the principle of full and equal educational opportunities.
Suri,P.C raises a very pertinent question here, "Does the 1986
Policy Draft, fulfil this commitment or does it provide for
effective inequality?[39]

Suri argues that the challenge paper had got demorali-
sed on three main counts: "One, paucity of resouces, two, the erosion,
demoralization due to pervasive politicization of the educational
system, and three, lack of co-operation or response from the State

---

37. Naik,J.P; op cit., pp.37
38. Myrdal,G; op cit., p.1736.
39. Suri,P.C; 'New Policy is for Effective Inequality', Mainstream,
    May 10, 1986. p.30.

Governments. The challenge paper did not face any of the challenges though it candidly exposed the chaotic nature of the educational system.

The challenge of education paper had misled and misdirected the debate by avoiding the basic diagnosis and by its misleading diagnosis. They claimed "the obvious paucity of resources" as "the most important reason". In their anger, they challenge: "There is no point in continuing argument that it is possible to save the situation with non-monetary inputs".

As a consequence of this convinced helplessness, they opted for the status-quo. The policy draft is a product of the state of helplessness. The 'challenge paper' did not ask the question: why are resources not available?

The vocationalization approach is relevant and applicable for political economies, where in bulk of the employment is generated through jobs. These advisers, including their national level expert agencies - NCERT and NIEPA, do not seem to be aware of many facts in this challenge draft.

The 1986 policy draft has adopted a national system of education with a common 10+2+3 structure, without investigating its relevance and effective ess; without relating it to the potentials of the children, and the functionally educated illiterates in the village to absorb technology. Suri argues that the Ministry of Human Resources Development has not applied its mind to the most

crucial issues of the potential of the middle school level for cultivating effective equality of opportunities and making education an agent of continuing change. Is not the national education system, proposed in the 1986 Policy Draft, irrelevant, obsolete, both socially and for the challenges of the future?

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND POLITICS

Thus, having gone through a general history of education in India from ancient to that of New Education Policy, we are now in a position to see the relationship between education and politics. Scholarly concern with the relationship between education and other social systems is a recent phenomenon within sociology of education which itself is quite recent. It was only in the 1960s that specific attention came to be paid by sociologists and sociologists of education to such relationship, and more specifically, to the role of education in economic or political development. It is nevertheless true that the concept of citizenship education, and broadly speaking, the relation between education, the state, and the Government were not outside the awareness of philosophers. In the west, Plato and Aristotle were among the first to underline the role of education in relation to the state.

Here, it is necessay to define both the system of

education and politics. According to Vincent Ostrom, "Education

is viewed as an enterprise in learning ; politics as an enterprise

in decision making and social control".[40]

To say that education is an"enterprise in learning"

implies that education involves "the capacity to learn; to organise

learning in symbolic forums; the communication of learning; and acting

on the basis of learning and knowledge.[41]   The last two functions

mentioned here will have a very direct bearing on any political

system.

David Easton defines a political system as "those

interactions through which values are authoritatively allocated

for a society".[42] It is rightly pointed out[43] that this wide concept

of the political system constitutes a departure from the older

concept of the state or government which had a rather limited

scope.The political system thus becomes the master determinant

of the values and ideologies to be pursued by a nation, thereby,

influencing the total character of the society as a whole. Here,

40. Ostrom, Vincent; "Education and Politics", in the both near
    Book of the NSSE, Part II,pp.8-9.
41. Ibid.
42. Easton, David; A System Analysis of Political Life,(New York:
    John Wiley & Sons INC, 1965), p.21.
43. Coleman,J.S(ed.); Education and Political Development,(Princeton
    University Press, 1965), p.539.

it is pertinent to point out Marxists would say that it is the economy which determines the total character of the society as a whole.

Having examined briefly the nature of these two social systems, we are now in a position to study the nature of their mutual interaction. In view of the fact that no social system works in isolation, it should be quite obvious that both education and politics influence each other. Changes in the political system and its ideologies tend to influence education quickly, whereas the influences of education on the polity are usually much slower and indirect.

Education can be seen as providing the intelligence, skills, and wisdom which determine the "limits of the capability of the political system". How well or badly the government and political leaders in the long run will depend to a large extent on the wisdom made available to them by their total education. Furthermore, "Education not only prepares the strategic elites for their roles; it also enlarges the capacity of all members of a society, and in this way maximizes the capacity of the whole polity.[44]

---

44. Coleman,J.S(Ed.); Education and Political Development,(Princeton University Press, 1965), p.539.

When India, for instance, emerged indpendent after long years of colonial rule, the type of constitution that our leaders gave the country was in no small measure the product of liberal education that most of them had received from the west. Their success and failures on the political elite of the country also had much to do with the ideals, skills and wisdom they had received from their education. India has not been able to do very well as a democracy, the widespread illiteracy and ignorance of the masses has a large share of responsibility to own.

Besides maximizing the capacities of the political elite and the masses, education determines the strength of the polity in another important ways. The key to such strength now lies in continued scientific and technological advancements by extending the frontiers of knowledge and learning. As has been pointed out by Ostrom Vincent: "we find ourselves engaged in a basic struggle in which scientific, economic, political and cultural capabilities may be as significant as military......Education is now defined as our first line of defence."[45]

This relationship between education and the political order, and education's potential to influence politics has been variously described by different authors.

---

45. Ostrom, Vincent; op cit., p.23.

According to Coleman, the three functions of the
political system which have a fairly clear relationship to
education are those of political socialization, political recruit-
ment and political integration.[46] In other words, there are
functions for the efficient performance of which the political
system must depend on the educational. But since education has
to perform many non-political functions, and of the many and varied
demands made on education,the political in certain contexts may be
the least obvious or important. This relationship between education
and politics is at best only indirect.[47]

As another author puts it,[48] education has the pote-
ntial to influence the political system either (1) from the outside,
as the generator of support and demands or (2) from within, by opera-
ting as a sub-system within the larger political system. But what
the nature and content of this influence is will depend on many
factors, including the aims and contents of education itself.

Now we will see how politics influences education.
The state is the permanent institution in any society. As an institu-
tion for decision-making and social control, which can authoritatively
allocate values, the state is very much in a position to influence the
other institutions of the society. It is the most vulnerable as

46. Coleman, J.S; op cit., p.18.
47. Ibid., p.14.
48. Massialas, B.G; Education and the Political System,(Addison-werley
    Publication Co., 1969), pp.209-10.

the state finds in education an instrument of great potential
that can be very well manipulated to serve its own ends. In
conformity with the law of self-preservation, every political
system tends to evolve a system of education that it thinks can
best serve to maintain and strengthen it. The educational systems
of Sparta, Nazi Germany, or fascist Italy are historical examples.
But the motive of self-preservation is as strong in the pluralistic
as in the totalitarian states so that education, overtly or covert-
ly, becomes an instrument of national policy in either case.
If the Soviet Union, for instance, seeks to inculcate through
education the communistic ideology, so does the U.S.A aim to
teach democratic values. The approach and methods may differ
vastly, but that again is in keeping with the socio-political
philosophy that inspires the whole system.

Perhaps the single biggest influence of the political
system on education lies in how much autonomy the former concedes
to the latter.

This delicate and controversial relationship between
education and the political system leads us to the discussion of
political socialisation. Political socialisation or politicisation
is a term coined more recently to connote the familiar concept of
citizenship education, which has been the concern of philosophers
and scholars.

Almond defines it: political socialization is the process of "induction into the political culture". The idea is made much more explicit when Coleman views it as "that process by which individuals acquire attitudes and feelings toward the political system and toward their role in it, including cognition, feeling, and one's sense of political competence".[49] The five nation comparative study by Almond and Verba[50] is quoted as showing that education is a decisive factor in politicisation, and the single singlemost important variable. The result of politicisation through education is not always 'unidirectional or positive'. Studies made in countries with different forms of governments show varying degrees of impact. Coleman argues:

> Boredom, political passivity, positive disaffection are just as likely to be the result of explicit politicization as is unquestioning loyalty. 51

In the case of our own country it is well known that despite many ideological differences and diversities, we as a nation own allegiance to the ideals of democracy, socialism, secularism and national integration and modernization. It is not at all clear, however, that during over twentyfive years of independence

---

49. Coleman,J.S; op cit., p.18.
50. Almond and Verba, The Civic Culture.

51. Coleman,J.S; op cit., p.227.

our formal educational system has made much conscious effort to
teach the younger generation these basic values. And 'cogni-
tion' is only the first step. Schools must also provide the
right climate where these values can be lived and internalized.
There is little research in this country to show what role educa-
tion has played in the politicization of our youth. Common experi-
ence is that even university graduates are unclear about the
implications of these values unless they have studied relevant
disciplines or have been politicised by agents other than formal
education. Apart from the role of education in political sociali-
zation it can lead to political development also.

Emphasizing the influence of education on politi-
cs, Troyna,B. writes, "some forty years on, the 1948 Education Act
remains the cornerstone of the organization and thrust of the
current educational system in Britain."[52]

Thus, seen through this perspective, we can conclude
that the education system of any society is largely determined
by the existing pattern of socio-economic formation of that
society according to its convenience for the maintenance of the
system.

---

52. Troyna, Barry(ed.); Racial Inequality in Education,(London:
    Tavistock Publication, 1987), p.1.

Chapter III

EDUCATION AND INEQUALITY :
A CASE AGAINST MERITOCRACY

During the 19th century and 20th century scholars ̎ﾑ
sought to elucidate the relationship between education and
occupation in order to highlight the role of education in
social transformation. The ideological impetus for most of their
studies seems to be the vindication of western capitalism. As
Bowles says they rest heavily on the assertion that 'the
equalising effects of education can counter the disequalizing
forces inherent in the free market systems.'[1]

This equalising effect was presumed to contribute
to the allround social betterment of the communities. More speci-
fically speaking, education could contribute to economic better-
ment, since education was the major criterion for employment in
a number of sectors of economy, at least theoretically.

Economic betterment, in turn, was envisaged as
contributing to the improvement of their socail status - better
style of living, more prestige in the eyes of others, and perhaps
better political status too. The attainment of the goal of reducing
inequality, through education received so much prominence in India,
that soon after independence in 1947, the national leaders went
to the extent of incorporating certain special provisions about

1. Bowles,S; 'Unequal Education and the Reproduction of the Social
   Division of Labour', in Karabel,J and Halsey,A.H (eds.); Power
   and Ideology in Education,(New York: Oxford University Press,
   1977), pp.137-53.

it in the constitution. For instance, Article 46, under part IV of the constitution, entitled "Directive Principles of the State Policy" states: "To promote with special care the educational and economic interests of the weaker sections of the people especially the Scheduled Castes and Tribes".[2] Provisions was also made in the constitution for the appointment of a special officer charged with the responsibility of looking after the progress of these communities as envisaged under the constitution.[3] In short, the government viewed education as a crucial instrument not merely in economic development but in social progress.

Attempts by sociologists, Indian as well as foreign to provide an empirical and theoretical perspective on the role of education in social transformation in the context of Indian society, have been limited indeed. This may be largely attributed to the nascent nature of sociology itself[4], and in particular, to that of its branch, sociology of education, in this country.

In the west, in contrast, sociology has been established as one of the major disciplines, and sociology of education has come to acquire considerable importance as a significant

2. Pylee,M.V; Indian Constitution,(Bombay, Asia Publishing House, 1962), p.145.
3. Ibid, p.365.
4. Srinivas,M.N & Panini,M.N; 'The Development of Sociology and Social Anthropology in India', Sociological Bulletin, 22(2),1973, pp.179-212.

field of training.[5]

Even such crucial problems as the role played by social inequality in access to educational opportunity have found only a few enthusiasts.[6] It is with this background against the aforesaid 'education is an equalizing force' the aim of this chapter is to analyse the influence of social background - ascribed and achieved - on the educational and occupational aspirations of students, within the theoretical framework of modernization. To be specific, the aim is to analyse the extent to which the dimensions of inequality like caste, class and power on the one hand and the traditional groups such as religions, caste and sex and modern groups such as social class and an urban community, affect or rather determines the access to educational opportunities.

Since our analysis heavily relies on the secondary sources and presentation is more of a theoretical nature, it is but natural to clarify some conceptual and theoretical problematics like the concept of inequality, caste, class, power etc. Social inequality

---

5. Worsley,P (ed); Introducing Sociology,(Harmondsworth; Penguin, 1970a);

_____ ; Modern Sociology: Introductory Readings,(Harmondsworth, Penguin);

6. Halsey,A (ed.); Education, Economy and Society,(Gleuwe: Free Press, 1961).

is one of the most debatavle topics in social science. From the very beginning, social scientists have tried to seek the roots, origins and rationales of the problem but they have not arrived at the common agreement. In fact, controversies are the natural outcome of the search for higher orders of explanation and inclusive system of classification of the problem. There is,thus, no consensus among them on the explanation of social inequality. The differing value system, perception of social orders, equality and justice have led them to provide different explanations. In such a situation, there arise a number of conceptual and theoretical issues in the study of social inequality which call for proper understanding and comprehensive analysis.

The first problem which puzzles analysts is the distinction made between social inequality and natural inequality. There is a popular view that social inequality and natural inequality are quite different from each other. For instance, Powseau[7] made a distinction between socially based inequality and biologically based inequality. He referred to biologically based inequality as "natural or physical because it is established by nature, and consists in a difference of age, health, bodily strength and the qualities of the mind or the soul." Similarly, socially based

7. For details, see,Rousseau,J.J; 'A Discourse on the Origin of Inequality' in his The Social Contract and Discourses,(J.M.Dent and Sons, 1938).

inequality according to him consists of the different priviles which some men enjoy, to the prejudice of others such as that of being more rich, more honoured, more powerful, or even in a position to excert obedience.[8]

However, Rousseau's dichotomous view does not provide an all inclusive explanation of the phenomenon. It seems that he has overlooked the normative evaluations of the society which present biologically based inequalities as social inequalities. In fact, every society has its own cultural code, value systems and the systems of evaluation of normative pattern which provide the foundations for building structures of social inequality. The biologically based inequalities assume importance in many societies because of the meaning assigned to them. In fact, ".......Natural inequality is based on differences in quality, and qualities are not just there, so to say, in nature, they are as human beings have defined them, in different societies, in different historical epochs."[9] In reality they have social context and social base and, thus, it would be wrong to assume that natural inequality has nothing to do with social inequality. In the present inquiry the main focus is, however, on those inequalities which arise from the unequal distribution of wealth, power and

---

8. Quoted in Bottomore,T.B;Classes in Modern Society,(London: George Allen and Unwin, 1965), pp.15-16.
9. Beteille, Andre; Inequality Among Men,(Delhi: OUP, 1977),p.10.

prestige and which form the structural realitis of different societies.

Social stratification, hierarchy, class, status etc. are different forms of social inequality. These are used frequently in the study of social inequality with a great deal of overlap in their connotations. Thus, it is imperative to examine these concepts, though due to the ongoing debates and controversies around these, it may not be possible to provide a single and precise definition to each of them. However, some workable definitions of these may be sought in the light of available literature.

Generally, a distinction is made between social stratification and hierarchy. Dumont rejects the commonly adopted view of the Anglo-American writers that caste is a form of social stratification. He argues that the term hierarchy should be reserved for the analysis of Indian caste system because of the fact that hierarchy is a consciously organised principle and caste is an expression of that reality. On the other hand, stratification refers to the layers which are constructed by the sociologists on the basis of variable criteria. Insisting on this principle Dumont[11] makes a difference between the hierarchical order of Indian society and the layering of American society.

---

10. Dumont,L; Homo-Hierarchicus,(Delhi: University Press, 1970), pp. 239-358.
11. Ibid, pp.231-238.

Homo - Hierarchicus.

He treats the Indian social order as homo-hierarchicus(based on hierarchical principle) and the American system as homo-Acqualis (based on egalitarian principles). Thus, the term social stratification refers to the existence of different layers which are created on the basis of unequal positions occupied by the members in a society. The unequal distribution of wealth, power and prestige provides the basis for the creation of different layers or strata in a society. The members of one stratum generally have a common awareness, common identity, common life styles and common life chances. However, this also depends upon their class positions.

The term 'class' has got different connotations in the writings of sociologists and social scientists. In the classical Marxism the term 'class' is different from that of the liberal perspectives. Moreover, the treatment of class as a category in neo-Marxist thesis differs from classical Marxism. It is interesting to note that the distinction is also made between class and stratification. In French tradition class is opposed to stratification because of the fact that the former is an analytical and dynamic category whereas the latter is descriptive and static one.[12] But in the English tradition class is not opposed to

12. Dahrendorf, Ralph; Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society,(Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1959), p.76.

stratification but is a form of it.

It is, however, important to note here that class is different from status. Classes are generally defined in terms of economic criteria whereas statuses or status groups are considered as the expression of unequal esteem, honour and prestige.[13] Bottomore clearly writes:

> The differences, broadly is between a hierarchy of organised or partly organised economic groups whose relations to each other are antagonistic, and a hierarchy of groups, more correctly described as aggregates of individuals of equal social prestige based on similarities which are not primarily antagonistic but are partly competetive and partly emulative.....[14]

Dahrendorf also shares the similar view where he asserts that,

> class is always a category for the purpose of analysis of social conflict and its structural roots, and as such it has to be separated strictly from stratum as a category for the purpose of describing hierarchical systems at a given point of time.[15]

It seems logically convincing that class and status are two distinct categories. But it is wrong to assume that the relationship between two status groups is always of harmony and co-operation. The whole exposition shows that these terms have separate

---

13. Weber, Max; 'Class, Status and Party', in Bendix,R and Lipset, S.M (eds.); Class, Status and Power: Stratification in Comparative Perspective,(New York: Free Press, 1966), p.21-28.
14. Bottomore, T.B; op cit., pp.58-59.
15. Dahrendorf, Ralph; op cit., p.76.

connotations but they are basically manifestations of the same reality, i.e., social inequality.

The conceptualization of social inequality is also debatable and a subject of controversy. Marx's explanation can be regarded as a watershed in the analysis of social inequality, as for him social inequality can always be understood in terms of society's socio-economic formation. He also states that every type of social inequality is basically a manifestation and reflection of such formation. He further argues that every historically known societies, except the primitive communism, are divided into classes based on the existence of "private property" and "social division of labour".

However, this position has been challenged by Dahrendorf[16] besides several others, who holds the view that the root cause of social inequality is the unequal distribution of power and position in the authority structure. In general, we understand by 'power' the chance of a man or a number of men to realize their own will in a communal action ever against the resistence of others who are participating in action.[17] Runcimen also accepts the multidimensional analysis of social reality in general and social inequality in particular appears as more

---

16. Dahrendorf, op cit.
17. Weber, Max (1966); op cit., p.21.

logical and comprehensive though the same may not be universally applicable. In every societies there may be the tendency of dispersal. In the traditional Indian society, for instance, there was almost complete congruence between wealth, power and prestige but over a time the situation has slightly changed.[18]

However, Troyna[19] argues that "this is a political and policy choice influenced, to a significant extent, by the way in which the core concept 'equality' is understood in the educational context. As Lyn Yates[20] has pointed out, for some theorists and researchers the basis for intervention stems from an understanding of inequality primarily in terms of 'disadvantage'. Yates has suggested that from this perspective: Inequality was measured by success in school, post-school status and earnings etc. This was liberal rather than radical definition of the problem in that the question was how to distribute achievements more evenly within the existing system.

Although, to Troyna, no single or coherent meaning of equality (or inequality) in education prevails, it seems to him that Yates is wrong to consign this particular conceptual

18. Beteille,A; Caste, Class and Power: Changing Pattern of Stratification in a Tanjore Village,(Bombay: OUP, 1969), pp. 1-18 and 185-225.
19. Troyna, Bary(ed.); Racial Inequality in Education,(London: Tavistock Publication, 1987), p.3.
20. Yates, L; 'Theorizing Inequality Today', British Journal of Sociology of Education, 7(2),(1986), pp. 119-34.

framework to the annals of history. The conception of inequality

in these terms continues to give rise to incrementalist approaches

to change which characterize, if not dominate, a number of current

anti-sexist and anti-racist policies and initiatives. In

Jenniter Hochschild's words 'incrementalism' implies focusing [21]

on those few problems that present themselves as urgent needs

rather than on many features of a system that could probably

be improved but seem to function adequately at the moment. If

we accept this definition, then, it is possible to identify a ra-

nge of contemporary initiatives which conform to the model

'Inequality as disadvantage, but which operate under both liberal

and radical guises. Essentially, they represent liberal, or what

Crosland defines as 'weak' version of 'equality of opportunity'

which are incrementalist in nature. They demand a greater or less-

er extent of manipulation of resources, provision, organization,

and priorities within the existing meritocratic and highly competi-

tive structure of the educational system. Naturally, the techniques

of manipulation may and do differ. As Nick Jewson and David Mason [22]

have indicated in their discussion of equal opportunities,

policies, there are those subscribing to 'liberal' traditions who

21. Hochschild, J; The New American Dilemma: Liberal Democracy and School Desegregation,(New Haven: Yale University Press,1984), p.79.
22. Jewson,N and Mason,D; 'The Theory and Practice of Equal Opportunities Policies: Liberal and Radical Approaches', The Sociological Review 34(2) (1986), pp.307-34.

favour the establishment of 'fair procedures'. In an educational context this approach adheres and gives credence to the merito-cratic ideal as legitimate.

MERITOCRACY

Thus, for a proper understanding of and explanation for the existence of inequalities in educational opportunity it is necessary to counter the meritocratic arguments justifying such inequalities. This necessitated a demonstration of the fact that absolute justification of merit in educational recruitments is only a rationalization. This is so because the socalled merit is itself a cumulative product of certain non-academic and socio-economic factors. Here, we are immediately reminded of Michael Young's[23] 'The Rise of Meritocracy, 1870-2033'. The theme is the transformation of English society, by the turn of the twenty-first century, owing to the victory of the principle of achievement over that of ascription. For centuries, the elite position in the society had been held by the children of the nobi-lity on the hereditary principle of succession. But in the nature of modern society, "the rate of social progress depend on the degree to which power is matched with intelligence". The post-industrial

---

23. Young,M; <u>The Rise of Meritocracy</u>, 1870-2033,(London: 1958)

society, in its initial logic, is a meritocracy. Differential status and differential income are based on technical skills and higher education. By the logic of a meritocracy, these high-scoring individuals, no matter where they are in the society, should be brought to the top in order to make the best use of their talents. This is the basis of the liberal theory of equality of opportunity. But, the resulting meritocracy, instead of cutting across the ascriptive factors, inequality and stratification, as had been speculated by Young in his satirical analysis of the rise of meritocracy over a century in England, tends to superimpose itself and reinforce them.

REDEFINITION OF MERITOCRACY

Thus, the justification of the existence and perpetuation of a meritocratic system in which admissions are said to be based solely on 'merit', and which individualize failure (Berustein)[24] seems to be a clever strategy for social closure (Parkin)[25] and elite perpetuation. It legitimizes inequality and makes its continued existence acceptable as a kind of safety

---

24. Bernstein, B; 'Social Class and Linguistic Development: A Theory of Social Learning' in A.H.Habey, Floud & Anderson (eds.): Education, Economy and Society: A Reader in the Sociology of Education, (New York: The Free Press, 1961), pp.288-314.
25. Parkin,F.(ed.); The Social Analysis of Class-Structure, (London: Tavistock), pp.1-18.

valve (Eutwiztle,[26] Parkin,[27] and Bourdieu[28]).

How the meritocratic principle masks the mechanism of social reproduction has been outlined by Bourdieu[29] with great insight, and he is worth quoting in full here:

> By giving individuals educational aspirations strictly tailored to their position in the social hierarchy, and by operating a selection procedure, endorses real inequalities, schools help both to perpetuate and legitimize inequalities. By awarding allegedly impartial qualifications for socially conditioned aptitudes which it treats as unequal 'gifts', it transform de facto inequalities into de jure ones and economic and social differences into distinctions of quality, and legitimates the transmission of the cultural heritage. In doing so, it is performing a confidence trick. Apart from enabling the elite to justify being what it is, the ideology of giftedness, the cornerstone of the whole educational and social system, helps to enclose the underpriviledged classes in the roles which society has given them by making them see as natural inability things which are only a result of an interior social status, and by persuading them that they owe their social fate to their individual nature and their lack of gifts. By giving cultural inequalities an endorsement which formally at least is in keeping with democratic ideals, it provides the best justification for these inequalities.

---

26. Eutwiztle,H; <u>Class, Culture and Education</u>,(London: Methuen,1978), p.11.
27. Parkin,F; <u>Class Inequality and Political Order: Social Stratification in Capitalist and Communist Societies</u>,(Granada: Frogmore, St. Albans, 1972), p.49.
28. Bourdieu,P; 'Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction', in Brown,R (ed.); <u>Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change: Papers in the Sociology of Education</u>,(London: Tavistock, 1973),pp.71-112.
29. Bourdieu, P; 'The School as a Conservative Force: Scholastic and Cultural Inequalities', in Eggleston,J (ed.); <u>Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education</u>,(London: Mathuen,1974), pp. 32-46.

DESCHOOLING

From a different direction there has come another attack on the idea of meritocracy: the argument that all schooling is being subordinated to the demands of technocratic thinking and that the school is assuming a disproportionate influence in the society. The argument is made most sharply by Ivan Illich.[30] The hidden curriculum teaches all children that economically valuable knowledge is the result of professional teaching and that social entitlements depend on the rank achieved in a bureaucratic process. The hidden curriculum transforms the explicit curriculum into a commodity and makes its acquisition the securest form of wealth. Knowledge certificates - unlike property rights, corporate stock or family inheritance - are free from challenges......School is universally accepted as the avenue to greater power, to increased legitimacy as a producer, and to further learning resources.

Illich makes a distinction between schooling and education. Schooling is an instrument that enables a person to accumulate a "knowledge-stock", just as business once allowed individuals to accumulate a "capital stock".[31] Education is the

---

30. Illich, Ivan; 'After Deschooling, what?' Social Policy,(Sept-Oct 1971), p.7.
31 Illich, I; 'Deschooling Society'(Harmondsworth: Penguin,1973).

"free determination by each teacher of his own reason for living and learning - the part that his knowledge is to play in his life". Since schooling has become completely instrumental, and a barrier to education, one must eliminate schools and create a process whereby each person can pursue the education he wants and needs.

For Illich, schooling creates a new hierarchy in which the hierophants of knowledge maintain their position by arcane and technical knowledge that is closed off from the rest of society.[32] "Effective access" to education requires a radical denial of the right of facts and complexity of tools on which contemporary technocracies found their privilege, which they, in turn, render immune by interpreting its use as a service to the majority.

In place of institution - which only develop vested interests to maintain the privileges of its administrators - Illich would substitute "learning webs" made up of skill-exchanges, peer-matching and Educators-at-large, intellectual sadhus or gurus, wandering scholars, available at call. There would be no compulsory attendance, no credentials, just education pair in the street bazzars of teaching. And all of it financed by the

---

32. Illich, Ivan; 'After Deschooling, What?, 'Social Policy, (Sept-Oct, 1971), p.13.

tax money hitherto spent on the schools.[33]

The question, however, is whether this changed relationship requires the deschooling of society or a very different conception of education and schooling. Illich is a romantic Rousseauian. His picture is drawn from Emile, and has the same farrago of rhetoric, the emphasis on the "authority of being" - those curt words of modernity which can never be defined.

Having gone through the literatures on the concept of equality and meritocracy, it can be argued that both the concepts need the redefinition of it. There has never been clear-cut meaning to equality and meritocracy. The earliest form of the idea of equality in the seventeenth century was quite different than what it assumed in its popular form by the third decade of the nineteenth century. A curious blend of Roman republican imagery and the Lockean thinking - since both emphasised agrarian virtues and labour - informed their language. But in the very use of Lockean language there was an implicit commitment to a hierarchy - the hierarchy of intellect.

The singular changeover was symbolized by the "Jaksonian persuasion" to use Markn Mager's phrase. This is what gives point to the thinking observations of Tocqueville in "Democracy in America".

---

33. Wollheim,R; 'Ivan Illich', The Listener (16 December 1971),p.826.

What is at stake today is the redefinition of
equality. A principle which was the weapon for changing a vast
social system, the equality of opportunity, is now seen as leading
to a new hierarchy and the current demand is that the "just prece-
dence" of society, in Locke's phrase, requires the reduction of all
inequality, or the creation of equality of result in income,
status,and power for all men in society.

As a principe, equality of opportunity denies the
precedence of birth, of nepotism, of patronage or any other criter-
ion which allocates place, other than fair competition open
equally to talent and ambition. It asserts, in the terms of
persons, universalism over particularism, achievement over as-
cription. It is an ideal derived directly from the Enlightenment
as codified by Kant, the principle of individual merit generalized
as a categorical imperative. Thus, there occurred a complete social
revolution: a change in the social base of status and power, and
a new mode of access to place and privilege in the society. Bell[34]
argues that the post-industrial society, in this dimension of
status and power, is the logical extension of the meritocracy;
it is the codification of a new social order based, in principle,
on the priority of educated talent.

---

34. Bell, Daniel; The Coming of Post-Industrail Society (New York:
    Basic Books, 1976).

The meritocracy is thus the displacement of one principle of stratification by another, of achievement for ascription. In the past this was the progressive meaning of liberation. The new principle was considered just. Men were to be judged - and rewarded - not by attributes of birth or primordial ties but on individual merit. Today that principle is held to be the new source of inequalities and of social and psychological injustice.

JUSTICE OF RESULTS

Many sociological and philosophical objections to the meritocracy have been put forth by many scholars. We will discuss some of them, and John Rawls[35] is one of them. Here it is necessary to point out that if Rousseau sought equality of result for the sake of virtue, and Mill equal representation proportionate to one's interest for the purpose of utility, the contemporary philosopher John Rawls to establish the priority of equality for reason of justice. As he elegantly declares, "Justice is the first virtue of social institutions, as truth is of system of thought".

Then what is justice to Rawls? It cannot be the greatest good for the greatest number, for the price of those

---

35. Rawls, John; A Theory of Justice, (Cambridge, Mass, 1971),p.3.

magnitudes may be injustice for the lesser number. It has to be a distributive principle for judging competing claims - i.e., the appropriate division of social advantages. For Rawls, this is justice as fairness,[36] and the foundation of fairness rests, initially, on two principles:

First: Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others.

Second: Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both (a) reasonably expected to be everyone's advantage, and (b) attached to positions and offices open to all.

It is with the second principle that we are concerned. The controlling terms in the propositions are the phrases "to everyone's advantage" and "equally open to all". Rawls rejects the idea of a meritocracy. Although meritocratic idea is democratic, it violates the conception of fairness:

The (meritocratic) social order follows the principle of careers open to talents and uses equality of opportunity as a way of releasing men's energies in the pursuit of economic prosperity and political domination. There exists a marked disparity

---

36. Ibid, p.12.
37. Ibid, p.60.

between the upper class and lower classes in both means of life and the rights and privileges of organizational authority. Thus a meritocratic society is a danger for the other interpretations of the principles of justice but not the democratic conception.[38]

We have here a fundamental rationale for a major shift in values: instead of the principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his ability", we have the principle, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need." And the justification for need is fairness to those who are disadvantaged for reasons beyond their control.

With Rawls, we have the most comprehensive effort in modern philosophy to justify a socialist ethic. In this redefinition of equality as equity, we can observe the development of a political philosophy which will do far to shape the last part of the twentieth century.

Today we have come to the end of classic liberalism. It is not individual stratification which is the measure of social good but redress for the disadvantaged as a prior claim on the social conscience and on social policy. Rawls' effort in a theory of justice is to establish the principle of fairness, but

38. Ibid, p.107.

he pays little attention, other than using the genetic term 'dis-
advantaged' to who is to be helped.

EDUCATION AND ITS RELATIONSHIP WITH
OTHER DIMENSIONS OF INEQUALITY

Now that we have finished the existing theoretical
debate on education and equality, we are in a position to look
into the impact of various facets of inequality, both tradition-
al and modern, achieved and ascribed on the degree of access to
education.

EDUCATION AND CASTE

Firstly we will discuss caste and its bearing on
the access to educational opportunity. As has been said earlier,
traditionally, the social structure of Indian society has been
vertical and unidimensional. That is, in the traditional system
there was some measures of association and linkage between caste
system and socio-economic status. By and large, members of the
higher castes such as Brahmins, and others exercised control over
both land and the political system, In describing the corresponde-
nce between caste and landownership in Kerala, M.N.Srinivas[39]
writes: "At the top of the hierarchy were the Nambutri Brahmins
who were non-cultivating owners, the 'high' Nayar castes were

39. Srinivas, M.N; 'Social Structure', The Gazetteer of India,
     Vol.1,(New Delhi, 1965), p.511.

the non-cultivating leyess of Nambutri land on twelve-year
leases. The agricultural labourers, both tied and free, came from
the lower castes like Cheruman and Pulayan and from the Pariah
tribes". In Madhopur, a village in Eastern Uttar Pradesh studied
by Bernard Cohn,[40] the high caste Thakurs, forming 24 percent of the
population, enjoyed social, economic and political dominance over
the more numerous but lower status Noniyas and untouchable Chamars
until the 1940s. Bailey's[41] study of the upward mobility of the
Boad outcastes of Orissa also found that in nineteenth century
Orissa, "the division of wealth and political power followed the same
lines as caste divisions, and the hierarchy in these fields app-
roximated the ritual hierarchy." It means, caste values virtually
influenced each and every aspect of social life including an access
to education.

Studies conducted on castes after Independence show
that the upper caste families (Brahmins especially) continue to be
at the top of the hierarchy. Noet,P.Gist[42], in his study, explored
the proposition that caste differentials are associated with
specific differentials in other aspects of South Indian society.
From his data it could be seen that in the Mysore Sample, 80 percent
of the Brahmins and 40 percent of the backward castes and scheduled

40. Cohn,B; 'Changing Status of Depressed Castes' in M.Maniot (ed.)
    Village India,(American Anthropological Association, 1955).
41. Bailey,F.G., Caste and the Economic Frontier (Bombay: 1958),
    pp. 184-85.
42. Gist,N.P; 'Caste Differentials in South India', American Socio-
    logical Review, 19 April, 1954, p.129.

castes, respectively, were distributed in four prestigious occupational categories (professional, managerial, business and clerical). This shows that the first two caste groups are more educated and more upwardly mobile than others. Edwin Driver[43] also recorded that about 80, 82 and 64 percent of rural and 87, 65 and 80 percent of urban samples of Brahmins, other high castes and trading castes were distributed in four occupations (Land-owning, professional, management and commercial). Sovani[44] observed in a survey of the pattern of employment in Poona city in 1954 that nearly 70 percent of salaried posts and the higher professions were occupied by Brahmins. In contrast, the largest contribution to the unskilled labourer's class came from the Marathas and ex-untouchables. On the whole Brahmins showed a uniform concentration in occupations where education and training were at a premium.

Data furnished by Subrahmaniam[45] showed that although the traditional monopoly of the civil services by Brahmins has been decreasing, they are still over-presented in them. To quote Gist[46], "High caste individuals, while free to make vocational

43. Driver,E; 'Caste and Ocupational Structure in Central India', Social Forces,(Dec, 1963), p.29.
44. Sovani, et al: Poona: A Resurvey,(Poona: Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, 1956).
45. Subrahmaniam,S.V., Social Background of India's Administrators, Pub. Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting,GOI,1971.
46. Gist,N.P; 'Caste Differentials in South India', A.S.R.,(19 April, 1954).

choices within the limits of the respectable and dignified occupations, are commonly unwilling to accept employments at tasks involving physical labour. Hence, the inter-occupational mobility of the upper castes tends to be mainly into the non-manual jobs".

It seems obvious that caste is a system of stratification in which the status of the individual is determined by his birth and ritual purity. Thus an important feature of the caste system is the association between caste status and the status of the ritual purity of the ocupation chosen. In the traditional Indian society, each caste or varna was supposed to provide an ocupation in conformity with its ritual status. According to Olcott[47], for instance, caste not only prescribes for each person a hereditary ocupation but also discourages his attempts to surmount the ocupational barriers existing for his group. Similarly, Ghurye[48] says, "generally a caste or a group of allied castes considered some of the callings as its hereditary ocupation, to abandon which in pursuit of another, though it might be more lucrative, was thought not to be right."

47. Olcott,M; 'The Caste Sysyem of India', American Sociological Review ,(9 Dec, 1944).

48. Ghurye,G.J; Caste, Class and Ocupation,(Bombay: Popular, 1961), p.15.

discrimination' with a view to uplift the social and economic status of these underprivileged groups, mainly by providing greater concessions in education and by reserving 15 percent of the posts in government services for them.

N.Jayaram[52] argues that it is easy to understand how the palliative of protective discrimination and th illusion of social mobility created by it are adopted by the ruling class to wean away and absorb the ablest elements among the scheduled castes. Thus, protective discrimination is an effective instrument of social control of groups which could otherwise prove to be potentially disruptive.

Recent studies carried out in different parts of the country, on certain specific problems relating to untouchables such as their economic and social condition and educational progress, indicate that there has not been much change.[53] But Ramaswamy[54], in her paper after some years, says that, "the growth of literacy and the emergence of a small stratum of educated elite bears testimony to the ability of Harijans to take advantage of the reservation policy and improve their social and economic condition. The continuation of

52. Jayaram,N; 'Fresh Look at Harijan Question', Mainstream, 19(38), pp. 10-14.
53. Mahar,M.J; The Untouchables in Contemporary India,(Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1972);
   - Ramaswamy,V; 'Sceduled Castes in Andhra: Some Aspects of Social Change', EPW, 9(29),(1974), pp.1153-58.
54. Ramaswamy,V; 'Education and Inequality' EPW, Vol.XX, No.36,(1985), pp. 1523-28.

protectionist policy could eventually make them ocupationally and economically quite indistinguishable from any other caste.

EDUCATION AND CLASS

From the above discussion it is amply clear that cast has a bearing upon socio-economic factors and in turn on education. Likewise, class as a dimension of inequality also determines an accessibility to education. Class as an aspect of social stratification is in one sense a system of institutionalized social inequality that perpetuates a structure of privileges from generation to generation. It should be stressed that membership of a high social class carries real social advantages, such as better ocupations, living conditions, as well as greater leisure, prestige and power. In effect, such membership means greater returns for less effort.[55] Society offers to its elites such rewards as: (I) Preferential treatment in sustenance and comfort, (II) honour, (III) self respect and opportunity for ego-expansion.

Social stratification thus involves different "life-chances" for the various groups in the society. In other words, one's life chances influence one's attitudes, perceptions and aspirations. For example, individuals with better social and economic status have the chance of acquiring an advanced education and of

---

55.Tumin,N.M; 'Rewards and Task Orientation', American Sociological Review,(22 April, 1955).
56. Davis and Moore; 'Some Principles of Stratification', American Sociological Review, 10: (April, 1945), pp.242-49.

rising to higher positions. There is a positive relationship between class and education.[57] Many research works have been carried out by western scholars as well as Indian. We shall first examine some of the major works by western scholars.

Hollingshed[58] set out to study the social behaviour of high school adolescents in Elmtown Home state, Middle Western USA, during the school year 1941-42, to determine whether the observed behaviour of the adolescends was related to the position their families occupied in the community's social structure. Hollingshed concluded that class values and patterns of behaviour, working through the family and neighbourhood subpcultures, not only set the stage upon which the child acts, but they also provide him with ways of acting and with definition of action.

Sewell and associates[59] tested the hypothesis that "levels of educational and ocupational aspirations of youth of both sexes are associated with the socail status of their families, when the effect of intelligence is controlled". The findings of the study strongly supported the hypothesis of association between social class and aspiration. Similar findings have been recorded by

57. Sharma,K.L; The Changing Rural Stratification System,(Orient Loyman, 1974), p.116.
58. Hollingshed, A.B; Elmtowns Youth,(New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc, 1949), pp. 205 - 10.
59. Sewell, Haller and Protes; 'The Educational and Early Ocupational Attainment Process', ASR, 34: 82-92, 1969.
Sewell

several other scholars.[60]

The above studies thus led to two findings: one,
class, status affects the perceptions of individuals, and two,
one's perception of adult roles is the result of one's socialisation.

B.G.Desai[61] has made a descriptive study of high
school students in Baroda District. In doing this the author
has looked into the social background from which the youth came;
their sociographic features; the way they behaved and thought about
themselves, their guardians and others, and their habits and
aspirations. The objective of the study was to find out to what
extent the social structural factors such as caste, class, rural-
urban background determined access to high school education.

Vimal Shah, Tara Patel and W.Sewell[62] undertook a
study of social class and educational aspirations of high school
students of Ahmedabad. The main objective of the study was to
examine the relationship of socio-economic status to educational

60. Hyman,H.H; 'The Value System of Different Classes: A Social
    Psychological contribution to the Analysis of
    in Bendix & Lipset(ed.);Class,Status and Power,(The Free Press,1953);
    - Lipset,S.M; 'Social Mobility and Urbanization', Rural Sociology,
    20, 1956;
    - Lipset and Bendix; Social Mobility in Industrial Society,(Heinemann,
    1959).
61. Desai,B.G; The Emerging Youth,(Bombay: Popular Prakashan,1987).

62. Shah, Patel & Sewell; 'Social Class and Educational Aspirations in
    an Indian Metropolis', Sociological Bulletin, 20: 113-33, 1971.

aspirations, controlling for academic performance, for males and females separately. The findings reveal that there was a positive relationship between the level of aspiration and social class status, when the effect of sex was controlled.

Gore, Desai and Clituis,[63] reporting in 'Field Studies in the Sociology of Education' based on a survey of teachers and students conducted in with different States on a co-ordinating committee. The main objective of the survey was to study the social background of the students and teachers in terms of their caste, religion, father's education and ocupation and rural-urban residence with a view to assess the extent to which the constitutional goal, i.e., equality of opportunity had been achieved. Rich children from middle class white-collar homes enrol in larger proportion than children from other ocupational groups! The data showed that there was a differential access to education in terms of one's social background.

Karuna Ahmed[64] studied women college students. The objective of the study was to find out whether the social background in terms of caste and class determined access to higher education

63. Gore, Desai and Clituis: Field Studies in the Sociology of Education(All India Report),(New Delhi: NCERT, 1970).
64. Ahmed, K, 'Women's Education: Recruitment and Relevance', in Singh and Attbach(eds); The Higher Learning in India,(Bombay: Vikas, 1974).

and the relevance of higher education to women's potential role of wife and mother. The findings showed that the women students were largely drawn from the upper castes and classes and urban background.

Rajgopalan and Singh's[65] study showed that the IITs were engaged in producing what might be termed as a class of potential elite which was itself being recruited from the higher strata of society almost to the exclusion of the lower strata.

<div align="center">EDUCATION AND SEX, FAMILY STATUS
AND RURAL URBAN DIFFERENCE</div>

Like caste and class, the other variables determine the educability of the groups are family class status, sex, rural-urban difference, religion and public and private school. We shall deal these variables very briefly.

The family gives children an opportunity to observe many adult roles some of which are ocupational. Ocupational perception and choosing a career is very greatly influenced by families. Eventhough much ocupational acitivity is greatly separated from families, the family style of life is influenced by the ocupation of the householder.

Smeber[66] has shown that adolescent and adult personality variables are a function of the family's socio-economic

---

65. Rajgopalan and Singh; The IIT - Do they contribute to social mobility? EPW, 9,29), 1974, pp.1153-58.
66. Smelser, W.T; "Adolescent and Adult Ocupational Choice as a Function of Family Socio-Economic History', Sociometry 26, 1963, pp.399-513.

history during the sons development years. Simpson,[67] however, found that among boys aspiring to higher ocupations, the proportion of those whose parents had advised them to enter the professions was much higher than the proportion of such among lower aspirers. The enquiry by Martin[68] among fathers about the ocupation they would like for their sons showed that family tradition was most important for professional groups and declined in influence with social class. The upshot of all these findings is that, those young people who identify with the ocupational sub-culture of their parental generation are thereby directed, limited, and advantaged by their family experience.[69]

The role and status of men and women in any society is defined by the cultural ideology, the normative system of beliefs and values, which the society has developed over a period of time. Traditionally the role and status of women have been lower than those of men. The main role of women had been that of bearing and rearing children. Even in the matrilineal societies women never wielded any real power and authority

67. Simpson,R.R; 'Parental Influence, Anticipatory Socialization and Social Mobility', ASR, Vol.XXVII, 1962.
68. Marlin,

69. Weinstein,E.A; 'Children's Conception of Ocupational Stratification', Sociology and Social Research, 4, (March-April 1958),p.278.

although the property was transmitted through women.

"In practically all societies, whether patrilineal or matrilineal, women have, in fact, a lower status than men".[70]

The Indian society mainly defines the role identities of women in terms of marriage and children. Cormack's[71] study sought to discover how Indian girls internalized the traditional feminine role. Girls are trained in social relationships rather than in autonomy over their bodies. "Girls who have superior intelligence and strong motivation to pursue higher education are faced with a dilemma because parents and other well-wishers try to persuade them that higher education ruins their chances of getting married.[72] A.D.Ross[73] shows that most young Hindu girls of the middle and upper classes are still educated with a view to marriage rather than to career. However, a number of parents were anxious to have their daughters attend universities. And college is one way of 'keeping them busy' until marriage.[74] Here the contradiction is obvious. It has been held that enlightened womanhood is one of the

70. Beteille, A; 'The Position of Women in Indian Society' in D.Jain (ed.); Indian Women,(M.I.B., Govt of India, Pub. Division, 1975),p.64.
71. Cormack, M.L; The Hindu Women,(Columbia: Columbia Univ. Press, 1953).
72. Sindhu, Phadke.

73. Ross,A.D; The Hindu Family in its Urban Setting,(Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961).
74. Ahmed, K; op cit.

prerequisites for 'modernization'.[75] But the under-representation

of women at all educational levels seems to be an ubiquitous

feature of the educational systems of developing areas.[76]

Alongwith all these determinants, the urban

bias of the Indian educational system is well known and manife-

sts itself in various ways.[77] Jayaram concludes that students

in higher and professional education tend predominantly to come

from schools which are considered to have a higher standard and

status. This seem to be more true in the case of medical

students than that of research scholars or post-graduate stude-

nts.

Therefore, it is clear that 'public school' and

English medium school students are in an advantageous position

in gaining admission to higher and professional education. Since

the social background of students operates as a selective factor

in their admission to qualitatively different types of education-

al institutions,[78] and as it is only a minority of the higher

75. Mc.Clelland,D.C; The Achieving Society,(Princeton, New Jersy: D. van Hostrand, 1961), pp. 399-401.
76. Foster,P; 'Access to Schoolong', in D.Adams(ed.); Education in National Development,(London: R&K.P, 1971), pp.13-33.
77. Jayaram,N; 'Urbanization and Educational Growth: Some Reflections on the Indian Experience',(Madras Institute of Development Studies, (, 14(12)), pp.5115-39.
78. Rao,M.S.A; 'Education, Social Stratification and Mobility', in Gore, Desai and Clituis (ed.) Papers in the Sociology of Education in India,(New Delhi: NCERT), pp. 127-46.

higher stratum of society which goes through the 'public schools' and English medium education.[79] Its role in perpetuating the privileges of a few people becomes clear.

Thus, the relationship between education and caste and class can be described in the words of Victor,S.D'Souza: (a) the lower the position of persons in the caste and the ocupational hierarchy, the higher is the degree of their illiteracy, (b) the lower the positions of persons in the caste and ocupational hierarchy, the lower is the amount of their education, (c) the lower the position of persons in the caste and ocupational hierarchy, the lower is the quality of their education.[80]

We can say that despite all the attempts both formal and informal to curb their near monopoly in the domain of education, the people who are on the higher echelons of caste, class, and other means of modern society still continues to be the dominant section in the academic world. The progess of education among the lower castes, especially the scheduled castes, seem to be painfully slow and halting.[81]

79. De Souza,A; Indian Public Schools: A Sociological Study,(New Delhi: Sterling, 1974). pp. 236-46.
80. De Souza,V.S; 'Education, Social Structure and Democracy in India', in Ruhela,S.P; Social Determinants of Educability in India, p. 19.
81. Chitnis,S; A Long Way to Go: Report on a Survey of Scheduled Caste High School and College Students in Fifteen States of of India,(New Delhi: Allied, 1981). pp. 12-37, 38-72.

Chapter IV

EDUCATION   AND   MOBILITY :
MYTH   AND   TADPOLE   PHILOSOPHY

In the modern industrially advanced societies
formal education and ocupation are intimately linked with each
other. With industrailization and urbanization, the advance of
science and technology, education in the western societies became
increasingly differentiated from the family and came to be
associated with economic and ocupational systems. Schelsky[1]
has described the way in which science and technology have influe-
nced the amount and kind of skill required of the labour force, and
the changes which the future are likely to bring about. He shows
that the proportion engaged in manual work has declined and the
proportion in white-collar and professional and mangerial jobs has
risen. As a result "the diffusion of literacy, the growth in the
number and size of schools and colleges and universities and
substantial changes in the content and methods of education were
closely linked with the development of modern industry, and the
social changes that accompanied it."[2]

EDUCATION AS A MEANS OF MOBILITY

Whether education promotes ocupational mobility or
not, depends upon the extent to which formal educational qualifications

1. Schelsky,H; 'Technical Change and Educational Consequences', in
   Habey, et al.: Education, Economy and Society,(Heinemann, 1961),414-20.
2. Chinoy,E; Society: An Introduction to Sociology,(New York: Random
   House, 1967), p.386.

are a enecessary requirement for positions of high status. Studies

of ocupational mobility have demonstrated the important part

played by education. For example, Glan's[3] study in Britain

showed quite clearly the advantages of a grammar school educa-

tion for those of working class or lower middle class origin. They

were much more likely to be socially mobile than those who had

received no more than an elementary education. Similar findings

have been reported for the United States.[4]

To demonstrate that education is a factor in ocupati-

onal mobility is not, however, to say that it is the only or the

most important factor. Anderson[5], for example, argues that "while

education certainly influences a man's chances to move upward or

downward, only a relatively modest part of all mobility is linked to

education."

In the context of Indian society it may be asked

whether higher education, except professional and technical which is

not exclusively geared to ocupational training, can be considered

as a pre-requisite for modern ocupation. While it is true that

---

3. Glass,D.V.(Ed); Social Mobility in Britain,(London: Routledge and Kegan Paul), Chapter X, pp.291-307. 1954.
4. Centers,R; 'Education and Ocupational Mobility', American Sociological Review, Vol.XIV, Feb 1949, pp.143-44.
5. Anderson,A.C; 'A Skeptical Note on Education and Mobility', in Habey and Others(ed.); Education, Economy and Society,(The Free Press of Glencoe & Inc, 1961), pp. 164-79.

education at present in India or elsewhere does not prepare

students for any specific ocupation, except professional/technical

ones, a certain level of degrees has become imperative for recrui-

tment to most of the ocupations, especially in organised sectors

such as government, industries etc. The Education Commission

notes, "the disappearance of the old 'job value' attached to

primary education which makes secondary education the 'minimum'

and higher education the 'optimum' qualification for any worthwhile

job."[6]

Now, before we go into the great deal of literature,

it is important to say few words about mobility itself. As is well

known, the term 'social mobility' refers to "the process by which

individuals move from one position to another in society - positions

which by general consent have been given specific hierarchical

values." The study of mobility thus involves an analysis of 'moveme-

nt of individuals from positions possessing a certain rank to posi-

tions either higher or lower in the social system.'[7] It is 'rank

to position higher' we are concerned about here. Keeping in mind

this very meaning of mobility, we face some important and immediate

questions. To what extent the formal education is facilitating

social mobility? What role does social inequality play in social

---

6. The Education Commission Report.

7. Lipset,S.M and Bendix,R; <u>Social Mobility in Industrial Society</u>,
   (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959), pp.197-99.

mobility? What role do caste and class play in it? Is mobility a myth or conservative ideology?

It is with this background of questions we will try to understand the problem both theoretically and empirically carried out by scholars in western as well as Indian contexts. First, we will deal with western experience.

WESTERN EXPERIENCE

The postulates underlying the thesis of a positive relationship between education and upward social mobility may be briefly summarized as follows. The urban industrial societies of the west are open, at least in theory. That is, the stratification system in these societies rely on achievement rather than ascriptive criteria in determining the social positions and privileges of individuals. Occupation becomes the main, if not the sole,basis of social stratification:

On the one hand, the occupation of an individual will reflect his education, values, and previous personal associates; on the other hand, it will strongly influence his current personal associates, income, job security, working conditions, the wealth which he can accumulate, and the life style which he can afford and choose.........The occupations themselves will contribute to the social honour bestowed upon the ocupant, independently of these other more specific dimensions of economic and status

power which the occupations may reflect and produce.[8]

Thus, the hierarchy of broad occupational categories is serviceable as a rough and ready guide to overall differences in socio-economic positions, so far as the bulk of the population goes.

In such a 'credential society', as Collins[10] labels it, entry into a large range of occupations is restricted to those who have acquired the requisite qualifications. Generally, those at or near the apex of the occupational hierarchy will have more education than those at the bottom.[11] Data on more than sixty countries shows that a society's occupational differentiation exhibits substantial positive correlation with the level of education.[12]

Besides confering social status through occupational placement, education has a status value in itself, for it

8. Hopper,E; 'Notes on Stratification, Education and Mobility in Industrial Societies', in E.Hopper(ed.); Readings in the Theory of Educational Systems,(London: Hutchinson, 1971),pp.13-37.
9. Westergaard and Resler; Class in a Capitalist Society: A Study in Contemporary Britain,(London: Hainemann, 1975), p.288.
10. Collins,R; The Credential Society: An Historical Sociology of Education and Stratification,(New York: Academic Press, 1979)
11. Collins,R; 'Function and Conflict Theories of Educational Stratification', in Karabel and Habey (ed.); Power and Ideology in Education,(New York: OUP, 1977),pp.118-19.
12. Blau,P.M; 'Parameters of Social Structure', in P.M.Blau(ed.); Approaches to the Study of Social Structure,(London: Open Books, 1976), p.243.

has traditionally been a status symbol. This is what Harighurst[13] terms the 'symbolic' value of education, as different from its 'functional' value in the context of occupational placement and social mobility. Consequently, education becomes an indispensable adjunct even for those aspiring to acquire social status irrespective of the occupational hierarchy.

It is easy to conclude, therefore, that the more education, the more advantaged the class status; Depending on the starting point, education facilitates either upward social mobility or the maintenance of a favoured class position; lack of education brings on downward social mobility, or stability in a disadvantaged class position.[14]

As the educational system is the conduit of social mobility, other things remaining the same, the rate of growth of education can be considered as an indicator of vertical mobility.

Empirical support for this thesis is not wanting. Studies on social mobility in the west have highlighted the crucial role of education. Hall and Glan's[15] study in Britain and that of Cantey[16] in the U.S.A, though varying in details, substantially point to the same pattern:

---

13. Harighurst,R.J;'Education and Social Mobility in Four Societies' in Habey, Floud and Anderson (ed.); Education, Economy, and Society: A Reader in the Sociology of Education,(NY: The Free Press, 1961), p.113.
14. Rogott,N; 'American Public Schools and Equality of Opportunities', in Habey and Others(ed.); op cit., pp.140-47.
15. Hall and Glass 'Education and Social Mobility', in D.V.Glan(ed.); Social Mobility in Britain,(London:R&KP,1954),pp.291-307.
16. Centers,R; 'Education and Occupational Mobility',ASR, 14(2),1949, pp.143-44.

Within lower status groups a child is more likely to be socially mobile if he has a superior education, and at the same time, a superior education lessens the possibility of downward mobility for those in the higher status group.[17] In their major study of the American occupational structure, Blau and Dunean[18] have argued that "education exerts the strongest direct effect on 'occupational achievements' and that "most of the influences of social origins on occupational achievement is mediated by education and early experience". A more recent elaboration of this thesis is to be found in Sewell and Hanser's[19] extensive analysis of the achievements of a large sample of wisconsin men during the 10 years following their highschool graduation. On the basis of the available evidence, several scholars have foreseen educational achievement having a far greater impact on occupational achievement. The industrial and democratic society of the year 2000, Harighurst[20] predicts, will be even more open and fluid than the most highly industrialised societies today, so that education

17. Banks,O; The Sociology of Education,(London: B.T.Batsford, 1976).
18. Blau and Dunean; The American Occupational Structure(NY: John Wiley, 1967), p.403.
19. Sewell and Hanser: Education, Occupation, and Earnings: Achievement in the Early Career,(NY: Academic Press, 1975).
20. Havighurst,R.J;'Education and Social Mobility in Four Societies' in Habey and Others(ed.); op cit., p.105-20.

will be the main instrument for upward mobility and lack of education or failure to do well in one's education will be the principal cause of downward mobility.

And Husen[21] anticipates a 'learning society' where the educational credential will be democracy's substitute for ascriptive social prerogative.

The above thesis and the evidence adduced in its support have not, however, gone unchallenged. It was Anderson[22] who stuck perhaps the first sceptical note in his well known controversial paper. Reanalysing three separate sets of data concerning education and mobility in Britain, the United States and Sweden, he argued that "while education certainly influences a man's chances to move upward or downward, only a relatively modest part of all mobility is linked to education," and that the education is but one of many factors influencing mobility and it may be far from a dominant factor.

Anderson's scepticism has been echoed by Jencks and his associates.[23] Concluding their analysis of occupational inequality in America they observe that "while occupational status is

21. Husen,T; The Learning Society,(London: Methuen, 1979).
22. Anderson,C.A; 'A Skeptical Note on Education and Mobility', in Habey (ed.); op cit., pp.164-79.
23. Jencks and Others(ed.) Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America,(London: Allen Lane, 1973). pp. 191-99.

more closely related to educational attainment than to anything
else we can measure, there are still enormous status differences
among people with the same amount of education." They have drawn
attention to the part played by random factors, which they in-
appropriately called 'luck'.[24] It should be pointed out here that
neither Anderson nor Jencks and his associates deny the influence
of education on occupation, but they only emphasize its limitations
as the sole or complete explanation of differential occupational
achievement.

Boudon,[25] a French sociologist has contributed to this
line of thought. His understanding of this level of educational
attainment and mobility has led him to conclude : except under very
special conditions which are unlikely to be met, a highly meritocratic
society will not necessarily give to those who have reached a high
level of education more chances of promotion or fewer chances of
demotion than those whose level of eduation is lower. This paradox
is derived from two circumstances, according to him: first, since
those who obtain a high level of education more frequently have
a higher background, they have to climb still higher in the hierarchy

24. Ibid.
25. Boudon; R; Education, Opportunity and Social Inequality: Changing
    Prospects in Western Society,(New York: John Wiley, 1974),pp. 13-15.

of social status in order not to experience demotion. Second, one consequence of the discrepancy between educational and social structure is that even under a high degree of meritocracy, people with same level of education will reach different social status.

He contends, "even if a society has a strong tendency toward gaining the best social position to those who are better educated, education may have no apparent influence on mobility." Somewhere else he argued that "there is no reason to expect that a considerable increase in educational demand, which is occuring in industrial societies is connected to an increase in social mobility, even if accompanied as it certainly is, by a reduction in unequal educational opportunity."

We see that most of the evidences belies the dictum that education is the key in the process of upward social mobility, and tends to show that it is neither empirically nor logically true, or rather, that it is true only under very special conditions that are not likely to be ordinarily encountered. While this is the general view, the possibility of some individuals coming from a very poor background being able to improve their occupational status through educational achievement cannot be ruled out. In fact, such cases are only exceptions which prove the rule. On the other hand, what is more significant is the finding that the educational system is an important mechanism which contributes to the 'reproduction' of the existing social

structure,[26] and is guilty of legitimizing and perpetuating existing social inequalities.[27]

Among the several aspects of the role of education as an agency of social reproduction an important one is what is called 'unequal education' or inequality of educational opportunities, i.e., 'differences in level of educational attainment according to social background.[28] Sociological investigation in different countries have considerably demonstrated that inspite of a rapid growth in education the correlation between privileged family background and occupational achievement through education has not been reduced. In their introduction to the reader, 'Education, Economy and Society', Floud and Habey[29] observe,"there can be little doubt, indeed, that......educational inequalities became, in effect, fundamentally determinant of all social inequality." This was 61's position. After such a long time, the situation has remained the same.

---

26. Bowles and Gintis; <u>Schooling in Capitalist America</u>,(New York: Basic Books, 1976), p.150.
27. Boordieu; 'The School as a Conservative Force: Scholastic and Cultural Inequalities' in J.Eggleston; <u>Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education</u>,(London: Metheun, 1974),pp.32-46.
28. Boudon,R; <u>Education, Opportunity and Social Inequality: Changing Prospects in Western Society</u>,(New York: John Wiley, 1974),pp.21-24.
29. Floud and Habey; 'Introduction.....', op cit., pp.1-12.

INDIAN EXPERIENCE

This stagnant situation raises a series of unanswered questions, at least theoretically. Why has not expansion of education resulted in equality of opportunity? Can equality of opportunity be achieved without equality of socail conditions? This is not the problem particular about West, the more worse situation is prevalent in Indian society.

The traditional Indian society, characterised by the caste system is generally referred to as a typical manifestation of what sociologists called the 'dozed' system. A caste-defined division of labour, an immutable rank order within the society, and recruitment by ascription are claimed to be its ethnographic hallmarks.[30] Brahmins, the highest ranking caste group according to the Scriptures, held the exclusive right for preaching, teaching and priesthood. As such, they had a virtual monopoly over literary education. Knowledge of the vedas, and Sanskrit, the language through which it was communicated, were considered to be sacred and taboo for the non-Brahmins. The warrior Kshatriyas and the trading Vysyas were given some education in the vernacular. The content of such education was poor in comparison to what was taught to the Brahmins, and even this was denied to women and the members of the lower castes.[31] This system of education, controlled and

---

30. Cohn, 1970, Recruitment of Elites in India Under British Rule, 121-47
31. Mookerji, R.K; Ancient Indian Education: Brahminical and Buddhist, (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas, 1960).

administered by the Brahmins, not only helped the legitimization of the hierarchical division of society and the unequal distribution of privileges, but also gave an element of immutable continuity to them.[32]

This scriptural or more appropriately, text-book model apart, archial records point to the existence on the eve of the British advent to India of an indigenous system of education, which was as widespread as it was broad based. The indegenous schools and colleges catered to a large variety of students both from the upper and the lower castes. But the overwhelming predominance of the Brahmins in the realm of indegenous education can hardly be gainsaid, just as the severe disabilities suffered by the lower castes can scarcely be denied. Thus whatever may have been its virtues, the indegenous system of education contributed to the perpetuation and reinforcement of a social order based on an inequalitarian ideology.

The major jolt to the traditional social order came in the latter half of the eighteenth century with the advent of British colonialism in India. Concentrating principally on the port towns and urban centres, the British set up an elaborate administrative machinery, recognised the supremacy

---

32. O'Malley, L.S.S,(ed.); Modern India and the West: A Story of the Interaction of their Civilisations,(London: OUP, 1941).

government itself. Students of education have now convincingly

proved that the "spreading of English education was not an act

of disinterested magnanimity".[35] On the contrary, it was the

outcome of an intricate combination of motives that is religious

proselytizing spirit; moral to inculcate new values in the spirit

of western liberal christian concepts; administrative to staff

the vast and elaborate bureaucracy, economic to familiarize the

Indians with the modalities and values of the capitalist economic

system and also to develop in them a taste for British products,

and last but not least, political to consolidate and maintain their

hold over the country, in general.

But it should be concluded by this fact that the

British embarked upon a programme of mass English education in

India. They were only interested in creating a typical small class

of English educated Indians who may act as 'interpreters between

British and the Indian'.[36] This particular class was supposed to

filter down to the masses the knowledge and values it had acquired

and internalized.

In tune with the aims of their educational policy

most of the educational institutions established by the British

were colleges and highschools, and were located mostly in the

---

35. Basu,A; 'Policy and Conflict in India: The Reality and Perception of Education' in Attbach and Kelly(ed.); Education and Colonialism,(New York: Longman, 1978), pp.53-68.
36. Sharp,H; Selections From Educational Records, Part I,(1791-1839), (New Delhi: Published for the National Archives of India, by the Manager of Publications Division, Govt. of India, 1965).

urban areas. At the turn of the century three out of four villages were without a school, and less than one-fifth of the boys of school-going age were in schools.[37]

The syllabus of English education was made to suit the recruitments of the colonial economic and employment policies. The higher opportunities in almost all the services were in effect reserved for British. In addition to this, there was an opposition to industrialization. This resulted in a limited opportunities for qualified and trained Indians excepting perhaps in the lower echelons of the bureaucracy and in the teaching line. In reality English education created a large number of what Edwardes[38] called 'unemployables'.

Despite all these limitations, English education was necessary for those who aspired for good jobs in bureaucracy, profession and managerial lines, sometimes for leadership also in the changing order of the social structure. Not only this, the British Government also demanded good proficiency in English for administration, judicial system, and commercial institutions which they introduced. So, people were compelled to depend on the new modalities of

37. Basu,A; op cit. pp. 57 -59.
38. Edwardes,M; British India, 1772-1947: A Survey of the Nature and Effects of Alien Rule,(London: Sidswick and Jackson,1967), p. 242.

English education. English was the language of ruling class. Hence it held good prestige also.

The urbanization started by the British, confused the established means of evaluating people and distributing them their respective social status and positions. Formal education became a significant parameter in the social context. Not only was a new scale of socio-economic status created, but the new education system was also based on universalistic criteria, thereby opening the possibility for upward social mobility to groups which had been denied this opportunity hitherto.

At this juncture it is important to point out that modern education, with its pronounced urban bias, entered India as a scarce commodity capable of conferring both economic and social status, and as a part of the emerging market economy. The principle of universalistic criteria of admission and the implied mobility potential on a large scale were, therefore, rendered largely theoretical and infructuous in actual practice. Because of the initial advantages of their high status, the benefits of English education naturally accrued to the upper caste groups - the Bengali Kayasthas, the Tamil Brahmins and the Marathi Chitparans - and the well-to-do in urban areas.[39] In this way, there emerged the first generation of the urban-based indigenous English educated,

---

39. Rao,M.S.A; 'Education, Social Stratification and Mobility', in Gore, Desai and Clituis; op cit., 1127-46.

'westernized', industrial, commercial, political, administrative and intellectual elite in India.[40]

The lower castes entered into the mainstream of English education rather lately. This was due to the least interest of the lower castes themselves in education on the one hand, on the other hand government was also little interested in the education of numerous non-Brahmins. The lower castes who made use of English education in due course of time were from an urban background and belonged to well-to-do families.[41] Despite the extension of English education to sections of the population which were never before touched by it and the various efforts at countering the dominance of Brahmins in the field of education,[42] the Brahmins and the other upper castes still had an edge over others on the eve of independence.

After Independence, the national leaders committed themselves to the modernization of the country on the principles of 'democratic socialism'. The new Constitution categorically repudiated the caste ideology based on the principle of inherited inequality.

40. Cohn, 1970,135.

41. Siva Kumar,C; Education, Social Inequality and Social Change in Karnataka,(New Delhi: Hindustan Publishing Corporation, 1982).7-45.
42. Dushkin,L; The Non-Brahmin Movement in Princely Mysore: A Dissertation in South Asia Regional Studies,(Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1974).

With the state assuming the role of a welfare organisation, unbridled faith was reposed in education as the foundation and vehicle for national development, and a remedy for many of the social ills of the country, including socio-economic inequality.

Seen from the financial angle, the expenditure on education has risen from about Rs.5.70 million in 1947 to Rs.21.407 million in 1975-76.[43] Nearly 22 per cent of the total expenditure on education in 1975-76, was incurred in the sector. An analysis of the distribution of per pupil public expenditure for different levels of education reveals that it is the highest for universities and institutions of higher education. Even among them the major share goes to professional colleges, the per student expenditure in them being nearly three times more than that of the same expenditure for general higher education.[44]

It is in the urban areas that the separation between caste and occupation could be complete, and it is in the towns and cities that the variety and incidence of secular

43. Naik,J.P; Policies and Performance in Indian Education,1947-74,(New Delhi: Orient Longman, 1975), pp. 15-18.

44. Raja, Aggarwal and Hussan; 'Higher Education in India: An Assessment', in J.V.Raghavan(ed.); Higher Education in the Eighties: Opportunities and Objectives, (New Delhi: Lancer International, 1985), p.95-173.

occupations and professions for which education is a prerequisite is maximum. Hence, the possiblity of individual upward mobility should be greatest in urban areas; "there are more 'escalators' there are more people riding them.[45]

So far, our preceding discussion delineating the role of higher education in accelerating upward social mobility reaches to the conclusion that higher education acts as a mechanism with the help of which the privileged sections of society manage to retain.

Now, keeping the student as the reference point, we shall try to establish some basic facts of upward social mobility, if any, among the students. It is presumed that the students will not only successfully complete their course of study but also that they will eventually occupy high position and status. Our task, now is to visualise those status and positions in the context of the theoretical formulations of the sociology of education in particular and in sociology in general.

There are various ways in which social mobility can be analysed; and which way to go is not primarily a methodological question but an analytical one.[46] In view of its analytical

45. Bierstedt, R; The Social Order, (New Delhi: Tata Mc Graw-Hill, 1970: 424).
46. Miller,S.M; 'The Future of Mobility Studies', American Journal of Sociology, 77(1), 1971:62, pp.62-65.

convenience and descriptive character we shall mainly use some thesis and studies for theoretical analysis. A strong tendency for maintaining parental social status defined in terms of education and occupation between grandfather's and father's generation is observed. This tendency towards status inheritance or status retention is more pronounced between the fathers' and students' generation.[47]

Even the little upward mobility that is observed seems to be selective in character. While those who moved up from the lower categories spanned a longer social distance than those who moved up from the higher categories, the percentage of the former is far too less compared to the latter. The findings also point to the almost insurmountable difficulties in social climbing faced by those born in occupational groups at the lower levels of the status hierarchy.

Several findings although in their own limited way, confirm the stationary character of the status structure, especially in the urban areas of the country. A review of the empirical evidence on social mobility suggests that in spite of the greater opportunities, especially during the last five

47. Jayaram,N., This paper published in Mainstream,Republic Day Special No. 1986, pp. 26-33, was originally delivered by the author as the Key Note Address at a Seminar on the New Education Policy organised by the Bangalore Uni. College Teachers Association at Tumkur on 25 Dec.,1985.

decades or so, the resultant social mobility is not appreciable.[48]
The broad trends indicate that for a very large proportion of
families there has been a greater tendency to remain stationary
in one or more generations. The percentage of mobility in the
higher grades is negligible and movement out of unskilled and
skilled manual work is difficult for anyone born into them. On
the whole,those moving out of their parental grades exceed more
remaining within only by a small percentage.

In this context the concept that appears to be
significant is that of status retention, which is sometimes
confused with the residually defined idea of non-mobility.
It subsumes many important characteristics. It is to this aspect
that we turn our attention.

Advancing meritocratic arguments, some may altoge-
ther deny inequality of educational opportunities as an issue.
Since schooling would ostensibly be open to all, one's acheivement

---

48. Sovani,N.V; 'Occupational Mobility in Poona City Between Three
Generations', in Sovani(ed.); Urbanisation and Urban India,(Bombay:
Asia, 1966), pp.90-105;
- Jorapur,P.B; 'Inter-Generational Occupational Mobility', The
Indian Journal of Social Work,31(4), 1971, pp.461-67;
- Dubey,S.M; Social Mobility Among the Professions: Study of
Profession in a Transitional Indian City,(Bombay: Popular,1975);
- Rao, V.L.S; The Structure of an Indian Metropolis: A Study of
Bangalore, (New Delhi: Allied), p.2; and
- Tewari, V.K.

of higher education or absence of it, could be portrayed as a result not of his birth and background, but of his own efforts, ability, and talents. This is what Tewary calls the 'Tadpoll Philosophy'.

It is possible that intellignet tadpoles reconcile themselves to the inconveniences of their position, by reflecting that, though most of them will live and die as tadpoles and nothing more, the more fortunate of the species will one day shed their tails, distend their mouth and stomach, hopnisibly on to dry land, and croak addresses to their former friends on the virtue by means of which tadpoles of character and capacity can rise to be frogs.

Even in the face of the mounting evidences most of the people deny the existence of social inequality. To the liberals, such inequalities are passing phenomena, hold overs from an earlier, less enlightened era, which are rapidly being eliminated.[49] Some may still defend it on the ground that it need not reflect prejudices or deliberate neglect of subordinate groups by the subordinate ones.[50] We would do well therefore to bear in mind Tawney's[51] admonition about the 'religion of inequality'.

---

49. Bowles, S; 1977: 137., in Habey(ed.); op cit., p.137-53.
50. Anderson, C.A and Forbs,P.J; 'Discrimination and Inequality in Education', Sociology of Education, 38(1), 1964, pp. 1-18.
51. Tawney,R.H; Equality, (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1964), p.105.

It may well be the case that capricious inequalities are in some measure inevitable, in the sense that, like crime and disease, they are a malady which the most rigorous precautions cannot wholly overcome. But, when crime is known as crime, and disease as disease, the ravages of both are circumscribed by the mere fact that they are they are recognised for what they are, and described by their proper names, not by flattering suphemisms. And a society which is convinced that inequality is an evil need not be alarmed because the evil is one which cannot wholly be subdued. In recognising the position it will have armed itself with an antidote. It will have deprived inequality of its sting by stripping it of its stem.

We can say that our educational system is elitist and inequalitarian and strongly reinforces and gives impetus to the working of what is called the 'Mathew Principle'. A remarkable manifestation of this phenomenon is the high subsidization of higher education by the government which benifits the affluent sections of society to the detriment of its poor section.[52]

However, it cannot be concluded that education has not contributed at all to the process of upward social mobility in urban areas. The presence of first generation educables in schools in general and colleges in particular will not sustain such a claim. Part of the little mobility that can be and is

---

52. Foster,P; 'Access to Schooling', in D.Adams(ed.); Education in National Development, (London: R&K.P, 1971), pp.13-33.

seen is sponsored by the government as part of its measures for ameliorating the status of the scheduled castes and tribes and other backward classes. And part of it has been the outcome of the strategy of the economically dominant groups of converting their status parameters, i.e., from land holding to education. However, taking into consideration the phenomenal growth of higher education in the last four decades, the extent of such mobility appears to be only marginal.

In this connection, the conceptual distinction between social mobility, through the supply of vacant statuses and by the interchange of ranks, outlined by Lipset and Zetterberg[53] seems to be meaningful. One will have to grant that some people from the lower strata are more educated and better employed now than they were a few decades ago, partly because of the widening of opportunities in education and occupation, and partly because of the policy of protective discrimination. But it remains a hard fact that the relative advantage of the upper strata and the informal barriers to the higher status occupations have not only persisted but also become strengthened.

---

53. Lipset, S.M and Zetterberg,H.L; 'A Theory of Social Mobility', in Bendix and Lipset(ed.); Class, Status and Power: Social Stratification in Comparative Perspective, (New York: The Free Press, 1966), pp.561-73.

"All in all, what education has helped to achieve is a limited
embourgeoisement of certain segments of the population"[54].

✓ While a general trend in status retention is obser-
ved, it is markedly so at the highest levels of occupational
status. While access to higher education is selective, the
selectivity seems to be more pronounced with regard to the
prestigious professional courses like medicine, technology,
management etc.

✓ At this juncture, it is important to point out
that the structure of the educational system itself contributes
to a great extent towards this tendency. This is one of the
notable ways in which the educational system directly reinforces
the prevailing stratification and rigidities to further.

✓ Besides inequalities in opportunities for education
there is an important factor limiting the mobility role of
higher education in urban areas. That is, 'peoples' ideas as to
what qualifications ... what job tend to change over time[55]. The
generation of employment in the country has been inordinately slow

---

54. Kamat, A.R; Eduaation and Social Change in India, (Bombay:Samaiya
Pub; 1985) , pp.18-20.

55. Dore,R; The Diploma Disease : Education, Qualification and
Development, (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1976), pp.4-6.

as compared to the output of people with educational credentials. Hence, there is an increasing availability of people with educational credentials in relation to the availability of jobs, a phenomenon described as 'educated unemployment'. This has resulted in a continuous escalation of educational qualifications for jobs without any necessary relation to more effective job performance or sophistication demanded by the economy. Such an educational inflation or degree devaluation has diluted the mobility potential of education in relation to occupation. In short, along with a hardening of social arteries, there has been a secular decline in the mobility significance of education.[56]

Such an educational system with potentialities of stabilising social status and perpetuating inequality is not peculiar to India, but is true of developed countries also. Nonetheless, it seems to be a generally accepted view, as Boudon[57] has pointed out, that the level of educational attainment is one of the major determinants of status and a major factor of social mobility in such societies. It appears that such a faith is

56. Saberwal,S; 'Epiloque: Focus and Milieu', in S.Saberwal(ed.); Process and Institution in Urban India,(New Delhi: Vikas,1978), pp. 241-43.
57. Boudon,R; Education, Opportunity and Social Inequality: Changing Prospects in Western Society,(NY: John Wiley, 1974), pp.39-42.

largely due to what is termed the 'mobility myth', which is an element of the capitalist ideology.[58] This myth has been outlined by Reid[59] as follows:

> Social mobility is seen as a necessary characteristics of industrial society, both economically - changing technology and production demand a redefinition of occupations - and culturally - democracy has a value set aiming towards an open, meritocratic society. Educational qualifications can be viewed as a relatively neutral criterion for occupational entry once educational opportunity has been extended, even minimally, to the whole of society......Underlining such reasoning is, then, the belief that social mobility is a desirable characteristics of society and that the educational system exists to promote and facilitate it.

Not only this, this myth provides society with a useful complacement belief in the openness of society through the educational system.

Andreski[60] calls it "the educational blind alleys of social mobility is necessarily an illusion". People may feel that they could move up the hierarchy and this way may provide them with some psychological satisfaction. Functionalists are prone to look for the functional significance of such an illusion for the maintenance of social stability.[61]

---

58. Levitas,M; Marxist Perspectives in the Sociology of Education, (London: R & K.P., 1974), p.59.
59. Reid,J; Sociological Perspectives on School and Education,(London: Open Books, 1978), p. 243.
60. Andreski, S; Prospects of a Revolution in the USA,(New York: Harper and Row, 1974), p. 14.
61. Levy, M.J; Modernization and the Structure of Societies,(Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Uni. Press, 1966), 785-86.

Thus, if sociology of education has not been able to completely explode the above myth, and to project the educational system as obstructing social mobility, limiting educational opportunity and achievement, contributing to social closure, and in general contributing towards social and cultural reproduction, it is because "the sociology of education like education itself, operates within a set of cultural values".[62]

---

62. Reid; op cit., p.244.

Chapter V

SUMMING-UP

Our discussion of social origin and educational opportunity has thrown some light on the crucial interconnection between the variables of social inequality such as caste, income and access to opportunities for education on the one hand, and sex, rural urban residence and family class status as determining factors for access to education on the other.

The major beneficiaries of higher education came from the upper social strata and from an urban background. That is, those hailing from upper castes, upper income and educational strata, and white-collar and urban background had the largest opportunities for obtaining higher education. This social phenomenon provides some insight into the role played by education in the maintenance of status and interests of the upper strata vis-a-vis those below them. As one moved down the various scales of the stratification system, there was a corresponding decline in obtaining access to education which in turn restricted the scope of mobility of those born in the middle and lower rungs.

Such a situation is, perhaps, comprehensible in a social context where changes in the major institutional spheres such as economic, political and caste have been rather slow and gradual, if we take up the latter part of the British rule as the point of reference and departure.

The policy of protective discrimination also did
not work much due to the unavailability of the socio-economic
background of the sections envisaged.

For the lower castes and scheduled castes, especia-
lly in rural areas the extension of the dominant peasant castes
hegemony to the State level meant a further undermining of their.
position.

In the field of feminine education, besides the
factors of castes and income the patrilineal principle influen-
ced the spread of education among women.

Though one may characterize the changes in the pat-
terns of educational and social mobility as slow and gradual, these
changes seemed to have had made some dents in the relatively
rigid hierarchical framework of the traditional order. This is
in sharp contrast to the traditional order in which they could
not even dream, let alone aspire for education.

Urban residence seems to provide easier access to
education than rural background. In a metropolitan city like Delhi,
where Karuna Ahmed studied two women's colleges during 1962-63,
low castes accounted for only 2.7 % of the students, while 77.8 %
of the students consisted of upper caste Hindus.

Thus, we see that the situation pertaining to edu-
cational inequality could not have radically altered, given the
fact that the Indian society has not witnessed any radical

structural transformation in the intervening decade and a half. The State policies of many regions in India, in general continues to be largely characterized by dominant caste politics and it is hardly in their interests to either opt for or implement any radical measures of change that could benefit the majority.

Studies concerned broadly with education and social mobility in British, American and Indian societies have tried to throw light on the extent and nature of the relationship between social origins of students and their access to educational opportunities. In Western studies of the relation between social class and educational opportunities there is a strong emphasis on occupation in view of its crucial significance class affiliation. Glass, Wolfe, Floud, Halsey and Martin, Grigaard, Rossi, Bernstein, and Kahl studies are some examples. In the Indian context, besides class affiliation caste affiliation also works which is also evident from various studies conducted by sociologists.

In the large context of the socio-economic and political framework of those developed societies of the West, the role played by cultural and economic factors in perpetuating educational inequality and thereby also social inequality of varied sorts, is perhaps of little surprise. It would be of interest to enquire about the nature of the educational system in the socialist societies of Russia, East Europe, and China whose ideologi-

cal structures, at least in theory, vary to a significant extent from the 'capitalistic democratic' ideology of the West.

It is at this juncture, we will briefly deal with the alternative theoretical way out for a just education system as envisaged by many radical sociologists of education in counter-position to functionalist stance.

While the allocation function of education has long since been recognised as important, it is only recently that the role of education in legitimizing existing social inequalities and power relation has been seen more clearly. Bourdeiu and Boudon have made notable contributions in this regard. Bourdeiu maintains that education plays a vital role in "reproduction of the structure of the power relation" and that it does so "under the appearance of neutrality". Boudon has attempted to show that the development of the educational system in Western industrial societies has not had a positive effect on social and economic equality: "If any effect is to be observed at all, it is more likely to be negative."

Some fundamental re-thinking of the school's function in relation to development has been done in radical circles. Accordingly, many writers have questioned the functionality of school in relation to development goal (Freire,P, Illich, I, Reimer, Goodman). More of a reformist, than a radical, Freire provides a sharp critique of existing education as

"banning" system. He views it as an instrument of oppression. Illich argues that school presents personal, creative and automatic interaction.

In the sixties, Kozol and Herndon demonstrated that the big city schools in America were unable to educate the underprivileged children. According to the radical thesis, the school is manifestly incapable of educating all children and is instead latently dustunctional in that it perpetuates class privileges and turns out generations of acceptors of the the status quo. That is why to Reiner the 'school is dead' and to Goodman 'compulsory schooling is compulsory miseducation.'

However, one may disagree with these views of radical sociologists, but it is difficult to ignore it, seen through the perspective on education in India as well as in developed countries.

Arguing why the efforts have failed Bowles says, "they sought to eliminate educational inequalities without challenging the basic institutions of capitalism.'

Thus, it almost seems that the word 'equality' is an accidental occurrence in the phrase, where everything really hangs on the word 'opportunity' which, in turn, seems logically inconsistent with the notion of equality. When the emphasis is upon opportunity, the implication is that outcomes will be unequal. He who is offered and seizes an opportunity receives a

bonus, something which the others have not got.

In short, the formally egalitarian education compensates for inequalities generated elsewhere in the system is patently fallacious and equality of opportunity without equality of conditions is a sham. The educational inequalities are deep in the basic institutions of society, a far-reaching, thorough-going egalitarian transformation of society seems to be the only way out.

To sum up education has not contributed significantly to the replacement of traditional attitudes and values by modern and scientific ones, nor it has been able to change the existing system of stratification to an appreciable extent. Indeed in many cases education even reinforces the existing structure of inequalities and leads to the stabilization of class structure. And since education as one of the indices (occupation, power, and cultural style of life) support the view that "modernization...so far has been continued to the privileged castes and class families. Consequently, modernization does not result in distributive justice, as the role differentiation is continued within the upper segments of the ...(Indian) society".

* * * *

B_I_B_L_I_O_G_R_A_P_H_Y

Adams, D.,   Education and Modernisation in Asia, Reading,
                Addison-Wealey Pub., 1970.

Ahmed, Karuna,Women's Higher Education : Recruitment and Rele-
                vance, in Singh, A and Altbach, Philips (eds.),
                The Higher Learning in India, Vikas Publishing
                House, Delhi, 1974.

Airan, J.W,   Bainabas, T., and Shah, A.B (eds.), Climbing a
                Wall of Glass: Aspects of Educational Reforms
                in India, Manaktolas, Bombay, 1965.

Ali Yavar, Jung, Education, Its Ends and Means, National,
                New Delhi, 1976.

Allaway, A.J., 'Social and Educational Change Since 1900',
                The SQ Review, Vol. XLIII, Section Eight.

Altbach and Philip, Turmoil and Transition; Higher Education
                and Students Politics in India, Lalvani Publi-
                shers, Bombay, 1969.

Altbach, Philip, 'Higher Education and Modernization : The
                Indian Case', in Gupta and Giriraj (eds.),
                Contemporary India, Main Currents in Indian
                Sociology, Vol. I, Vikas Pub., Delhi, 1975.

Altbach, P.G and Kelly, G.P.,'Education and Colonialism', in
                Don Admas (ed.), Education Policy, Planning and
                Theory, Longman, New York, 1978.

Altekar, A.S.,Education in Amcient India, Ed. 6, Nand Kishore,
                Varanasi, 1965.

Althusser, L.,'Ideology and Ideological State Apparutus', in
                Lenin, Philosophy and Other Essays, NLB, London,
                1975.

Anderson, C. A and Bowman, M.J (ed.)., Education and Economic
    Development, Frank Cass, London, 1971.

Angriot, S.S and Almquist, E.M., Careers and Contingencies,
    New York, Dunellen, 1975.

Apple, M.W., Education and Power, APK, Boston, 1985,

Arohowits, S and Giroux, H., Education Under Siege : The
    Conservative, Liberal and Radical Debate Over
    Schooling, R & K.P., London, 1987.

Aruntianian, V., The Social Structure of the Rural Popul-
    ation of the U.S.S.R. Progress Publishers,
    Moscow, 1971.

Banks, Olive, B.T., Sociology of Education, Batsford Ltd.,
    London, 1971.

Barber, Barnard, Social Stratification: A Comparative Analys-
    is of Structure and Process, Hascourt, Brace
    World Inc., New York, 1967.

Basu, Arpana, The Growth of Education and Political Development
    in India, 1898-1920, OUP, Delhi, 1974.

Bell, D., The Coming of Post-Industrial Society, Basic Books,
    New York, 1964.

Bell, R.E and Youngman, A.J (ed.), Present and Future in
    Higher Education, Tavistock Publications, London,
    1973.

Bendix, R and Lipset, S.M., Social Mobility in Industrial
    Society, University of California Press, Berkeley,
    1959.

                    (ed.), Class, Status and Power: Social Stratific-
    ation in Perspective, The Free Press, New York,
    1966.

Bendix, R., Nation Building and Citizenship, New Delhi,
    Arvind, 1969.

Bennur, 'Communal Stereotypes of High School Children', in
    G.S.Mallappa (ed.) Studies in Education and
    Culture, Dharwar, 1959.

Berg, I., Education and Jobs, Penguin, London, 1974.

Bergel, E.E., Social Stratification, Mc Grow-Hill Book Co., New York.

Berger, Peter, Sacred Canopy : Social Reality of Religion, Free Press, New York, 1970.

Berger, P, Berger, B and Kelinger, H., Homeless Mind, Penguin, London, 1974.

Beteille, A.,Caste, Class and Power, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1965.

_____,'The Future of B.C : The Competing Demands of Status and Power', Supplement to the Indian Journal of Public Adm, xi(i) 1965, New Delhi.

Bhat, Anil, Caste, Class and Politics, Monhar Book Service, Delhi, 1975.

Bhatia, B.M., History and Social Development, Vol. I: Elites in Modern India, Vikas Pub. House, Delhi, 1974.

Bhatnagar, G.S., Education and Social Change, Minerva Associate, Calcutta, 1972.

Blaug, M., Education and the Employment Problem in Developing Countries, International Labour Office, UN, Geneva, 1981.

Boudon, R., Education, Opportunity and Social Inequality: Changing Prospects in Western Society, John Wiley, New York, 1973.

Bowles, S and Gintis, H., Schooling in Capitalist Society, Free Press, New York, 1970.

Boyle, R.P., 'On Neighbourhood Contact and College Plans (III)', American Sociological Review, 31, Oct. 1966.

Brass, P.R., Language, Religion and Politics in North India, Cambridge Univ. Press, London, 1974.

Bremback, C.S.,Social Foundation of Education, John Wiley & Sons Inc, New York, 1971.

Brookover, W.B., A Sociology of Education, American Book Co., New York, 1955.

Carnoy, M., Education As Cultural Imperialism, David Mc Kay, New York, 1973,

Centers, R., 'Education and Occupational Mobility', American Sociological Review, Vol. xiv, Feb. 194.

Chaband, J., Education and Advancement of Women, Unesco, Paris, 1970.

Chandra, Bipin, Modern India, NCERT, New Delhi, 1976.

Chaudhri, D.P., Education, Innovations and Agricultural Development : A Study of North-India, Vikas, N.Delhi, 1979.

Chinoy, E., Society: An Introduction to Sociology, Random House, New York, 1967.

Chitnis, S., 'Urban Concentration of Higher Education', Economic and Political Weekly, July, 1969.

_____, 'Education for Equality', EPW, 7(31-3), 1972.

Chitnis, Suma 'Education of the Scheduled Castes' Journal of Higher Education, UGC, New Delhi, 1975.

Chitra,M.N., 'Higher Education and Society in Mysore Under British Rule', Sociological Bulletin, Sept, 1972.

Chaudhuri, Saroj Kanti, 'Educational Progress in Rural Bengal - A Study of Four Villages', EPW, Bombay, Vol, V, No. 6, Feb. 7, 1970.

Clark, H.F and Slown, H.S., Class Room in the Main Street,Free Press, New York, 1970.

Cohn, B., 'Changing Status of Depressed Castes', in M. Marriot(ed.), Village India, American Anthropological Association, 1955.

Cormack, M.C., The Hindu Woman, Colombia Univ. Press, Colombia, 1953.

Court, D and Cihai, D.P., Education, Society and Development : New Perspective from Kenya, OUP, Nairobi, 1974.

Corner, T.,   Education in Multicultural Societies, Croom
Helm, London, 1984.

Curle, A.,   Education for Liberation, Tavistock Pub.,
London, 1973.

Das, S.K.,   Education System of the Ancient Hindus, Author,
Calcutta, 1930.

Davis, K and Moore, W.E., 'Some Principles of Stratification',
American Sociological Review, 10: 242-49,
April, 1945.

Denkson, E.F.,'Education and Economic Productivity', in
S.Harris(ed.) Education and Public Policy,
Cambridge, MIT Press, 1969.

Desai, A.R.,   Sociological Background of Indian Nationalism,
Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1966.

Desai, B.G.,   The Emerging Youth, Popular Prakashan, Bombay
1967.

Dhar, T.N et al., Education and Employment in India: The
Policy Nexus, Minerva, Calcutta, 1976.

Dhekney, B.R., Hubli City : A Study in Urban Economic Life,
K.V., Dharwar, 1962.

Dickinson, Richard, D.N., The Christian College in Developing
India, A. Sociological Inquiry, OUP, Madras, 1971.

Douglas, J.W.B., The Home and the School, Mc Gibbon Kee, London,
1964.

D'Souza, V.S., 'Social Grading of Occupations in India', Sociolo-
gical Review, 1962.

_____, Educational Inequalities Among S.C : A Case
Study in the Punjab, Chandigarh, Deptt, of
Sociology, Punjab Univ. 1980.

Driver, E.,   'Caste and Occupational Structure in Central
India', Social Forces, Dec. 1963.

Dube, S.C.,   Contemporary India and Its Modernization,
Vikas, Delhi, 1974.

Durkheim, Emile, Sociology of Education (Tr. by Fox, S.D, 1956), Free Press, New York, 1966.

Elipow, F.B., Education in Soviet Union, Progress, Moscow, 1973.

Floud, Jean, 'Education, Inequality : A Perspective From the West', Journal of Higher Education, Vol.1, No.2, 1975.

Folger, J K and Nam, C.B, Trends in Education in Relation to Occupational Structure, Macmillan, New York, 1967.

Freire, P., Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1972.

_____, Education for Critical Consciousness, Continum Book, New York, 1973.

Gandino, Robbert, The Indian University, Popular, Bombay, 1965.

Gautam, G.S., Crisis in the Temple of Learning, S.Chand & Co. Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 1972.

Ghosh, S.C (ed.), Education Strategies in Developing Countries, Sterling, New Delhi, 1976.

Gist, N., 'Occupational Differentiation in South India', Social Forces, Vol. 33, 1954.

Glass, D.V.,(ed.), Social Mobility in Britain, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1954.

Goel, S.C., Education and Economic Growth in India, Macmillan, 1975.

Good Carter, V., Introduction to Educational Research, Appleton Century Crofts, New York, 1963.

Goodman, P., Compulsory Miseducation, Penguin, London, 1942.

Gord, M.S (ed.), Papers in Sociology of Education in India, NCERT, New Delhi.

Gore, M.S., 'Education and the Equality of Opportunity', in Narain (ed.), Explorations in Family and Other Essays, Thacker & Co. Ltd., 1975.

Gore, M.S.,   Education and Modernization in India, Rawat Pub.,
                Jaipur, 1982.

Gore, M.S.,   Desai, D.P and Chitnis, S (eds.), Field Studies
                in the Sociology of Education, All India Re-
                port, NCERT, New Delhi, 1970.

Goyal, B.R.,   Educating Harijans, Academic Press, Gurgaon,1981.

Grace, G (ed.), Education and the City : Theory, History and
                Contemporary Practice, R & K.P, London, 1984.

Gramsci, A,   Prison Notebooks, Pathfinder, New York, 1970.

Gupta, S.S.,   Report of the Socio-Economic Survey of College
                Students of Aligarh, D.S.College, Aligarh, 1957.

Haggerthy, Wilan, J.,   Higher and Professional Education in
                India, U.S.Govt. Printing Office, Washington,
                1969.

Harbison, F and Myers, Charles, A., Education, Manpower and
                Economic Growth, Free Press, New York, 1961.

Havighurst, R.J., Human Development and Education, Longman,Green
                & Co, New York, 1953.

Havighurst, Robert, J and Nevgarten, B., Society and Education,
                Allyn and Bacon Inc., Boston, 1975.

Harris, Seymour (ed.)., Economic Aspects of Higher Education,
                O.E.C.D., Paris, 1964.

Hollingshead, A.B., Elmtowns Youth, John Wiley, New York,
                1949.

Hope, Keith(ed.), The Analysis of Social Mobility, Clarendon
                Press, Oxford, 1972.

Howell, A.,   Education in India, Allied, Bombay, 1950.

Husin, Torsten, Social Influences On Educational Attainment,
                O.E.C.D., Paris, 1975.

Hyman, H.H.,   'The Value Systems of Different Classes: A
                Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis
                of Stratification', in Bendix and Lipset(eds.),
                Class Status and Power, Glencoe, The Free Press,
                1953.

Kloskowska, A and Martinotti, G (ed.), Education in a Changing Society, Sage, London, 1977.

Knupfer, G., 'Portrait of the Underdog', The Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. xi, in Bendix and Lipset(eds.), Class Status and Power, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1947.

Kothari, R., Politics in India, Orient Longman, New Delhi, 1971.

Lenski, G., The Religious Factor: A Sociological Inquiry, Doubledgy and Comp. Inc., Anchor Books, New York, 1901.

Lipset, S.M., 'Social Mobility and Urbanization', Rural Sociology, 20, 1956.

Lynch, O.M., The Politics of Untouchability: Social Mobility and Social Change in a City of India, Colombia Univ. Press, New York, 1964.

Madan, Sarup ,Education, State and Crisis: A Marxist Perspective, R & K.P., London, 1982.

Marrou, H.J.,A History of Education in Antiquity, New American Library, 1967.

Marx, K and Engels, F., Communist Manifesto, Progress, Moscow, 1963.

Mazumdar, V., Education and Social Change, Indian Institute of Anthropological Studies, Shimla, 1972.

Mc Cully, Bruce Tiebout, English Education and the Origins of Indian Nationalism, Glouster, Mass, Petersmith, 1966.

Metcalfe,Thomas, R., The Aftermath of Revolt, India 1857-1870, Princeton Uni. Press, Princeton, 1965.

Miller, Robert, The New Class, Longsman, London, 1966.

Miller, S.M and Roy, P.A., The Future of Inequality, Basic Books Inc. Publishers, New York, 1970.

Mishra, B.B., The Indian Middle Classes: Their Growth in Modern Times, OUP, London, 1961.

Mujeeb, M., Education and Traditional Values, Meenakshi Pub. Meerut, 1965.

Mookerjee, S.M., Education in India : Today and Tomorrow, Ed. 6, Acharya Book Depot, Baroda, 1969.

Mookerji, S.N., 'An Introduction to Indian Education.', Acharya Book Depot, Baroda, 1958.

_____, History of Education in India, Acharya Book Depot, Baroda, 1974.

Myrdal, Gunnar, Asian Drama, Pantheon, New York, Vol.III,1968.

Naik, J.P., Equality, Quality and Quantity: The Elusive Triangle in Indian Education, Allied Pub. Bombay, 1975.

_____,Elementary Education in India, Allied, Bombay, 1976.

Naik, J.P and Nurullah, S., Student's History of Education in India(1800-1961), Macmillan, Bombay.

Narain, D.(Ed.), Exploration in the Family and Other Essays (Prof.KM.Kapadia Commemoration Volume), Thacker & Co., Bombay, 1975.

Nazareth, M., Education and Indoctrinations: The Sociological and Philosophical Bases, Univ. of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1976.

Nelson, J.P.,'Impact of Education on Social Stratification' Journal of Social Research, Deptt. of Anthropology, Ranchi Uni., Sept, 1972.

O'Hear,A., Education, Society and Human Nature: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education, R & K.P, London, 1981.

O' Malley, L.S.S (ed.), Modern India and the West, Oxford, 1938.

Ottaway, A.K.C.(ed.), Education And Society: An Introduction to the Sociology of Education, R & K.P., London, 1970.

Pandey, S.N., Education and Social Changes in Bihar, 1900-1921: A Survey of Social History of Bihar from Curson to Non-cooperative Movement, M.Banarsidas, Delhi, 1975.

Mujeeb, M., Education and Traditional Values, Meenakshi Pub. Meerut, 1965.

Mookerjee, S.M., Education in India : Today and Tomorrow, Ed. 6, Acharya Book Depot, Baroda, 1969.

Mookerji, S.N., 'An Introduction to Indian Education.', Acharya Book Depot, Baroda, 1958.

_____, History of Education in India, Acharya Book Depot, Baroda, 1974.

Myrdal, Gunnar, Asian Drama, Pantheon, New York, Vol.III,1968.

Naik, J.P., Equality, Quality and Quantity: The Elusive Triangle in Indian Education, Allied Pub. Bombay, 1975.

_____,Elementary Education in India, Allied, Bombay, 1976.

Naik, J.P and Nurullah, S., Student's History of Education in India(1800-1961), Macmillan, Bombay.

Narain, D.(Ed.), Exploration in the Family and Other Essays (Prof.KM.Kapadia Commemoration Volume), Thacker & Co., Bombay, 1975.

Nazareth, M., Education and Indoctrinations: The Sociological and Philosophical Bases, Univ. of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1976.

Nelson, J.P.,'Impact of Education on Social Stratification' Journal of Social Research, Deptt. of Anthropology, Ranchi Uni., Sept, 1972.

O'Hear,A., Education, Society and Human Nature: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education, R & K.P, London, 1981.

O' Malley, L.S.S (ed.), Modern India and the West, Oxford, 1938.

Ottaway, A.K.C.(ed.), Education And Society: An Introduction to the Sociology of Education, R & K.P., London, 1970.

Pandey, S.N., Education and Social Changes in Bihar, 1900-1921: A Survey of Social History of Bihar from Curson to Non-cooperative Movement, M.Banarsidas, Delhi, 1975.

Parmaji, S., **Education and Jobs**, Leeladevi Pub., Delhi, 1979.

Parsons, T (ed.),'Knowledge and Society', **Voice of America**, Washington, D.C., 1973.

Patwardhan, S., **Change Among India's Harijans**, Orient Longman, New Delhi, 1973.

Pearle, A.L., 'Education's Role in Development', **Economic Development and Cultural Change**, Vol. 17,April, 1969.

Premi, K.K., 'Educational Opportunities forthe Scheduled Castes: Role of Protective Discrimination in Equalization', **Economic and Political Weekly**, Vol. ix, Nos.45-46, No. 9, 1974.

Raghavan, J.V (ed.), **Education and the New International Order**, Concept, New Delhi, 1983.

Rajagopalan, C and Singh, J., 'The Indian Institues of Technology - Do They Contribute to Social Mobility?' EPW,3, No. 14, April, 1968.

Ramaswamy, V.,'Scheduled Castes in Andhra, Some Aspects of Social Change', EPW, 9 (29), 1153-'58, 1974.

Rao, M.S.A., **Social Change in Malabar**, Popular Book Depot, Bombay , 1951.

_____, **Tradition, Rationality and Change**, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1972.

Rao, S.V., **Education and Social Development**, Sage Pub., New Delhi, 1985.

Rao, V.K.R.V.,**Education and Human Resources Development**, Allied Publishers, New Delhi, 1966.

Reimer, E., **School is Dead**, Penguin, London, 1973.

Rilich Thomas, I., **Education and Poverty**, The Bookings Institution, Washington D.C., 1968.

Roger, Rick (ed.), **Education and Social Class**, Falmer Press, London, 1986.

Rudolph and Rudolph, **Education and Politics in India: Studies in Organisation, Society and Policy**, OUP, Delhi, 1972.

Ruhela, S.P (ed.), Social Determinants of Education in India, Jain Bros., New Delhi, 1969.

Ruhela, S.P and Vyas, K.C., Sociological Foundation of Education in Contemporary India, Dhanpat Rai & Sons, Delhi, 1970.

Sachidananda, Education among the SC/ST in Bihar, Vol. I, Patna, 1974.

Sarkar, J., 'Occupational Mobility and Changes in Class Structure', Man in India, Vol. 53, No. 1, 1973.

Sarkar, S.C., Education, Ideas and Institutions in Ancient India, Janaki, Patna, 1979.

Schelsky, H., 'Technical Change and Educational Consequences' in Halsey, A.H. et al.(eds.), Education, Economy and Society, Heinemann, 1961.

Schuts, T.W., Investment in Human Capital, Free Press, New York, 1970.

Seetharamu, A.S.,Education and Rural Development, Asia Pub., New Delhi, 1980.

Seetharamu, A.S and Ushadevi, M.D., Education in Rural Areas, Ashish, New Delhi, 1985.

Shah,O.P and Mukherjee, D (ed.), Education in India Today, Firma KLM, Calcutta, 1980.

Shah, K.R and Srikantiah,S., Education, Earnings and Income Distribution, Criterion, New Delhi, 1989.

Sharma, K.L., 'Modernization and Rural Stratification', EPW, Vol. V, No. 37, Sept 12, 1970.

Sharp, R and Greqi, A, Education and Social Control: A Study in Progressive Primary Education, R & K.P, London, 1983.

Shils, Edward,The Intellectuals Between Tradition and Modernity: The Indian Situation, Mouton, The Hague, 1963.

_____, The Intellectuals and the Powers and other Essays, Uni. of Chicago, Chicago, 1973.

Shri, Prakash, Education System in India, An Econometric Study, Concept, Delhi, 1978.

Simon, R., A History of European Education, Allen & Unwin, London, 1942.

Singhi, N.K., Education and Social Change, Rawat Pub, Jaipur, 1979.

Sivakumar, C.,Education, Social Inequality and Social Change in Karnataka, Hindustan, Delhi, 1982.

Smelser, W.T., 'Adolescent and Adult Occupational Choice as a Function of Family Socio-economic History', Sociometry, 26, 1963.

Spear, P., A History of India, Penguin, London, 1971. Vol. II.

Srinivas, M.N.,Caste in Modern in India, Asia Pub. House, Bombay, 1962.

_____,Social Change in Modern India, Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, 1966.

Sundaram, P.S., and Shah, A.B.,(ed.), Education or Catastrophe: Papers Presented to Mohan Sinha Mehta, Vikas,N.Delhi, 1976.

Thaper, R., History of India, Penguin, London, 1972.

Thomas, A., Education, Communalism and Income Distribution, ed. by Fred, R. Von Der Mchden, Texas, 1976.

Ulich, R., Education of Nations: A Comparison in Historical Perspective, Rev. ed. Cambridge, Harward Uni. Press, 1972.

Vaizey, J., 'Education in the Modern World', New Education, Weidenfeld & Ni lson, London, 1975.

Veblen, T., The Theory of Leizure Class, Allen and Unwin, London, 1970.

Watson, K.,(ed.), Education in the Third World, Croom Helm, London, 1982.

Weber, Max., <u>Economy and Society,</u> Free Press, New York, 1970.

Weiner, M.(ed.), <u>Mod: The Dynamics of Growth</u> Voice of America, Washington, D.C., 1966.

Weiner, M., <u>Politics of Scarcity,</u> Asia Pub. House, Bombay, 1967.

West, E.G., <u>Education and the State: A Study in Political Economy, Ed. 2,</u> Institute of Economic Affairs, Westminster, 1970.

Wilder, R.G.,<u>Mission Schools in India,</u> Allied, Bombay, 1948.

Wilson, A.B., 'Class Segregation and Aspirations of Youth', <u>American Sociological Review,</u> xxiv, 1957.

Windham, D.M., <u>Education, Equality and Income Distribution:</u> A Study of Public Higher Education, He-- Lexington Books, Lexington, 1970.

Young, M., <u>The Rise of the Meritocracy,</u> Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1961.