

# SOCIAL STRUCTURE & STRATIFICATION



**Ranjit Rajadhyaksha**  
**Dr. Sarita Verma**



## ***Social Structure & Stratification***

|||||

**Ranjit Rajadhyaksha**

**Dr. Sarita Verma**





## ***Social Structure & Stratification***

|||||

**Ranjit Rajadhyaksha**  
**Dr. Sarita Verma**

**Dominant**  
Publishers & Distributors Pvt Ltd  
New Delhi, INDIA



*Knowledge is Our Business*

## **SOCIAL STRUCTURE & STRATIFICATION**

*By Ranjit Rajadhyaksha, Dr. Sarita Verma*

This edition published by Dominant Publishers And Distributors (P) Ltd  
4378/4-B, Murarilal Street, Ansari Road, Daryaganj,  
New Delhi-110002.

ISBN: 978-93-84161-22-4

Edition: 2022 (Revised)

©Reserved.

*This publication may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publishers.*

# **Dominant**

## **Publishers & Distributors Pvt Ltd**

**Registered Office:** 4378/4-B, Murari Lal Street, Ansari Road,  
Daryaganj, New Delhi - 110002.

Ph. +91-11-23281685, 41043100, Fax: +91-11-23270680

**Production Office:** "Dominant House", G - 316, Sector - 63, Noida,  
National Capital Region - 201301.

Ph. 0120-4270027, 4273334

**e-mail:** [dominantbooks@gmail.com](mailto:dominantbooks@gmail.com)  
[info@dominantbooks.com](mailto:info@dominantbooks.com)

---

**w w w . d o m i n a n t b o o k s . c o m**

# CONTENT

<b>Chapter 1.</b> Understanding the Importance of Social Stratification.....	1
— <i>Dr. Sarita Verma</i>	
<b>Chapter 2.</b> Analysing the Fundamental of Stratification Concepts .....	8
— <i>Dr. Sarita Verma</i>	
<b>Chapter 3.</b> A Comprehensive Review on Social Exclusion and Hierarchy in Stratification.....	16
— <i>Dr. Sarita Verma</i>	
<b>Chapter 4.</b> Understanding the Theories of Social Stratification.....	23
— <i>Dr. Sarita Verma</i>	
<b>Chapter 5.</b> Recognizing the Roles of Caste, Class, and Gender as Social Stratification Factors .....	31
— <i>Dr. Sarita Verma</i>	
<b>Chapter 6.</b> Analysing the Role of Social Stratification in Urban Industrial Settings .....	40
— <i>Dr. Sarita Verma</i>	
<b>Chapter 7.</b> Understanding the Concept of Caste: An Analytical Review.....	49
— <i>Dr. Sarita Verma</i>	
<b>Chapter 8.</b> Understand the Concept of Class.....	56
— <i>Dr. Sarita Verma</i>	
<b>Chapter 9.</b> A Brief Introduction to Race and Ethnicity .....	63
— <i>Dr. Sarita Verma</i>	
<b>Chapter 10.</b> Discussion on the Gender and Stratification.....	71
— <i>Dr. Sarita Verma</i>	
<b>Chapter 11.</b> A Brief Introduction about Women Empowerment.....	80
— <i>Dr. Kuldeep Kumar</i>	
<b>Chapter 12.</b> Exploring the Concept of Social Mobility and Determinants of Social Mobility.....	87
— <i>Dr. Kuldeep Kumar</i>	
<b>Chapter 13.</b> Mobility in Closed and Open Systems of Stratification .....	95
— <i>Dr. Kuldeep Kumar</i>	

## CHAPTER 1

### UNDERSTANDING THE IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL STRATIFICATION

---

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor,  
Department of Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India  
Email Id- sarita.verma@muit.in

#### **ABSTRACT:**

A key idea in sociology is social stratification, which describes how people or groups are organized in a society according to numerous characteristics including income, power, education, and vocation. By emphasizing how social stratification affects society structures, personal life outcomes, and social change, this abstract examines the significance of social stratification. Stratification is a classification of roles in economic output that determines the social benefits given to persons in those positions. Social stratification is a term in sociology that refers to the "division of individuals into groups based on common socioeconomic characteristics a relational system of inequalities having economic, social, political, and ideological aspects." Social Stratification occurs when disparities lead to increased status, power, or advantage for one group over another. It is a system by which society ranks categories of people in a hierarchy. It is based on four basic principles: social stratification is a trait of society, not simply a reflection of individual differences; social stratification carries over from generation to generation; social stratification is universal but variable; and social stratification involves not only inequality but also beliefs.

#### **KEYWORDS:**

Economic, Mobility, Political, Stratification, Social.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

In current Western civilizations, stratification is divided into three categories: upper, medium, and bottom classes. Each of these categories may be further broken into smaller categories. These categories are unique to state-based civilizations, as opposed to feudal cultures based on nobility-to-peasant interactions. Kinship relationships or castes may also be used to describe stratification. According to Max Weber, social class is separated from status class, which is based on criteria such as honor, prestige, and religious affiliation. Talcott Parsons stated that as social development progressed, the forces of societal divergence and the subsequent pattern of institutionalized individualization would significantly lessen the significance of class. It is controversial whether the first hunter-gatherer tribes were 'stratified,' or if such distinctions emerged with agriculture and extensive acts of commerce across groups. One of the continuous challenges in identifying social stratification stems from the fact that status differences between people are prevalent, therefore deciding how much disparity qualifies as stratification becomes a mathematical issue [1], [2].

#### **The Social Stratification Concept**

The idea of social stratification is viewed differently by sociology's many theoretical views. According to proponents of action theory, since social stratification is frequent in industrialized countries, hierarchy may be required to sustain social structure. Talcott Parsons, an American sociologist, claimed that universal values, in part, control stability and

social order, yet universal values were not synonymous with "consensus" and might as well be the cause for intense struggle, as they had been numerous times throughout history. Parsons never maintained that universal principles "satisfied" a society's functional conditions in and of themselves; rather, the constitution of society was a far more sophisticated codification of evolving historical variables. Conflict theories, such as Marxism, highlight the scarcity of resources and the lack of social mobility observed in stratified societies. Many sociological theorists have critiqued how improbable it is for the working classes to rise socioeconomically; the affluent tend to have political power, which they utilize to abuse the proletariat intergenerationally. However, theorists such as Ralf Dahrendorf have seen a trend toward an expanded middle-class in contemporary Western nations as a result of the need for an educated workforce in technical and service industries [3], [4].

Social stratification is a universal phenomenon that is inherent in all human civilizations, albeit it takes various shapes and degrees. Individuals, jobs, and groups are distinguished in a particular community based on distinct standards and criteria. The standards and criteria used to separate individuals change throughout time. Stratification may be simple and less intricate, or complex and more detailed, depending on the nature of a society, its culture, economics, and government. Considerations in stratification in a society might include the accomplishments of an individual member, his/her family or group, or all three in various ways, permutations, and combinations. Individuals, families, and groups, or all three in various circumstances and situations or in combination with one another, are the units ranked in a society. Flexibility in social stratification standards and criteria is now seen as an indication of growth, development, equality, and social justice. However, old social stratification systems are being altered and replaced by new social ranking standards and criteria. Thus, understanding ideology, structure, and process as characteristics of inequality and its dynamics is essential to the study of social stratification. Ideology includes values, standards, and criteria that are used to rank units as higher and lower, superior and inferior. The term structure refers to the entirety of ranking units, whereas process refers to the changes that occur in the ideology and structure of social stratification.

## DISCUSSION

Melvin M. Tumin describes social stratification as the division of any social group or society into unequal positions in terms of power, property, social assessment, and/or emotional fulfillment. Power, property, and social appraisal are often seen as the most essential determinants of position in a particular culture. In the distribution of roles, tasks, and responsibilities, Max Weber refers to "class, status, and party" as three essential "orders" of society, namely, economic, social, and political. Similarly, Talcott Parsons defines social stratification as the unequal ranking of the human persons who comprise a specific social system and their treatment as superior and inferior in certain socially essential aspects. Parsons makes a rigorous distinction between "stratification" and "differentiation," as the criteria are also classified as "social" and "non-social," respectively. The social criteria provide the foundation of a social system's differentiated appraisal of units. These include kinship, personal characteristics, accomplishments, assets, authority, power, and so forth. Non-social criteria are merely differentiating factors. They are age and gender. Thus, for Parsons, stratification is the most important element of human beings as units' normative orientation.

### Perspective on Structure and Function

Like Parsons, Kaare Svalastoga does not differentiate between "differentiation" and "stratification." Svalastoga advocates the term "social differentiation" rather than "social



stratification" to refer to any distinctions that emerge over the course of social interaction between people, social positions, or groups. In truth, such a viewpoint is not much different from Tumin and Parsons' definitions. Tumin also refers to the development of stratification seen by Svalastoga throughout the process of social interaction. Svalastoga, on the other hand, is a little more specific in his understanding of stratification. He distinguishes four types of differentiation: functional or division of labor differentiation, rank differentiation, custom differentiation, and competitive differentiation. Svalastoga defines rank distinction as stratification - a differentiated or stratified group, organization, or society. Rank distinction may be seen in all known human communities as well as a broad variety of animal species. Svalastoga makes no distinction between ranking and hierarchy. He notes that hierarchy is a stable phenomenon that acts as a distributive mechanism for the allocation of privileges, which reinforces hierarchy and uneven distribution and generates a vicious loop of inequality [5], [6].

Functional differentiation or division of labor is an inevitable need for society to run smoothly. The functional divisions might be non-antagonistic classes that evolved/were developed to suit the fundamental demands of a specific human culture. The principles for differentiated correct behavior are referred to as custom differentiation. Individual members' success and failure in general or in a specific context are implied by competitive difference. Thus, rank distinction extends to people, social positions, organizations, and even civilizations, and is thus present everywhere. Svalastoga, like Parsons, alludes to biological and social theories for stratification. Time and distance, as well as stratified variation, are not addressed in biological theories. The sociological explanation emphasizes both individual and group cooperation and conflict. P.A. provides a relatively complex notion. Sorokin. Sorokin defines social stratification as the division of a certain population into hierarchically superposed groups. It is shown by the presence of upper and lower levels. Thus, stratification denotes an uneven distribution of rights and privileges, obligations and responsibilities, social values and privations, social power and influence among members of a certain community. There are several tangible kinds of social stratification, including economically, politically, and occupationally stratified. These are the primary forms, and they are interconnected.

In the current liberal western society characterized by capitalism, the above-mentioned conceptualizations of social stratification imply primarily status disparities. The non-western world does not share the same industrial and capitalistic mindset. The premise is that similarity in division of labor, need, or functioning of identical tasks cannot be confirmed in all human civilizations. As a result, it is vital to take a critical look at the previously believed universality and functionality of social stratification. M.G. studied social stratification in pre-industrial cultures. Smith writes, "Stratification never consists in the mere existence or occupancy of differential positions, but in the principles by which the distribution of access and opportunities is regulated." Age and gender are the primary considerations for having access and opportunities to resources in pre-industrial societies, according to Smith. Age and gender are more than just biological factors. These are pre-industrial social and cultural phenomena. These, according to Parsons and Svalastoga, are purely biological or non-social requirements. Political authority may be justified biologically, since older males would be able to dominate their societies while weakening younger individuals and female members [7], [8].

Smith refers to analytic and concrete stratification notions such as analytic and concrete structures or membership units, as well as generalized features of social process. Tumin and Parsons, for example, consider stratification as an abstract need of all social systems. It specifically relates to empirical distributions of advantages and rewards in certain

civilizations. Smith sees stratification as both a process and a condition of things. Yogendra Singh examines patterns in social stratification in India from the perspectives of theory, structure, and process. He sees that the process factor is more fundamental than the other two components, theory and structure. Smith defines the state of affairs as both a result and a condition of the social process.

Smith's thesis is essential because, in his opinion, institutionalization is the foundation of social ties between groups/units in a particular society. In other words, since randomness, contingency, and disharmony cannot be the foundations of a ranking system, structural principles define the structure and operation of a social stratification system. The dominant distributions of advantage are governed by structural principles. The structural notion aids in the identification of these principles and their combinations. Changes or adjustments in structural units, that is, status, are implied by structural change. Thus, social stratification entails not just an ordered hierarchy, but also a uniform quality across all strata. Homogeneity, on the other hand, may not be found in "situs" systems or caste systems. Inequality and stratification vary in that stratification is typically founded on normatively established norms and ideals, while inequality may have its origins in fixed, unchanging structures such as lineages and age-sets. A line may be drawn between stratification and inequality, or between contemporary industrial cultures and pre-industrial societies, based on the roots of social disparity [9]–[11].

### **Marxist Point of View**

The structural functional conception outlined above differs analytically from the standard Marxian stance on social stratification. It would be inaccurate to claim that Karl Marx proposed a simple theory of technical or economic determinism. He advanced a broad structural explanation of society that included themes like as class, class antagonism, and change. Marx writes in his classic work *Capital*: "The owners merely of labor power, owners of capital, and landowners, whose respective sources of income are wages, profit, and ground-rent, in other words, wage-labourers, capitalists, and land-owners constitute the three big classes of modern society based on the capitalist mode of production." Marx goes on to say that the middle and intermediate strata obliterate all lines of demarcation. The trend can be seen increasingly in the growth of the capitalist mode of production, which transforms labor into wage labor and the means of production into capital. Landed property is also prone to transforming into a capitalist mode of production. Although Marx could not provide a comprehensive definition of social stratification, he did highlight empirical referents in his articulation of class and class conflict. According to Marx, each epoch of history is defined by a dominating mode of production and a class structure comprised of a ruling class and an oppressed class, which may be seen as two strata of society. The fight between these classes influences men's and groups' social relationships. Control over the means of production, and hence the whole moral and intellectual life of the people, determines this further. Law and governance, art and literature, science and philosophy all serve the ruling class's interests in some way.

Marx makes no difference between "class" and "status" or between class hierarchy and social stratification. Marx explicitly states that "production" is done by "social individuals" and must be understood within a certain "social context." The Marxian framework emphasizes terminology like "domination" and "subjugation" or "effective superiority-inferiority relationships" in the context of social stratification. As a result, the two classes are known as bourgeoisie and proletariat. According to Marx, a social class is any group of people who perform the same function in the industrial system. Historically, social classes include freeman and slave, patrician and plebian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, or, to

put it another way, oppressor and oppressed. Marx regards class as an existent social phenomenon. A class is an actual group that is aware of its own existence, status, and aims. Class, according to Marx, is a mirror that reflects the totality of interactions in a particular society.

### **Max Weber's Point of View**

Max Weber's clear and rationally developed stance on social stratification might be seen as a criticism of Marx's idea of class and stratification. "Power" is an important concept in Weberian social stratification theory. Weber identifies three "orders" of society, namely economic, social, and political. He notes that "classes", "status groups", and "parties" are manifestations of power allocation within a society. Weber's differentiation makes his theory multidimensional, as opposed to Marx's unidimensional theory of class. Weber writes about class:

1. Several persons share a certain causal component of their life chances.
2. This component is solely comprised of economic interests in the ownership of things and revenue possibilities.
3. This is further illustrated by the commodities or labor market circumstances. These three factors together refer to the "class situation." The "market situation" determines the class situation. The word "class" refers to any group of persons who are in the same class. As a result, "property" and "lack of property" are the fundamental categories of all class situations.
4. Competition drives out certain market participants while favoring others. As a result, the class issue is ultimately a market condition. The critical time in the market is the kind of chance.

However, the two are not the same. To a large extent, the social order is defined by the economic order and responds to it. Weber's theory of class contains a deft application of Marxist ethos. According to H.H., some of Weber's work might be regarded as an effort to "round out" Marx's economic materialism with political and military materialism. C.W. Gerth and C.W. Mills. Weber, on the other hand, makes it clear that "status groups" and "classes" are not reducible to one other. The status groups obstruct the rigid application of the pure market idea. Status groups, as opposed to classes, are often communities of an amorphous nature. There is a "status situation," which is similar to a "class situation" in that it is defined by a plurality's societal assessment of honor. It might be tailored to a particular class, or vice versa. However, status honor does not have to be associated with a social class. It usually stands in stark contrast to the pretensions of pure property. Propertied and propertyless persons might share the same status. However, under the Marxist worldview, such equality of position between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is inconceivable. The two are polar opposites, since they are class foes, and their statuses would vary due to their hostile positions in the production system.

Weber used the phrase "guarantees of status stratification" in the context of status honor as shown by a certain way of life. The most essential issue here is that there are constraints on "social" intercourse that are not dictated by economic standing. Marriages demonstrate the "status circle." Visits to streets, neighborhoods, groups, temples, particular locations, and so on are instances of status group encirclement. "Ethnic segregation" and "caste" are the finest examples of status rings. A system of status stratification is stable because of both legally sanctioned social order and norms and rituals. Status groups are responsible for the "stylization" of life. Consumption of products and "styles of life" are markers of status stratification [12]–[14].

"Power" is the most important component in Weber's definition of social stratification. Weber defines power as "the chance of a man or a group of men to realize their own will in a communal action even in the face of resistance from others who are participating in the action." Power might be determined economically or socially. However, power in and of itself is distinct from economically and socially driven power. On the contrary, the formation of economic power may be a result of power that already exists on other bases. Man does not want authority alone to benefit himself financially. Power, particularly economic power, may be appreciated "for its own sake". The desire for power is sometimes conditioned by the "social honour" it involves. However, not all power implies social honor. Economic power or raw money power is not a recognized source of social honor. Power is not the sole source of social honor. Induced social honor or reputation may even serve as the foundation for political or economic power. Power and honor may be guaranteed by the legal system, but it is not usually their major basis. The legal order is another source, although it cannot always guarantee power and honor.

Weber claims in his classic essay "Class, Status, Party" that "parties" live in a house of power. The behavior of "parties" is focused toward the development of "social power," that is, toward influencing a community action regardless of its substance. Power occurs in any organization or situation in relation to the actors/participants who engage with it. Parties usually imply societalization, with a purpose in mind, which may be for personal reasons. "Parties" may be determined by "class situation" and "status situation." However, parties may not be "classes" or "status groups." They are both "class parties" and "status parties." And, on sometimes, they are neither. Parties represent the dominance structure within the society. Methods of obtaining power may range from open aggression to canvassing for votes using money, social influence, the force of words, suggestion, amateurish hoaxing, and so on.

### Critique

Following the discussion of several conceptualizations of social stratification, a criticism of them is required here. The Chapter on "Theories of Social Stratification" will, however, go into more depth. Ralph Dahrendorf offers a unique theory for societal stratification. According to Dahrendorf, social stratification is an instantaneous effect of positive and negative punishments used to manage social behavior. Sanctions always result in "a rank order of distributive status". Stratification is a trait of all human civilizations that is required for their survival. To perpetuate its system of rules and consequences, a society needs an authority structure. It has a "institutionized power" structure. Stratification arises from the "closely related trinity of norm, sanction, and power." Authority relationships are usually superordinate and subordinate relationships.

### CONCLUSION

Human civilizations are characterized by social stratification, which has profound effects on both people and groups. It acts as a prism through which we may examine and comprehend how resources, opportunities, and power are distributed in society. The power of social stratification to influence people's life outcomes, maintain inequities, and promote social change underlies its significance. Social stratification significantly affects the opportunities that are accessible to people. The top of the hierarchy often has easier access to economic, medical, and educational resources, while those at the bottom have difficulties moving up. For disadvantaged populations, this uneven allocation of resources may lead to a cycle of poverty and constrained social mobility. In addition, class stratification provides an impetus for social transformation. It may lead to tension and conflict and inspire movements for justice and equality. Societies could adjust their policies, cultural values, or economic

structures over time to overcome these disparities. Sociologists, governments, and people all need to comprehend the significance of social stratification. By realizing how it affects us, we may try to create a society where opportunities and resources are allocated more fairly, and people have a better opportunity to realize their full potential regardless of their social standing.

## REFERENCES:

- [1] J. R. Posselt and E. Grodsky, "Graduate education and social stratification," *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2017. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-081715-074324.
- [2] X. Wu, "Higher education, elite formation and social stratification in contemporary China: Preliminary findings from the Beijing College Students Panel Survey," *Chinese J. Sociol.*, 2017, doi: 10.1177/2057150X16688144.
- [3] M. B. Augustyn and T. A. Loughran, "Juvenile waiver as a mechanism of social stratification: A focus on human capital\*," *Criminology*, 2017, doi: 10.1111/1745-9125.12136.
- [4] D. S. Singgih, "Prosedur analisis stratifikasi sosial dalam perspektif sosiologi," *Univ. Airlangga*, 2017.
- [5] A. Selin, "A conference on social stratification in Russia between the 16th and 20th centuries: European context," *Quaestio Rossica*. 2017. doi: 10.15826/qr.2017.4.275.
- [6] M. Oris, R. Gabriel, G. Ritschard, and M. Kliegel, "Long Lives and Old Age Poverty: Social Stratification and Life-Course Institutionalization in Switzerland," *Res. Hum. Dev.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/15427609.2016.1268890.
- [7] H. Kerbo, "Social Stratification," in *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social Theory*, 2017. doi: 10.1002/9781118430873.est0761.
- [8] J. Naito, "Effect of social stratification on the usability of relational resources: Social support networks and individual freedom," *Sociol. Theory Methods*, 2017.
- [9] C. Meyskens, "Inequality and social stratification in maoist China," *Twentieth-Century China*. 2018. doi: 10.1353/TCC.2018.0020.
- [10] V. A. Anikin, "Social stratification based on life chances: Operationalization for mass surveys," *Monit. Obs. Mneniya Ekon. i Sotsial'nye Peremeny*, 2018, doi: 10.14515/monitoring.2018.4.03.
- [11] A. Fan and B. Cheng, "Social Stratification and Studying Overseas: Empirical Evidence from Middle Schools in Beijing," *Asia-Pacific Educ. Res.*, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s40299-017-0361-2.
- [12] H. Forsberg, "School competition and social stratification in the deregulated upper secondary school market in Stockholm," *Br. J. Sociol. Educ.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/01425692.2018.1426441.
- [13] U. Isopahkala-Bouret *et al.*, "Access and stratification in Nordic higher education. A review of cross-cutting research themes and issues\*," *Education Inquiry*. 2018. doi: 10.1080/20004508.2018.1429769.
- [14] H. Zhu and A. Walker, "Pension system reform in China: Who gets what pensions?," *Soc. Policy Adm.*, 2018, doi: 10.1111/spol.12368.



## CHAPTER 2

### ANALYSING THE FUNDAMENTAL OF STRATIFICATION CONCEPTS

---

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor,  
Department of Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India  
Email Id- sarita.verma@muit.in

#### **ABSTRACT:**

Our knowledge of how societies arrange and distribute resources, opportunities, and power among its members is based on the basic sociological idea of stratification. The main characteristics, root causes, and effects of stratification are examined in this abstract. Additionally, it focuses on a number of theoretical stances that aid in deciphering and explaining the processes of social stratification. Addressing challenges of inequality and social justice in modern society requires an understanding of these basic ideas. Inequality is a worldwide phenomenon. It may exist in the shape of a group or individual hierarchy, or it can exist without the formation of a hierarchy. Social differentiation occurs when social imbalances do not generate hierarchy. However, social stratification occurs when social disparity expresses itself as a hierarchy or gradation of groups. Social stratification is the process of arranging social layers in a society in a hierarchical order. Ascription and attainment are two normative elements that all communities use to determine such arrangements.

#### **KEYWORDS:**

Class, Gender, Inequality, Race, Social Stratification

#### **INTRODUCTION**

"Social stratification is the division of society into permanent groups of categories linked by the relationship of superiority and subordination," writes Gisbert. Social stratification has a long history. It evolved as a social institution of society at a given stage of social growth and development. Social distinction existed in primitive communities, but there was no system of social stratification. With the creation of economic excess and the accumulation of wealth, stratification began to emerge. Society's stratification was developed. However, the issue here is how society creates hierarchy. Society creates stratification by bestowing various benefits on distinct groups, such as money, status, power, and so on. Thus, social stratification is organized around three fundamental organizing principles: (1) position, (2) money, and (3) power, among others. These incentives, as well as power, might be overlapping. Cumulative stratification is the name given to this kind of stratification. The first premise of stratification is status. In terms of social stratification, status denotes a place in the hierarchy based on honors or esteem. Caste is an example of a status group in Indian society [1], [2].

Another benefit of organizing stratification is wealth. The principle of stratification changed when the manner of production shifted from agrarian to industrial. More wealth was created as output increased. The accumulation of money formed the foundation of stratification in this case. The group with more influence over money had a better position in society, and vice versa. A wealth-based stratification example is class. Power is the ability of a man or group to actualize their own will in a community activity even in the face of opposition from others via the authorized use of coercive methods. Power is the ability to exert influence on

others. Power enters the concept of stratification when the state uses it to actively influence the principle of stratification. For example, the state is transforming Indian society's stratification structure via the use of positive discrimination. Lower caste persons may now change their place in the traditional system.

## **Equality and Inequality in Relation to Stratification**

### **1. Equality**

The primary issue is whether equality is the inverse of inequality. Other questions include: Is equality a mirage? Is there simply equality before the law? Is there a fundamental incompatibility between individual rights and social equality? Is equality the result of violent or extreme action by subordinate/subaltern groups? There is a school of thought that "all men are created equal," at least at the moment of birth, regardless of their parents' origins or cultural history. Another point of view is that democratic societies declare equality of opportunity, result, working circumstances, and so on.

However, understanding the many meanings and definitions of the term of "equality" is required. "Equality" and "inequality" are fundamental notions in current social sciences and the capitalist system. Political equality may be a legitimate expression, but varied access to society resources seems to be a glaring reality. Inequality is explained and defended as a necessary and unavoidable phenomenon. The dichotomy between equality and inequality is seen in practically every aspect of life; nonetheless, the two are not mutually exclusive. Equality and inequality are relative phenomena that fluctuate over time owing to both structural and cultural elements of social development. There is constantly a quest towards equality, and in this process, new types of inequality may develop, as well as the elimination or lessening of existing disparities.

When status and birth advantages dwindle, equality and citizenship thrive. Genuine equality, on the other hand, can be attained only if capitalistic institutions such as the market, private property, family inheritance, and the class structure are weakened. Individualism, competitiveness, and accomplishment as dominating ideals should ordinarily promote equality in life; however, this does not occur. Without public assistance and welfare programs for the poor and vulnerable, no society can attain equality among its inhabitants. Equality, as a system of equitable interactions, disrupts a society's stability or status quo. According to Bryan S. Turner, only political stability and egalitarian philosophy can secure equality. The nature of equality, social stability circumstances, ideology, and social movements all contribute to greater equality and coherence [3], [4].

## **DISCUSSION**

Turner comments, "Basically, I think of equality as a value and a principle that is fundamentally modern and progressive." Inequality is no longer accepted as a given or as a normal human condition. Why is there inequity? What is the moral reason for it? Not only is equality a contemporary virtue, but it is also employed as a gauge of modernity and the whole modernization process. Equality is linked to the growth of the nation-state, political equality, and social justice. In the French Revolution of 1789, the motto "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" concretized equality as an ideal and a principle. During the French Revolution, social disparity was rejected as an unavoidable and natural fact. By promoting universalistic social involvement, the American Revolution of 1765 also enhanced the notion and practice of equality. The election of Barak Obama as President of the United States in 2009 dealt a crushing blow to the ethnic/racial component in achieving equality.

## Equality as a Concept and a Value

Equality destroys established social rank and hierarchical disparities. Individual distinctions and freedoms are likewise obliterated by the equality concept. True equality cannot exist with caste-based authority and feudalism. In actual life, no ascriptive disparities or birth-based concerns would be permitted to decide possibilities and access. Such a concept and pattern of equality might develop from revolutionary movements and egalitarian behavior. True equality would not be incompatible with personal autonomy and cultural diversity. Turner adds, "The modern notion of equality cannot be divorced from the evolution of citizenship." T.H. Tawney and T.H. Marshall and Turner define egalitarian citizenship in three dimensions: (i) equality before the law, personal liberty, the right to own property, and freedom of expression; (ii) political citizenship; and (iii) social citizenship. Political fights are a necessary component of attempts to achieve equality. For example, democratic political systems arose as a result of (1) checking arbitrary rules, (2) replacing arbitrary laws with reasonable and logical ones, and (3) obtaining a stake in rulemaking for the underlying population. Democratic systems have developed as a result of the demise of political absolutism and tyranny. Karl Marx advocated revolutionary class consciousness as a means of overthrowing the prevailing capitalistic system [5]–[7].

## Social Justice and Equality

In his well-known book *A Theory of Justice* (updated edition), John Rawls addresses the issue of "equality" from the standpoint of social justice rather than simply as a political notion. Rawls considers equality to be the fundamental structure of society, governing the assignment of rights and obligations and regulating the distribution of social and economic benefits. He notices:

1. Everyone has an equal right to the most comprehensive framework of equal fundamental rights compatible with a corresponding scheme of liberties for others.
2. Social and economic disparities are to be structured in such a way that they are both (a) reasonably anticipated to benefit everyone and (b) related to positions and offices held by everyone.

In reality, there are two justice concepts advanced by Rawls. He goes on to say, "All social values - liberty and opportunity, income and wealth, and the social bases of self-respect - are to be distributed equally unless an unequal distribution of any, or all, of these values is to everyone's advantage." Free market systems, for example, may operate inside a framework of political and legal institutions. The framework limits excessive accumulations of property and money, as well as equitable educational opportunities for everybody. "Chances to acquire cultural knowledge and skills should not depend on one's class position," Rawls argues, "and so the school system, whether public or private, should be designed to even out class barriers." Rawls focuses on "democratic equality." Natural aristocracy indicates that social conditions are not managed above and above what is necessary by formal equality of opportunity, for the benefit of societies poor.

Democratic equality and the principle of diversity, according to Rawls, are coterminous and coexistent. The principle of difference eliminates the indeterminacy of the concept of effectiveness by assessing the underlying structure's social and economic imbalances. Equality entails raising the expectations of society's least advantaged members rather than raising the expectations of its better-off individuals. The distribution of income and access to societal resources may explain the concepts of diversity and effectiveness while keeping the better off and disadvantaged members and their aspirations in mind.



Almost everyone can profit from the difference concept. S., for example, explains functional gradations. In the case of Poland, Ossowski is founded on the requirement of diversity rather than the hierarchical order of society.

Rawls defines equality as an egalitarian view of justice. The principle of difference, as an unavoidable fact, is associated with the redressal of the disadvantages of worthy members of society. Inequalities exist because the allocation of innate skills and social circumstances is unequal. Rawls goes on to say that "the natural distribution is neither just nor unjust; nor is it unjust that people are born into society in certain positions." These are merely realities of nature. What is equitable and unjust is how institutions handle these circumstances." In a caste society, ascriptive distribution is unfair since the system becomes closed. The system's arbitrary nature renders it unfair and inequitable. Rawls goes on to say that the foundation of equality is fairness. According to Rawls, there are three levels at which the idea of equality applies. These are: (1) the administration of institutions as public rule-making processes; (2) the application of equality to the substantive structure of institutions; and (3) the moral people's right to equal justice.

Thus, equality is fundamentally justice in the sense of regularity. All people must be granted the same fundamental rights. Persons capable of possessing a vision of their own good and a feeling of justice, as well as an effective willingness to act and adhere to the principles of justice, may be allowed equality for their own and society's welfare. As a result, equality cannot be founded on inherent characteristics. Rawls makes some broad remarks on equality. We must guarantee that everyone's rights are equal. Justice principles are implemented equitably to everybody. Without substantive force, a procedural regulation cannot secure justice and equality. The notion of justice may explain the distribution of particular commodities and the equality of the respect due to individuals regardless of their social standing as examples of fairness. The first defines the second, and the second defines the first. In society, there is a balancing process based on equal opportunity [8], [9].

Absolute equality, justice, and fairness are only utopian concepts. However, human history demonstrates that attempts have always been undertaken to abolish, remove, or diminish social and economic inequities in order to achieve maximal equality among men in a particular community. As inequality remains, so does the desire for equality in society. Both are relative and contradictory phenomena. Marc Galanter alludes to formal versus substantive equality, as well as vertical and horizontal perspectives on equality, in the Indian context, notably with regard to reservation policy in educational institutions and government positions. In fact, Galanter discusses equal opportunity and the many definitions of equality. Most human cultures adhere to the three basic ideals of equality, justice, and fairness.

## **2. Inequality**

"What is the origin of inequality among men and whether it is authorized by natural law," wrote Jean Jacques Rousseau. Rousseau, a misguided rebel, believed that inequality was a fundamental issue. He gave substantial thought to the twin issues of man's "original nature" and the foundation of society. He believed in the cause of civilization's corrupting impact. "The social structure itself perverted human nature, our way of life, our search for happiness." "To inquire how inequality came to be is to inquire how society came to be, because inequality is a social relationship." Rousseau believes that society "came to be" as an act of human will, and that a "natural man" living in isolation is possible at least theoretically. Rousseau's *Discourse on Inequality*, on the other hand, states that "historical or social man, because of the very conditions of social living, is inevitably evil - that is, he is impelled to selfish actions that will harm others." The more civilized the society, the more horrible he

will be." Rousseau's "natural man" is also joyful and unchanging. "The imposition of society on this natural man has created a situation of conflict, inequality, distorted values, and misery." Such a genesis seems to be logically solid and philosophically persuasive, yet it is impractical in real life. Income, income, employment, education, authority, lifestyle, and so on all influence the character and process of distributive justice or unfairness. Social interactions among persons in a society are formed based on distinction resulting from these factors. Thus, birth, ethnicity, race, and the previously specified factors might all be used to determine status. The character and operation of a society would be determined by a certain system of stratification.

While tracing the history of inequality, Dahrendorf claims that the genesis of inequality was the focus point in the 18th century, the construction of classes was argued in the 19th century, and now 20th and 21st centuries we are discussing the idea of social-stratification. The original issue remains, but a new explanation may be proposed. Dahrendorf's following comment is noteworthy: All pairs of unequals are the lathe operator and pipe fitter, the general and the sergeant, the aristocratically gifted kid and the mechanically gifted child, the brilliant and the untalented. However, these disparities are clearly uneven and must be separated from one another in at least two ways. First, we must differentiate between inequalities of natural ability and inequalities of social status; second, we must distinguish between disparities that do not include any evaluative rank order and those that do. Dahrendorf distinguishes four categories of inequality based on the combination of these two techniques. There are (a) natural distinctions of kind in looks, character, and interests, and (b) natural differences of rank in intellect, ability, and strength in respect to the person. In terms of society, they are: (c) social distinction of positions fundamentally equal in rank, and (d) social distinction based on reputation and money, represented as a social status rank order [10], [11].

While admitting Rousseau's difference between natural and social inequalities, as well as his preference for natural disparities as beneficial, Dahrendorf displays his primary focus in stratification inequalities. There are both distributive and non-distributive inequalities. Wealth and status are stratification-related, and hence distributed. Property and charisma are not shared. The "distributive" and "non-distributive" inequalities are also known as "intransitive" and "transitive" inequalities. Aristotle, like Rousseau, was interested in the origins of social stratification (inequality). Both, however, lacked what we need today as a sociological investigation of social stratification. Dahrendorf observes, while commenting on the Aristotelian argument of natural equality, "If men are equal by nature, then social inequalities cannot be established by nature or God; and if they are not so established, then they are subject to change, and the privileged of today may be the outcasts of tomorrow; it may even be possible to abolish all inequalities." Men are born free and with equal rights. As a result, social inequalities can only be founded on general usefulness, as noted by Dahrendorf. Dahrendorf also asks the following questions:

1. Where do societal inequities arise if men are born equal in rank?
2. If all men are born free and equal in rights, how can we explain why some are affluent and others are impoverished, why some are revered while others are ignored, why some are strong while others are in servitude?

It demonstrates that the premise of an initial condition of inequality, as well as the explanation of inequality's creation in terms of property, have remained uncontested to this day. In theory, a society may exist without private property, but in practice, even the former Soviet Union, East European nations, and modern China have accepted discrepancies in

ownership and income, resulting in social inequality. Differences in profession and income are based on the division of labor. This is also the foundation of class formation (i.e., rank inequality). Because vocations vary, the creation of social classes and positions is an unavoidable result.

### **The Pervasiveness of Social Inequality**

According to Talcott Parsons, Kingsley Davis, W.E Moore, and others, inequality exists in all human communities and is accompanied by a system of behavioral norms and consequences. In a broad sense, law is the pinnacle of all rules and punishments. As a result, the rule of law is both a necessary and sufficient condition of social inequality. "There is inequality because there is law; if there is law, then there must also be inequality among men". All men may be equal in the eyes of the law, but they may not be after it. In other words, norms, punishment, or legislation create inequality. Two points should be made here:

- (i) That every society is a moral community and, as such, recognizes rules that govern the behavior of its members; and
- (ii) That penalties are required to reinforce these standards by rewarding compliance and punishing deviation. This is obviously a functionalist stance, which we shall examine later when presenting methods to the study of social stratification.

According to Dahrendorf, such concerns undercut the rigidities of inequality. He does, however, point out that "the origin of social inequality lies neither in human nature nor in historically dubious conceptions of private property." It is rather found in some characteristics of all human civilizations that are vital to them." Differentiation of social positions in terms of labor division or role multiplicity is a universal trait of all cultures. However, evaluative distinction of ranks or social positions based on prestige and money scales is not ubiquitous and unavoidable.

Social stratification, according to Dahrendorf, is a very real aspect of our daily life. It is a distributive system, that is, a system of unequal distribution of wanted and scarce resources. Aside from honor and riches, prestige and income, lawful power, patronage, or the transfer of authority as a reward for particular actions or qualities might be regarded as ranking factors. Dahrendorf states, following Weber's difference between power and authority, that power and power structures logically precede social stratification systems.

Thus, the answer for inequality is found in power relations. In other words, in the explanation of social inequality, norm, sanction, and power are all closely connected phenomena. Inequality is a fact of life. The concept of a completely equal society is both unrealistic and terrifying.

W.G. Runciman also wonders, "What exactly should be meant by social inequality?" The apparent response to this issue is that the affluent and poor may be found everywhere and, in all civilizations, as can the strong and the weak. Inequality has been a burning problem throughout history, and attempts have been undertaken to minimize its scale.

According to Runciman, socioeconomic disparities are numerous and complicated. "If social inequalities of any kind are to be either evaluated or explained, they must first of all be distinguished by reference to the numbers of separate dimensions in which the members of societies are collectively ranked above or below one another - that is, the meaning to be given to 'social stratification' as such," he writes. This categorization would be discussed subsequently in the Weberian method.

## CONCLUSION

Sociology's foundational idea of social stratification serves as a critical lens through which we may examine society's intricate systems. It includes the unfair allocation of assets, opportunities, and power among people and groups based on a variety of variables, including class, race, and gender. Social stratification has many different root causes, many of which are impacted by historical, economic, and cultural influences. It has serious effects on people's prospects for success in life, their ability to advance in society, and their general well-being. Diverse theoretical viewpoints, such as those of Marx, Weber, and the Davis-Moore theory, provide new views on the causes and effects of stratification. For the purpose of creating tactics to combat injustice and advance social justice, it is crucial to understand the subtleties of various viewpoints. The study of social stratification is still important in today's society because we want to build more inclusive and equal communities. Informed policy-making and social change initiatives aiming at eliminating gaps and ensuring a fairer allocation of resources and opportunities for all members of society may be built on a foundation of understanding of the basic stratification ideas.

## REFERENCES:

- [1] M. Rajabi Asadabadi, M. Saberi, and E. Chang, "Letter: The concept of stratification and future applications," *Appl. Soft Comput. J.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.asoc.2018.02.035.
- [2] M. R. Asadabadi, M. Saberi, and E. Chang, "Targets of Unequal Importance Using the Concept of Stratification in a Big Data Environment," *Int. J. Fuzzy Syst.*, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s40815-017-0430-y.
- [3] M. R. Asadabadi, "The stratified multi-criteria decision-making method," *Knowledge-Based Syst.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.knosys.2018.07.002.
- [4] G. D'Amico *et al.*, "New concepts on the clinical course and stratification of compensated and decompensated cirrhosis," *Hepatol. Int.*, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s12072-017-9808-z.
- [5] J. Forstenpointner, J. Otto, and R. Baron, "Individualized neuropathic pain therapy based on phenotyping: Are we there yet?," *Pain*. 2018. doi: 10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001088.
- [6] M. Izadi Najafabadi, B. Somers, B. Johansson, and N. Dam, "Combustion stratification study of partially premixed combustion using Fourier transform analysis of OH\* chemiluminescence images," *Int. J. Engine Res.*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/1468087417740270.
- [7] J. Forstenpointner, A. S. C. Rice, N. B. Finnerup, and R. Baron, "Up-date on Clinical Management of Postherpetic Neuralgia and Mechanism-Based Treatment: New Options in Therapy," *J. Infect. Dis.*, 2018, doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiy381.
- [8] P. Lambert and D. Griffiths, *Social inequalities and occupational stratification: Methods and concepts in the analysis of social distance*. 2018. doi: 10.1057/978-1-137-02253-0.
- [9] M. Chand *et al.*, "Novel biomarkers for patient stratification in colorectal cancer: A review of definitions, emerging concepts, and data," *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*. 2018. doi: 10.4251/wjgo.v10.i7.145.

- [10] A. Elagizi *et al.*, “An Overview and Update on Obesity and the Obesity Paradox in Cardiovascular Diseases,” *Progress in Cardiovascular Diseases*. 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.pcad.2018.07.003.
- [11] N. Bögeholz, D. G. Dechering, and L. Eckardt, “Improved risk stratification for patients with atrial fibrillation by advancing the concept of atrial cardiomyopathy?,” *International Journal of Cardiology*. 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.ijcard.2018.08.014.

## CHAPTER 3

### A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW ON SOCIAL EXCLUSION AND HIERARCHY IN STRATIFICATION

---

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor,  
Department of Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India  
Email Id- sarita.verma@muit.in

#### ABSTRACT:

Fundamental elements of social structures that influence how people's experiences and opportunities within society are shaped include social exclusion and hierarchy in stratification. This essay examines the complex connection between social exclusion and hierarchy, emphasizing the ways in which hierarchies often support exclusionary tendencies. We study the many aspects of social exclusion and its effects on people in diverse socioeconomic circumstances, drawing on sociological theory and empirical data. This research provides insights into the intricacies of social stratification by examining the methods through which hierarchy fosters exclusion. The results highlight the need for laws and programs that work to lessen social exclusion and increase fairness in society. Ordinarily, the phrase 'hierarchy' refers to the classification of social units as superior and inferior, or higher and lower. Race and caste are natural hierarchies because they both entail an ordering of endogamous groups with unchanging hereditary membership. Caste and race have certain parallels in terms of endogamy, but the two are built on independent and distinct ideas, and their actual functioning is likewise not comparable.

#### KEYWORDS:

Inequality, Social Exclusion, Social Hierarchy, Stratification.

#### INTRODUCTION

Famous French sociologist Louis Dumont popularized the notion of hierarchy by describing India's caste system as a strict and unchanging structure of stratification. Dumont's well-known book *Homo Hierarchicus* is, literally speaking, opposite of '*Homo Aequalis*'. In other words, "hierarchy" characterizes India, whereas "equality" characterizes France. Dumont sees the caste system as a sort of inequality explained by beliefs and values. The basic antagonism between the pure and the impure is a defining feature in Dumont's study of the caste system. The antagonism is not total, however, since the pure contains the impure, and the two combined would establish organic caste linkages. C. Bougle articulated the caste system in terms of hierarchically ordered hereditary groupings, segregation, and dependency much before Dumont's *Homo Hierarchicus*. In reality, discreteness, segregation, ordering, and dependency coexist as aspects of the same theory and practice in caste hierarchy. As a result, caste hierarchy has included "principles" as well as the principle of antagonism between the pure and the impure. But the issue emerges when Dumont refers to it as "a single true principle." According to Dumont, this resistance is a trait of men and women, food and clothing, jobs and division of labor, and so on [1], [2]. Now the issue is, to what degree does the notion of contrast between the pure and impure permeate Indian culture historically and even today? Chris Smaje provides a concise explanation of the notion of hierarchy. Smaje distinguishes between "ranking hierarchies" and "encompassing hierarchies." The first denotes a world of discourse that is totally split into two or more non-overlapping groups of



superior and inferior things. As a result, this is referred to as "transitive hierarchization." This schema broadly relates to Euro-American notions of racial hierarchy, as well as gender and economic inequality. The second entails that the ranking units are coextensive with the discourse universe; in other words, the superior entity includes the inferior entity. In India's caste system, for example, there is a type of "unity" of the pure and the impure. In a totally different context, Karl Marx spoke of "the unity of opposites" in the setting of the bourgeoisie and proletariat cooperating in industry, but with distinct goals and interests. In the second scenario, complementarity or conflict is contained inside a higher order unity. As a result, the level of hierarchy at which it is located must be defined.

C may be mentioned here. The concept of "dual organizations" as proposed by Levi-Strauss, which has some similarities to Dumont's theory of hierarchy. The ranking hierarchy generally correlates to Levi-Strauss' concept of "diametric" organization, while the concept of the encompassing hierarchy corresponds to Levi-Strauss' concept of "concentric" organization. Diametric structures may seem equal if their two constituents are seen as complimentary, yet they are still unequal. Concentric constructions, on the other hand, are always unequal because they are structured around, or emerge from, a higher center point. The issue is, how relevant are Dumont and Levi-Strauss' concepts or frameworks for understanding and explaining India's caste hierarchy? Smaje alluded to the shortcomings of both theories and discussed the "radial" model of caste relations, which rejects any one, central point of hierarchical preeminence. To connect the hierarchically ordered groups/units, a "triadism" or a third or mediating element may be necessary. The "radial" caste paradigm relates to a variety of contexts, such as unique center-periphery interactions or the sacred-profane dichotomy [3], [4].

As a result, Dumont stands out as a proponent of the hierarchy notion. "A hierarchical relation is a relation between larger and smaller, or more precisely between that which encompasses and that which is encompassed," argues Dumont, referring to what Smaje refers to as "concentric hierarchies." Under the idea of caste hierarchy, the encompassing and the encompassed are both complementary and antagonistic. Pure and impure stay static as the foundation upon which this duality exists/persists indefinitely. T.N. Madan lauded Dumont for his deep and significant contributions to the study of Indian society. He possesses clarity of ideas, scholarship, and writing lucidity. "Homo Hierarchicus is an unusual work in its conception, design, and execution," comments Madan. Madan observes that the ranking principle, which ranks the components of a whole in relation to the whole, aids us in obtaining a holistic perspective of the system and overcoming dualism of antagonism. As a result, Dumont seems to subscribe to the functionalist approach to social stratification advocated by Talcott Parsons, Kingsley Davis, and Wilbert Moore.

## DISCUSSION

Dipankar Gupta is another surprise supporter of Dumont. Dumont, the author of *Homo Hierarchicus*, is regarded by him as "the most advanced and sophisticated proponent of the social anthropological mainline view of the caste system." Gupta goes on to say: Dumont is not only the most systematic exponent of the dominant conceptual view of the caste system, but he achieved this distinction by undermining almost all known conceptual views on the subject, either in terms of detail in the case of those whose overall conclusions match his - or in terms of conception and methodology - in the case of those whose conclusions could possibly be extended to refute his, namely Senart and Bougie. When he challenges Bougie, Senart, or even Ghurye and Karve, he does so not so much for what they say as for what they suggest. As we find ourselves sympathizing with these consequences, we must pay more attention to Dumont.

Gupta further adds that even Dumont's detractors acknowledge his unique contribution to the issue. The so-called distinctive contribution of Dumont, in our opinion, is the conception of "hierarchy" as a rigid and static system of stratification, in contrast to the egalitarian and equalitarian system of social interactions in France and the rest of the Western world. Dumont is tormented by the western world's dominance in general, and its intellectual supremacy in particular. His hostile remarks and criticisms on the opinions of several Indian academicians, such as A.K. Saran, Iravati Karve, A.R. Desai, and others bear witness to his presumed inferiority of Indian culture and intelligentsia. Because T.N. Madan has gone out of his way to praise Dumont's understanding of the caste system, it is vital to consider the ramifications of Dumont's standpoint as emerging from his own perspective of the concept of "Homo Aequalis." Let us now check what Gupta says after defending Dumont's concept of caste as "true hierarchy." Gupta's questions in place of Dumont's "Facts against Theory" are highly diverse, referring to disparate settings, circumstances, topics, places, and persons. As a result, there can be no "true hierarchy" in the caste system [5], [6].

### **Caste Structure**

McKim Marriott's suggestion of caste elaboration or a scale of rigidity-flexibility of caste ranking is highly useful to understanding India's various areas. Gupta seemed to concur with this assessment. "A true hierarchy, according to us, is an unambiguous linear ranking on a single variable," he writes. Aside from such factors as riches in cash, women, livestock, or land, authority may also be a viable requirement for a real and continuous hierarchy." Relative positions of status and power would alter if a specific organization/system underwent revolution. According to Gupta, "continuous hierarchies are built around a single criterion, which is shared to a greater or lesser extent by all those who occupy that hierarchy." There are discrete classes that segregate units into exclusive, incommensurable, and qualitative categories. A person is a Brahmin, a Vaishya, a Rajasthani/Bengali/Punjabi, and so on. In the present setting, he cannot be anything other than himself. "A continuous hierarchy, on the other hand, is built on the quantitative variation of a single attribute across levels or strata." As a result, there exist both continuous hierarchies and discrete classes. This difference roughly correlates to Smaje and Levi-Strauss' categories.

Dumont's research on India's caste system has mostly relied on indological sources. Independent India exhibits huge contrasts, disparities in interests, disputes, exploitation, upward and downward mobility, and internal and international migrations, all of which should serve as the foundation for comprehending Indian social construction. Dumont has downplayed the significance of social media. There is no unilinear caste hierarchy. Today's Indian society is characterized by several hierarchies. Intercaste and intracaste contacts are no longer the foundation of organic links between and within castes. Family and individuality are more important than castes and groups in achieving honor and social esteem. "Caste is increasingly becoming a desire, a state of mind, a plastic and malleable institution." There is no longer any ongoing hypersymbolisation to indicate caste disparities and typifications".

### **Exclusion from Society**

Though the term "exclusion" has been popular in works on social stratification, caste, class, and race, as a concept, "exclusion," specifically "social exclusion," became popular in western studies on social stratification and race in the 1970s. The notion of inclusion and exclusion, or pure and impure, serves as the foundation of the caste system, defining superior and inferior positions and access to power and privilege. Because "exclusion" implies social ties, we could choose to refer to it as "social exclusion" rather than "exclusion".



In Western Europe, the term refers to several types of social disadvantage, such as economic, social, political, and cultural disadvantage. Social exclusion manifests itself in many forms and degrees of severity. When social integration is threatened, it is thought that social exclusion has emerged. In the 1970s, Europe had an alarming level of unemployment, which was seen as a sign of strained togetherness. The idea of "relative deprivation" is employed in America to differentiate between the advantaged and disadvantaged segments of society. Minorities, especially the impoverished, are regarded "marginalized" in India. Karl Marx saw poverty, unemployment, and hardship as the primary causes of social exclusion, as well as disengagement, retreat, underclass, and alienation. Herbert Marcuse saw an individual's lack of freedom as the primary source of his exclusion. The term "social exclusion" is often used in research on political participation, access to society resources and opportunities, unemployment, poverty, education, health care, and so on. It is currently expanding. It is debatable whether social exclusion creates poverty or poverty causes social isolation. Despite these difficulties, social exclusion is defined as a break in social relationships. It is an effective notion for explaining socioeconomic inequality [7]–[9].

### **Social Exclusion Dimensions**

There are several types of social exclusion. India is a textbook case of social isolation. Caste, the Jajmani system, untouchability, religion, gender, disability, traditions and practices, and other factors have been utilized to socially exclude lesser castes and groups. According to the International Institute of Labour Studies /UNDP, the following are the conditions for social exclusion:

1. In resource allocation processes such as power relations, agency, culture, and social identity, social exclusion is a negative state of process.
2. Social exclusion may be manifested as a subjective or objective element of people's life, such as a feeling of inferiority or being materially disadvantaged.
3. It might be seen as a disadvantage for a person.
4. Individuals who are socially excluded are also denied commodities, services, and resources.

Nobody appreciated being isolated from his surroundings and social circumstances. Thus, social isolation is an involuntary situation imposed by the state society, notably by the wealthy few. Societal exclusion leads to conflict and discord, and it surely disrupts societal peace and coherence. It is not, however, immobile or unidimensional. It has four dimensions:

1. Civic participation
2. The labor market
3. Provision for the welfare state
4. Family and neighborhood

Social exclusion has a negative impact on various components of society.

### **Poverty and Exclusion from Society**

Aside from civic integration, the aspects of labor market, welfare state, family, and community all pertain to poverty among the poor. In reality, social isolation results in hardship and deprivation. While it is associated with marginalization, closure, disaffiliation, dispossession, deprivation, and poverty on the one hand, it also means insertion, integration, citizenship, and solidarity on the other. In India, social exclusion manifests itself as a lack of distributive justice, caste-based barriers and discrimination, uneven access to opportunities,

and inadequate governmental policies. In other words, social disparities are created by society and the state, respectively, via caste hierarchy and bad welfare programs.

Exclusion of persons from economic, political, and social activities is the responsibility of the state. The Indian Constitution, as well as institutional structures and practices, provide veiled rationalizations for the perpetuation of inequality. The poor are still excluded from mainstream activities, and as a result of social and political awakening, they are becoming more aware of their low social position. Except for those saints who have rejected the world, no one is self-excluded. Such folks are quite uncommon. Throughout history, there have been movements and demonstrations against exploitation and privilege. In our opinion, the poor continue to be socially excluded, whereas only the very wealthy are socially excluded. Those who are socially excluded do so not of their own decision, but as a result of the dominant segment of society's hegemony and supremacy [10], [11].

As a result, social exclusion is a complex, ambiguous, multifaceted, and vast notion. It describes who gets marginalized, alienated, isolated, and labeled as "outsiders" in a particular culture. Because society is not a static entity, not only does the idea of social exclusion need to be revised to reflect structural and cultural changes, but the nature of social exclusion and inclusion also varies. The key challenges of social exclusion in India today include nutrition, elementary education, and basic health care, access to housing, water supply, sanitation, and social security. Let us acknowledge that exclusion-inclusion is a long-standing fact in Indian society. The notion of distance and inclusion-exclusion underpins caste hierarchy. The pure-impure concept is nothing more than excluding some by labeling them "impure" and embracing others by labeling them "pure." Lower castes, for example, have been referred to as outer castes, dalits, untouchables, and so on. The evolving matrix of India's lower castes reflects the dynamism of the idea and practice of social exclusion.

Tribal and indigenous groups have been dispossessed of land and forest resources. Several actions and agitations undertaken against the exploiters attest to the excluded's exclusion and fight for their insertion and inclusion. In their households, women are isolated and marginalized. Recent efforts at "feminification" are in opposition to women's exploitation and enslavement. In the hands of a male-dominated culture, patriarchy has been a harsh instrument. The poor are denied appropriate nourishment, education, healthcare, work, decision-making involvement, and other associated activities. Who is to blame for this ailment? We may need to examine the state's dynamics since independence with attention. Why do the wealthy continue to accumulate wealth?

### **Poverty in India**

Prior to the Green Revolution, caste hierarchy and landholdings interacted in rural India. The relationship between caste and profession was more or less identical. In other words, the higher a caste's standing, the more influence it had over land and profitable jobs. Macro-structural improvements, such as the Green Revolution, have helped rural people in general, but inequitably. Several secular or non-caste vocations have emerged in the six decades following independence, with no caste-based access. Some of the new jobs, which are highly profitable, are seized by the most enterprising members of society. In the past, marginal peasants, landless agricultural and manual laborers suffered greatly. However, there is a discernible improvement in the size of poverty reduction as a result of many job programmes and increased daily earnings. Poverty has also decreased as a result of migration to towns and cities. Unemployment, including underemployment, is the leading cause of poverty. Poverty is also caused by low income and family members' reliance on one or two earners. Inequalities are rising and evolving in both rural and urban environments.

The rural poor have a propensity to relocate to urban areas, contributing to urban unemployment or underemployment as well as housing, electrical, water, and sanitation issues. Squatters, chawls, jhuggi-jhonpadis, and jhonpadpatis are frequent names for urban impoverished houses. Squatter colonies house roughly 30% of the population of Mumbai and Kolkata. Slums are rapidly and massively expanding in metropolises and other large cities. According to Oscar Lewis, cities, slums, poverty, and a distinct culture are all interwoven phenomena. The "culture of poverty" is more than simply a state of deprivation or disarray; it is a way of life with predetermined responses to human issues. This has been noticed in metropolitan Latin America and New York. Poverty culture is a subculture in urban slums. He writes", one of the key features of poverty culture is a lack of effective involvement and integration in main organizations of broader society. Poverty is the primary cause of the poverty culture. Uprootedness and isolation, poor income, underemployment, a lack of close social life, personal insecurity, a lack of access to municipal facilities, and other characteristics of urban poverty are listed below. In our setting, the rural-urban link survives to a significant degree, thus the urban poor who have relocated from villages are not isolated and displaced [12]–[14].

Finally, the poor, whether rural or urban, are not a homogeneous group. They are a diverse group, working as manual and construction workers, masons, agricultural laborers, craftsmen in small enterprises, domestic staff, and so on. Some people work in our economy's official and structured sectors. The impoverished are also from many cases, groups, regions, and faiths. The social-cultural background of both rural and urban poor influences their access to employment and opportunities, as well as their personal choices. In general, the incidence of poverty has decreased, both in terms of money and capacity. Various development programs, job schemes, slum clearance plans, modes of transportation and communication, and so on have all contributed to a decrease in social disparity and poverty.

## CONCLUSION

The social structure of civilizations is largely shaped by two interrelated phenomena: social exclusion and hierarchy in stratification. This essay has examined the complex interplay between these two ideas, illuminating the ways in which hierarchies sustain social exclusion through a variety of processes, including prejudice, marginalization, and uneven access to resources. For politicians and campaigners attempting to address problems of inequality and social justice, understanding these interactions is essential. A multifaceted strategy must be used to counteract social exclusion and lessen the effects of hierarchy on excluded groups. This entails putting into reality laws that advance equal opportunity, opposing discriminatory acts, and acknowledging the intersectionality of people's identities and experiences. In addition, promoting an inclusive and compassionate culture within society may help undermine negative hierarchies and lessen the impacts of social exclusion. Individuals, communities, and institutions must work together to overcome social hierarchy and exclusion. We may attempt to lessen the negative effects of stratification and build a more fair and peaceful environment for everybody by attempting to develop a more egalitarian and inclusive society.

## REFERENCES:

- [1] K. Photikanit and P. Sirasoonthorn, "Reconstruction of social ideology through the power of music: Case study of Suntaraporn band, Thailand," *Kasetsart J. Soc. Sci.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.kjss.2018.05.003.
- [2] D. Konduru and C. Hangsing, "Socio-Cultural Exclusion and Inclusion of Trans-genders in India," *Int. J. Soc. Sci. Manag.*, 2018, doi: 10.3126/ijssm.v5i1.18147.

- [3] R. E. Dwyer, "Credit, debt, and inequality," *Annu. Rev. Sociol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-060116-053420.
- [4] E. Y. Kostina and N. A. Orlova, "Socio-economic determinants of crime in modern Russian society," *Russ. J. Criminol.*, 2018, doi: 10.17150/2500-4255.2018.12(6).795-805.
- [5] J. E. Farley and M. W. Flota, "Race and Ethnic Relations," in *Sociology*, 2018. doi: 10.4324/9781315527611-7.
- [6] C. Ferrant, "Class, culture, and structure: Stratification and mechanisms of omnivorousness," *Sociol. Compass*, 2018, doi: 10.1111/soc4.12590.
- [7] H. P. Şenoğuz, *Community, change and border towns*. 2018. doi: 10.4324/9780815358855.
- [8] A. Pratesi, *Doing care, doing citizenship: Towards a micro-situated and emotion-based model of social inclusion*. 2018. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-63109-7.
- [9] S. K. Rai, "Social histories of exclusion and moments of resistance: The case of Muslim Julaha weavers in colonial United Provinces," *Indian Econ. Soc. Hist. Rev.*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/0019464618796896.
- [10] D. O. Brien and P. K. Oakley, "Cultural Value and Inequality: A Critical Literature Review," *A Rep. Comm. by Arts Humanit. Res. Counc. Cult. Value Proj.*, 2015.
- [11] R. Spaaij, K. Farquharson, and T. Marjoribanks, "Sport and Social Inequalities," *Sociol. Compass*, 2015, doi: 10.1111/soc4.12254.
- [12] R. Van Voorst and J. Hellman, "One Risk Replaces Another: Floods, Evictions and Policies on Jakarta's Riverbanks," *Asian J. Soc. Sci.*, 2015.
- [13] A. B. Shlay, "Life and Liberty in the Pursuit of Housing: Rethinking Renting and Owning in Post-Crisis America," *Hous. Stud.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/02673037.2014.963521.
- [14] A. M. Butz and J. E. Kehrberg, "Social distrust and immigrant access to welfare programs in the american states," *Polit. Policy*, 2015, doi: 10.1111/polp.12115.

## CHAPTER 4

### UNDERSTANDING THE THEORIES OF SOCIAL STRATIFICATION

---

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor,  
Department of Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India  
Email Id- sarita.verma@muit.in

#### ABSTRACT:

The notion of social stratification, which includes the hierarchical organization of people or groups within a society based on numerous characteristics including income, power, and reputation, is crucial to sociology. In order to offer insight on how societies construct inequality and hierarchies, this essay examines some of the major ideas of social stratification. This research offers insights into the causes and effects of social stratification via an analysis of structural-functionalism, conflict theory, and symbolic interactionism. It also emphasizes how these ideas interact and how important they are for comprehending current socioeconomic inequities. All cultures want stability, order, and peace, according to functionalist views. They believe that certain fundamental necessities must be addressed in order for civilization to exist. As a result, they look to social stratification to evaluate how far it fits these fundamental demands, which they refer to as functional prerequisites. Functionalists see society as an organism composed of several parts and believe that these facts constitute an integrated whole. According to this viewpoint, each component of the social structure serves distinct roles that are vital for the society's existence.

#### KEYWORDS:

Class, Inequality, Mobility, Social stratification.

#### INTRODUCTION

Thus, functionalists are particularly concerned with the function of social stratification and its contribution to society's upkeep and well-being. The functionalists think that although all of the functions performed by the different components of society are necessary for the society's existence, certain functions are superior to others. People who fulfill outstanding duties are thus highly rated in the hierarchy. The functionalists are especially interested in determining the origins of this hierarchy and the reasons for its widespread acceptance in society [1], [2].

#### Davis and Moore's Theoretical Formulations

Davis and Moore, two American sociologists, published their renowned theory of stratification in an essay titled 'Some Principles of Stratification' in the American Journal of Sociology in 1945. They contended that all social systems have basic functional conditions that must be addressed in order for the system to exist and function properly. Effective role allocation and performance is one such crucial functional need. This prerequisite has four components.

First, all positions must be filled; second, they will be filled by individuals most suited to fulfill those tasks; third, the required training must be completed; and fourth, the roles must be done conscientiously, which implies with devotion to the job. They said that all societies need some kind of system to ensure appropriate role allocation and performance. This process is social stratification, which they define as a system that assigns uneven incentives and advantages to various social positions.

## Stratification Functions

People vary in terms of their intrinsic skill and talent positions, as well as their relevance to society's existence and preservation. Certain locations are more significant in terms of functionality than others. One key purpose of stratification is to match the most capable individuals with the most significant functional jobs. It does this by assigning high pay to certain roles. The pursuit of such prizes pushes individuals to compete for them, and the most skilled will, in principle, triumph. Davis and Moore concluded that social stratification is a tool used by civilizations to ensure that the most important posts are filled by the most competent people. Unequal rewards benefit civilizations in two ways. First, it drives individuals to fill certain positions, and second, the incentives must remain uneven even after the post is filled, so that those who are appointed are pushed to enhance their performance even more. People in contemporary civilizations are assigned occupations based on their talents and credentials.

Ascription was the primary method of filling offices in old cultures. In such a system, uneven incentives would have no impact on enhancing system efficiency. Davis and Moore contended that, although the son of a laborer would continue to be a laborer in such a society, if he does his tasks properly, he will be rewarded in other ways [3], [4].

## Davis and Moore's Functional Prerequisites

According to Davis and Moore, all social systems have certain functional criteria that must be satisfied in order for the system to survive and function properly. The first functional condition is effective role allocation and performance. This will guarantee that the appropriate individuals are put in the appropriate places. This requirement has four components:

1. All societal roles must be filled.
2. The most capable individuals must occupy these posts.
3. They should get training.
4. Roles to be carried out diligently.

They argued that stratification was a strategy for ensuring appropriate role allocation via uneven incentives for various jobs. According to Davis and Moore, the functional relevance of a job may be judged in two ways. To begin, a position is functionally unique if there are no alternative positions that can execute the same role well. The degree to which other positions are reliant on the one in issue is the second measure of significance.

## DISCUSSION

Davis and Moore's points of view sparked a lengthy argument. On the surface, their idea seems to be sensible and practical. However, this is in contrast to traditional ascriptive cultures where occupational mobility is rigorously limited. Tumin, a well-known intellectual adversary, has criticized their idea on various grounds. There is no objective means of quantifying the functional relevance of position, which Davis and Moore used as the foundation for reward distribution. Tumin contends that Davis and Moore have disregarded the effects of power on uneven reward distribution. For example, the salary disparity between agricultural laborers and coal miners might be understood as a consequence of the two groups' negotiating strength. Second, there is little evidence that extraordinary skill is necessary for the roles that Davis and Moore see as crucial. Tumin also criticizes the notion that the training necessary for a high-level employment is a cost that must be compensated. He sees no need to keep this remuneration going for the duration of a person's working life.



Tumin disputes the notion that uneven pay motivates smart people to assume critical roles. He contended that in practice, they operate as impediments to talent motivation and recruitment. Closed stratification systems work in the inverse of Davis and Moore's hypothesis. Tumin also claimed that Davis and Moore neglected to address the likelihood that persons in highly compensated positions may construct obstacles to recruiting. Tumin says that the American Medical Association is preventing more individuals from entering the field. It artificially generates a doctor shortage and secures high pay for medical services. Tumin said that stratification is a divisive rather than an integrating factor because disparities in reward foster antagonism, mistrust, and distrust among society's diverse sectors [5], [6].

### **Davis and Moore's Theory**

T.B. Bottomore's research 'elites and societies' demonstrates that even in industrialized nations like as the United Kingdom and France, where the stratification system is more open, the vast majority of government officials are the progeny of civil servants. Another reality is that access to increase knowledge and skills is critical to filling positions with efficient personnel. Tumin concluded that stratification, by definition, can never fully execute the responsibilities assigned to it by Davis and Moore. 'Differential incentives may theoretically be justified as useful only when there is really equal access to recruiting and training for all potentially competent individuals,' he believes. And it seems that stratification systems are intrinsically hostile to the creation of such complete equality of opportunity.'

### **The Davis-Moore Stratification Theory**

Following an earlier articulation by Davis, Davis and Moore offered a functional theory of stratification in 1945 to account for what they said was the "universal necessity" of class disparity in every social structure. Beginning with Tumin's publication in 1953, the Davis-Moore hypothesis generated constant study, discussion, criticism, and controversy until the 1970s. Although professional work on the theory has largely ceased since the late 1980s, the Davis-Moore theory is still widely cited in American introductory sociology and stratification textbooks and is "required reading" in hundreds, if not thousands, of undergraduate and graduate courses across the country. The current research chronicles the debate's history and aims to explain the theory's endurance and vigor in the face of generally unfavorable judgments by other sociologists during the previous fifty years.

In 1945, two young Harvard-trained sociologists, Kingsley Davis and Wilbert Moore, wrote a brief, seven-page piece on social and economic inequality in the *American Sociological Review*, the younger of the discipline's two most prominent publications. The study, titled "Some Principles of Stratification," received no published comments for many years. Beginning in 1953, with the publication of Melvin Tumin's book "Some Principles of Stratification: A Critical Analysis," the Davis and Moore piece started to get regular public treatment and attention within the field. Davis and Moore's readiness to side with Tumin undoubtedly contributed to the original article's growing prominence. "Some Principles of Stratification" became one of the most frequently cited and critically acclaimed papers in American sociology throughout time. Nonetheless, despite being severely criticized on both logical and empirical grounds, the paper remains a pillar of conventional sociology and is even regarded a "classic".

Kingsley Davis, a student of Pitirim Sorokin and Talcott Parsons, obtained his Ph. D. from the University of Chicago. In 1936, he graduated from Harvard's Department of Sociology. Parsons was assembling the teachers and students who would help him build functional theory at the time, including Davis and Moore. Davis began his career at Pennsylvania State College in the late 1930s, then moved on to Princeton University in the 1940s, Columbia

University in the 1950s, and the University of California at Berkeley from the late 1950s until his retirement in the 1980s. Davis' main scholarly focus subsequently became demography. Wilbert E. Moore earned his Ph.D. in sociology from Harvard in 1940. While Moore was a student at Parsons, Davis, along with Robert Merton and John Riley, was part of the school's inaugural graduate student cohort, and Davis maintained a strong intellectual and collegial relationship with the school early in his career. Davis and Moore were both teaching at Princeton University at the time "Some Principles of Stratification" was written in 1945. Moore was a professor at Princeton University until the mid-1960s. He spent a few years at the Russell Sage Foundation before joining the faculty at the University of Denver, where he finished his career. Davis and Moore were both elected president of the American Sociological Association after getting doctorates from reputable departments and teaching at many distinguished colleges [7]–[9].

Melvin Tumin released the first public remark on the Davis-Moore essay in 1953. Tumin thoroughly analyzed their argument and eventually participated in a series of written debates with Davis and Moore over the hypothesis. The exposure, and maybe the tone, of the dispute with Tumin, as well as its placement inside the pages of the ASR, drew widespread notice and resulted in numerous published answers to the initial piece. Indeed, the Davis and Moore essay has become "one of the most widely cited and debated pieces to ever appear in a sociology journal," a remarkable achievement for an argument of less than 5,000 words. Over the years, thirty significant papers and opinions addressing the Davis-Moore article have emerged in professional publications in the United States, many authored by notable members of the field. Furthermore, the bulk of these papers published in important journals: throughout the 1950s and 1960s, the majority of the pieces appeared in the pages of the American Sociological Review, with approximately two-thirds appearing in either the ASR or the American Journal of Sociology. In this aspect, one might almost argue that the ASR's stature it was only in its tenth year when the original article was published and the popularity of the Davis-Moore issue rose in tandem, each feeding off the other.

While the article was primarily an American thesis advanced and debated by American academic sociologists, papers, books, and course syllabi addressing the article and ensuing controversy were written by foreign authors and published in languages other than English, indicating the article's reach, if not influence. Given the early postwar insularity of American sociology, the Davis-Moore essay did not spread quickly into European sociology groups. The majority of foreign references are from the recent twenty-five years, not the first twenty-five years after the 1945 article was published. Throughout the long debate, there was, as Broom and Cushing observed twenty-five years ago, "a sense that the writers were dealing with matters worthy of argument," despite addressing a topic and theory "susceptible to diverse interpretations." This sense of "worthiness" pervades the entire debate more than fifty years later.

### **Parsons' Theoretical Formulations**

Parsons, an American thinker, rose to prominence as a serious social thinker who attempted to add fresh original thinking to modern social philosophy. He elaborated on the notion of social action. For him, society included the whole of man's social realm. He also developed the theories of social action and social control. He believed in individuality. Institutions are the most essential social control tool for him. He has expressed his thoughts on the social system and social organization. He felt that sociology could be used in both broad and restricted contexts. Talcott Parsons thought that value consensus is the foundation of social order and stability. Value consensus refers to a widespread agreement among members of society on what is desirable and worthwhile. He said that stratification systems are the result



of shared ideals. In Parsons' words, "Stratification, in its valuation aspect, then, the ranking of units in a social system in accordance with the common value system" the ranking, according to Parsons, relies on what that society's values identify as superior. For example, if a community sets a high value on courage, as the Sioux Indians do, people who excel in this attribute will be rewarded with a high position in the stratification system. Because various civilizations have diverse value systems, the paths to a high position will change from one society to the next [10]–[12].

### **Value Agreement and Stratification**

According to Parsons, stratification is an unavoidable element of all human societies because he thinks stratification systems are fair, right, and appropriate since they are essentially an expression of shared ideals. He referred to these common ideals as social values, and the behaviours that resulted from these values as norms. Each community develops its own set of values and norms that are best suited to preserving order and stability. Shared values are an essential component of all social systems. He felt that power and prestige differentials are necessary for social system coordination and integration. It serves to advance communal benefits based on social principles. However, this does not mean that there is no friction between the haves and the have-nots. There is conflict between those who are well paid and those who are not. However, he maintained that this conflict is held in control by a shared value system that justifies uneven distribution of benefits; if these values are questioned, the society would become unstable.

### **The Value Consensus's Role**

A society's social values are its common beliefs. These ideals stem from every society's need to preserve order and stability. Each community develops its own set of values that are best suited to preserving stability. They come from the members of that society's consensus. Anyone who acts in accordance with the values is better rewarded. If someone breaks the agreement, he or she is penalised. Individuals are assessed and ranked in the hierarchy based on their values. The value system justifies stratification or rank differences. So, according to Parsons, stratification is the ordering of units in a social system in line with the shared values system. As a result, it is the value agreement that causes stratification in a community. They argued that stratification was a strategy for ensuring appropriate role allocation via uneven incentives for various jobs.

### **Parsonian Theory of Social Stratification Criticism**

According to Parsons, stratification is the classification of social units based on their shared values. As a result, it is the value system that causes social stratification. His primary focus in stratification analysis was the issue of social order. Stratification is a value factor, according to Parsons. According to Parsons, the ranking is determined by what the ideals of that society consider as superior. For example, if a community sets a high value on courage, as the Sioux Indians do, people who excel in this attribute will be rewarded with a high position in the stratification system. Because various civilizations have distinct value systems, the paths to a high position will differ from one another. He also stated that stratification is an unavoidable element of all human civilizations because he thinks stratification systems are fair, reasonable, and appropriate since they are essentially an expression of shared ideals. These common ideals were referred to by him as social values norms. He felt that power and prestige differentials are necessary for social system coordination and integration. It serves to advance communal benefits based on social principles. However, this does not mean that there is no friction between the haves and the have-nots. There is conflict between those who are well paid and those who are not. However, he maintained that this conflict is held in

control by a shared value system that justifies uneven distribution of benefits; if these values are questioned, the society would become unstable. The functionalists think that all of the functions performed by different segments of society are necessary for the society's existence. They are not, however, of comparable significance. People who accomplish more important tasks are rated higher. People vary in terms of intrinsic ability and skill. Positions vary in their relevance to the existence and upkeep of society. Certain locations are more significant in terms of functionality than others. According to functionalists, one of the most essential functions of stratification is to match the most capable individuals with the most functionally significant roles. It does this by assigning high pay to certain roles. The pursuit of such prizes pushes individuals to compete for them, and in principle, the most competent will prevail. Functionalists such as Davis and Moore maintained that social stratification is a tool used by societies to ensure that the most important posts are filled by the most competent people. Parsons considers stratification systems to be fair, reasonable, and appropriate since they are essentially a reflection of shared ideals. These common ideals were referred to by him as social values norms. Each community develops its own set of values and norms that are best suited to preserving order and stability. Shared values are an essential component of all social systems. He maintained that power and prestige differentials are necessary for social system coordination and integration. It serves to advance communal benefits based on social principles. However, Parsons did not ignore the conflict factor here, stating that there would be conflict when societal ideals are challenged.

### **Social Action Theory**

His interest in Institutional Economics grew significantly over time, which he attributes to Prof. Hamilton. He was an avid student of German social theorists such as Max Weber. He also translated 'Protestants Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism'. He was also influenced by Pareto's idea of residue and non-logical behaviors. Durkheim also influenced him with his theories on Non-Natural Normative Elements of Social Action. Max Weber's thoughts regarding capitalism and subjective meaning helped shape his beliefs.

He began his career as a teacher at Emerist College before moving on to Harvard University. He was named Professor of Sociology in 1944. He has had a significant impact on modern social thinking via his views and works.

#### **1. His Significant Works**

'Structure of Social Action; Theory of Social and Economic Organizations'; Essays in Sociological Theory; The Social System, and Towards a General Theory of Social Action are some of Parsons' key publications. He translated Max Weber's classic essay, 'Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism,' as previously said.

#### **2. His Social Action Theory**

According to Parsons, "the society may be defined as the total complex of relationships insofar as they grow out of actions in terms of means end relationship, intrinsic and symbolic." Society, he says, is an element in the totality of human social activity. Environments, genetics, and culture, on the one hand, and theological, philosophical, and political systems, on the other, all have an impact on society. Society is so complicated that it encompasses and affects all human to-human connections. Society is just a collection of social relationships. He defined society as the sum total of all human relationships. In this aspect, he was heavily inspired by Pareto, Max Weber, and a plethora of other social philosophers.

### 3. Social Action is defined

Before we define Social Action, it is important noting that his opinions on the subject evolved through time. He attempted to analyze the nature and consequences of social activity in his work 'Structure of Social activity'. He also discussed this in another book, 'The Social System,' which was published in 1951. According to Parsons, "social action is a process in the actor-situation system that has motivational significance to the individual actor or, in the case of collectivity, its component individuals." In other words, all social activities are initiated by a system. According to Parsons, social activities are concerned with the relationships of individual actors with other people and social structures.

### 4. Social Action Elements

Parson's social activity consists of four components. The first ingredient is the actor, who serves as the channel through which all acts are carried out. The next attribute is the goal or aim with which the activity is carried out. It is considered that every activity must have a goal in mind. His next characteristic is situation. Each activity is carried out under certain circumstances and not in isolation. Some circumstances are within the actors' control, while others are not. Another feature of social action is the selection of alternative means. Each actor has several goals and multiple ways to achieve those goals. In other words, there are other ways and purposes. These circumstances aid in the acceleration of social acts, but they are not inevitable.

### 5. Social Action Systems

Following components, Parsons Moves on to social action systems. These are also known as social action elements. Personality, cultural, and social systems are the systems. The personality system is in charge of satisfying the requirements of individuals, for which actions are done. However, attempts cannot be undertaken until specific circumstances are met, which are differentiated by numerous symbols and symptoms. As time passes, these symbols take on a broader meaning, and different social actors within a given cultural system engage in a variety of social interactions. This is an example of a cultural system. In terms of the social system, Parsons defines it as "a plurality of individual actors inter acting with each other in a situation which has at least a physical or environmental aspect, actors are motivated in terms of tendency to be optimization of gratification and whose relations to the situation, including each other, are defined and motivated in terms of system of culturally structured and shaped symbols." All three are connected, and they are really complementing rather than opposed to one another. Though many of his predecessors and contemporaries affected Parsons, it cannot be disputed that he articulated his thoughts in such a manner that the whole theory became innovative. The concepts seem to be his own and are being offered for the first time.

## CONCLUSION

Understanding the many dynamics behind societal inequality is made possible in large part by theories of social stratification. To sustain order and stability in societies, structural-functionalism stresses the functional components of stratification. Contrarily, conflict theory emphasizes the function of political and economic forces while focusing on the power conflicts and exploitation present in stratified systems. The study of symbolic meanings and interactions that influence how people perceive and experience stratification is known as symbolic interactionism. These theories provide us with a variety of views through which to view and understand social stratification. Applying these ideas in the quest for more fair and equitable social structures is essential since inequality is still a problem in contemporary

cultures. For politicians, academics, and people alike, understanding the interaction between money, power, and prestige and how they affect social class and mobility is crucial as they strive toward a fairer and more inclusive future.

## REFERENCES:

- [1] A. Aziz, "The operational value of human capital theory and cultural capital theory in social stratification," *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*. 2015. doi: 10.1177/2047173416629510.
- [2] J. L. Brown, "Using Information Processing Theory to Teach Social Stratification to Pre-Service Teachers," *J. Educ. Learn.*, 2015, doi: 10.5539/jel.v4n4p19.
- [3] H. Scholtz, "Rational Choice Theory in Comparative Sociology," *Comp. Sociol.*, 2015, doi: 10.1163/15691330-12341359.
- [4] P. Nolte, "Social Inequality in History (Stratification and Classes)," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences: Second Edition*, 2015. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.6-4.
- [5] M. Zou, "Employment Relations and Social Stratification in Contemporary Urban China: Does Goldthorpe's Class Theory Still Work?," *Sociology*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0038038514562853.
- [6] S. Marginson, "Rethinking education , work and 'employability': Foundational problems of human capital theory," *SRHE Conf. Newport, 9 December 2015*, 2015.
- [7] A. V. Vreeland, "Color Theory and Social Structure in the Films of Wes Anderson," *Elon J. Undergrad. Res. Commun.*, 2015.
- [8] G. Blank and D. Groselj, "Examining internet use through a weberian lens," *Int. J. Commun.*, 2015.
- [9] E. Bonilla-Silva, "More than Prejudice," *Sociol. Race Ethn.*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/2332649214557042.
- [10] A. Díaz-Tendero Bollain, "Economic solidarity towards the elderly from the perspective of political economybr aging," *Papeles Poblac.*, 2015.
- [11] B. V. Carolan and S. J. Wasserman, "Does parenting style matter? Concerted cultivation, educational expectations, and the transmission of educational advantage," *Sociol. Perspect.*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0731121414562967.
- [12] C. Dewilde, "What have ECHP and EU-SILC to contribute to the comparative study of housing?," *Crit. Hous. Anal.*, 2015, doi: 10.13060/23362839.2015.3.3.238.

## CHAPTER 5

### RECOGNIZING THE ROLES OF CASTE, CLASS, AND GENDER AS SOCIAL STRATIFICATION FACTORS

---

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor,  
Department of Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India  
Email Id- sarita.verma@mit.in

#### ABSTRACT:

Sociology, anthropology, political science, economics, and psychology are just a few of the fields that examine and do research on social stratification. The study of social stratification has been and continues to be one of the most exciting areas of research in the social sciences since it is the ideal that appeals to the greatest number of people. The word "social stratification" refers to the division of humans into layers of strata that may be thought of as being vertically ordered in the same manner that layers of the earth are stacked above or below other layers. Urban industrial social stratification is the hierarchical organization of people or groups inside a city or metropolitan region according to variables including income, education, employment, and social status. The uneven distribution of resources and opportunities among the metropolitan population is the outcome of a complex interaction of economic, political, and cultural factors. This abstract gives a general overview of the major issues and conclusions of social stratification in urban industrial environments, stressing the ramifications and outlining viable solutions.

#### KEYWORDS:

Income, Inequality, Mobility, Social stratification, Urbanization.

#### INTRODUCTION

It is a concept that has been taken from geology. However, this geological metaphor has a drawback of its own. Andre Beitel made a valid point when he said that "the arrangement of persons in a society is enormously more complex than the arrangement of layers of the earth; and social strata are not visible, to the naked eyes in the way that geological strata are." When we discuss social stratification, we call attention to the uneven roles that different people play in society. In general, social stratification refers to the partition of society into several strata, ordered in hierarchical order. Castes, estates, and classes are the most well-known historical and cultural variants that these divisions have taken on. Ethnic and gender stratification also came under scrutiny starting in the 1960s. Although there is disagreement on this matter, the general consensus among sociologists and social anthropologists is that social stratification is a global phenomenon, even if the causes of inequality change from time to time and from civilization to society. "Since there are very many bases on which human inequalities may be understood and upon which exploitation and oppression may be produced and reproduced, it is important to recognize that these variables are not mutually exclusive," David Jary and Julia Jary write in their Dictionary of Sociology. In the pre-industrial world, religious and military strata frequently co-existed alongside those based on gender and ethnicity. Simply said, social stratification occurs when individuals are ordered in a hierarchy along some aspect of inequality, such as money, wealth, power, status, age, ethnicity, or another factor [1].

Power has a significant role in the preservation and reproduction of social stratification everywhere, according to Andre Beitel's explanation of the mechanism and dynamics of social stratification. First, as in South Africa, the governmental infrastructure is used to enforce the rights and privileges of superior and inferior strata. Violence, however, may also be used for the same purpose beyond the purview of the state, as in the instance of lynching, whether it be of Black people in the United States by White people or of Untouchables in India by 'caste Hindus'. Power plays a crucial role in maintaining the status quo, although there are different degrees to which dominant strata openly utilize force against lesser strata [2], [3].

A social science idea known as "caste" has come to be connected with the word. Early in the colonial era, western observers of India gave the phenomena that we now refer to as "caste" a name. More debate has likely been generated by the caste phenomena than by any other component of Indian culture or ideas. According to some academics, the caste system in India is what defines 'Indian culture'. It is difficult to describe caste since it is such a complicated reality, and classifications often lead to confusion. However, some of the definitions listed below may be used in order to apply it practically: Caste is defined as "a collection of families with a common name who claim a common ancestor, either human or divine, and who profess to follow the same hereditary calling and are regarded by those who are competent to give an opinion as forming a single homogenous community". Caste may be defined and described as a kind of social stratification that entails the following, based on these definitions and hundreds of others:

1. A hierarchy-based system
2. Finished
3. Endogamous strata are
4. Ascribed membership
5. Limiting caste-to-caste contact
6. Theoretically impossible mobility.

Caste stratification is ultimately based on non-economic factors even if "it reflects economic inequalities, by virtue of the occupations typically followed by, or permitted to members." According to David Jary and Julia Jary, "the caste concept is religious in Hindu India, where castes are classified according to the level of 'ritual purity' assigned to individuals and to their activities. Hinduism has always been associated with India, where caste segregation has been the most developed and, some would say, the only authentic form. This system has a murky history. They most likely rest on the dual foundations of ethnicity and professional specialization.

The five basic divisions of the system that the Brahmins mastered included four caste groups and an outcast group, the untouchables. The four caste groupings were the Vaishyas, the commercial middle class, the Kshatriyas, the secular and military ruler and landowner caste, and the Shudra, the servants and slaves class. The Brahmins were the priestly class with religious authority. Only the most abhorrent and ritually impure/polluting chores were carried out by the untouchables.

## DISCUSSION

Caste has been referred to as India's most important social institution. The phrase is sometimes used figuratively to allude to strict social divisions or excessive social exclusivity wherever they are prevalent, as Andre Battelle notes. Although similar systems exist among Muslims, Christians, Sikhs, and other religious communities in South Asia, the system is most completely established among Hindus in India.



## Class

Along with estate and caste, class, often referred to as social class, is one of the main kinds of social stratification. In the first three decades of the nineteenth century, the word "class" increasingly took the place of "estates," "ranks," and "orders" as the most common way to refer to social divides. Zygmunt Bauman, in a brilliant analysis published in *The Social Science Encyclopaedia*, states that "the change of vocabulary reflected the diminishing significance of rank and ascribed or inherited qualities in general and the growing significance of possessions and income among the determinants of social position. Class now referred to big groups of people who were: different from other groups in terms of wealth and associated social standing; distinguished from other groups primarily by where they were in the creation and distribution of social wealth; Sharing particular interests that are either in opposition to or complementary to those of the group; showing a propensity for the group's distinctive political, cultural, and social attitudes and behaviors. A class is, to put it simply, a category or group of people with a certain standing in society, whose relationship to other groups is permanently determined. The degree of prestige associated with a class determines its relative place within the social hierarchy [4]–[6].

Karl Marx and Max Weber's writings on the newly forming class structure of industrial capitalism in the nineteenth century serve as the foundation for the main theoretical school in class analysis. Marx examined class in light of who controlled the means of production and the capital. A group of people who have the same function in the production process are referred to as a class. Marx split the whole human race into two groups: the proletariat and the capitalist class, or those who did not possess property or the means of production. Marx believed that classes were actual, social forces that had the power to alter society. Marx felt that the proletariat would become impoverished as a consequence of the capitalists' unrelenting desire to maximize profits, which led to its exploitation. Under these conditions, class consciousness would emerge among the workforce, and the proletariat would evolve from being a class in itself an economically defined category lacking in self-awareness to a class "for itself" a group of workers prepared to engage in class conflict with capitalists. Marx therefore discriminated between classes based on their relative positions in the production system, or in objective terms.

Weber places more emphasis on the market, distribution, and consumption than Marx does on classes in relation to production. According to Weber's thesis, any individual with comparable economic power and interests belonged to the same class. Weber used the term "economic factor" to refer to both the market-based relationships as well as the production linkages. According to economic variations in market capability that result in varied life chances, Weber categorized the population into classes. One source of market capacity was capital, but another came from talent and education. While Marx had highlighted that property owners and owners of the means of production formed a class, people whose abilities were in great demand on the market and demanded high incomes also made up a different class. Weber therefore identified four classes: the working class, the old petty bourgeoisie class of small company owners and merchants, the intellectual, the administrative and managerial, and the class of the propertied. Therefore, the root of Weber's theory of class lies in unequal power rather than economic exploitation.

## Gender

Women and males are socially defined by the term "gender." It is neither the same as sex, which refers to the biological differences between men and women, nor is it the same as women. The responsibilities, positions, and perceptions that are given to men and women in

society and in both public and private life are what define gender. These characteristics, chances, and connections are socially formed and acquired via socialization processes. They are flexible and context- and time-specific. What is expected, permitted, and appreciated in a woman or a man in a certain setting is determined by gender. In the majority of cultures, there exist distinctions and inequalities between men and women in terms of the tasks given to them, the activities they engage in, the resources they have access to and control over, and the possibilities for making decisions. The gender approach differs from other approaches in that it emphasizes both men and women rather than just women. It emphasizes:

1. The variations in interests between men and women, even within the same home, and how they interact and are expressed.
2. The customs and social structures that dictate how men and women are positioned within families, communities, and society at large, where males often have the upper hand when it comes to women.
3. The disparities between men and women depending on age, income, ethnicity, and other characteristics.
4. How social, economic, and technical developments affect gender norms and relationships, often extremely quickly [7]–[9].

Equal access to socially desirable goods, opportunities, resources, and incentives is necessary for gender parity. Gender equality simply means that women and men have equal opportunities and chances in life, not that they become one in the same. When developing policies, gender analysis considers the social and economic inequalities between men and women in order to:

1. Exposing the potential for policy, program, and legal impacts on women and men to vary;
2. Ensuring equitable outcomes in the design and use of measurements for men, women, and children.

### **Sex and gender**

"Sex marks the distinction between women and men as a result of their biological' physical and genetic differences. Gender roles are sex by convention and other social, economic, political, and cultural forces". In feminist theory, political feminism, and sociology, the concepts of sex and gender distinction are used to differentiate between sex, which is a natural or biological aspect, and gender, which is the cultural or taught meaning of sex. Because the argument that gender is not a biological destiny and that patriarchal oppression of women is a cultural phenomenon that need not necessarily follow from biological sexual differentiation is based on this distinction, it is strategically significant for some strands of feminist theory and politics, particularly second wave feminism. Feminists may criticize gender injustice while accepting some natural sexual variation because to this divide.

The biological-natural significance that the difference attributes to sex has been contested by third-wave feminists like Judith Butler, French feminists like Monique Wittig, and sociologists who believe that both sex and gender are socially produced and structurally complicit. Some feminism philosophers contend that sex has no bearing whatsoever on gender. Sex and gender are not defined in this way as they are often used. Due to the word "sex" having both a biological characteristic and the act of sexual intercourse as definitions, the term "gender" has been more often used to describe sexual distinctions.



### **Gender and sexuality differ from each other**

One of the first to objectively root the contrast between the biological and social traits of men and women was American anthropologist Margaret Mead. She accomplished this fairly spectacularly by examining how the Arapesh, Mundugamor, and Tchambuli communities in the New Guinea Islands saw masculinity and gender. She made the case, based on this data, that the Western distinction between aggressiveness and masculinity and nurturing and femininity is only one of many potential permutations of qualities that have no inherent connection to biological sex. The three non-Western civilizations Mead researched showed several alternative conceivable combinations of these elements together. Despite being debatable for a number of reasons, Mead's research had a considerable impact on how gender was conceptualized in the second half of the 20th century [10], [11].

Another undeveloped forerunner of the idea of gender was the functionalist concept of "sex roles." It was said that "instrumental" and "expressive" sex roles are socialized into both men and women. In addition to the sexual division of labor, these positions were seen as the cornerstone of a complimentary relationship between men and women, which helped to maintain a stable social order. The conceptualization's emphasis on 'individual' men and women who are indoctrinated into sex-specific roles has drawn criticism from academics. They contend that gender is more than the roles played by men and women, just as the economy is more than the sum of its constituent parts. Additionally, critics have noted that socialization is never a guarantee and that gender identities are truly constructed via agency, interpretation, and negotiation. The concept of "sex's" universality and "gender's" diversity underlies the difference between "sex" and "gender," which started to dominate theorization in the sociology of gender in the 1970s. Sociology became particularly receptive to the sex-gender difference thanks to Ann Oakley's *Sex, Gender and Society*. According to Oakley, the term "sex" refers to the biological distinctions between males and females, including their distinct genitalia and other reproductive organs. However, "gender" refers to the social division into "masculine" and "feminine" and is a cultural issue. The phrases may be credited to Robert Staler, an American psychiatrist, who first used them to address situations with people whose biological 'sex' did not match their 'gender'.

### **Gender as a Social Construction**

A notion or behavior that is an invention of a certain group is referred to as a social construction. When we refer to something as being socially built, we are emphasizing its reliance on socially dependent characteristics. Reality, knowledge, and learning are often considered as the basic premises of social constructivism. It is commonly accepted that social structures are the by-products of numerous human decisions rather than laws emanating from the will of God or the laws of nature. In American culture, the main economic and powerful groups generate a variety of values, conventions, and beliefs. This process is known as "social construction of meaning." Social institutions including the workplace, the media, education, religion, and others uphold and promote these values, conventions, and beliefs. In addition to determining access to opportunities for upward mobility, these values, norms, and beliefs also influence identity, personality, and gender roles. The upshot of a socialization process based on the prevailing values, conventions, and beliefs of society is often the development of gender roles and norms. Both male and female children are socialized from birth to behave, think, act, and interact in ways that are distinctive to their gender roles. Examples of the many features and characteristics that men and women are trained to accept as their own in society abound. In order to prepare them for responsibilities as wives and mothers, female youngsters are often trained to be cooperative, sensitive, loving, and nurturing. Male children, in comparison, are often required to hide their emotions and

sentiments and are trained toward independence, aggressiveness, competitiveness, and accomplishment.

Male or female, but not masculine or feminine, we are born. Femininity is an artifice, an accomplishment, and a way to embody and recreate established gender standards, which manifest as several physical traits. There are noticeable disparities in gesture, posture, movement, and overall body comportment between men and women. Women's mobility and spatiality are far more constrained than men's. Iris Young makes the observation in her seminal paper on the subject that women have an imaginary space around them that they are hesitant to cross. This manifests itself both in a resistance to reach, stretch, and extend the body to meet resistances of matter in motion as in sport or in the performance of physical tasks as well as in a typically constricted posture and general style of movement. Woman's space is an enclosure in which she feels placed and by which she is constrained rather than a field in which her physical intentionality may be fully realized. The "loose woman" deviates from these standards; her laxity is evident not just in her morality but also in her speech patterns and, quite literally, in the unforced and unhurried manner in which she walks.

### **Caste and gender**

Every element of Indian life is influenced by caste. But in contemporary India, where caste hierarchies are often expressed via gender, gender is one of the main axes on which caste stratification depends. This Chapter makes a distinction between gender performance in the public and private spheres using exclusive data the authors collected for 40,000 households across India. It demonstrates that being a member of the Brahmin caste significantly affects women's behavior in public but not much in the home. By insisting on restricting premarital contact between the bride and the groom, restricting women's visits to their natal families, insisting that women not go out alone in public, and adhering to a dress code that includes veiling, Brahmin families are much more likely to display a nod of deference to the dictums of obedience and chastity in their public behavior. Privately however, Brahmin women are just as powerful in the home decision-making process as women from other castes.

We contend that this Brahminical norm of gender behavior has repercussions for India's public discourse on gender, which is often used to defend repressive practices and institutions, including violence against women from lower castes. India has always been mostly a Hindu country, although having a wide range of religious practices. India has the second-largest Muslim population in the world, with 12% of the population being Muslim. About 3% of people identify as Christians, while another 3% practice Jainism, Sikhism, Buddhism, or another lesser-practiced religion. Though a significant portion of Muslims, Christians, and Sikhs identify with caste groupings that are outlined by Hindu traditions, the Hindu stratification system has a tendency to dominate Indian culture.

Hindu society is divided into four varnas or castes, according to the Hindu religion as enunciated in The Vedas: Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya, and Shudra. These are split even further into several smaller castes, called jatis. In the past, a person's caste standing determined their vocation, wealth, and access to land. Furthermore, the jajmani system's reciprocal rural relationships established the wages connected to different professions. Caste is nevertheless one of India's most lasting institutions, despite the introduction of new professions that break down caste boundaries and the gradual waning of the jajmani system over time. The Dalits and the Adivasis have experienced the greatest marginalization under this caste system. The Scheduled Caste population includes the dalits, who were formerly known as "untouchables" but were subsequently described to as "Harijan," or "children of God," by Mahatma Gandhi. The Scheduled Tribe population includes the adivasis or tribal

people. Caste is seen as having a religious foundation rather than an economic or political one in a large portion of 20th-century anthropological debate. Louis Dumont gave this viewpoint its classic expression with the release of *Homo Hierarchicus* in 1966. He maintained that the religious sphere dominated the political and social spheres of Indian society, pitting purity against pollution, with the Brahmin at the top of the religious hierarchy standing for the maximum degree of purity achievable by Hindus. Anthropologists and historians continue to have a heated discussion about whether or not Brahmins are at the top of the Hindu social hierarchy. The caste system in India has been extensively studied in anthropological literature. A summary of some of the arguments made in this literature may be found in , although a more thorough treatment of the caste system's history is beyond the purview of this Chapter.

Dalits are the lowest caste, but traditionally, they have not been included in the caste system since it was thought that because of their poor status, they had no right to be given a caste. They were and still are referred to as "untouchables" in contrast to caste Hindus, who are Hindus who are members of a certain caste. However, there seems to be broad consensus that caste structure in India relies on social discrimination between castes based on readily observable symbols, including rituals, attire, tonsorial patterns, and a variety of other behavioral markers . The social markers that divide the population seem to be generally acknowledged in society, as does the important criterion upon which such forms of differentiation are founded.

It seems that such markers possibly the most significant markers of Brahminical or Sanskritized rank are outward manifestations of gendered behavior. Renowned anthropologist from India, M.N. Women's responsibilities as stewards of caste purity and family status have been extensively discussed by Srinivas. According to the canonical Hinduism, this entails a variety of actions. Women are expected to participate in religious ceremonies and rituals that call for chastity and attention to detail. Women are expected to cleave to the husband's family and learn the customs of their husband's family, abandoning the customs of their natal families. They are also expected to be chaste and remain virgins until marriage, forsake all worldly pleasures after widowhood, dress in white clothes, and frequently shave their heads. Widow Remarriage is considered a marker of low status. The main virtues of a woman are obedience and chastity; a woman is supposed to be submissive to her spouse as an adult, to her father as a child, and to her son as she ages.

Hinduism is only one of several religions that restricts women's independence and elevates deference to male authority. It doesn't seem plausible that this code of behavior in and of itself would bind women any more than the Hindu code of conduct compel current Hindu males to practice asceticism, celibacy, and renounce worldly pleasures in middle life. But in a caste-based stratification system where public adherence to these symbols and rituals confers high prestige on a caste, there may be enormous social pressure on women to affirm and on males to make sure their wives are compliant. According to Srinivas' concept of Sanskritization, castes with greater limitations on women's sexuality in particular, prohibitions against widows being remarried have better social standing than castes with less restrictions. Many of these beliefs have become so entrenched over time that even Mahatma Gandhi, one of the most feminist figures who supported Indian women's political involvement, once said that a woman should commit herself if she is in danger of being raped in order to protect her honor.

There is a great deal of consensus in the research about the relationship between gender role performance and greater caste rank as well as the manner that caste hierarchies are expressed via gender. There is, however, a great deal of debate about whether caste in contemporary

India really has the same relevance as it had during colonial times. There are several grounds to think that caste's influence in contemporary India may be greatly diminished. Caste is seen to have less significance as a result of urbanization, increased education, and increasing Westernization. A decrease in the focus placed on Brahminical forms of behavior may be caused by the emergence of anti-Brahmin political movements and the influence of political parties from lower castes.

Over the last thirty years, India has had a booming women's movement, which has been led by middle class women from higher castes, possibly weakening the link between upper caste rank and visible gender performance. The colonial discourse may have created caste differentiation and hierarchies during the two centuries that preceded India's independence in 1947, and new scholarship on the social construction of caste during the colonial era contends that actual caste differences in Indian society may be relatively small. We make use of information from a 40,000-household survey we devised and conducted throughout India's 25 states and union territories. Homes in both urban and rural areas are included in the sample. For this research, we only include 32,362 married women between the ages of 15 and 49 in our dataset.

## CONCLUSION

Urban industrial social stratification is a ubiquitous, complex problem that has a big global influence on the lives of millions of people. It causes financial gaps, less access to high-quality healthcare and education, and reduced chances for social mobility. Understanding and solving this issue become more important as cities continue to develop and become more industrialized. The reduction of wealth disparity, enhancing access to education and employment opportunities, and fostering social cohesiveness are all goals of efforts to lessen social stratification. Societies may strive towards lessening the negative effects of social stratification and building a fairer, more just urban environment by encouraging more economic inclusion and making sure that the advantages of urbanization and industrialization are more evenly distributed. In order to track the evolving dynamics of social stratification in urban industrial contexts and to assess the efficacy of interventions over time, continual research and data collecting are also crucial. We can only aspire to construct urban settings where everyone, regardless of their socioeconomic background or circumstances, has a fair opportunity to prosper via a focused and continuous effort.

## REFERENCES:

- [1] N. P. Ololube, L. A. Onyekwere, and C. N. Agbor, "Social Stratification and Mobility: How Socio-Economic Status of Family Affects Children's Educational Development and Management," *Education*, 2015.
- [2] A. Fagertun, "Labour in Paradise: Gender, Class and Social Mobility in the Informal Tourism Economy of Urban Bali, Indonesia," *J. Dev. Stud.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/00220388.2016.1184248.
- [3] P. Chowdhry, "Enforcing Cultural Codes," *Econ. Polit. Wkly.*, 2017.
- [4] R. Hansda, "Small-scale farming and gender-friendly agricultural technologies: The interplay between gender, labour, caste, policy and practice," *Gend. Technol. Dev.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/09718524.2018.1434990.
- [5] U. Singh, "Caste & Masculinity: A Critique of R.W. Connell's Theory on Masculinity," *Int. J. Gend. Women's Stud.*, 2017, doi: 10.15640/ijgws.v5n2a11.

- [6] S. Srinivasan, "Cross-region migration of brides and gender relations in a daughter deficit context," *Migr. Dev.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/21632324.2015.1083723.
- [7] C. U. Dhavaleshwar and C. C. Banasode, "Dr. B R Ambedkar as a Social Worker for the Marginalised Sections," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2017, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3044336.
- [8] S. Parashar, "Inclusion of Transgender Community Within Socially and Educationally Backward Classes: Examining the Deeper Concerns," *ILI Law Rev.*, 2017.
- [9] S. Bose and A. Jalal, *Modern South Asia: History, culture, political economy*. 2017. doi: 10.4324/9781315106076.
- [10] M. Levien, "Gender and land dispossession: a comparative analysis," *J. Peasant Stud.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/03066150.2017.1367291.
- [11] N. S. Panwar, "Decentralized Political Institution in Madhya Pradesh(India): Inclusion of the Marginalized through Local Self Government," *IFF Work. Pap. Online No 23*, 2017.

## CHAPTER 6

### ANALYSING THE ROLE OF SOCIAL STRATIFICATION IN URBAN INDUSTRIAL SETTINGS

---

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor,  
Department of Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India  
Email Id- sarita.verma@mut.in

#### ABSTRACT:

Caste, class, and gender are only a few of the many elements that contribute to social stratification, which is a complicated issue. These elements are crucial in defining a person's social standing and prospects in society. This essay examines how caste, class, and gender interact as key elements in social stratification. It explores the interplay of these aspects, their historical background, and their current significance. The study emphasizes the significant effects of this interaction on people's prospects for success in life, access to resources, and general well-being. In order to advance social justice and equality, a more inclusive and equitable society that tackles these structural inequities is required, as the study makes clear. Professional and working classes make up a significant portion of urban industrial social stratification. Training is necessary to develop the abilities needed to execute various duties with professionalism. It teaches pragmatism, objectivity, and reason. In the areas of vocation, industry, and economics, professional classes indicate social and structural difference or shifts from tradition to modernity.

#### KEYWORDS:

Caste, Class, Gender, Inequality, Social stratification.

#### INTRODUCTION

Understanding urban-industrial social structure and stratification has relied on a number of parameters. These factors include the degree of closure or openness as well as the kind of gratifications and privations. Other factors include the structure of motivation, the structure of opportunities, and the structure of communication, or the degree of "visibility" of opportunities. There are many references for an individual in an urban-industrial milieu based on these sets of criteria for comprehending urban-industrial social life since a person is assessed based on traits like education, money, employment, way of life, etc. All of these criteria are compared while keeping in mind the social stratification and rural-agrarian social structure as opposed to the urban-industrial world. It becomes difficult to create a clear distinction between "rural" and "urban," as well as "individual" and "corporate" ranks. In both contexts, the affluent and the poor are largely the same; the distinction is mostly one of circumstance. A person lives to a large degree as a corporate entity since they are a significant component of their family and a family is connected to a group. Similar to this, a village is a part of a larger society and civilization since it is a part of its territory and the region is connected to civilization [1], [2].

There are many changes happening in the countryside, especially in the power structure, agricultural relationships, and caste stratification, but the rural social stratification system has not evolved into an urban stratification system. Given that social connections are governed by the same principles in both urban and rural environments, social stratification in both have a number of similar characteristics.



The fundamental distinction is in how far a given concept or set of standards/attributes is applied. Caste, class, and power are present in both environments, but due to structural variations between the village and the town, they operate differently in social life.

### **Urban-Industrial Stratification**

As social stratification continues, the emergence of professional classes becomes a gauge of social mobility. According to Navalkha, the professional classes make up a smaller share of total employees in India than they do in other Asian nations. Navalkha also draws attention to the unequal development of professions, exposing the pattern of hiring practices that are skewed strongly in favor of higher castes, groups that live in cities, and the urban populace. Several additional testimonies have also made it clear that caste is not only a rural phenomenon and class is not just seen in urban India. Although in various shapes and ratios, both have coexisted in rural and urban-industrial structures [3], [4].

The classes that make up urban-industrial social stratification are as follows:

1. Upper class,
2. Upper middle class,
3. Lower middle class, and
4. Working class,

These groups are often created based on "income" and "occupation." The 'real income' may be difficult to determine from the apparent job position, however. Regarding family, caste, class, religion, and the residents' placement or lack thereof, D'Souza examines the "bases of social organization" in Chandigarh. According to D'Souza, there is a strong correlation between the economic, occupational, and educational hierarchies. However, there is no statistically significant association between any of them with the actual caste order. According to a recent research by Mishra, local institutions like caste and family are important in reshaping the interaction between humans and machines without upending the established social order or negatively impacting the industrialisation process. Theoretically, a fairly open perspective of status, position, and power distribution characterizes an industrial society. An industrial society is characterized primarily by open relationships, rivalry, radicalism, invention, and utilitarianism-rationalism. The following information is pertinent to social stratification in industrial society:

1. What are the managers' and entrepreneurs' social backgrounds?
2. Does the caste system match the hierarchy of the industrial elite?
3. Do pre-industrial society values and those of the industrial society coexist?
4. What connection exists between the employees' caste and class structure and the internal organization of the factories?
5. Do the families that have risen to prominence in recent years include industrial employers, municipal council members, philanthropists, and controllers of educational and religious institutions?

## DISCUSSION

Studies on rural-urban interactions, rural-urban migration, social mobility, and the rise of urban-industrial cities have all sparked an interest in urban-industrial social stratification in India. Urban-industrial social stratification studies have primarily focused on caste and class, occupation, income, education, and class; social mobility and elite formation; professionals and working classes; middle classes; processes of social change and status-crystallization; dissonance and inconsistency; and professional associations and trade unions. The influence of society on industrialisation and the impacts of industrialization on society are examined in Sheth and Patel's and Patel's extensive annotated bibliography and study of trends in industrial sociology in India. Along with trade unions, unofficial organizations, and business owners, employees, managers, and supervisors make up the majority of the human components in the sociology of industrialisation. Indian society has been divided into 'classes' as a result of industrialization's weakening of the caste system. Industrialization's resulting economic fragmentation has caused both vertical and horizontal change, and as a result, the status-evaluation criteria are changing. Industrialization has the power to alter human life, manufacturing methods, excess labor, etc. According to Rubin, "An industrialization can produce the professional employments and affluent style of life to which urban middle and upper classes aspire" [5], [6].

### Urban-Industrial Stratification System's Historical Relevance

Even though they are not absolutely independent, urbanization and industrialisation are not entirely related processes. In the pre-industrial era, urbanization was not only a prevalent phenomenon but also a clear indicator of the optimum standard of life. Jha discovers that 'urbanism' was a mode of life in ancient Bihar based on the study of the Arthashastra and Varna Ratnakara. According to Arthashastra, a sophisticated system of social hierarchy existed in addition to supplies for water, roads, grounds, defense, and other municipal amenities. The mayor of the city was known as nagarka. Sthanikas, who were below the nagarka, were subordinated by gopas. There were more officers and functionaries to handle different critical functions. Independent of caste hierarchy, the administrative structure was established. The fundamental aspects of urban social life were non-agricultural jobs, organized groupings, and impersonal relationships. While describing the prevalence of non-agricultural jobs, complexity and variability of the society, and inclination for individualized relationships, Varna Ratnakara also gives a vivid depiction of the lower castes, "market activities, and artistic endeavors, ascetics." These two priceless ancient texts describe the structural and cultural characteristics of urban life in addition to discussing the processes of urbanization [7], [8].

One might think of a number of places that became a position of cultural and religious importance in old India. Many of these towns rose to prominence as hubs for political and administrative activity. Towns in medieval India are divided into four groups by Naqvi: capital cities; administrative centers with commercial activity; pilgrimage centers; and towns with a particular kind of economy. Our major aim, though, is to understand the individuals and the standards by which they were given "high" and "low" rankings. According to a subaltern study of a north Indian Oasba in the nineteenth century by Pandey, the community consciousness was centered on the religious fraternity, class, qasba, and mohalla. This cannot be explained using terms from modern social science, such as Muslim/Hindu, working class/rentier, urban/rural, etc. Human dignity and self-respect were the primary factors of communal awareness.

People were socially divided into the following classes notwithstanding a sense of solidarity anchored on a particular perception of honor and dignity:

1. Zamindars
2. Weavers
3. Trader-moneylenders
4. Fostering tenants
5. Labourers

Meera Kosambi provided information on the occupational structure, ethnic makeup, languages, religious composition, age-sex structure, and other factors in her comparative study of Bombay and Poona. However, rather of focusing on the structure of socioeconomic stratification, Kosambi's research primarily examines the 'functions' carried out by the two cities. Rural-born physicians, teachers, engineers, and administrators serve the urban population, according to Lipton, who claims that "Inequalities within rural areas also owe much to the urban-biased nature of the development policy." Rural regions provide surpluses that are harvested for the metropolitan population. The urban-rural balance in India, however, is not as depressing as Lipton's definition would have you believe. A significant shift in rural stratification brought about by the green revolution has ramifications for urban social structure. Capitalists, administrators, professionals, the labor aristocracy, and wealthy landowners may be used to describe urban social stratification in terms of the relationship between capital and labor. On the other hand, there are landless agricultural labourers, small-scale farmers, renters, and members of the informal economy in the countryside. However, Byres identifies "rural bias" as the primary barrier to industrialisation.

There is now enough data from two recent studies of the sugar business by Simon Commander and Ignatus Chithelen to demonstrate the establishment of a new form of social stratification. The core of the system was obviously agriculture, and the separation from the means of production that characterizes the factory system proper was never fully developed, according to Commander, who speaks on the sugar sector in North India. Instead, the zamindar-khandasari's control over labor, land, and credit the three pillars of the system was, in many ways, in opposition to a model of pure capitalism. A social stratification system distinct from both the agricultural and the urban-industrial one has been created as a result of the integration of non-capitalist economic aspects with the capitalist system of production. The expansion of local markets and the creation of cutting-edge transportation systems originally supplied the necessary impetus for the growth of the sugar industry. However, the fundamental causes were a plentiful supply of inexpensive, disorganized labor and money-lending-debt links that produced notably large profit margins. But in the Ahmednagar region of Maharashtra, the affluent peasants were able to grow sugarcane thanks to the early 1900s formation of a rich peasant strata, the extension of canal irrigation, and financial backing from a co-operative credit infrastructure [9]–[11].

Early 1900s stratification among the Deccan peasants helped an affluent peasant stratum to form, putting them in a dominant position. By the middle of the 20th century, it was easy to distinguish between the wealthy peasants and the vast majority of impoverished peasants. A wealthy peasant was one who controlled and owned land, as well as having possession of and expertise with agricultural tools and methods. The freedom and autonomy in the credit relationship were also advantages for the wealthy peasants. They provided credit to others and were themselves lenders of money. The wealthy peasants increased their business

connections by controlling the crops and estates of the creditors. These wealthy peasants were from one of Maharashtra's higher castes that were not Brahmans. They were once aristocratic members of traditional cultivating families, previous royal family members, Inamdars, and other office holders. A few low caste groups, like as the mails, also progressed to become wealthy peasants. The spread of canal irrigation, co-operatives, laws, a favorable political environment, etc. were a few of the factors that led to the socio-economic and political transformation of the peasantry, which had an impact on changes in both the rural and urban social stratification.

The emergence of the property-owning, business-minded, capitalist-employer may be attributed to a number of factors, including the dissolution of the feudal order. The capitalist economy has also developed a working class alongside the capitalists. The notion of the society that produces commodities is Marx's theory of the capitalist society. Employees are seen as commodities. Marx identifies the proletariat and the bourgeoisie as the two primary opposing groups, but he also recognizes the way society is changing and the growing importance of the middle class, which exists between the workers and the industrial capitalists. He also recognizes how the shift from capitalism to socialism has increased the influence of the managerial, ministerial, and labor classes as well as trade unions. The bourgeoisie, petty-bourgeoisie, and working class are distinct from one another and from one another. 'Economistic' explanations for class disparity are not sufficient. However, regardless matter how industrially evolved a society is, economic class divisions and the dominance of one class over another exist in all cultures. Over the course of its protracted development, capitalist society has experienced the following modifications:

1. Due to the expansion of major joint-stock businesses, professional salaried management now controls capital and industry.
2. The class system has changed. Especially in emerging nations like India, the middle class has expanded significantly thanks to the new governmental machinery.
3. All around the globe, employees' living conditions have significantly improved.
4. Trade unions, civil liberties movements, and democracy have all considerably increased the power of the working class.

Prior to gaining independence, planning in India attempted to topple the colonial state structure and replace it with a free-standing indigenous capitalist state structure. In order to oppose colonial mercantilism and capitalism, the great capitalists and a significant number of minor traders and merchants actively backed the national movement. The capitalist class in India exhibited the following traits:

1. The Indian businessmen operated mostly on their own financial resources and did not serve as compradors or junior partners of foreign capital.
2. Overall, the capitalist class was neither politically nor economically entangled in a servile relationship with pro-imperialist feudal interests.
3. Between 1914 and 1947, a time close to India's independence, it expanded quickly.

'The marginality of class politics' is listed by Rudolph and Rudolph as one of the characteristics of the Indian State and a significant change that occurred after 1947. Because a third factor the State is so important to Indian politics and policy, capital and labor have a little influence. The Indian State now serves as a champion and defender of the rights of the working class and the impoverished. Strong white-collar unions and organizations exist as well, which in turn undermine the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. Although it has been able to exert some influence, neither directly nor indirectly, business has been able to dominate the government. The function of major industrial houses and international corporations is largely

unaffected by the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956, despite the fact that it reasserts the constitutional stance that the "common good" of the people and "distributive justice" will remain the key priorities. Capitalist associations have been utilized to advance both political and economic agendas on the other hand, sees the Indian State as a tool of the bourgeoisie following a capitalist course for growth. The state has a history of being "oppressive" and "repressive."

It doesn't really matter to us whether or not the great landowners and other members of the Indian bourgeoisie were a result of colonial control. It's crucial to remember that the Indian bourgeoisie never existed as a homogeneous group, and that colonial rule and the class nature of the Indian National Congress, the movements it led, and the fact that India was emancipated and divided all had an impact on how it developed.

According to Ghosh, the bourgeoisie is split into two groups: the great comprador and the small and middling national bourgeoisie. 'Guided industrialisation' has occurred as a consequence of the comprador nature of the large bourgeoisie and a latent predisposition in the national bourgeoisie to follow suit. Guha offers a similar historical analysis of the Parsi Seth family's origins, entrepreneurial spirit, and comprador role.

### **Entrepreneurship and the Entrepreneurs**

Now let's discuss entrepreneurs and entrepreneurship. New options for economic activity are seen as enhancing one's economic and social status in a scenario of new social dynamics. Tripathi addresses the entrepreneurial process while giving an integrated picture of entrepreneurship, taking into consideration the constellation of factors, entrepreneurial initiative, and change in the constellation of forces.

A person who discovers a confluence of sociopolitical and economic elements favorable for embarking into one or more enterprises is considered to be an entrepreneur. If this person is successful, he or she will become socially and economically different from others who choose not to engage in such activities and from those who fail. Recent research has proven that even large farming families and landowners participated in money lending and trade in several regions of the nation prior to independence. Castes and groups that formerly pursued non-mercantile activities now have a broad range of entrepreneurial opportunities available to them. Both higher caste manual and agricultural labourers and "peasant entrepreneurs" existed.

Additionally, entrepreneurship is not restricted to only industry, business, and agriculture. It has permeated many fields, including those of education, government service, science, and medicine [12], [13]. Some recent studies show interest in the study of entrepreneurs as an important stratum in the social stratification scheme. According to Singh's research, Muslims made up 39% of all business owners in an eastern Uttar Pradesh town that made carpets, while Hindus made up 56% of them, Jains accounted for 3%, and Sikhs made up 2%. The carpet business is dominated by Banis, Muslims, and to a lesser degree, Rajputs. R.S. discovers a strong connection between land ownership, leadership, and entrepreneurs. Singh.

However, the three highest castes of Brahmins, Rajputs, and Bhumihar make up around 75% of the rural businesses. Following the Second World War, historically dependent variables led to the peasant caste of Mahisyas in the city of Calcutta dominating the engineering sector, surpassing both Brahmins and Kayasthas. The discovery of new status-determination criteria is explained by Trivedi's research of 250 indigenous entrepreneurs. Muslim business owners discover no societal beliefs impeding their ability to build their businesses.



## Professional elites and the Middle Classes

The merchant, the craftsman, and the landed nobility made up the pre-British middle classes, which had its origins in "authoritarianism." Due to a number of circumstances and legislative changes throughout the British era, the middle classes' makeup and structure changed. The industrialists, landed gentry, educated classes, professionals, and other groups made formed the new middle classes. Since the middle classes are essentially organized "service groups," they provide services to both the top and lower classes, but not equally. Due to the form and character of the Indian State, the middle class' post-independence organization saw a significant shift in terms of its size, functions, and role. Below is a quick summary of some chosen studies.

Shah notes that the middle class in Gujarat has expanded disproportionately with economic expansion in the backdrop of the anti-reservation protests there. Although their goals have increased, they are unable to meet their requirements and maintain the status quo, which leaves them feeling deeply deprived. For Shah, the middle class is a class between labor and capital, and this is particularly true of the upper and middle caste members who are envious of the new entries from the historically low castes. India's middle classes are a result of both state growth and capitalism.

According to Shah, the anti-reservation protests in Gujarat represent a struggle between the established middle classes and the lower classes, who are vying for middle-class status through having access to high-paying white-collar jobs.

According to Navlakha, the traditional social structure of India particularly caste religion, language, networks, money, occupational history, education, family background, etc. all play a significant role in elite development. The results of this research demonstrate that people from certain socioeconomic strata typically occupy specific social positions. The positions of prestige, power, and responsibility are under the authority of this small clique. Since upper castes still control higher education, it is a "status-stabilizer" as opposed to an encroachment on status rigidities.

Despite a long history of reservations, 60% Brahmin and 34% Lingayat and Vokkaliga students were admitted to four of Bangalore's most prestigious institutions to prepare them for higher professional and administrative careers, while only 4% of lower caste students were placed in this program. The results of Navalkha are quite illuminating. 81.3 percent of the Hindu respondents belonged to an upper caste, 6.8 percent to an intermediate caste those who cultivate higher crops, and just 4.6 percent to a lower caste. In addition, 86.5% of respondents were of urban origin, 89.3% received their education in contemporary institutions of higher learning, and 79% hailed from the social group with the greatest level of advantage.

Now let's look at several research of various vocations. S.P. undertook a survey of attorneys and legal students in Pune. Smita Kahikar, Shaila Kunchur, and Sathe, on which H.K. remarked. According to Pranjape, the Brahmins predominate the profession in terms of both number and level of achievement. The percentage of attorneys from lower socioeconomic levels is fairly modest, and the majority of them are new system entrants. And they make far less money. However, compared to Brahmin and other Hindus, there are more women attorneys from the lower social levels. The study's key justification is that it is simpler to accept a junior female lawyer from a less developed country. Recent years have seen the completion of several research in the fields of sociology of law and the legal profession. Among them are those by J.S. K.L. Gandhi.



## CONCLUSION

Examining caste, class, and gender as social stratification variables exposes how intricately intertwined and impactful, they are in determining how people live in society. Despite legal attempts to address them, caste-based discrimination and hierarchy still exist in many regions of the globe. Economic gaps significantly impede upward mobility, and class divisions continue to grow. Even while it is changing, gender-based prejudice persists, restricting opportunities and feeding bigotry and violence against women. Additionally, the intersectionality of these characteristics creates additional levels of complexity since different caste, class, and gender identities result in different benefits and disadvantages for different people. This intersectional viewpoint emphasizes the necessity for social policy and activism to have a comprehensive approach. An all-encompassing strategy is needed to solve the problems caused by caste, class, and gender in societal stratification. To eliminate discriminatory institutions, advance economic and social fairness, and question established gender norms, policymakers, activists, and society at large must cooperate. We can only expect to establish a more fair and equitable society where everyone has equal possibilities and is not constrained by the artificial borders of caste, class, or gender by sustained efforts.

## REFERENCES:

- [1] K. J. R. Phillips, E. S. Larsen, and C. Hausman, "School choice & social stratification: How intra-district transfers shift the racial/ethnic and economic composition of schools," *Soc. Sci. Res.*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2014.12.005.
- [2] A. Aziz, "The operational value of human capital theory and cultural capital theory in social stratification," *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education*. 2015. doi: 10.1177/2047173416629510.
- [3] G. Esping-Andersen, "Welfare regimes and social stratification," *J. Eur. Soc. Policy*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0958928714556976.
- [4] D. Chao, H. Hashimoto, and N. Kondo, "Dynamic impact of social stratification and social influence on smoking prevalence by gender: An agent-based model," *Soc. Sci. Med.*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.08.041.
- [5] J. L. Brown, "Using Information Processing Theory to Teach Social Stratification to Pre-Service Teachers," *J. Educ. Learn.*, 2015, doi: 10.5539/jel.v4n4p19.
- [6] A. Sollami and L. Caricati, "Intergroup threat perception among intermediate-status group members: The role of stability/instability of social stratification," *Psicol. Soc.*, 2015.
- [7] K. D. Bramesfeld and A. Good, "The Game of Social Life: An Assessment of a Multidimensional Poverty Simulation," *Teach. Sociol.*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0092055X15569316.
- [8] N. P. Ololube, L. A. Onyekwere, and C. N. Agbor, "Social Stratification and Mobility: How Socio-Economic Status of Family Affects Children's Educational Development and Management," *Education*, 2015.

- [9] P. Arestis, A. Charles, and G. Fontana, "Power, Intergroup Conflicts and Social Stratification in the United States: What has the Global Crisis Taught us?," *Rev. Soc. Econ.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/00346764.2015.1089109.
- [10] J. Drahokoupil, "Class in Czechia: The Legacy of Stratification Research," *East Eur. Polit. Soc.*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0888325415599198.
- [11] L. Zhimin and G. Yao, "Family Capital Social Stratification, and Higher Education Attainment - An Empirical Study Based on Jiangsu Province," *Chinese Education and Society*. 2015. doi: 10.1080/10611932.2015.1085773.
- [12] X. Ye and Y. Ding, "Expanding Chinese Higher Education:Quality and Social Stratification," *Society*, 2015.
- [13] Y. Li, M. Savage, and A. Warde, "Social stratification, social capital and cultural practice in the UK," in *Handbook of Research Methods and Applications in Social Capital: Handbooks of Research Methods and Applications*, 2015. doi: 10.4337/9780857935854.00006.

## CHAPTER 7

### UNDERSTANDING THE CONCEPT OF CASTE: AN ANALYTICAL REVIEW

---

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor,  
Department of Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India  
Email Id- sarita.verma@mit.in

#### ABSTRACT:

Caste has a long history and is deeply ingrained in society; it is most often linked with South Asia but may be found in many variations around the globe. Caste is a sophisticated system of social stratification that creates hierarchical divisions within communities according to social position, place of birth, and employment. This abstract examines the caste system's complex nature, historical development, social effects, and ongoing applicability in the present. It explores caste's intricacies and difficulties, such as discrimination, inequality, and social reform initiatives. Finally, it emphasizes the need of continual deliberations, analysis, and policy initiatives to solve the enduring caste-related problems in modern society. People grew increasingly rigid as they came to embrace the overall notion of society being divided into four groups, and membership, profession, etc. became hereditary. Because it was believed that Brahmins had a divine authority to interpret and apply the law, they were granted the higher status in the social structure. Thus, karma and dharma beliefs lead to the rigidity of the caste system, proving that religion was undoubtedly the driving force behind the caste dogmas. The Indologists assert that since castes are considered divine, they will endure into the future.

#### KEYWORDS:

Caste, Discrimination, Inequality, Social, Stratification.

#### INTRODUCTION

Three approaches have been used to study the caste system in India: indological, socio-anthropological, and sociological. The Indologists have regarded caste from the perspective of the scriptures, social anthropologists from the perspective of culture, and sociologists from the perspective of stratification. The scriptures provide insight into the history, meaning, and future of the caste system from an Indo-religious viewpoint, according to Indologists. They contend that castes are the fissioned units within the varna system that were established as a consequence of hypergamy and hypogamy practices, and that varnas have their origins in Brahma the virat purusa. The varna order determined how these units, or jatis, were given their rankings. The Brahmanas, which were written about 800 B.C., include status-bound rites for the four varnas, and the Smritis, which were written between 200 and 100 B.C., contain the traditions and rules for each caste. The ordering of jati has increasingly come to be impacted by regional, linguistic, ethnic, and sectarian variances. According to them, the division of labor served as the catalyst for the creation of castes [1], [2].

#### Caste as a Concept

The Portuguese term *casta*, which means breed, race, or type, is where the word caste originates. Varna, jati, at, biradri, and samaj are some of the Indian words that are sometimes translated as "caste." These phrases all relate to ranking groupings that range in size and

breadth. Castes and caste subdivisions, often referred to as subcastes, are included in the other categories, which together refer to vast divisions that encompass multiple castes. There are several castes that have historically been connected to a particular profession, including high-ranking Brahmans, middle-ranking farmer and artisan groups including potters, barbers, and carpenters, and extremely low-ranking "Untouchable" leatherworkers, butchers, launderers, and latrine cleaners. On the caste system, ceremonial status and economic wealth are somewhat correlated. On the overall, those who belong to higher castes tend to be wealthier than people who belong to lower castes. Many members of lower castes suffer from extreme poverty and social disadvantage. The origins of the four-tiered varna groupings are said to have originated from distinct sections of the primordial man's body, which Brahma formed from clay, according to ancient books known as the Rig Veda, which are based on oral traditions from more than 3,000 years ago. Each group had a purpose in keeping society's social body functioning. Priests known as brahmans were produced from the mouth. They were to meet the community's requirements in terms of education and religion. The arms gave rise to the Kshatriyas, who were both warriors and rulers. They had two responsibilities: to govern and to defend. Landowners and businessmen known as vaishyas emerged from the thighs and were given control over trade and agriculture. Shudras, or slaves and craftsmen, emerged from the feet. They had to carry out all physical labor [3], [4].

A fifth group of "Untouchable" menials was later developed; they were restricted to doing very menial and filthy duties connected to physical decomposition and dirt. Due to their inclusion on government rosters or schedules, "Untouchables" have been referred to as "Scheduled Castes" since 1935. Although the term Untouchable appears in literature produced by these low-ranking castes, in the 1990s, many politically aware members of these groups preferred to refer to themselves as Dalit, a Hindi word meaning oppressed or downtrodden. They are also frequently referred to by Gandhi's term Harijans, or "Children of God." In India, there were 138 million Scheduled Caste people, or around 16% of the population, as per the 1991 census. It seems that the first four varnas existed in the pre-Aryan civilisation of northern India. Some historians contend that rather than being castes, these classifications were initially rather flexible functional groupings. The intricate ranking systems of medieval India eventually evolved as a consequence of a higher degree of fixity, and they still exist today. Although a varna is not a caste, many Indians would respond with a varna name when questioned directly about their caste allegiance, especially if the questioner is a Westerner. Upon more prodding, they could provide a far more unique caste name, or jati, that belongs to that varna. A Brahman could say, for instance, that he belongs to the Jijotiya or Smartha caste group, or something like. People may also be members of certain clans and lineages as well as minor sub-caste groups within such castes. These more exclusive terms often appear in newspaper matrimonial advertising and are especially important when weddings are being planned. The caste system also includes many groups that are often referred to as tribes to differing degrees [5], [6].

## DISCUSSION

In the extreme northeast and the country's wooded interior, where tribes resemble ethnic groupings more than castes, some tribes coexist apart from one another. Some tribes have divisions within them that resemble subcastes. They are often seen as belonging to distinct castes that are low on the hierarchy in areas where tribal individuals coexist in peasant villages alongside nontribal peoples. The Hindu devout see caste disparities as a component of the divinely designed natural order that are articulated in terms of purity and defilement. When all villagers are invited to a wedding or funeral feast, relative status is most visibly exhibited inside the community.

A member of a caste from which all caste members may eat cooked food prepares meals at the residence of a high-ranking caste member. Diners are seated in rows; those from the same caste sit next to one another in a row, while those from other castes sit in rows that are either parallel to one another or spaced out from one another. Dalit caste members may be seated apart from the other diners even outside in an alley such as leatherworkers and sweepers. A sweeper may be stationed farther away, at the border of the feeding area, waiting with a big basket to collect leftovers that other eaters have flung into it. It is seen to be much too contaminating for members of any other caste to engage in the practice of eating food tainted by touch with the saliva of people who are not related to them. Higher castes often do not attend feasts or celebrations held by Dalits. Although there are status disparities among Muslims, brotherhood may be emphasized. Muslims of all income levels often eat from dishes set on a cloth that has been spread out on the floor or a table during celebrations. However, Muslims who desire to host religiously faithful Hindus must make separate preparations for a high-caste Hindu chef as well as a dining room and meals that are ritually clean. The top four varnas are commonly referred to as the "clean castes," with Dalits being regarded as "unclean."

The top three varnas' castes are sometimes referred to as "twice-born," alluding to the ceremonial initiation that its male members must endure, which entails being vested with the Hindu holy thread, which is equivalent to undergoing a ritual rebirth. Non-Hindu caste-like communities often don't fit into these categories. Devout Hindus believe that each caste has its own dharma, or divinely established rule of morality. As a result, there is often a high level of tolerance for various castes' alternative lifestyles. Given their ancient duties as vegetarian, alcohol-free priests, Brahmins are often believed to be peaceful and spiritual. Kshatriyas are expected to be powerful, aggressive meat eaters, heavy drinkers, and good combatants and rulers. Due to their historical involvement in trade, vaishyas have a reputation of being skilled merchants. Although their behavior is expected to be somewhat base, Shudras are often viewed by others as tolerably nice, but Dalits especially Sweepers are frequently seen as living obscene lifestyles. On the other hand, individuals of lower caste often see persons of high status as arrogant and cold. Women's virginity and caste position are closely tied.

In general, women from castes with better social standing are expected to exercise more sexual restraint. Brahmin brides are expected to remain virginal, monogamous, and celibate after losing their spouses. A sweeper bride, on the other hand, may not be virginal, adulterous relationships could be accepted, and the lady is urged to remarry if she has been widowed or divorced. Such restrictions on female sexuality for the upper castes assist maintain the integrity of the bloodline, which is essential to maintaining high rank. High status and female virginity are also closely connected among Muslims. Explicit norms are upheld within castes. A caste council may convene frequently to deal with transgressions and decide caste-specific matters. These councils are often composed of teams of wise men, virtually generally men. It is possible to impose penalties like fines and exclusion, which may be temporary or permanent. Rarely, someone will be exiled from their caste due to egregious caste norms violations. Marriage or open cohabitation with a partner from a caste lower than one's own is an example of such a transgression; in such cases, the higher-caste person would typically be demoted to the status of the lower-caste person [7]–[9].

While anybody may engage in activities like farming or commerce, only members of the right castes often work as priests, barbers, potters, weavers, and other skilled craftsmen, whose trade skills are passed down via families from one generation to the next. Occupational specialization is seen to be in accordance with the divinely designed order of

the cosmos, much as other important aspects of Indian social structure. The concept of reincarnation in accordance with one's karma, or the total of one's acts in this life and in former lifetimes, supernaturally supports the existence of rigorous ranking. Following death, a person's life is evaluated by divine powers, and, according on what is merited, a high or low location for rebirth is allocated. This heavenly approval must never be disregarded since it establishes a person's place in the caste system, which is important for any interaction involving food or drink, speaking, or touching.

In the past, Dalits were required to show extraordinary reverence to individuals of high rank in certain locations, preserving their physical distance lest their touch or even their shadow contaminate others, and refraining from wearing shoes or any upper body covering while they were among the higher castes. The lowest-ranked individuals had to ring a little bell to alert others about their polluting approach. In a large portion of India, Dalits were forbidden from visiting temples, drawing water from wells used by the "clean" castes, and even going to school. In previous ages, Dalits who studied or simply heard religious writings were subject to severe penalties. Pre-independence reform movements headed by Mahatma Gandhi and the Dalit leader Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar campaigned against such demeaning discrimination, which was rendered illegal by laws enacted under British rule. Dalits successfully pushed for the adoption of tougher legislation challenging the limitations placed on them while agitating for the right to use rural wells and access Hindu temples. Ambedkar almost crafted the whole constitution of independent India, including important clauses outlawing caste-based discrimination. Even Nevertheless, as the 20th century draws to a close, discrimination against Dalits continues to be a problem, particularly in rural areas.

### **Tribe, Sub-Caste, Varna Caste**

Caste is often mixed up with varna, subcaste, and tribe. The sociological examination of the institution of caste has been complicated by the interchangeability of these concepts. S.C. made reference to this conceptual muddle. The analytical short-cuts often obscure the difference between them, and the resultant depiction of the social order does not stay helpful for the purposes of meaningful comparison. The knowledge of caste as a crucial component of the social structure of Hindu India has been obfuscated by the lack of uniform operational definitions and widely accepted units of analysis in caste studies. Despite the fact that all scholars—including Ghurye, Srinivas, Dube, Bailey, and Mayer—have emphasized the necessity for clarity between these notions, no one has been able to identify a glaring distinction between them. It is logical to assume that caste is a developed version of varna, which began as a class in ancient India and over time evolved to include religious restrictions. The caste system differs from the stratification system in America and many other nations based on ascriptive status, endogamy, and low-prestige status due to the recognized theological ideas that sustain it.

### **Varna and Caste**

Caste and varna are distinct ideas. Senart was the one who first made the distinction between a caste and a varna known to the general public. The Hindu notion of social structure is unique in that it makes reference to Varnashram system. Despite being two independent organizations, the varna organization and the ashram organization are related since they both address issues related to human nature and upbringing. Varna organization refers to the labor that a person would perform in society in accordance with his nature, while ashram organization refers to the behavior of an individual in the world at various periods of his life. These two organizations are being studied from two distinct perspectives. In the ashram organization, the issue is approached from the perspective of a person's training or nurturing



through four different life stages, whereas in the varna organization, the issue is considered from the perspective of a person's position in relation to the group, as well as with reference to his innate nature, his tendencies, and his dispositions [10], [11].

Only the varnas Aryavarna and Dasa varna have been referenced in the Rig Veda, which dates back to about 4000 B.C. The partitioning of society into three orders Brahma, Kshatra, and Vis is described in the same Veda, however. Sudras, the fourth order, are not mentioned, but there is mention of Ayogya, Chandala, Nishad, and other tribes that the Aryans disdain. These four orders eventually divided into four varnas. The Sudras were not regarded as untouchables at first. According to Srinivas, this fourth order's members were in fact peasants, laborers, and servants rather than being considered untouchables. Cooks as well as household helpers were engaged as Sudras. In the Vedic era, there was no concept of upper or lower varna.

The division of labor served as the foundation for society's partition into its four varnas. Priests were Brahmins, warriors and kings were Kshatriyas, merchants were Vaishyas, and servants were Sudras. Each varna practiced diverse rites and worshipped several gods. This distinction resulted from the fact that each group had various goals to accomplish depending on its job position. Brahmins desired the greatest amount of holiness, so they worshiped fire and chanted Gayatri mantras; Kshatriyas desired physical strength, so they chanted Trishtubh mantras; and Vaishyas desired cattle wealth, so they chanted Visvedevas and Jagati mantras. However, there were no limitations on marriage unions, commensal or social relationships, or even the switching of membership from one varna to another. The four varnas eventually came to be placed hierarchically, with Brahmins at the top and Sudras at the bottom, as we go from the Vedic to the Brahmanic period.

One perspective was that the hierarchical structure and differentiation were likely related to differences in color. Varna, which translates to "color," appears to have been used to contrast the Arya and the Dasa, alluding to their different fair and dark colors. When the classes started to be often referred to as varnas, the word's association with color became so strong that four distinct colors were allocated to the four classes, by which their members were believed to be differentiated. White, Kshatriya red, Vaishya yellow, and Sudra black are the colors related to the Brahmin, Kshatriya yellow, and Sudra black. According to Hutton, it's probable that this color differential has anything to do with race. Hocart asserts, however, that the color has a ritualistic and not a racial meaning.

Although academics like Risley, Ghurye, Majumdar, and others have explained the genesis of castes in terms of racial elements, it cannot be stated that castes are sub-divisions of varnas. Although castes were not originally related to varnas, during the course of their history, they became so, and the hierarchy of castes and the mobility of a caste began to be expressed in terms of varnas. Thus, Varna offered a framework that influenced how every Indian thought about and responded to caste.

According to Srinivas, varna has also provided a common social language that is thought to be beneficial for India as a whole. In other words, it has made it easier for regular men and women to understand the caste system by giving them a straightforward framework that is applicable to all of India.

According to him, the varna system is significant because it provides an overall framework for all of India within which the lower-ranking jatis have consistently attempted to advance their position by adopting the practices and rituals of the top jatis. This has aided in the Hindu society's emergence of a unified culture. However, integrating jatis into the Brahmanic and Sudra groups is simple; however, integrating them into the middle groups that is, the

Kshatriya and the Vaishya groups is challenging and unclear because one jati may be treated as a Vaishya jati in one area while claiming a Kshatriya status in another. Thus, the varna concept has led to a misrepresentation of the caste system's reality. While varna operates over all of India, caste is connected to a particular locale. A sociology student must thus separate oneself from the varna paradigm in order to fully and scientifically grasp the caste structure. According to Hsu, caste is a depiction of an actual reality in Hindu society whereas varna is only a conceptual framework for the Hindu society as a whole.

### **Sub-castes and Caste**

A caste and a subcaste cannot be easily distinguished from one another since they share many characteristics. A sub-caste, on the other hand, is a division of a caste. For instance, the caste of Kayasth has many sub-castes, including Mathur, Saxena, Srivastava, Nigam, and Bhatnagar. The Oswal caste is split into Dhaya, Pancha, Dasa, and Bisa sub-castes, whereas the Agarwal caste is divided into Dasa and Bisa sub-castes. Thus, a marriage between a guy of the Dasa Oswal caste and a woman of the Dasa Agarwal caste will serve as an example. Brahmin is consistently incorrectly referred to as a caste although it is really a varna, which is a constellation of numerous castes. The caste examples are Kanyakubja, Saryupari, and Gaur Brahmins; the sub-caste examples are Shrimali, Purohit, and Pushkarna Brahmins; and the gotra examples are Bhardwaj, Gautam, and Kashyap Brahmins. Gotra is an exogamous group, while castes and subcastes are both endogamous [12]–[14].

How did sub-castes start to exist? There are two perspectives: one is that they split off from a parent group, and the other is that they became separate groupings. Ghurye claims that the sub-castes separated from the castes due to geographic segregation, mixed ancestry, and occupational distinction. In reference to this, she said in 1958: 133 that "the difference in religious practices and techniques reflects the separate existence and history of these entities than serves as the cause for their separation from the larger units." Sub-castes breaking away from the major castes/tribes to advance their position have been discussed by Risley, Hutton, and Majumdar.

According to B.R. Chauhan, the development of sub-castes as a result of the fission process may be described in terms of factors like migration, altered customs, political choices, etc. Sub-castes, or the fractured groups of castes, according to Krickpatrick, were initially formed as a result of migration and political and social factors. However, today, they are the result of attempts by the wealthy members of a despised caste to distance themselves from their lower caste brothers and climb the social ladder by adopting a new name, one with a shady history, and associating themselves with some higher caste.

### **CONCLUSION**

Caste has persisted for millennia, influencing the social, political, and economic environment of places like South Asia. Caste has changed throughout time, but its core characteristics, such as birth-based hierarchy and vocational vocations, have continued to have an impact on society. Despite attempts to address these problems via social reform movements and legislative measures, caste-related discrimination and inequality still exist in many locations. In order to solve the problems, it raises, caste is a complicated and deeply embedded component of human society that needs constant attention. Fostering inclusion, social justice, and equality in the contemporary world requires an understanding of the complex nature of caste and its effects on people and communities. In order to prevent prejudice and injustice from being perpetuated in the future by the legacy of caste, ongoing study, lobbying, and legislative actions are crucial.

**REFERENCES:**

- [1] V. Das, "Caste," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences: Second Edition*, 2015. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.12030-6.
- [2] M. C. Arcaya, A. L. Arcaya, and S. V. Subramanian, "Inequalities in health: Definitions, concepts, and theories," *Glob. Health Action*, 2015, doi: 10.3402/gha.v8.27106.
- [3] J. Lee, "Beyond Caste: Identity and Power in South Asia, Past and Present . By Sumit Guha. ," *J. Hindu Stud.*, 2015, doi: 10.1093/jhs/hiv030.
- [4] M. R. Vallabhaneni, "Indian caste system: Historical and psychoanalytic views," *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*. 2015. doi: 10.1057/ajp.2015.42.
- [5] L. N. Venkataraman, "Social construction of capabilities and intersectional complexities in a Tamil village," *Dev. Pract.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/09614524.2015.1083537.
- [6] A. Kapilashrami, S. Hill, and N. Meer, "What can health inequalities researchers learn from an intersectionality perspective? Understanding social dynamics with an inter-categorical approach?," *Soc. Theory Heal.*, 2015, doi: 10.1057/sth.2015.16.
- [7] H. Tambs-Lyche, "From the Indian Individual to Hierarchising Discourse: Elements for a Theory of Caste," *Asia Pacific J. Anthropol.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/14442213.2015.1021373.
- [8] M. C. Arcaya, A. L. Arcaya, and S. V. Subramanian, "Inequalities in health: definitions, concepts, and theories Motivation for studying health inequalities," *Glob. Health Action*, 2015.
- [9] A. Devare, "Civility against Caste: Dalit Politics and Citizenship in Western India," *J. Intercult. Stud.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/07256868.2015.1050311.
- [10] S. Parashar, "Inclusion of Transgender Community Within Socially and Educationally Backward Classes: Examining the Deeper Concerns," *ILI Law Rev.*, 2017.
- [11] D. Kumar and N. R. Mishra, "Caste hierarchy and new agro-technological practices: Some anthropological thoughts on Western Uttar Pradesh," *Man in India*. 2017.
- [12] L. B. Bishwakarma, "Caste-based Discrimination in Schooling: A Narrative Inquiry," *Nepal. J. Dev. Rural Stud.*, 2017, doi: 10.3126/njdrs.v14i1-2.19648.
- [13] M. Herrick, "New Ways of Thinking Recovery from Trauma in Arundhati Roy's the God of Small Things and Two other South Indian Narratives of Caste-based Atrocity," *Interventions*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/1369801X.2017.1293555.
- [14] "EXCLUDED SPACES IN FEMINIST FRONT IN INDIA – CURRENT SCENARIO," *Asia Pacific J. Adv. Bus. Soc. Stud.*, 2017, doi: 10.25275/apjabssv3i2ss14.

## CHAPTER 8

### UNDERSTAND THE CONCEPT OF CLASS

---

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor,  
Department of Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India  
Email Id- sarita.verma@muit.in

#### ABSTRACT:

In a variety of disciplines, including sociology, economics, education, and even computer programming, the idea of class is basic and diverse. This abstract examines the many facets and applications of the notion of class in these fields. It explores the definition of class, how it affects people and cultures, and how it affects social hierarchies and economic systems. This abstract offers a detailed grasp of the idea of class and its importance in modern society via a thorough analysis. In India, class is often considered as a result of caste system transformation rather than as a simultaneous and coexisting system that cannot exist without caste. The study of caste hierarchy and social mobility may highlight a number of issues. Instead of mobility at the level of families and individuals, as well as economic and political issues, corporate mobility and the study of the social and cultural components attract more emphasis. In the study of intergroup interactions, resentment, antagonism, and conflict are still dormant concepts.

#### KEYWORDS:

Caste, Community, Mobility, Sociology.

#### INTRODUCTION

For instance, why did Srinivas and his colleagues focus on the sociological aspects of caste structure, positional changes, village community, family life, and kinship but ignore studies of class relations, vertical mobility, urban community, industry, and formal organizations? In the majority of research conducted by Srinivas and his supporters, culturology is given precedence over the structural viewpoint in the understanding of the caste system. The notions of dominant caste and sanskritization continue to be crucial to this approach. Class models have often been utilized in European sociology to examine the social structure. In order to investigate the distribution of income and power, the degree of mobility across classes, and the degree of openness of the class structure, these models divide the economic realm according to a "class schema." Such schemes have typically been defined in terms of a classification of occupations and employment statuses, and analyses typically assume that class membership is long lasting and stable. Although little emphasis has been paid to the implications of this for class theory, a number of recent studies have shown that there is, in fact, a significant amount of occupational shifting, some of which results in a change of class. For instance, Goldthorpe found that the Oxford movement Survey data revealed a high level of short-range, short-term movement [1], [2].

According to the work-history data compiled by Cousins, Curran, and Brown, throughout a ten-year period, 40% of the men and women in their sample had employment that were classified under more than one Registrar General's class. Significant class mobility among women has also been recognized in other work-history literature. These research point to the need of a more thorough investigation of the effects of short-term class mobility. Using a nationally representative sample of more than 90,000 working individuals, this unit will apply

a model of the class structure that divides classes according to market-related characteristics to record the degree and type of short-term interclass mobility. Men who work full-time, women who work full-time, and women who work part-time will all have their outcomes compared. It will be shown that the patterns of interclass mobility are systematically different for men and women, with the occupational system being far less organized for women. It has been found that certain professions make it easier to move across classes. Overall, the migration pattern shows how well occupational classes can be recognized experimentally as rather stable collectivities.

The observed rate of class mobility is influenced by a variety of variables. It first fluctuates with the total reported rate of job switching, which then changes with the interval between observations and the current state of the economy. Data from recent years, for instance, are likely to demonstrate the impact of the present economic downturn and reorganization. When businesses fail and employees are laid off, finding a new job often requires switching careers and learning a new skill. Second, the degree of occupational mobility will determine the rate of observed class movement. This may be the outcome of workers' "normal progression" up the promotion ladder and into management and supervisory roles. It could also represent less intentional occupational change that takes place to get better income or working conditions or for a number of other reasons, such a more convenient area to work [3], [4].

Although various kinds of job switching are required before a class change may take place, they do not define a change of class in and of itself; this happens only when a job switching takes place at the same time as a division between the classes in whichever schema is being used. The kind and volume of class change that is recorded will thus be greatly influenced by the class classification. In comparison to a model with more classes, one that simply distinguishes between manual and non-manual activity is likely to record fewer class switches. The mobility rates for women may only be an artifact of employing that specific class schema if the borders between classes are simply created in terms of the features of the occupational structure of male work, as has often been the case in prior research. In addition, occupational segregation, which tends to concentrate most women in a small number of occupations, means that their mobility is largely restricted to a select group of "female" occupations. Women are also probably less likely to be promoted into supervisory and managerial positions than men, which would move them into a different class. Married women should not be included in studies of occupational mobility or the entire class system, according to these and other differences in how men and women relate to the occupational structure. We and others have made attempts to refute this claim in other places.

## DISCUSSION

The class mobility noted between 1980 and 1981 by respondents to the Labour Force Survey will be investigated for men and women separately in the next sections of the article. Separate studies have also been conducted for women working full-time and part-time since prior research shown that the labor markets for part-time employees and full-time workers are quite different. We do not take into account the fluxes between the full-time and part-time labor markets for women. Both Dube and Singh are aware that the conceptions of caste and class have mostly been 'western' and, as a result, overlook the historical roots of Indian society in their formulations. The indigenization of social science paradigms would guarantee that Indian society-related ideas and theories were properly infused with historical context. Marxist and non-Marxist academics have argued for the use of native notions and categories, respectively. D.P. Mukerji argued forcefully in favor of using only Indian tradition to evaluate societal progress. Desai was adamantly opposed to the use of non-Marxist methods. Mencher and Saberwal both attributed Srinivas' misuse of British structural-functionalism to



him. Class is viewed as an alternative system to caste since caste has been assumed to be synonymous with the social construction of Indian society. But the truth is that neither class nor caste are the exact opposites of one another in terms of the scope of social formations. Caste alone is not challenged by studies like caste and class, caste, class, and power, caste, religion, and power, or caste, class, and politics. These studies have their roots in Weber's 1947 observation that the western dualism of tradition and modernity, as well as the trinity of "class, status, and party," are false.

They are insufficient in delivering us from these strange ideas and theories because they do not take into account the experience of Indian society while defining caste, class, and power. It has been remarked that caste, class, and power have never perfectly coincided. In ancient and medieval India, moving about and migrating were commonplace practices. While land reforms and politicization have brought about incongruities and caste-free zones, Bailey, Beteille, and Bhatt convey the sense that caste, class, and power were congruent in pre-independent India [5]–[7].

Marxist historians are aware of the connection between caste and class in India, but they prefer to examine caste from a class perspective. After the Rig Veda, Kosambi does a class study of the Aryans. Desai, Thapar, and Habib have all examined class in Indian society. Caste is a poorly formed but potentially explosive class component, according to Desai. Desai examined the Indian State from a class perspective in different research. However, class does not always imply openness, mobility, or a mixture of certain characteristics as usually believed by Indian followers of western social scientists and social scientists in the West. For all conceivable purposes, castes have served as classes. As ancient as or perhaps older than caste ties are class relations. According to Lamb, class connections were common as early as 600 B.C. to India. Cultural and material customs class transition had been a significant reality in the shape of new kingdoms, settled agriculture, commerce, cities, banking, and guild organizations. These things all existed in a way that was rather congruent.

Class is treated by D'Souza as a conceptually abstracted category. Non-Marxist researchers often rely on analytical abstractions in the form of statistical-mathematical indicators or analytical topologies. Caste is a community, but class is not. Operationally, class is defined in terms of certain indices. D'Souza only uses the construction of an "order" made up of higher, medium, and lower-class categories when applying the attributional approach to class. Classes in India have been the subject of the following arguments:

1. Castes are ingrained in Indian culture, but classes are not found there as a system of stratification.
2. Class is not a universalistic social stratification phenomenon.
3. Classification cannot be determined by any objective standards.
4. It's unclear if class refers to a general category or a specific unit that interacts with other units.

One can claim that the purpose of these arguments is to avoid classifying Indian society. Caste has contributed to several class-related issues including economic dominance and subjection, advantages and deprived, "conspicuous waste," and basic survival. These issues haven't, however, been the main focus of social study. Caste's all-encompassing authority, pollution-purity, and other characteristics have been embraced as beneficial aspects of the caste system. The common pretense is that there is no class analysis since there is no evidence of class conflict, class awareness, or class unity as Karl Marx had predicted. This is untrue, however. Caste is a system of harmonious relationships from just one viewpoint; from another, which has not been given much consideration, it is a system of hostility and conflict.



The Marxian approach to social stratification must include the method of production and class conflicts. According to Gough, the mode of production is a social structure in which caste, kinship, family, marriage, and even rituals are connected to the forces of production and the relations of production. Due to historical changes in the method of production, Gough's study of Thanjavur explains the rise of a new bourgeoisie, the polarization of the peasants, and the pauperization of the working class. Through the contradictions in the method of production, it is possible to discern the whole scope of social stratification's conflicts. Marxist theorists that discuss caste and kinship in India, such as Namboodiripad and Ranadive, see class ties as a domain assumption. Due to their integration into the method of production, even varna and the jajmani system may be described in terms of class relations. Djurfeldt and Lindberg, Heera Singh, Thorner, Saith and Tanakha, and Bhardwaj and Das are some other authors who have utilized the mode of production as the foundation for analyzing class relations in rural India [8], [9].

In terms of the continuation of the old classes and the simultaneous formation of new ones, contradictions may be discovered between different classes. Urban India is characterized by the industrial, commercial, and professional classes, while the countryside is home to landowners, renters, sharecroppers, and agricultural laborers. There are ideological undertones to these divisions. Landowners, moneylenders, and laborers are classified together, although class conflict is not always implied. But the alternative categorization, which includes the bourgeoisie, landowners who resemble capitalists, wealthy peasants, landless peasantry, and agricultural laborers, inevitably refers to class interaction, dependence-independence, and conflict as the fundamental components of class structure.

The ways that caste and class are approached have ideological undertones. These methods were given credibility by the technique and data employed in the caste and class studies. Caste was seen as an all-encompassing institution that included all other facets of Hindu society rather than as a "social formation." Caste, however, was more than just a 'ritualistic' mechanism, and because of its inclusive nature, it was susceptible to many influences and limitations. It's very burdensome character would have caused it to fall apart long ago if it were just a ceremonial setup. Along with caste, India's social structure also includes class, ethnicity, power, religion, and economics. These social formational elements all interact with one another. They provide insight into the historical development of Indian society, including caste and class systems. The fulfillment of such a creation and the full scope of its historicity must result in the indigenization of the ideas of caste and class.

Functional, dialectical, psychological, and structuralist techniques are unable to explain the historicity of the Indian predicament since they are based on conditions that are unrelated to the history of India. Through the process of the academic hegemony of western researchers, caste and class-related issues were brought up and discussed abroad and then transmitted to Indian intellectuals. Caste-related questions, such as whether it should be studied through participant observation or surveys, whether it should be treated as the only representative institution or whether class, power, and religion should also be studied, and whether it should be studied "alone," have all been brought up by western scholars and later adopted by their Indian counterparts with the tacit understanding of promoting certain ideas upheld by them. We must carefully consider the reasons behind the rise of structural-functionalism, the reverence accorded to participant observation as a research methodology, the acceptance of Redfield's and Marriott's ideas of "little community" and "peasant society," as well as the parochialization and universalization theories. According to one theory, Srinivas' Brahminocentric sociology resulted from this academic establishment's brainwashing [10]–[12].

In a previous investigation, Singh offers a model of social stratification in the context of cultural vs structural, and unique versus universal, traits. These criteria lead to the following types: cultural-universalistic, cultural-particularistic, structural-universalistic, and structural-particularistic. Based on Parson's study of social structure, this paradigm. The structural-particularistic type is relevant for examining social stratification in India, according to Singh's study. Singh does not, however, provide any justifications for why such a categorization would be appropriate. The apparent justification for Singh's scientism is nomology. However, Singh offers another categorization of the social stratification research conducted in the 1970s in a more recent study. The four primary theoretical concerns are: structuralist; structuralist-historical; historical-materialist; and Marxist-historical. Some of the papers that have been examined in light of these methodologies were previously mentioned by me. All scholars, even Marxists, are preoccupied with caste.

Class connections are absorbed by the inclusive system of caste. Class connections develop as a result of any deviation from caste, which is seen as an incongruence between caste, rank, income, and power. This perspective is referred to as structural-functional. Consensus, adaptability, and change within the caste are the defining characteristics of structural-functionalism. The most well-known advocate of structuralism is Dumont. In *Homo Hierarchicus* by Dumont, which he wrote, are expressed the basic ideas of this approach. Ideology, dialectics, transformational relationships, and comparison are cited by Singh as the key elements of Dumont's caste analysis. According to Dumont, hierarchy is an ideology, and hierarchy entails categorizing things according to their purity or impureness. The contrast between pure and impure is a case of binary opposition or dialectics. Regarding the hierarchy of castes, pure and impure imply exclusion as well as inclusion. The link between the "encompassing" and the "encompassed" is another definition of hierarchy. The 'pure' includes the 'less pure,' and so on. This holds true for all societal divisions and facets. Change thus occurs inside society rather than outside of it.

All the shortcomings of structural-functionalism that have been mentioned are present in Dumont's perspective. Singh adds that Dumont's structuralism suffers from both theoretical and substantive shortcomings in addition to these criticisms. The dichotomy or binary opposition between the pure and the impure is also refuted by Gould's concept of the "contra priest" from 1967. The males of the lower caste serve as priests as well, making them pure as a result. Despite being lower in the caste system, they continue to be unclean. Dumont's understanding of caste implies a binary antagonism between caste and class. The following is what Singh said about structuralism: "The structuralist's view of dialectics is divorced from history. History does connect superstructure to infrastructure, form to content, theory to practice, and essence to existence. Without this sense of historical hypothesis, structuralism is just a collection of intellectual schemas that have nothing to do with how society has evolved through time. Tautologies abound in its historical transformative links [13], [14].

In a research, Klass brought up the issue of caste origin. Klass outlines a scenario for how the caste system may evolve. The essential point is that whereas the caste system transfers products without transferring women, clans do. According to Klass' argument, India has produced ecosystems in which people live in a variety of ways. As a result, distinct human groups would engage in a minimal amount of sexual activity and refrain from exchanging women with other groups. Corporate organizations so create marriage circles. Klass associate's caste with strength physically and financially. However, it may be historically and substantively erroneous to connect caste groups' corporate nature with their egalitarian nature.

Understanding caste and class requires an approach that includes dialects, history, culture, dialects, and structure, among other things. Dialectics refers to persuasive ideas that create contrasts and draw attention to relationships between unequal groups, including men and women. As a result, it does not only refer to the pure and impure division in the cognitive structure of Indian civilization as described by structuralists. A significant account of the circumstances of human life is provided by history. It is not a speculative invention based on beliefs, texts, or myths. The nature of the relationships between the wealthy and the poor is defined by culture. The cultural activities, rituals, rites of passage, etc. are not the only things that constitute culture. Structure is the result of historical forces, dialectical difficulties, and a certain "formation." Once it manifests, it has some influence on historical development, the character of contradictions, and criterion-setting. Structure, then, refers to the relationships between social groups at a given period as a historical outcome and an actuality.

A mixture of theory, structure, and process regarding the social development of Indian society is referred to as dialectics, history, culture, and structure. Together, they provide a history of Indian society starting at its inception. Today's hot button issues include whether caste and class changes are "transformational" or "replacements," if caste is "closed" and class is "open," whether caste is "organic" and class is "segmented," and whether caste is being replaced by class. Due to the fact that the concept of "social formation" has not been widely accepted in our understanding of caste and class, these problems have arisen very often. Caste and class are not seen as elements of the historicity of India's social development because of the concern with seeing them as diametrically opposed. The 'congruence' theory concerning caste, class, and power in ancient India has been refuted by a number of researchers. They have shown without a shadow of a doubt that social mobility occurred in prehistoric and medieval India. In reality, the jajmani system was never really 'organic'. The notion of the contrapriest reveals the falsity of the hierarchy and pollution-purity paradigms. The study of upward mobility and embourgeoisement, downward mobility and proletarianization, urban incomes for rural people, the migration of the rural rich to towns, rural non-agricultural income and mobility, among other topics, must take the place of sanskritization, westernization, and dominant caste, among other things.

In the Indian context, caste has historically been entwined with class, and class has historically been entwined with caste, and Indian society still reflects this unbreakable combination today. Caste and class play a part in elections, which is proof of this mixture. However, caste works differently as a "marriage circle" than it does in other contexts. The function of position and riches within caste is explained by hypergamy. Caste-like divisions inside a caste and class-like behaviors within a class are features of people's daily lives. As 'class' has been a built-in mechanism inside caste, caste cannot be understood as a purely 'ritualistic' system, and class cannot be considered as an open system because it has often been impacted by the institution of caste. It becomes impossible to avoid using a structural-historical viewpoint in order to investigate such a phenomena in depth.

## CONCLUSION

Our culture is shaped and pervaded by the idea of class, which has an impact on how we see and engage with the outside world. We may study societal structures, economic inequalities, and educational possibilities via this perspective. Our identities, our access to resources, and our life paths are all significantly influenced by class. Class is often used in sociology to examine the stratification of society and uncover patterns of advantage and disadvantage. Economic systems are designed with class distinctions in mind, which has an impact on social mobility and income distribution. Class may have a big influence on chances for personal and professional advancement and access to high-quality education.

Despite its complexity, the idea of class serves as a constant reminder of the problems that inequality and social hierarchies continue to present. A comprehensive strategy that takes social, educational, and economic factors into account is needed to address these difficulties. Building more fair and just societies, where everyone have equal opportunity to prosper regardless of their social class, requires understanding and tackling class-related concerns.

## REFERENCES:

- [1] M. O. Guudle, "The Concept of ' Class ' on Marxist Doctrine," *Int. J. Nov. Res. Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, 2017.
- [2] A. Halim, S. Suriana, and M. Mursal, "Dampak Problem Based Learning terhadap Pemahaman Konsep Ditinjau dari Gaya Berpikir Siswa pada Mata Pelajaran Fisika," *J. Penelit. Pengemb. Pendidik. Fis.*, 2017, doi: 10.21009/1.03101.
- [3] G. Gunawan, A. Harjono, and S. Sutrio, "Multimedia Interaktif dalam Pembelajaran Konsep Listrik bagi Calon Guru," *J. Pendidik. Fis. dan Teknol.*, 2017, doi: 10.29303/jpft.v1i1.230.
- [4] Y. Sun, Z. Wang, H. Li, and Y. Li, "A novel ensemble classification for data streams with class imbalance and concept drift," *Int. J. Performability Eng.*, 2017, doi: 10.23940/ijpe.17.06.p15.945955.
- [5] K. H. Aburto, M. M. Rioseco, and E. Moyano-Díaz, "Concept of happiness in adults from low-income class," *Paideia*, 2017, doi: 10.1590/1982-432727s1201703.
- [6] S. Wang *et al.*, "Multi-class Latent Concept Pooling for computer-aided endoscopy diagnosis," *ACM Trans. Multimed. Comput. Commun. Appl.*, 2017, doi: 10.1145/3051481.
- [7] Marlina, S. Udaya, and L. Yuliati, "Pengaruh Authentic Problem Based Learning (APBL) Terhadap Penguasaan Konsep Ipa Siswa Kelas IV Sekolah Dasar," *J. Pendidik. Teor. Penelitian, dan Pengemb.*, 2017.
- [8] S. Azeri, "Marx's Concept of Class: A Reconsideration," *Critique*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/03017605.2015.1099848.
- [9] J. G. Carrier, "The concept of class," in *Anthropologies of Class: Power, Practice, and Inequality*, 2015. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781316095867.003.
- [10] J. Iivari, "Distinguishing and contrasting two strategies for design science research," *European Journal of Information Systems*. 2015. doi: 10.1057/ejis.2013.35.
- [11] J. Pakulski, "Class: History of the Concept," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences: Second Edition*, 2015. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.03071-3.
- [12] B. Mirza, Z. Lin, and N. Liu, "Ensemble of subset online sequential extreme learning machine for class imbalance and concept drift," *Neurocomputing*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.neucom.2014.03.075.
- [13] I. Tyler, "Classificatory struggles: Class, culture and inequality in neoliberal times," *Sociol. Rev.*, 2015, doi: 10.1111/1467-954X.12296.
- [14] M. Darnstädt, "The optimal PAC bound for intersection-closed concept classes," *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.ipl.2014.12.001.

## CHAPTER 9

### A BRIEF INTRODUCTION TO RACE AND ETHNICITY

---

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor,  
Department of Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India  
Email Id- sarita.verma@muit.in

#### ABSTRACT:

The social constructions of race and ethnicity have a significant influence on both people and society. This essay examines race and ethnicity's fluid character, their historical foundations, and their current importance. We may better grasp the difficulties and possibilities these notions bring in our increasingly varied society by looking at how race and ethnicity interact with problems like identity, prejudice, and socioeconomic injustice. This article adds to the continuing discussion on race and ethnicity by drawing on both empirical data and theoretical viewpoints. It also emphasizes the need of continual discussion and action to advance equity and social justice. It is seen to be very challenging to differentiate between race and ethnicity. While race is often thought of as the biological and/or cultural essentialization of a group's hierarchy of superiority/inferiority based on their biological makeup, ethnicity is frequently thought of as the cultural identity of a group from a nation state. According to presumptions about power structures, there are racialized ethnicities and ethnicized races.

#### KEYWORDS:

Discrimination, Diversity, Inequality, Ethnicity, Race, Social Justice.

#### INTRODUCTION

'Racial/ethnic identity' is one idea, according to Raman Grosfoguel, therefore race and ethnicity cannot be employed as distinct, stand-alone categories. Prior to Weber, people often saw race and ethnicity as two sides of the same coin. Cultural distinctions between peoples were thought to be the consequence of hereditary features and tendencies about 1900 and prior to the essentialist primordialist view of ethnicity becoming widespread. At that time, "sciences" like phrenology claimed that they could link the cultural and behavioral qualities of various groups to their external physical attributes, such the form of the skull. Race and ethnicity were split apart with Weber's presentation of ethnicity as a social construct. The societal notion that there are distinct races based on biology persisted [1], [2].

National, religious, geographic, linguistic, and cultural groups do not necessarily coincide with racial groups, and the cultural traits of such groups have no demonstrated genetic connection with racial traits, according to the 1950 UNESCO statement "The Race Question" signed by some of the most well-known scholars in the world at the time. It would be preferable to talk about "ethnic groups" instead of "races" when discussing human races since severe mistakes of this kind are often made when the word "race" is employed in common speech. David Craig Griffith, an anthropologist, summarized forty years of ethnographic study in 1982, suggesting that racial and ethnic categories serve as symbolic representations for the many ways that individuals from across the globe have been integrated into a global economy: By making reference to "racial" and "ethnic" characteristics, the competing interests that separate the working classes are further strengthened. By relegating stigmatized people to the lower levels and shielding the top echelons from competition from below, such appeals help to assign distinct kinds of workers to rungs on the scale of labor markets.



All the racial and ethnic characteristics that serve to separate different worker classifications from one another were not created by capitalism. However, the act of worker mobilization in a capitalist society gives these divisions their real meanings. According to Wolf, ethnic groupings were created and integrated during the time of capitalist growth, while races were created and incorporated during the period of European commercial expansion [3], [4].

Ethnicity often also denotes similar cultural, linguistic, behavioral, or religious characteristics. For instance, identifying as Jewish or Arab automatically invokes a number of linguistic, religious, cultural, and racial traits that are thought to be shared by members of each ethnic group. Macroethnicity is another word for such large ethnic groupings. This sets them apart from smaller, more individualized ethnic traits, sometimes referred to as microethnicity. Ethnicity and nationality may sometimes be related, particularly when transnational migration or colonial expansion are involved. Following Ernest Gellner and Benedict Anderson's modernist interpretation of ethnicity, anthropologists and historians believe that the emergence of countries and nationalism in the seventeenth century coincided with the emergence of the modern state system. They resulted in the emergence of "nation-states," where the alleged borders of the country corresponded with state borders. Thus, much like race and country, the idea of ethnicity emerged in the West during the period of European colonial expansion, when mercantilism and capitalism encouraged population flows throughout the world even as state borders were more precisely and rigorously defined. Modern governments often sought legitimacy in the nineteenth century by asserting that they stood in for "nations."

However, communities who have been excluded from national life for a variety of reasons are always present in nation-states. As a result, members of excluded groups may either demand inclusion based on equality or desire autonomy, sometimes even going so far as to demand total political segregation inside their own nation-state. Individuals who identified with one country but lived in another state established ethnic groupings as a result of these circumstances when individuals relocated from one state to another or as a result of one state conquering or colonizing peoples outside of its national borders.

## DISCUSSION

There are several ethnic and racial groupings in most contemporary nations. These are multiple societies: India, the USA, the UK, Canada, etc. Although they are often different from one another culturally, ethnic and racial groupings may serve the same economic and political purposes in a given country. However, in actuality, racial and ethnic distinctions are also characterized by disparities in income and power, friction, and discrimination. There are minority of both races and ethnicities, and as a result, they will inevitably have uneven access to opportunities and status differences. Both highly industrialized and less industrialized civilizations have documented cases of discrimination based on racial and ethnic factors. Minority groups, however, are not always economically and socially backward. Although certain ethnic groups are minority in India, they are economically significantly more advanced than the main ethnicities. In their particular areas, Parsis, Christians, and Sikhs often do better than other groups.

It is generally accepted that individuals may be divided into many races based on their biological makeup. People have been divided into four or five main races by some anthropologists. These distinctions are often made based on factors like skin tone, hairstyle, physique, etc. These are unfounded assumptions, as genetics has shown; they are not real traits. Physical differences might be caused by population inbreeding and the level of interpersonal interaction.



The same demographic group may exhibit a range of physical characteristics. Although certain physical distinctions between people are inherited, these disparities are often used as a basis for prejudice and social discrimination. More than "race," "racism" is practiced via a false attribution of inherent behavioral traits, according to Anthony Giddens. "Racial differences, therefore, should be understood as physical variations singled out by the members of a community or society as ethnically significant," he writes [5], [6].

Physical anthropologists have extensively studied the issue of "race" in light of the physical differences between various demographic groups. Race is a legitimate biological term, according to anthropologist A.L. Kroeber. According to Kroeber, it is neither a legitimate socio-cultural notion nor one that can be used in socio-cultural contexts. Instead, it is a group that is bound together by heredity: a breed, genetic strain, or subspecies. All people are *Homo sapiens*; it is unknown how they divided into many sorts.

### **Race classification**

Different races have been categorized based on characteristics like stature, or physical height, cephalic index, or the ratio of the length and breadth of the head, nasal index, or the relation between breath and nose length, prognathism, or the degree of jaw protrusion, capacity of the skull, hair texture, body hairiness, hair color, and eye color, as well as steatopygia, or a heavy deposit of fat in the buttocks, etc. There are three main racial classifications. Caucasian, Caucasoid, or Europoid is the first group, followed by Negroid and Mongoloid. These three are further known by the terms "White," "Black," and "Yellow," respectively. More than nine out of ten of the countries and tribes in the globe may be attributed to the three major groupings.

### **Comparing Caste and Race**

In a recent research, Chris Smaje argues that "race" and "caste" are both examples of natural hierarchies, i.e., that individuals may be grouped into arranged communities of their own will. Caste and race, however, are not the same thing; there are some variances between the two, as well as certain parallels. Three things that the two institutions have in common are as follows:

1. The division or distinction between people and things;
2. Concepts of the cosmos' order and how it relates to the variety of the planet, notably in terms of political borders; and
3. The personality of the individuals and the "substance" that they represent.

With regard to social dynamics, both produce a certain amount of tension and conflict. The two institutions are fundamentally opposed to equality. The socio-cultural restrictions of caste and race are also absent from social science ideas and conceptualizations. The physical characteristics of a race have societal implications. Smaje views "race" not only in terms of physical characteristics but rather in terms of a particular interaction between political ideology and the colonial expansion of Europe. Smaje rejects the notion that there is an unmistakable characteristic or characteristics that distinguishes one group of people from another. In other words, it rejects the notion that a group of individuals is defined by their innate characteristics. A certain kind of relationship between people is inherent in race; this relationship is reflected or indicated by the term "race". Race refers to the categories or methods used to construct specific notions of group identity. Therefore, race is not a predetermined "natural" characteristic, according to Smaje; rather, it is the concept of a connection that is developed in certain historical or social situations, often including some

kind of exclusion or discrimination. In actuality, many civilizations engage in "racism" without fully understanding its implications. According to Kenan Malik, "the notion of race is not an illustration of a single phenomenon or connection. Instead, it serves as a platform through which many perspectives on the evolving interaction between mankind, society, and environment may be expressed. Smaje challenges the idea that race is an immutable medium or background for social connections, which are dynamically changing. It seems that Malik contends that racism first surfaced as an excuse for inequality in the 19th century, an era that promoted egalitarianism. It was used to enslave laborers in the 17th century. The current racial debate makes it clear that there have been many different "racisms". According to Louis Dumont, racism is only a natural human propensity for status discrimination. Before Dumont, Gunnar Myrdal believed that racism was used in American culture as a justification for slavery, for example. The terrible term "race" is used to undermine the unalienable rights of all men to freedom and equality. The distortion of equalitarianism, the ostensible national ideology of Americans, is racial discrimination. Individualist equality and racial hierarchy are the two poles of a single socio-cultural system that is defined by capitalist production. Persisting racism in a secular political system points to a conundrum in contemporary life. Myrdal aims to explain how racial prejudice based on biological factors has evolved into a sociocultural, political, and economic system of oppression [7], [8].

### **Racism**

Around 1800–1815, "racist mentality" emerged in Europe. The development of a new belief was sparked by anti-Jewish sentiment. A belief in science and rationality was used to combat theological dogmatism. Jews were referred to as a "race" with traits including offensive odor, inherited illnesses, covert illnesses, and other abhorrent flaws. Racial laws were created as a consequence of German nationalism and Nazi pride. In the 19th century, France, Germany, and other European nations all adopted philosophical and religious ideas that were influenced by racial notions and prejudices. In fact, there is a direct connection between the emergence of racism and nationalism. Christians and Jews used to compete against one another in every area. The two societies were plagued with superiority and inferiority mindset. Racism's proponents have said that "race" functions as a type of magical code to unlock shared historical secrets. There is no other fact than everything is race. The idea that "coloured races" were congenitally inferior was pushed in Great Britain and France by strong economic interests, according to the phrase "Race is key to history." In relation to racism, a kind of linkage was established between corporate objectives and psychological requirements. There are allusions to racial thought even in the works of Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud.

The idea of race, according to Peter Robb, "included any essentializing of groups of people which held that they displayed inherent, heritable, persistent, or predictive characteristics, and which, therefore, had a biological or quasi-biological basis." distinct race theories may exist, each reflecting a distinct perspective on biology, history, or society. The concept of race is an application of this process to people. Racism occurs when traits are inferred from generalizations and are unverifiable. The degrees of mutability or plurality that are acknowledged to exist inside categories and the arbitrariness of their outer borders are some of its key metrics. Racism, however, most importantly indicates a ranking based on the aforementioned biological origins and characteristics.

### **Indian Society and Race**

How important was biology, and how far can that be said to have been? Skin tone, birth, sexual orientation, and other factors were seen as the foundations of quasi-racial discrimination and stereotyping in Indian culture. Racism was strongly expressed in the

Varna hierarchy. It is challenging to assert that these categories were entirely or distinctly biological, nevertheless. The mleccha suffered from racial stigma. Through the exclusion of certain groups from the community, "Untouchability" also reflected racial characteristics. Racism was also expressed in the Hindu concept of dharma as inherited roles. Thus, even though they were considerably different from the word "race," terminology like "lineage," "blood," "breeding," "jati," and "varna" in some ways echoed the ideas of "race" and "racism." In a way, religious identities also mirrored ethnic characteristics.

The author makes a crucial point, noting that "the relation of caste to race is not simply a question of whether the groups are in fact racially different, but rather that there seems to be some disposition to attribute racial difference to even the most marginal cues in caste and caste-like situations." Why do pariah groups engage in the same types of occupations? Why do groups like butchers, leather workers, and tanners typically face discrimination? Both caste and race exhibit this pattern of exclusion and division. Although birth continues to be an important ascriptive factor in Indian culture, caste has been a robust, adaptable, and distinct system; as a result, biological or quasi-biological variables do not matter as much as they do in race.

### **Racial Groups**

It has been challenging to identify and describe the numerous ethnic aspects in India. India has long been a desirable destination for a wide range of immigrants from across the globe. Whether it was due to religious persecution, discrimination on other grounds, or simple economic pull to India, waves upon waves of people have been entering the subcontinent. The majority of them never returned to their natural habitats. In this manner individuals with diverse racial components have been arriving and settling down in India and the process of mixing has been taking place with the native populations. This has led to the vibrant mosaic of human affairs that is modern Indian society. Unfortunately, the only artifacts we have unearthed to yet are stone tools; skeleton remains have very sometimes been discovered. The limitations make it exceedingly difficult to create an Indian racial history. We know very little about India's racial past, and one of the key reasons for this is the scarcity of skeletal remains from even historical periods. There has been a growth in fossil discoveries as a result of archaeological study during the last 100 years. The circumstances are still unclear [9]–[11].

Risley can be regarded as the first academic to undertake the scientific racial categorization of India. He was a government official who carried out this investigation in 1890 using anthropometric methods. He was chosen as the 1901 Census Commissioner by the Indian government at the time. He reported his findings in the Census Report and in *The Peoples of India*, a ground-breaking study published in 1915. He divided the population of Indians into seven racial groups. His categorization may be summarized as follows:

1. The Turko-Iranian type included Baluchis and the border provinces in this category.
2. The Indo-Aryan type, which mostly included Punjabis, Rajputs, Jats, and Kashmiri Khatris.
3. The Coorgs and Maratha Brahmins are the best representatives of the Scytho-Dravidian type.
4. The Aryo-Dravidian type included chief representatives of this type are found in Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, and Bihar.
5. The Mongolo-Dravidian type, whose representatives are said to be Kayasthas and Bengali Brahmins.

6. The Mongoloid type, which comprised Assamese, Nepalese, and Burmese people.
7. The Dravidian type made up the majority of the people in modern-day Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, the southern area of Madhya Pradesh, and Chotanagpur.

The most evident flaw and shortcoming in Risley's categorization is that many of his arguments are based on arbitrary judgments and conclusions that have no basis in reality. The skeletal remains discovered at Mohenjodaro exhibit some Proto-Australoid racial traits. According to a number of academics, the Indian population consists of both Australoid and Proto-Australoid racial components. If the Negrito racial element had ever predominated the Indian population, then the populations of North Indians should have some distinct and readily discernible Negrito characteristics. According to serological research, even among India's most primitive tribal populations, Negrito traits are almost nonexistent. As is the case with Negroids, the prehistoric tribes of India have seldom shown a B-blood group majority. A-blood type individuals predominate among Australoid populations, including many of India's aboriginal tribes. Even while tribes like the Bhil and Munda have a high frequency of the B-blood group like the Negritos, they lack other Negrito physical characteristics, which is an additional intriguing and important element in this topic. Even so, it would be impossible to reach a definitive judgment based only on serological data, especially given India's dearth of serological research. Research opportunities in this area are many. Based on the current state of our information, the only conclusion we can draw is that the proto-Australoids may have been the first people to live in India and experience the mingling of African or Negrito blood in certain regions of the subcontinent. Even while this may not be the ultimate conclusion, it will continue to be the most logical conclusion until new pieces of evidence show differently.

### **Historical Concepts of Ethnicity**

Hans Adriel Handokho asserts that, until recently, two separate disputes dominated the study of ethnicity. The first is between "instrumentalism" and "primordialism". According to the primordialist perspective, each participant views ethnic relations as a communal social link that is forced upon them from beyond. The instrumentalist perspective, on the other hand, views ethnicity as essentially an ad hoc component of a political strategy, exploited as a resource by interest groups to accomplish secondary objectives like, for example, an increase in income, power, or prestige. Even if the majority of experts' perspectives lie between the two extremes, this argument remains a crucial point of reference in political science. "Constructivism" and "essentialism" are the topics of the second discussion. Even though national and ethnic identities are portrayed as being centuries old, constructivists see them as the result of historical events, typically recent ones. These identities are seen by essentialists as ontological characteristics that define social actors rather than as the outcome of social activity [12], [13].

According to Eriksen, researchers' efforts to address the increasingly politicized forms of self-representation used by people of various ethnic groups and countries have replaced earlier discussions, particularly in anthropology. This is in relation to discussions about post-colonialism in the Caribbean and South Asia as well as multiculturalism in nations like the United States and Canada that have sizable immigrant populations from a variety of cultures. Ethnic groupings, according to Weber, were artificial since they were predicated on an arbitrary sense of communal *Gemeinschaft*. Second, the group developed the belief rather than the belief in shared *Gemeinschaft*. Third, the desire to monopolize status and power led to group formation. This went against the prevalent naturalist viewpoint of the day, which maintained that disparities in socioculture and behavior across peoples were caused by inherent qualities and inclinations derived from common ancestry, then referred to as "race".

Fredrik Barth was another important ethnicity theorist. His 1969 essay "Ethnic Groups and Boundaries" is credited with helping to popularize the word in social studies in the 1980s and 1990s. Barth went farther than Weber in highlighting how ethnicity is a manufactured concept. According to Barth, ethnicity is constantly being assigned by others and re-assigned by one's own internal self-identification. According to Barth, ethnic groupings are neither logically inert groups to which individuals are born into nor discontinuous cultural isles. He intended to move away from anthropological ideas of cultures as discrete entities and ethnicity as links derived from primal forces and replace them with an emphasis on the boundaries between communities. Therefore, "Ethnic Groups and Boundaries" focuses on how ethnic identities are related. According to Barth, "categorical ethnic distinctions do not depend on an absence of mobility, contact, and information, but rather do entail social processes of exclusion and incorporation whereby discrete categories are maintained despite changing participation and membership over the course of individual life histories". Ronald Cohen, an anthropologist, said in 1978 that social scientists' identification of "ethnic groups" often reflected erroneous labels rather than indigenous realities: The designated ethnic identities we take for granted in the literature as fundamental truths are often imposed arbitrarily or, in the worst cases, incorrectly. In this manner, he made a point about how the identification of an ethnic group by outsiders, such as anthropologists, may differ from how its members saw themselves. When referring to smaller groups with shared cultural systems and shared heritage, the term "ethnicity" had been frequently used in place of older terms like "cultural" or "tribal" in the early years of its use. However, "ethnicity" had the advantage of being able to describe the similarities between systems of group identity in both tribal and modern societies. Additionally, Cohen argued that assertions of "ethnic" identity are often manifestations of colonialist practices and outcomes of the interactions between colonized populations and nation-states, similar to previous assertions of "tribal" identity. As a result, social scientists have concentrated on the processes through which various markers of ethnic identity emerge and why they do so. Joan Vincent, an anthropologist, noted that ethnic borders often have a volatile quality. Ethnicity, according to Ronald Cohen, is "a series of nesting dichotomies of inclusiveness and exclusivity." In Cohen's paraphrasing, he concurs with Joan Vincent's statement that "Ethnicity... might have its boundaries widened or limited depending on the particular requirements of political mobilization. Determining whether ethnic diacritic is prominent relies on whether people are scaling ethnic borders up or down, and whether they are doing so depends largely on the political environment. This may explain why descent is sometimes a marker of ethnicity and other times it is not.

## CONCLUSION

In our effort to create inclusive and egalitarian communities, research on race and ethnicity is crucial. As we've seen, race and ethnicity are social constructs that change through time rather than being rigid classifications. In order to solve the problems of discrimination, prejudice, and inequality that still exist in our modern society, it is essential to comprehend the complexity and subtleties of these structures. Moreover, by appreciating the importance of both individual and group identities within the context of race and ethnicity, we may better understand the variety and depth of human experiences. It gives us the ability to face prejudice head-on, promoting more empathy and understanding amongst people of all racial and cultural origins. We must keep having important discussions and doing important studies on race and ethnicity going ahead. By doing this, we may spot structural injustices and combat them, push social justice-related legislation, and seek to create a more inclusive and peaceful society for everyone. In the end, as we traverse the complicated landscape of race and ethnicity in a world that is always changing, the realization of our common humanity should be the guiding concept.



**REFERENCES:**

- [1] T. L. Cheng *et al.*, "Race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status in research on child health," *Pediatrics*, 2015, doi: 10.1542/peds.2014-3109.
- [2] A. F. Garland *et al.*, "Does Patient Race/Ethnicity Influence Physician Decision-Making for Diagnosis and Treatment of Childhood Disruptive Behavior Problems?," *J. racial Ethn. Heal. disparities*, 2015, doi: 10.1007/s40615-014-0069-4.
- [3] M. D. Schmiegelow *et al.*, "Race and Ethnicity, Obesity, Metabolic Health, and Risk of Cardiovascular Disease in Postmenopausal Women," *J. Am. Heart Assoc.*, 2015, doi: 10.1161/JAHA.114.001695.
- [4] A. Aldana and C. M. Byrd, "School Ethnic–Racial Socialization: Learning About Race and Ethnicity Among African American Students," *Urban Rev.*, 2015, doi: 10.1007/s11256-014-0319-0.
- [5] T. B. Mersha and T. Abebe, "Self-reported race/ethnicity in the age of genomic research: Its potential impact on understanding health disparities," *Human Genomics*. 2015. doi: 10.1186/s40246-014-0023-x.
- [6] L. M. Broidy, A. L. Stewart, C. M. Thompson, A. Chrzanowski, T. Allard, and S. M. Dennison, "Life Course Offending Pathways Across Gender and Race/Ethnicity," *J. Dev. Life-Course Criminol.*, 2015, doi: 10.1007/s40865-015-0008-z.
- [7] M. A. Rao and S. I. Donaldson, "Expanding Opportunities for Diversity in Positive Psychology: An Examination of Gender, Race, and Ethnicity," *Can. Psychol.*, 2015, doi: 10.1037/cap0000036.
- [8] E. V. Klinger *et al.*, "Accuracy of Race, Ethnicity, and Language Preference in an Electronic Health Record," *J. Gen. Intern. Med.*, 2015, doi: 10.1007/s11606-014-3102-8.
- [9] M. Vertelyte, "Key concepts in race and ethnicity," *Ethn. Racial Stud.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/01419870.2014.987795.
- [10] R. M. Johnson *et al.*, "Past 15-year trends in adolescent marijuana use: Differences by race/ethnicity and sex," *Drug Alcohol Depend.*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2015.08.025.
- [11] E. M. Ellis, H. Orom, G. A. Giovino, and M. T. Kiviniemi, "Relations between negative affect and health behaviors by race/ethnicity: Differential effects for symptoms of depression and anxiety," *Heal. Psychol.*, 2015, doi: 10.1037/hea0000197.
- [12] S. Pudasainee-Kapri and R. A. Razza, "Associations Among Supportive Coparenting, Father Engagement and Attachment: The Role of Race/Ethnicity," *J. Child Fam. Stud.*, 2015, doi: 10.1007/s10826-015-0187-6.
- [13] A. A. Peguero, Z. Shekarkhar, A. M. Popp, and D. J. Koo, "Punishing the Children of Immigrants: Race, Ethnicity, Generational Status, Student Misbehavior, and School Discipline," *J. Immigr. Refug. Stud.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/15562948.2014.951136.



## CHAPTER 10

### DISCUSSION ON THE GENDER AND STRATIFICATION

---

Dr. Sarita Verma, Assistant Professor,  
Department of Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India  
Email Id- sarita.verma@muit.in

#### **ABSTRACT:**

A persistent societal phenomenon known as gender stratification has resulted in enormous power, resource, and opportunity gaps between the sexes throughout history. This essay examines the complex issues of gender stratification, looking at its causes, effects, and expressions. It explores how gender intersects with other social categories including race, class, and sexuality via an interdisciplinary perspective, illuminating the intricate interaction of many influences on people's lives. The gender wage gap, occupational segregation, gender-based violence, and the role of social institutions in maintaining or opposing gender inequality are some of the major topics covered. The paper's conclusion emphasizes the significance of continued efforts to eliminate gender inequality and promote gender equality in all spheres of society. In light of these difficulties, it is critical to understand that gender stratification is a complex problem that is intertwined with larger systems of inequality. Therefore, to address the underlying causes and effects of gender stratification, a comprehensive strategy that takes intersectionality into account is required.

#### **KEYWORDS:**

Gender, Gender Equity, Inequality, Intersectionality, Stratification.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

In most civilizations, especially those in the West and the middle classes, men and women play separate roles. While males are often the family's breadwinners, women are expected to take care of household duties and raise children. This distinction has been thought of as "natural," because it is based on biological characteristics. The feminist movements, however, have questioned this kind of labor-dividend arrangement and the consequent oppression of women. Even if housekeeping is now done by women, it is not thought of as job that would be compensated. In addition, women make far less money working outside the house than males do. Numerous professions are categorized as being reserved for women, and they are not included in decision-making. According to feminists, males and patriarchal systems oppress women as a class, which is similar to how classes are oppressed. As a result, gender, rather than class, is the primary factor in social difference. The structures and expressions of inequality are explained by Marxists and Weberian thought. It has been frequently criticized how the class structure of families is determined by the breadwinner, who is often a guy. The gender question poses significant challenges for social stratification research, both theoretically and empirically. According to Newby, the gender equality debate was sparked by women's position in the social hierarchy and their growing involvement in all spheres of society [1], [2].

While Marxist approaches tackles the issue of sexual inequality in terms of the division of labor and views women as a "reserve army" that might be called upon in times of extreme labor scarcity, Weber discusses social stratification taking form in terms of class or position. According to Weber, economic and technical advancements encourage class stratification by

pushing status to the side. Gender inequality was never really addressed by the class and status theories of stratification, which held that gender ties were akin to ethnic ones. Marxist theory's explanation of sexual division has little to do with real social interaction or relationship patterns. An important concern that emerged from this viewpoint was whether or not domestic women have always had trouble coming up with a theory of action that makes sense and can be related to analyses of objective class position and system conflicts of class formation.

However, Mann said that the lack of a good stratification analysis of patriarchy led to a crisis in stratification theory. Patriarchy justifies the uneven access of men and women to resources, opportunities, and rewards in practically all civilizations. Institutions of patriarchy contribute to the status disparity between men and women. Sylvia Walby asserts that patriarchy includes both a disparate power structure and a system of production. Many different types of women's productive activities in society are the subject of cross-cultural research on the sexual division of labor, as well as how these activities affect women's status.

### **Stratification by gender**

To start, men still claim that women are inferior to men biologically. Education, which fosters modesty and humility, honest labor, and the submission of the woman to her husband are all effective ways to curb female disorderliness. Married women lack several sorts of freedom, including those related to their dowries and property. They are restricted to household life. These are the beliefs that are still widely believed and practiced in the majority of countries today. Almost no description can be found, for instance, in *The Making of the English Working Class* by E.P. Thompson. More or less just males are discussed in his class analysis. One may detect references to middle-class women's experiences even in Eric Hobsbawm's most recent works. The concept of "home" and "home making" has only lately been used to recognize the contributions of women. A new definition of "housewife" has also come to light, meaning a woman who takes care of her home and children while her husband works outside the home to support his family [3], [4].

The idea of the house and homemaking has brought to domestic patriarchy. The world as a whole has greatly acknowledged women's entitlement to adequate acknowledgement of their domestic duties. Today, women go to work, have savings, and control over their income. The majority of males do not dislike women who work. Despite these significant adjustments, the man's job still affects where the couple lives and how structured their lives are. R.W. Such a circumstance is referred to as "gender regimes" by Connell and "gendered work-cultures" by Harriet Bradley. Some jobs are seen as being "appropriate" for women, and due to informal hurdles and constraints, women are prevented from pursuing a number of other vocations. A gendered and unequal division of labor, marriage. In Indian culture, a husband begins to restrict his wife's activities and begins to impose some of his own. The husband's assistance to the wife is seen as a lower duty. Even while gendered division of labor still exists, technological technology has undoubtedly lessened the physical labor that women must do. Men do not share equally in parental responsibilities and household duties; hence women cannot achieve equality with men despite working full- or part-time.

## **DISCUSSION**

Michael Mann asserts vehemently that although gender differences are acknowledged as significant, they are not actually taken into account in the key concepts of stratification theory, which are social class, status, and political power. Individuals, families, households, the division of labor between the sexes, social classes, and nation-states are all mediated through them, as was indicated before in this Chapter. In spite of the fact that "neo-

patriarchy" has evolved as a result of newly discovered control methods by males over women in business, politics, and other fields, patriarchy has undoubtedly taken on a new shape as a result of modern industry, interchangeability of men's and women's vocations, equal democratic rights, and adult suffrage. Women have developed into "individuals" like males, but because of their ties to domesticity, they are gendered individuals. Women are still a part of patriarchal family structures, they belong to social classes, and they are impacted by caste and class inequality. They therefore belong to several stratification hierarchies that overlay each other. It is impossible to adequately aggregate their line of work into one scale. However, it is no longer possible to disentangle gender and stratification. "Stratification is gendered now, and gender is stratified".

### **The Use of Gender in Stratification**

"Gender regimes" refer to gender disparities in activities connected to the home, the workplace, and the state. The "male reason" and the binary of "maleness" and "femaleness" inside such a complex of institutions serve to reinforce gender. Connell states: "A gender regime is a cluster of practices, ideological and material, which in a given social context, acts to construct various images of masculinity and femininity and thereby to consolidate forms of gender inequality." For Indian women, N. Kabeer notes that gender hierarchies have an impact on how knowledge is produced and how resources are distributed. Consequently, there is a need for the "deconstruction" of traditional ideas. Class mediates the manner in which biological difference is translated into gender inequality, according to Kabeer, who asserts that "ideology is gendered as well as sexed." Thus, the gender component of the stratification hypothesis is crucial and supports Mann's viewpoint. Even the prestige that women get through their own accomplishments, such as education and paid employment, is underappreciated and is often assigned to spouses and their families or the parents of the upwardly mobile women. Therefore, despite their own independent successes and profits, women only enjoy derivative status. Additionally, not all women have the same status; instead, they are distinguished from one another according to their standing among other female family members [5], [6].

The concept of purush jati and stree jati is widely accepted by people in our culture. To address the issue of women, Nita Kumar offers four approaches: making women the center of human "gaze"; seeing women as men; concentrating on patriarchal, ideological, and discursive frameworks; and examining the covert, subversive methods in which women exercise their agency. The notion of "women as subjects" is contested by Kumar. She argues that women should take the position of the rational, free, male subject in all spheres of life. Our value system, constitutional and legal flaws, violence, aggressiveness, and crimes against women are partly to blame for the inferior and submissive position of women. The practice of dowry, child marriage, and the ban on widow remarriage all contribute to the continued devaluation of women in Indian culture. Genderization of social life has merged with patriarchy and caste-class stratification.

Urban middle-class women's socioeconomic standing has improved due to education and jobs. In addition to pursuing jobs, women are clamoring for autonomy by fighting to be recognized as human beings and members of society on par with males. There are calls for more representation in employment and reservations in local government, state legislatures, and the Lok Sabha. The 73rd and 74th constitutional amendments, respectively, approved requests for participation in PRIs and municipal bodies. The demand has remained stagnant for the Lok Sabha and state legislatures for a while now. Some women have also started their own businesses and engaged in other autonomous economic pursuits. However, they often continue to be second-tier earners. Even in major cities and populated areas, women still lack

true empowerment that would put them on par with men. Because Indian culture is overwhelmingly patriarchal, women nevertheless have actual and imagined faces. How may "gendering" in relationships, employment, and decision-making be reduced in daily life? Women don't require the male family and societal members' pity or compassion. They must have the same ownership and management rights over resources as males. To analyze women's concerns from the top down, "statization" and patronage are used to supply them with job, education, and health care. Effective property rights might lead to more equitable gender relations by reducing women's economic, social, and political subordination. The essential issue is a resource theory, not a reform theory [7], [8].

### **Patriarchy and Women's Subordination**

In a male-dominated household, patriarchy literally implies that the father is in charge. It is an intellectual and social construct that views men the patriarchs as being superior to women. It is referred to as "a system of social structures and practices in which men dominate, oppress, and exploit women" by Sylvia Walby in "Theorising Patriarchy". Men govern women's ability to produce, reproduce, and engage in sexual activity under a hierarchical and unequal system of power relations known as patriarchy. It enforces gender preconceptions of masculinity and femininity on society, strengthening the unfair power dynamics between men and women. Gender relations, which are dynamic and complicated, have altered throughout the course of history, and patriarchy is not a constant. Since class, caste, religion, geography, ethnicity, and sociocultural norms vary from one community to the next, so do the ways in which women are controlled and subjugated. Brahminical patriarchy, tribal patriarchy, and dalit patriarchy are so distinct from one another in the context of India. Within a given caste or class, patriarchy varies according to geographical and theological differences. In a similar vein, women's subjugation in industrialized nations differs from that in underdeveloped nations. While the extent of women's subjugation may vary, some traits, such as the ability to regulate a woman's sexuality and reproductive capabilities, are present in all patriarchies and transcend class, caste, race, religion, and geographic boundaries. The latter portions of this article will address many ideologies, social practices, and institutions including family, religion, caste, education, media, law, state, and society that institutionalize and legitimate this control that has historically grown.

The idea of motherhood, which limits women's mobility and places the task of caring for and raising children on them, is promoted by patriarchal society. The biological propensity to have children is related to the social obligations of motherhood, which include providing for, educating, and raising children while dedicating one's self to the family. According to Heywood, "Patriarchal ideas blur the line between sex and gender and assume that all socioeconomic and political distinctions between men and women have their origins in biology or anatomy." In order to comprehend social injustices, oppressions, and the unequal connection between men and women, gender analysis is crucial. Gender is a key social cleavage, much like social class, caste, race, or religion. Feminist researchers, philosophers, and authors have stated that in order to comprehend the oppression of women, the theories of "sexual politics" and "sexism" are intentional analogies with theories of "class politics" and "racism".

According to the traditionalist perspective, patriarchy is fundamentally predetermined, and since the biological needs of men and women are different, so are the social duties and responsibilities put on women. According to Sigmund Freud, "anatomy is destiny" for women, and their biology largely determines their psyche, and therefore, their capacities and duties. Similar to the old idea of the "public-private divide," which placed politics in the public domain while seeing family and personal ties as unrelated to politics, sexual disparity

was seen as natural rather than political. The domestic realm was allocated for women as housewives and mothers who were barred from politics, while the political sphere was kept for males. Feminists have contested and criticized these notions of male dominance due to their lack of historical or empirical support. The biological difference, according to feminists, may result in certain differences in their responsibilities, but it shouldn't serve as the foundation for a sexual hierarchy where men are in charge. By demolishing these notions, we are able to accept that patriarchy is a human invention that was historically shaped by socioeconomic and political factors in society [9]–[11].

## **Feminism**

Feminism, according to Bhasin and Khan, is "an awareness of patriarchal control, exploitation and oppression at the material and ideological levels of women's labor, fertility, and sexuality, in the family, at the place of work, and in society at large, and conscious action by women and men to transform the present situation." The independence for women to govern their lives and bodies both within the house and outside is a goal that requires constant fight. Feminism is a transversal ideology that addresses a variety of issues, including female suffrage, equal legal rights, the right to education, access to productive resources, the right to participate in decision-making, legalized abortion, recognition of property rights, and the elimination of domestic violence. Feminism has a variety of political positions. Thus, the first wave and second wave of feminism are two paradigms that feminism through.

Since the causes of patriarchy and the formation of male domination may be linked to a variety of forces and circumstances, feminists take varying approaches to understanding patriarchy and use various tactics to end it. Locating feminist ideas and their theoretical approaches to patriarchy within the larger philosophical and political viewpoints that have been widely categorized as Liberal, Marxist, Socialist, and Radical may help one grasp the different facets of feminist theories and their theoretical approaches to understanding patriarchy. The feminist organizations are however unified in their fight against unequal and hierarchical interactions between men and women, which is no longer acknowledged as a biological need, despite their ideological disagreements. They aim to comprehend the gendered character of all social and institutional interactions, which defines who does what for whom, what we are, and what we may become. They strive to understand the gendered nature of all social and institutional ties. Gender relations are seen as problematic and as having a connection to other societal inequities and paradoxes. "Relationships of gender, power, class, race, and sexuality are socially determinants of family, education, welfare, workplace, politics, and culture."

Gender relations are seen as historical and socio-cultural creations that are open to reconstruction rather than as being either naturally occurring or unchanging. In particular, feminist analysis dispels misconceptions and myths about the factual reality of women and develops theories for, by, and about women. Feminist theorists often make political arguments for social change in an overtly political manner. They contest the established systems of power that favor males over women, white people over non-white people, and adults over children. They also continue to fight for diversity.

## **Methods for Understanding Patriarchy**

**Liberal Feminism:** Liberal feminists have fought for women to have equal legal and political rights so that they may compete with men on an equal footing in society. Individualism is the conceptual cornerstone of liberal feminism, and they advocated for universal participation in public and political life. Several women's movements in the United States and the UK pushed for women's suffrage in the 1840s and 1850s. The renowned Seneca Falls Convention in



1848 marked the beginning of the women's rights movement, which included a request for women to have the vote as one of its main demands. The US Constitution first gave women the right to vote in 1920. Despite the UK granting women the right to vote in 1918, they did not have the same access to the polls as males for 10 years. The first work of contemporary feminism to advocate for women's right to vote/female suffrage was Mary Wollstonecraft's "Vindication of the Rights of Women". According to Wollstonecraft, the division between sexes would disappear from political and social life if women had access to education and were recognized as rational beings in their own right. In "The Subjection of Women", John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor argued that women should have the same citizenship, political rights, and freedoms as men. It accuses conventional work and family schedules of oppressing women and limiting their freedom of choice. Liberal feminists thus held the view that suffrage for women would end all sorts of discrimination and prejudice based on sexuality. According to Walby, it had a significant political impact.

The publication of Betty Friedan's "The Feminine Mystique" in the 1960s signaled the comeback of liberal feminist theory and is sometimes seen as having sparked the formation of "second wave" feminism. She made reference to the conventional myth that holds that women find comfort and joy in family life and that their feminine behavior prevents them from pursuing careers in work, politics, and other public affairs. According to Heywood, Friedan "discussed the problem of reconciling the achievement of personhood by making it possible to open up broader opportunities for women in work and public life while continuing to give central importance to family in women's life that has been criticized by radical feminists as contributing to the 'mystique of motherhood'" in "The Second Stage". Liberal feminism thus is primarily reformist and does not question the patriarchal nature of society as a whole. Critics assert that because socially structured inequalities have not been addressed by these reforms, not all women have benefited equally from liberal efforts to expand opportunities for women, end discrimination, and raise public awareness of women's rights. As a result, although the first wave of feminism culminated with the achievement of suffrage, the second wave, which emerged in the 1960s, understood that political and legal rights alone were inadequate to abolish women's oppression. Following then, feminist arguments and ideas grew radical and revolutionary.

**Marxist feminism:** Marxist feminism held that the historical development of private property was responsible for both the separation of classes and the subjection of women. According to Frederick Engels, the introduction of private property reduced women's domestic labor to insignificance in compared to men's productive labor, as stated in "The Origin of Family, Private Property, and the State". "The establishment of capitalism based on private property ownership by men did away with inheritance of property and social position through female line". This marked the end of the feminine sex in history. As a result, paternal power replaced maternal authority, and it was decided that property should be passed on from father to son rather than from mother to her tribe. The private property-owning bourgeois families developed into patriarchal households where women were oppressed. As males made sure that their possessions solely went to their sons, these patriarchal households became repressive. So, as a result of capitalism, bourgeois family and private property repressed and oppressed women.

Contrary to radical feminists, marxist feminists claim that class exploitation is more pervasive than sexual oppression and that in order to really free women, a social revolution that would topple capitalism and create socialism is necessary. According to Engels, "marriage will be dissolved in a socialist society, and once private property is abolished, its patriarchal features and perhaps also monogamy will disappear." Therefore, to comprehend



women's place in society, Marxist feminists, like many socialist feminists, relate structural changes in familial ties with changes in the division of labor. They contend that male economic and political power, private property, monogamous marriage, control over female sexuality, and monogamy are all factors that contributed to patriarchy rather than just women's nature. However, the Marxist feminists have come under fire for their distinction between working class and affluent women as well as their emphasis on economic considerations as an explanation for the subjection of women. Traditional Marxist feminists are criticized by contemporary socialist feminists because they place too much emphasis on the economic causes of gender inequality and fail to acknowledge that female subordination also exists in pre-capitalist and socialist regimes. In reality, socialist feminists charge that Marxist feminists are "sex blind" and only include the criticism of capitalism of women.

Contrary to liberal feminists, socialist feminists assert that the connection between the sexes is based in the social and economic structure itself and that women do not only experience political and legal disadvantages that may be remedied by equal legal rights and opportunities. Therefore, emancipation of women can only occur after structural transformation as a result of social revolution. The inevitable and logical connection between sex and gender differences is rejected by socialist feminists. They contest the idea that biology determines fate by clearly defining "sex and gender" and claim that the connection between childbearing and childrearing is cultural rather than biological. Therefore, socialist feminism aims to change the fundamental social structures of society so that categories of class, gender, sexual orientation, and race no longer act as barriers to sharing equal resources, whereas liberal feminism views women's equality with men as their main political goal. In her book from 1986, Gerda Lerner argues how the regulation of women's sexuality is essential to their subjugation. She makes the case that it's crucial to comprehend how reproduction and manufacturing were coordinated. The cornerstone of private property, the institutionalization of slavery, women's sexual subjugation, and their economic dependence on males is the expropriation and monetization of women's sexual and reproductive ability by men.

The majority of socialist feminists agree that restricting women to domestic roles like childbearing and housekeeping advances capitalism's economic objectives. Women free men from the responsibility of taking care of the home and raising children, allowing them to focus on gainful jobs. Thus, unpaid household work supports the strength and effectiveness of the capitalist economy and also explains why women have a poor social standing and are economically dependent on men. Socialist feminists, however, examine both the links of reproduction and production in order to comprehend patriarchy, in contrast to Marxist feminists. Modern socialist feminists place emphasis on sexual politics, in contrast to traditional Marxists who valued class politics above the latter. They think that since patriarchy has intellectual and cultural foundations, socialism alone will not be able to eradicate it.

In her essay "The Social Origins of the Sexual Division of Labor," Maria Mies refers to the labor performed by women as "shadow work." She contends that the sexual division of labor should no longer be seen as a family-specific issue but rather as a structural issue affecting the whole community. The class relations that dominate production in a given age and culture, as well as the larger national and global divisions of labor, are fundamentally shaped by the hierarchical division of labor between men and women and its dynamics. She makes the case that the asymmetrical division of labor by sex, once established via the use of violence, was supported by strong ideological systems as well as institutions like the family and the state.

Women are seen by patriarchal faiths as an element of nature that must be subdued and subjugated by males. Thus, by examining the intersections between class and gender relations, socialist feminists have expanded theoretical horizons. Eliminating social class inequalities alone won't definitely reduce sexism since gender relations are just as crucial in determining women's standing as economic class interactions are. Patriarchy predates capitalism and has persisted in other political-economic systems as well. However, the oppressive systems of capitalism and patriarchy are inextricably linked and mutually supporting. The patriarchal oppression of women as mothers, consumers, and domestic workers leads to their economic exploitation as wage workers and their subsequent subjection within capitalism.

## CONCLUSION

Gender stratification is still a pervasive and deeply rooted problem in cultures all over the globe. It takes on many different forms and is sustained by deeply ingrained social norms and historical legacies. In addition to highlighting the interconnectedness of gender with other social categories, this study has offered an overview of the complex nature of gender stratification. This highlights the necessity for nuanced methods to resolving inequality. Eliminating the gender wage gap and resolving occupational segregation are two of the key obstacles to overcoming gender stratification. These differences not only have an impact on people's financial well-being but also continue to reinforce conventional gender norms and expectations. The pervasiveness of gender-based violence also serves as a sharp reminder of the power disparities that still exist in our cultures. Education, the workplace, and the judicial system are just a few examples of the social institutions that have a significant impact on whether gender inequality is maintained or challenged. Progress toward gender parity depends on changes within these institutions. Steps in the right way include initiatives that promote diversity and inclusion, gender-sensitive policies, and educational interventions. Gender stratification is a complicated, multidimensional problem that calls for continuing commitment and work from people, organizations, and communities to bring about real change. We may strive toward a more equitable and inclusive society where every person, regardless of gender, has the chance to prosper by supporting gender equality and questioning conventional norms and prejudice

## REFERENCES:

- [1] M. S. Ahmad, Z. A. Damanhour, T. Kimhofer, H. H. Mosli, and E. Holmes, "A new gender-specific model for skin autofluorescence risk stratification," *Sci. Rep.*, 2015, doi: 10.1038/srep10198.
- [2] A. Pullman and L. Andres, "Two sides of the same coin? Applied and general higher education gender stratification in Canada," *Comp. Soc. Res.*, 2015, doi: 10.1108/S0195-631020150000031010.
- [3] C. C. Bueno, "Stratification Economics and Grassroots Development: The Case of Low-Income Black Women Workers in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic," *Rev. Black Polit. Econ.*, 2015, doi: 10.1007/s12114-014-9193-y.
- [4] Z. R. Khachmafova, I. S. Karabulatova, S. A. Lyausheva, E. N. Luchinskaya, and G. V. Osipov, "Gender features of discourse in women's literature as a reflection of changes in the modern society," *Mediterr. J. Soc. Sci.*, 2015, doi: 10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n3s2p476.

- [5] N. T. Quashie, "Who Supports Whom? Gender and Intergenerational Transfers in Post-Industrial Barbados," *J. Cross. Cult. Gerontol.*, 2015, doi: 10.1007/s10823-015-9260-2.
- [6] L. Bécares and N. Priest, "Understanding the influence of race/ethnicity, gender, and class on inequalities in academic and non-academic outcomes among Eighth-Grade Students: Findings from an intersectionality approach," *PLoS One*, 2015, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0141363.
- [7] R. A. Rothman, *Inequality and stratification: Race, class, and gender, fifth edition*. 2015. doi: 10.4324/9781315662794.
- [8] D. Chao, H. Hashimoto, and N. Kondo, "Dynamic impact of social stratification and social influence on smoking prevalence by gender: An agent-based model," *Soc. Sci. Med.*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.08.041.
- [9] J. Stein, "The Impacts of Worktime Control in Context: A Comparison Across Occupations in the U.S. Health Care Industry," *SAGE Open*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/2158244015581554.
- [10] B. T. Kerridge *et al.*, "Gender and nonmedical prescription opioid use and DSM-5 nonmedical prescription opioid use disorder: Results from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions - III," *Drug Alcohol Depend.*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2015.08.026.
- [11] M. Nagasawa, "Gender Stratification in Japanese Private Higher Education," *Int. High. Educ.*, 2015, doi: 10.6017/ihe.2005.40.7492.

## CHAPTER 11

### A BRIEF INTRODUCTION ABOUT WOMEN EMPOWERMENT

---

Dr. Kuldeep Kumar, Assistant Professor,  
Department of Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India  
Email Id- kuldeep.kumar@muit.in

#### **ABSTRACT:**

The notion of women's empowerment has several facets, including social, economic, and political aspects. It entails providing women with the instruments, assets, and chances they need to fully engage in society and realize their objectives. The numerous aspects of women's empowerment, its significance, and the obstacles to achieving it are examined in this abstract. It also emphasizes how empowering women benefits society as a whole. Women's empowerment, also known as gender empowerment, has grown in importance as it relates to development and the economy. The adoption of initiatives and policies that embrace the concept of women's empowerment may be beneficial to whole countries, companies, communities, and organizations. One of the key procedural issues when talking about human rights and development is empowerment. Women may be economically empowered via land rights, which gives them the self-assurance they need to combat gender inequality. In underdeveloped countries, women often face legal restrictions on access to their land based solely on their gender.

#### **KEYWORDS:**

Empowerment, Equality, Gender, Women.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The Millennium Development Goals, the Human Development and Capabilities Approach, and other reliable approaches/goals emphasize empowerment and participation as a critical step in a nation's effort to address the challenges of poverty and development. The Gender Empowerment Measure, or GEM, is a tool for measuring gender empowerment. The GEM displays the political and economic engagement of women in a certain country. Gem tracks "the share of seats held by women in parliament; of female legislators; of female senior officials; of female managers; of female professionals and technical workers; and the gender disparity in earned income, reflecting economic independence," and ranks countries based on this data. The Gender Parity Index and the Gender-related Development Index are additional metrics that consider the significance of female involvement and equality. Land rights are one strategy to use for women's empowerment. Women have the opportunity to exert themselves in a variety of spheres of their lives, both within and outside the house, as a result of having a claim to their property that they would not otherwise have [1], [2].

Giving women tasks that often go to males is another method to empower them. Women who are economically empowered are seen by others as equal members of society. By giving back to their communities, people grow in confidence and self-respect as a result. A community may benefit much by just accepting women as members. Women were granted a position in a forest conservation organization in a research by Bina Agarwal. This not only increased group productivity, but it also gave the women a tremendous boost in self-esteem and made other people, even males, appreciate them more. It has been suggested that participation, which may be understood and attained in a number of ways, is the most advantageous type of

gender empowerment. Political engagement, including the right to vote and express one's thoughts as well as the capacity to run for office with a reasonable chance of success, is crucial to the empowerment of peoples. Participation, however, is not only restricted to the political sphere. It might include taking part in family life, going to school, and having the autonomy to make decisions for oneself. One may argue that achieving these later participations is a prerequisite for engaging in more extensive political involvement. A better level of equality between men and women is produced when women have the power to do what they desire. It is said that microcredit provides a means of empowering women. Governments, organizations, and people all have become enamored with microfinance. They believe that by giving women access to credit and lending money, they would be able to participate fully in society and business, giving them greater ability to improve their communities. Women's empowerment was one of the main objectives when microfinance was founded. Women in poor nations are provided loans with low interest rates in the hopes that they would launch a small company and support their families. However, it should be noted that there is ongoing disagreement concerning the effectiveness and viability of microcredit and microloans [3], [4]. The majority of women throughout the world depend on the unorganized employment sector for their income. The potential for economic development becomes clear if women are given the freedom to do and be more. The economy of a country may suffer if a sizable portion of its labor force were to be eliminated on the basis of gender alone. Additionally, it is believed that having more women on boards, groups, and enterprises would improve efficiency. According to a study, Fortune 500 companies with more female board directors had significantly higher financial returns, including 53 percent higher returns on equity, 24 percent higher returns on sales, and 67 percent higher returns on invested capital. This study demonstrates the influence women can have on the overall economic benefits of a company. The inclusion of women in the formal workforce may boost a country's economic output if it is done on a worldwide scale. Many of the obstacles to women's equality and empowerment are deeply rooted in the traditions of several countries and communities. Many women experience these pressures, while others are used to being viewed less favorably than males. Even if men, lawmakers, NGOs, etc. are aware of the advantages that women's involvement and empowerment may have, many of them are afraid to upset the existing quo and continue to allow social norms impede growth.

## DISCUSSION

The method through which persons or organizations may fully utilize their individual or group authority, power, and influence and use it to their advantage while interacting with other people, institutions, or society. Or, to put it another way, "Empowerment is not giving people power; individuals already have enough of power, in the riches of their knowledge and passion, to execute their work excellently. We describe empowerment as "letting this power out". It motivates individuals to acquire the abilities and information necessary to overcome challenges in life or the workplace and, eventually, aid in their personal or societal development. According to Dr. Asa Don Brown, empowering a woman "sounds as though we are dismissing or ignoring males, but the truth is, both genders desperately need to be equally empowered." Empowerment happens as a result of bettering circumstances, norms, circumstances, and an overall viewpoint on life. Depending on an individual's opinions and aspirations, empowerment may also have a detrimental influence on people, businesses, and productivity. It may create racial or gender divisions. Many times, persons who satisfy the requirements for empowerment are kept back from opening doors because they lack crucial talents and strong competencies. Empowered individuals often develop into challenging, humiliating, and even aggressive coworkers.

### Status of Women: Change and Continuity

One of the most significant inequalities in many communities, and this is especially true in India, is that between men and women. Any evaluation of the position of women must begin with the social context. Women's roles and position in society are determined by social structures, cultural norms, and value systems. These factors also have an impact on societal expectations about how men and women should behave. India's treatment of women varies by culture, geography, and age. The social standing of women in our nation serves as an emblematic illustration of the disparity between the status and roles that are bestowed upon them by the constitution and the law and those that are forced upon them by societal customs. Women are socialized to be decent, obedient, and selfless daughters, wives, and daughters-in-law based on patriarchal institutions and beliefs. Through the process of indoctrination, they are culturally taught not to confront oppression, exploitation, and subjection within the social framework. Males' excessive senses of security, protectiveness, and patriotic attitudes can impede the development of their personalities and feeling of uniqueness. National Profile on Women, Health and Development, 2000. "The status of women in the family and society is largely determined by the socio-economic cultural, political, religious and geographical factors in different regions of the country" [5]–[7].

The joint family, which is the most prevalent kind of family structure, is made up of a group of patrilineally related men who are equally entitled to property, share a shared living space and a communal kitchen. Joint family standards still predominate to a large degree, despite the impact of industry, urbanization, and modernity having brought about significant changes in this pattern of life. Under this kind of family structure, a woman is subject to rigorous limitations, has little to no decision-making authority, and is submissive to her mother-in-law. Her position in the household is greatly influenced by her husband's economic contribution and the amount of dowry she brings. The caste system has long governed the position and cultural autonomy of women. This idea of ceremonial purity and impurity has been maintained by laws governing marriage and reciprocity, allegiance to a caste, vocation, and way of life. The degree of purity has been significantly influenced by vegetarianism, abstinence from alcohol, and restrictions on women. According to the National Profile on Women, religious texts and the patriarchal, patrilineal, and patrilocal family ideology are tightly governed by the caste system's intellectual and material foundations. Women are subject to control through:

1. Not inheriting assets and property;
2. Engaging in seclusion or purdah, which restricts women to the home realm and removes them from public life;
3. Socialization into the values and traditions ;
4. Marriage, which guarantees the safety of the family home and assets; and
5. Menstrual rituals; a shame-instilling attitude toward one's body;
6. Early marriage by arrangement; strict female monogamy; and the confinement of women's self-worth to marriage and family, particularly as the mother of multiple boys.

The top castes, whose women have less cultural liberty than their counterparts in lower castes, have imposed these institutions the most rigidly. Women in lower castes and the majority of tribal communities have higher rights to visibility and mobility, the freedom to select their life mates, and the freedom to divorce marriage if it does not work, mostly due to their bigger participation in family economics. Numerous lower castes have attempted to move up the status structure via the process of Sanskritization by adopting the ways of life, social mores, and behavioral characteristics of upper castes. As a result, their women's



autonomy is also losing ground. This is the cost that a lower caste must pay to advance in society. There is a significant preference for sons in the majority of Indian culture, which stems from the normative family structure where the male preserves the continuation of the lineage. Youngsters who are male significantly outperform youngsters who are female on almost all of these metrics and in the majority of states. According to Mutharayappa, Choe, Arnold, and Roy, son preference is notably robust in northern and central India and somewhat lesser in the south and west. Women are not subjected to serious prejudice in indigenous societies. Female infanticide and foeticide are practices that degrade women's position [8]–[10].

### **Women and the Workplace**

Due to their low status in the social system, complete exclusion from the systems of decision-making and authority, and lack of education and training, women are at a disadvantage in the workplace. According to the 1991 Report of the Census Commissioner, there has been a striking rise in the number of women leaving the four walls of the home and finding employment in both cities and villages. Only 13.0% of Indian women were counted as employees in the nation's workforce overall, according to the 1971 Census data. According to The Hindustan Times, around 80 percent of working women are indirectly involved in agriculture. This figure increased to 25.89 in 1981 and 28.57 in 1991. Only 12.0% of all workers in state and federal administrative services and public sector organizations are female. Tables 10.1 and 10.2 below show the overall number of women in the population and as 'unpaid' employees. The number of women engaged in agricultural labor rose from 20.76 million in 1981 to 28.27 million in 1991.

### **Motivation at Work**

Why do women look for work? Women are driven to work for different reasons than men are. Even while the primary driver seems to be "financial need," it would be inaccurate to state that all women want employment only for this reason. According to a survey of 728 working women, the following are the key motivators for pursuing employment: the husband's inadequate pay, his death, his sickness, his lack of support, his desertion, and his choice for work outside the house.

Generally speaking, 89.0% of the women were found to be employed out of need for money. In a 1989 study of 225 working women in Jaipur, Rajasthan, Deepa Mathur identified six motivational factors for women's employment, including financial necessity or boosting meager family income, security against future contingencies, improvement of living standards, escape from boredom or social affiliation, personal esteem, and self-fulfillment. As a result, 63.1 of women worked for financial reasons and 37.0% for non-financial ones. When asked whether they would prefer to be full-time housewives or full-time workers who also served as householders, 52.0 percent of the women said they would pick simply the domestic position, and 48.0 percent said they would want a job that included work and marriage.

As a result, somewhat more than half of the women were discovered to be eager to work, while slightly less than half were discovered to be unwilling to work. According to the motivational level test, 47.6% of women had a high degree of motivation, 35.1% had a moderate level, and 17.3% had a low level. High educational attainment, greater work satisfaction, and youth were shown to be correlates with a high motivation level. Family of origin accounted for 29.0% of motivation, followed by family of procreation, 23.0%, friends and teachers, 9.0%, and self-inspiration in 39.0% of instances. There are certain things that might reduce motivation to work just as there are those that can raise it.

According to Deepa Mathur's research, the demotivating issues were: lack of access to acceptable employment, lack of aptitude, lack of motivation, discouragement from husbands/in-laws, and incompatibility with husband's employment requirements [11], [12].

### **Dual Role Contentment**

How many women still find the dual roles to be fulfilling? An earning woman will be seen as a woman who is content with her multiple responsibilities if she tries and succeeds in combining her professional position with the traditional roles of mother and wife. The terms "high" and "moderate" satisfaction refer to levels of satisfaction with the performance of both the worker's and the homemaker's roles, respectively. The terms "low" and "lower" satisfaction refer to levels of dissatisfaction with one or both roles, respectively. In Deepa Mathur's research, women were found to be extremely content in 53% of cases, moderately happy in 18% of cases, and dissatisfied in 29% of cases. The happiness or discontent with these multiple positions impacts how working women see themselves. A woman with a "high" self-image believes that her work has strengthened her uniqueness, while a woman with a "low" self-image believes that her work has not had a beneficial impact on her personality.

Role conflict is a sociological issue that working women face due to low self-esteem and dual role issues. This issue has an impact on both the active and passive performance of roles in family relationships, child care, and role performance. Women with submissive personalities have greater difficulty juggling many roles than do those with dominating personalities. In her research, Deepa Mathur discovered that 21.8 percent of women had high levels of role conflict, 44.4 percent experienced mild levels, and 33.8% had no role conflict issues. Role conflict was shown to have a significant, moderate, or weak link with working motivation, husband employment attitudes, workplace interpersonal relationships, and woman personality type. Role conflict has a moderately significant correlation with the existence of children, a substantial correlation with husband's attitude and motivation levels, a weak correlation with workplace interpersonal relationships, and a strong correlation with personality types. According to Ramu, women's activities are compartmentalized, at least in the early stages of their marriages, as a consequence of the tension between the new economic and conventional home duties. This division, nevertheless, is only temporary since many women will find it difficult to balance the conflicting demands of their personal and professional lives. Many of these women eventually learn to either reduce their professional ambitions or their duties.

### **Role Modification**

The working women must 'adapt' themselves at home and at work. Role adjustment, in its simplest form, relies on role demands made by society and role performance made by the person. Role adjustment is defined as "smooth switch-over from one status to another status, perceiving roles as perceived by others, and performing multiple roles with efficiency and satisfaction." A working lady needs to deal with a plethora of issues. The home life must be modified to fit the workplace schedule. The organization of the housework must follow other principles than the conventional ones. Lazarns identified four key measures of adjustment: the level of psychological comfort, the absence of tension-related symptoms, and the acceptability of behavior in social contexts. On a continuum with just one dimension, the adjustment is measured. From the highest point to the lowest point on the continuum, a person's position may be determined. Maladjustment and low adjustment are distinguished from one another because they are fundamentally distinct from one another. Low adjustment denotes insufficient engagement in conditions, whereas maladjustment entails abnormal reactions.

According to Deepa Mathur's study of 225 working women, 38% of them had high home adjustment, 43% had moderate home adjustment, and 19% had low home adjustment. In terms of the degree of job adjustment, 44% displayed high, 30% moderate, and 26% low adjustment. It was discovered that the degree of work adjustment varied depending on the kind of job, duration of employment, access to authority, and long-term goals. In contrast, the degree of household adjustment is influenced by the family's structure, size, and the cooperation and self-esteem of the husband and in-laws. When considering both the home and the workplace, it can be said that working women typically succeed in creating plans that let them pursue their professional goals while still upholding their household obligations. Despite being accused of becoming proud, self-centered, arrogant, and negligent, working women manage to escape the confines of domestic life and contribute to society at large, if not humanity. They spend the majority of their income on improving living standards.

### **Women's Rights**

Orthodox and tradition-bound ideas and behaviors cannot be eliminated overnight in a culture where, according to the 1991 Census, three-fifths of females and roughly half of the whole population lack literacy. It is also difficult to instill a strong public sentiment against these behaviors. Of sure, legislation has an effect, but it can only be implemented slowly and with great caution. What laws relating to the rights of women are currently on the books? How drastically have these social regulations altered Hindu society? How far have they gone in their attempts to affect social change? We shall quickly go through the rights that women are guaranteed by these statutes. The Indian Constitution guarantees both men and women the following fundamental rights:

1. Right to equality, which includes the freedom from sexism and gender bias in terms of public employment, as well as equality of opportunity, equality before the law, and equal protection under the law.
2. Freedom of speech, expression, housing, employment, and movement are all examples of rights to freedom.
3. Right against exploitation, or against "begar," or forced labor.
4. Right to freedom of religion, which includes the right to proclaim, practice, and spread one's faith.
5. The ability to purchase, own, and dispose of property.
6. Rights to one's culture and education, or the right to pursue admission to institutes of higher learning.
7. Right to constitutional remedies, i.e., the ability to apply to courts to have basic rights upheld.

The state has the authority to pass specific laws to defend the interests of and give preference to women in addition to guaranteeing these basic rights. On account of this, the state periodically enacts legislative measures to fulfill its responsibilities of establishing a fair social order.

### **CONCLUSION**

Women's empowerment is not just a catchphrase; it is a vital need for every community to progress. We can promote a more equitable and fair society by addressing gender gaps, guaranteeing equal access to economic and educational opportunities, and encouraging

women's involvement in decision-making processes. Stronger economies, healthier communities, and improved social wellbeing result from the empowerment of women. Governments, organizations, and people all have a responsibility to keep advancing gender equality and women's empowerment. The trip may be difficult, but the benefits are immeasurable, since a society that genuinely flourishes and advances is one that empowers its women. A variety of laws have been passed or altered over the last three to four decades to guarantee women's equality of status and opportunity. These laws may be investigated on the social, economic, and political levels.

## REFERENCES:

- [1] B. Hossain, "Women empowerment and infant mortality in Bangladesh," *Appl. Econ.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/00036846.2015.1051657.
- [2] P. P. Deka, "Financial literacy and financial inclusion for women empowerment: A study," *Int. J. Appl. Res.*, 2015.
- [3] J. Vijayadurai, K. Marammal Devi, A. Subburaj, and N. Mohammad Syed Alikhan, "Impact of education in women empowerment," *Int. J. Appl. Eng. Res.*, 2015.
- [4] A. Bushra and N. Wajiha, "Assessing the Socio-economic Determinants of Women Empowerment in Pakistan," *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.321.
- [5] S. Islam, "Impact of ICT on women empowerment in South Asia," *J. Econ. Financ. Stud.*, 2015, doi: 10.18533/jefs.v3i03.166.
- [6] D. Arul Paramanandam and P. Packirisamy, "An empirical study on the impact of micro enterprises on women empowerment," *J. Enterprising Communities*, 2015, doi: 10.1108/JEC-08-2014-0017.
- [7] S. J. Sandhya, "Impact of Education in Women Empowerment of in Bagalkot District, Karnataka," *Asian J. Soc. Sci. Humanit.*, 2015.
- [8] A. Mainuddin, H. Ara Begum, L. B. Rawal, A. Islam, and S. M. Shariful Islam, "Women Empowerment and Its Relation with Health Seeking Behavior in Bangladesh.," *J. Fam. Reprod. Heal.*, 2015.
- [9] T. Akter, "How Women empowerment as a CSR (Corporate Social Responsibility) topic can be taken as competitive advantage to stay competitive in the RMG industry?," *IOSR J. Bus. Manag. I*, 2015.
- [10] C. Su Mustaffa and F. Asyiek, "Conceptualizing framework for women empowerment in indonesia: Integrating the role of media,interpersonal communication,cosmopolite,extension agent and culture as predictors variables," *Asian Soc. Sci.*, 2015, doi: 10.5539/ass.v11n16p225.
- [11] J. Sridevi, "Corporate Social Responsibility Towards Women Empowerment," *Int. J. Adm. Gov.*, 2015.
- [12] B. S.L., S. U.P., K. P., and R. R., "Women empowerment through women agripreneurship development in India," *Ann. Agri Bio Res.*, 2015.

## CHAPTER 12

### EXPLORING THE CONCEPT OF SOCIAL MOBILITY AND DETERMINANTS OF SOCIAL MOBILITY

---

Dr. Kuldeep Kumar, Assistant Professor,  
Department of Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India  
Email Id- kuldeep.kumar@muit.in

#### ABSTRACT:

Social mobility is a broad notion that refers to a society's ability to provide opportunity for people to gradually better their socioeconomic level. This abstract offers a succinct summary of the main aspects and significance of social mobility in modern society. The capacity of people to move up or down the socioeconomic ladder in a particular society is referred to as social mobility, and it mostly depends on elements like education, income, employment, and social capital. It is an important indicator of the inclusion and justice of society. In-depth discussion of social mobility's determinants, effects on people and society, and policies that may promote it is provided in this study. Social mobility is influenced by a variety of interrelated factors. These elements include racial diversity, gender equality, family history, economic opportunity, social networks, and educational access and quality. Social mobility is significantly impacted by a society's commitment to equal chances and the elimination of structural impediments. Social mobility has an effect that goes beyond individual achievement. Societies with higher levels of social mobility often have improved social cohesiveness, less income disparity, and more economic stability. Additionally, greater social mobility may result in a more inventive and diversified workforce, boosting economic development and competitiveness. Equitable access to high-quality education, cost-effective healthcare, fair taxation, and labor market changes are all examples of policies that support social mobility. In order to promote a more inclusive society where mobility is possible for everyone, it is also essential to overcome prejudice, discrimination, and other institutional hurdles.

#### KEYWORDS:

Cultural Mobility, Economic, Mobility, Social.

#### INTRODUCTION

People are assigned to arranged, uneven social positions in every culture. Differential access to opportunities, resources, and chances for learning results in connections that keep individuals in high and low positions. They make sure that the high positions and advantages they enjoy stay theirs alone and aren't shared with the aspirants. It might take many generations for someone to shift their social position in certain circumstances. People of low status would face impediments to social mobility under a closed or ascriptive system of stratification, while an open system would have a high incidence of social mobility. Regarding social mobility, merit, equality, and historical factors might all be considered. People who had the necessary skills would advance in rank. Everyone should have equal access, and nothing should stand in the way of their achieving greater rank. The history of humanity demonstrates that throughout time, economic and demographic considerations would compel a rearrangement of people, families, and society at large [1], [2].

Geographic mobility is more evident and pervasive, allowing people to migrate from rural to urban areas or vice versa as well as between cities, within countries, and across nations. Such changes have significant sociocultural repercussions, especially when people relocate from rural to urban areas. The other types include switching from one position to another inside the same company, moving to a similar or different role within a different company, and moving to a new sector or labor market in a similar or different position. There are instances of mobility as well, but they do not include a change in one's social or economic standing. Therefore, mobility entails a major change in the economic, social, and political standing of a person or strata.

Regarding the investigation of social mobility, the following facts are noteworthy:

1. It is important to understand a society's rigidity and/or fluidity while describing it.
2. Knowing the possibilities available to people to use their abilities is a worry.
3. To understand how people ascend to society's upper ranks.
4. To be interested in how society's working classes are moving.
5. Class attitudes and class awareness as a result of mobility, especially among the working class.
6. The impact of mobility on class attitudes and characteristics on a person's or a group's capacity for movement.
7. The impact of mobility on a mobile person.

In the case of a family, it is intergenerational mobility. "Mobility is measured as that of a family or that of an individual." It is intragenerational mobility in a person's situation. Stratum mobility continues to be largely ignored. However, caste mobility also refers to group/stratum movement in Indian civilization. Frequency, stability, and height are three ways that mobility may be quantified. Economic, social, and political mobility are all taken into account when using these mobility measuring criteria. All civilizations continue to see occupational mobility as the primary yardstick, although it is challenging to quantify it in terms of earnings, skill and direction, position or office, status, and subjective considerations.

## DISCUSSION

### Social Mobility

Social and Cultural Mobility, a famous book by P.A. Sorokin, offers a vivid conception of social mobility and its effects. Sorokin identifies horizontal and vertical social mobility as the two main categories. Horizontal social mobility refers to the movement of a person from one social group to another that is positioned on an equal footing. Vertical social mobility refers to the relationships that occur when a person moves from one social stratum to another. Additionally, there are two variations of vertical social mobility: social rising and social sinking. One may see rising and falling currents of economic, political, and professional mobility depending on the kind of stratification. The ascending currents take one of two main forms: the infiltration of people from a lower stratum into an already-existing higher one; or the formation of a new group by people and their insertion into a higher stratum in place of or alongside the existing groups of this stratum. Similar to ascending currents, declining currents may take one of two forms: dumping people from higher social positions into those that already exist at lower levels; or degrading a social group as a whole by lowering its standing among other groups or by dissolving as a social unit. In the first instance, a person is said to



have sunk, but in the second, a stratum or unit is said to have sunk. There are so two patterns: rising and falling of an individual, and ascending and descending of groups [3], [4]. Between the intensiveness and the generality of vertical motion, Sorokin also distinguishes. The term "intensity" refers to the vertical social distance or the number of economic, vocational, or political strata that a person crosses in his upward or downward journey during a certain amount of time. The quantity of people whose social standing has moved vertically during a certain time period is what is indicated by the generality. This might also be further divided into the absolute generality and the relative generality of vertical mobility, depending on the percentage of the provided persons to the whole population or the total number of mobile individuals. The total index of the vertical economic mobility of a given society may be calculated using the data on the intensity and relative generality of vertical mobility in a certain area. This makes it easier to compare cultures and a particular society across distance and time.

A certain society may be seen depending on the kind of vertical or horizontal movement, or intensiveness and generality. "Such a type of stratification may be as absolutely closed, rigid, impenetrable, or immobile" if there is no rising or descending, no circulation of its members, and a person is assigned to a stratum based on his or her birth. A society with very intense and widespread vertical mobility may exist in opposition to this. Both up and down, one may migrate from one stratum to another. There may be several medium or transitional varieties of social stratification between these two extreme categories, and they may be described as open, plastic, penetrable, or movable. Compared to authoritarian and dogmatic civilizations, democracies have more intense vertical mobility. A democratic society does not put any importance on birth-based ascriptive status. There is transparency and opportunity equality. There are other holes and elevators that must be accessed. According to Sorokin, there are many broad rules governing vertical motion [5]–[7].

1. There has almost ever been a society where the economic, political, and occupational vertical mobility in all three of its manifestations wasn't present.
2. Vertical social mobility has never been completely unrestricted and there has never been any impediment to moving up the social scale in any culture.
3. Vertical social mobility differs from society to civilization in terms of its intensity and generality.
4. In the same society, both the intensity and the generality of vertical mobility economic, political, and occupational vary with time.
5. As far as the related historical and other materials allow for observing, there does not seem to be a clear permanent tendency toward either an increase or a decline in the intensiveness and generality of mobility in the sphere of vertical mobility, in its three basic forms. This is put up as being true for the history of a nation, next for a sizable social group, and eventually for the history of humanity.

Sorokin claims that horizontal and vertical social mobility are the two main types. Currents that are both rising and falling constitute vertical mobility. In the systems of other groups, both have individual infiltration and collective ascension or decline of the whole group. We may differentiate between stationary and mobile kinds of society based on the degree of circulation. However, there is no civilization that is totally closed. It is difficult to go vertically, and there are often barriers in the path. There is no constant tendency toward rise or reduction in vertical movement based on time and space, intensity, and generality. In general, democratic countries tend to have higher levels of mobility than authoritarian ones.

## Vertical Mobility

Sorokin lists the following as the main manifestations of horizontal mobility in western societies: territorial circulation of people, circulation of things and values, intra-occupational circulation of people, inter-family circulation, shifting of citizenships among people, interreligious circulation, and inter-political party circulation. The term "horizontal mobility" connotes a high level of dynamism. The key aspect of horizontal mobility is that it has no impact on the social class structure per se. Within the broad normative framework of social stratification, people may go up or down. Education, employment, migration, new possibilities, and a desire for bettering lives all contribute to this becoming achievable. According to this definition, horizontal mobility occurs inside systems rather than beyond them. It is a shift of one's position in regard to another person. Such mobility is defined by social positional advancement. It makes sense that there are also some who are downwardly mobile. These individuals lose social standing and get less advantages than their prior "equals" when they are unable to adapt to new circumstances. Some individuals advance in a variety of ways within their lifetime, while others need more than one or two generations to do so. Intergenerational movement and intragenerational mobility are the names for these two patterns, respectively.

Along with horizontal and vertical motion, downward mobility is also present, but in considerably less amounts than the typical patterns of vertical and horizontal mobility. Downward mobility in western nations is often brought on by psychological issues and worries, which make it difficult for people to maintain the lifestyles to which they have become used. Another significant factor in downward mobility is redundancy. In India, tragedies, catastrophes, diseases, and disasters wreak havoc and have a negative impact on societal structures. The removal of privileges from historically privileged groups of people and families, the constitutional provision relating to adult franchise, the establishment of fundamental rights, and other human-made macro-structural changes have all contributed to egalitarianism and the downward mobility of previously advantaged groups in society [8], [9].

## Factors Affecting Social Mobility

Every civilization has social mobility. Its effects on society and social stratification are extensive. There are several things that influence social mobility. Social mobility is facilitated by certain circumstances while restricted by others. Social mobility has allegedly grown as a result of industrialisation. As a result, the majority of research on mobility has concentrated on the analysis of social mobility in industrial societies and the variables influencing mobility there. Scholars' perspectives on the variables influencing social mobility vary, nevertheless. Social scientist P.A. No civilization, according to Sorokin, can be entirely open or completely closed. Two different types of causes, according to him, influence social mobility. One is a fundamental element that impacts mobility across all civilizations, while the other is a secondary one that is unique to a given society at a given moment. He identified four main factors, which are as follows:

1. The demographics,
2. Ability and talent,
3. Alteration of the social climate,
4. Incorrect allocation of people to social roles.
5. Demographic component

In all civilizations, the demographic element has an impact on social mobility. The pace of social mobility is greatly influenced by the fall in fertility and the population. It has been noted that the birth rate of people in higher socioeconomic strata is lower than that of those in lower socioeconomic strata. Similar to how lower stratum populations have greater mortality rates than upper strata populations. Women's mobility is made possible by the decline in fertility rates. Life expectancy has increased, the mortality rate has decreased, and the birth rate has decreased. New institutions like hospitals, nursing homes, family welfare centers, etc. arise along with them. All of these led to additional job openings and enabled social mobility.

### **Ability and Talent**

Two elements at the individual level help social mobility. One is motivation for success, and the other is unique skill. With the use of their skill, such as brilliance in sports, the arts, music, etc., people may accomplish mobility. Talent and skill have minimal bearing on mobility in ascriptive cultures. According to Lipset and Bendix, there are constantly fresh sources of talent that must be absorbed someplace. Talented people can always move up the social ladder, even in countries where status positions are hereditary. But a culture that values performance may not be as accepting as we once believed. Effective human resources fulfil many roles in society, according to functionalist thinkers like Davis and Moore. According to their theory, social incentive and placement are facilitated by stratification. But in the current context, this is untrue. Due to opportunity inequality, even talented members of underprivileged groups will not be able to succeed. Numerous studies indicate that when placing a person in a job, the class of origin still has a significant role. The places at the very top and the very bottom move relatively little. As a result, skill and ability have a limited impact on social mobility. Vilfredo Pareto, a key proponent of elite theorists, maintained that social mobility is greatly influenced by skill and aptitude. People may lose elite skill with time, while those from lower social strata may display such ability. Therefore, there will be movement. The individuals with skill will take the position of the previous elites. The "circulation of elites" idea is also known as "repetitive change," according to Max Gluckman, who studied changes in African chiefdoms. This distinction between conflict 'inside the regime' and conflict 'over the regime,' as described by Maurice Duverger, is important [10]–[12].

### **Change in the Social Environment**

This is a crucial component that may affect all other social mobility variables. Social transformation is a key determinant of mobility. Industrialization is one of the significant economic shifts that is thought to have a significant influence on social mobility.

#### **1. Industrialization**

According to Lipset and Bendix, once all civilizations have attained a certain degree of industrialization, there is a resemblance in the rates of social mobility. Industrialization increases the rate of mobility, they said. The author of the convergence thesis, Kerr, asserts that all industrial civilizations move toward a similar pattern of mobility. Bendix and Lipset identified five key elements of social mobility in industrial societies based on their research.

- i. Variations in the number of openings,
- ii. Variations in fertility rates,
- iii. Modifications to the rank given to vocations,
- iv. Modifications to the number of jobs with inheritable status, and
- v. Modifications to the laws governing prospective opportunities.

The occupational structure of the society altered as a result of industrialisation. There are now openings in the industrial sector. The service industry began to expand. People from rural regions moved to metropolitan areas as a result of industrialization and urbanization. There were new white-collar jobs established. All of this resulted in an increase in the number of open positions. Social mobility thus existed to fill these gaps. Democratic systems of government are characteristics of industrial civilizations. Social barriers were abolished by the democratization of political systems and all of its noble qualities. Social mobility in India was further assisted by the institution of the universal adult franchise, the panchayati raj system, constitutional, political, and social rights, etc. Industrialization took the role of traditional occupational specialization. The stratification structure began to change as a result of education. Ascriptive stance lost its meaning. The nature and value of certain jobs have changed as a result of some occupations being reranked. Some professions that had greater relevance in the past have now lost some of their usefulness.

## **2. A Theory of Convergence**

One perspective on the connection between industrialisation and stratification is the convergence theory. According to the premise, all industrial civilizations move toward a similar pattern of mobility. One proponent of this theory, Kerr, said that industrialization was a common factor in today's globe that will affect all industrialized civilizations in the direction of a single future society that he dubbed a pluralistic industrialist society. The mobility pattern would be the same in this case. There would be a high rate of movement. The proponent of this concept also suggested that the rates of mobility will continue to rise. However, Goldthorpe disputed this theory based on Miller's empirical results since he discovered that the rates of migration in industrial civilizations do not converge. As a result, Goldthorpe discovered a number of additional variables, including political and ideological differences that also play a significant role in determining the pace of social mobility.

## **3. Transportation Challenges**

There are a number of things that prevent social mobility. Social mobility is impeded by factors such as poverty, limited educational possibilities, lack of knowledge about available jobs, members of the traditional top strata, unequal growth, etc. Although it is often assumed that industrialization opens up opportunities for upward mobility, this is not always true in industrial society. To succeed, the class of origin is still crucial. Even now, certain communities in India are not afforded equal access. Despite the removal of the legal obstacles, social inequality still remains and prevents mobility.

## **4. The Marxist View of Social Mobility**

Marx used 'class' division to illustrate how society is divided into strata. He thought that as capitalism grows, there would be a polarization of the classes. The lowest class groupings will descend into the intermediate classes. There would be downward mobility as a result. According to the Marxist view, there are few prospects for upward mobility since the causes driving mobility are those that are fundamental to capitalism.

## **5. Subjective Elements**

Subjective influences are the ones that encourage individuals to move around. Mobility is discouraged by certain elements and encouraged by others. Most people strive for upward mobility. Veblen demonstrated that any stratification system is inevitably a source of mobility in his book "The Theory of Leisure Class." For a person to move about, achievement motivation is crucial. Sanskritization is another factor contributing to aspirations

of caste hierarchical mobility. Andre Beteille noted that when aspirational groups reach higher positions, they often want to hold onto those positions by limiting access for others to go ahead. Weber called this concept "social closure." For instance, both the process of inclusion and exclusion coexist in the caste system. Through the idea of a "reference group," R.K.Merton attempted to explain the driving force behind mobility. Mobility motivation is shown when a person adopts the standards and beliefs of the group to which he aspires. This process is known as "anticipatory socialization."

## **6. Social Changes and Social Mobility**

Social transformation is a key determinant of mobility. The system of stratification may alter as a result of social mobility. Since dissatisfaction with the current system drove to change, social mobility restrictions will also aid in system transformation. When this happens, mobility also brings about change. Sometimes, mobility results via revolutions, reform movements, rebellions, etc. Marx, Merton, Giddens, and Pareto made significant contributions in this area.

## **7. Facilitating Social Mobility Factors**

Apparently, P.A. Sorokin, there are two types of variables that influence social mobility. There are two types of mobility factors: fundamental ones that apply to all cultures and secondary ones that are unique to certain civilizations at certain times. The most significant primary factor is the change in environment, followed by demographic variables, aptitude and ability, improper distribution of people in social positions, and demographic factors. He underlined the importance of population and fertility drop in influencing the pace of social mobility. With the use of their skill, such as brilliance in sports, the arts, music, etc., people may accomplish mobility. Social change is a significant contributor to social mobility. Compared to pre-industrial cultures are Lipset and industrial ones.

Urbanization, democratization, and mobility are all influenced by industrialization. As a result, employment increases and metropolitan areas expand at a relatively rapid pace. As a result, there were more opportunities for movement. Social mobility in an industrial society is facilitated by education access and democracy. According to this idea, equality and the pace of mobility both tend to rise with time. Theories by P.M. Brown and O.D. Duncan are the ones who first proposed this hypothesis.

## **CONCLUSION**

Social mobility is a complicated process that is impacted by many different things. Education stands out as a significant influencer since it gives people the abilities and information required for upward mobility. Depending on how severe it is and how society responds to it, income disparity may serve as both a hindrance and a driving force for mobility. Access to resources and job markets is crucial, as are social networks and relationships, often referred to as social capital, which may open or shut doors. Government programs like social safety nets and financing for education may either support or prevent social mobility. In order to create policies and activities that support a more socially mobile society where everyone have equal opportunity to better their socioeconomic position, it is essential to understand these variables and how they interact. This will eventually help to create a fairer and more just society for all.

**REFERENCES:**

- [1] M. Hout, "A Summary of What We Know about Social Mobility," *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0002716214547174.
- [2] M. L. Ritterman Weintraub, L. C. H. Fernald, N. Adler, S. Bertozzi, and S. L. Syme, "Perceptions of Social Mobility: Development of a New Psychosocial Indicator Associated with Adolescent Risk Behaviors," *Front. Public Heal.*, 2015, doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2015.00062.
- [3] J. V. dos Santos Motta, N. P. Lima, M. T. Anselmo Olinto, and D. P. Gigante, "Social mobility and smoking: A systematic review," *Ciencia e Saude Coletiva*. 2015. doi: 10.1590/1413-81232015205.01642014.
- [4] G. Clark, N. Cummins, Y. Hao, and D. D. Vidal, "Surnames: A new source for the history of social mobility," *Explor. Econ. Hist.*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.eeh.2014.12.002.
- [5] D. B. Grusky, T. M. Smeeding, and C. M. Snipp, "A New Infrastructure for Monitoring Social Mobility in the United States," *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0002716214549941.
- [6] M. Collins, G. Collins, and G. Butt, "Social mobility or social reproduction? A case study of the attainment patterns of students according to their social background and ethnicity," *Educ. Rev.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/00131911.2013.859127.
- [7] K. Snellman, J. M. Silva, C. B. Frederick, and R. D. Putnam, "The Engagement Gap: Social Mobility and Extracurricular Participation among American Youth," *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0002716214548398.
- [8] P. Coulangeon, "Social mobility and musical tastes: A reappraisal of the social meaning of taste eclecticism," *Poetics*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.poetic.2015.05.002.
- [9] O. Marcenaro-Gutierrez, J. Micklewright, and A. Vignoles, "Social mobility, parental help, and the importance of networks: Evidence for Britain," *Longit. Life Course Stud.*, 2015, doi: 10.14301/llcs.v6i2.313.
- [10] M. Walter, "The vexed link between social capital and social mobility for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people:," *Australian Journal of Social Issues*. 2015. doi: 10.1002/j.1839-4655.2015.tb00335.x.
- [11] T. L. Waldron, G. Fisher, and C. Navis, "Institutional entrepreneurs' social mobility in organizational fields," *J. Bus. Ventur.*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusvent.2014.06.006.
- [12] Y. Liu, Z. Li, Y. Liu, and H. Chen, "Growth of rural migrant enclaves in Guangzhou, China: Agency, everyday practice and social mobility," *Urban Stud.*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0042098014553752.



## CHAPTER 13

### **MOBILITY IN CLOSED AND OPEN SYSTEMS OF STRATIFICATION**

---

Dr. Kuldeep Kumar, Assistant Professor,  
Department of Humanities, Maharishi University of Information Technology, Uttar Pradesh, India  
Email Id- kuldeep.kumar@muit.in

#### **ABSTRACT:**

Social stratification systems that are restricted or open to mobility have significant effects on both people and society. Open systems, like contemporary capitalist civilizations, theoretically let people to move up or down the social order based on merit and effort, in contrast to closed systems, like caste-based societies, which limit mobility based on birth. This essay examines the dynamics of social mobility within two opposing systems and examines the elements that either support or prevent it. It becomes clear from a comparison perspective that although open systems have a better potential for mobility, there are still certain obstacles to overcome. The persistence of discrimination, socioeconomic divides, and structural inequality hinders people's capacity to rise beyond their social backgrounds. For more equal societies to be built, it is crucial to comprehend the intricacies of mobility in both closed and open systems.

#### **KEYWORDS:**

Caste, Closed systems, Mobility, Open systems, Social stratification

#### **INTRODUCTION**

A society's stratification is the ranking of its members. Ranking is determined by a set of standards. Power, position, and reputation are some of these requirements. Marxists see stratification in relation to the method of production. In reality, social stratification has evolved into a multi-disciplinary and multi-dimensional area of research in modern sociology. Because sociology, rural sociology, social anthropology, psychology, political science, and economics are other fields that research stratification, the word "multi" is used to describe it. Its multi-disciplinary makeup also results in a variety of research methods. They fall into two categories: Weberian or non-Marxist, and Marxist. Marxists analyze social stratification in terms of the means of production, as was already said. Such a strategy is historically based and takes into account the theoretical underpinnings of production forces and linkages. Although the mode of production is still the basic foundation in the Marxist approach to stratification, there are various variations. The ideas of money, power, and reputation are taken into account in the Weberian theory of stratification. Wealth, for instance, might be determined by a person's work and capacity to generate money, or by inherited treasures like real estate. The term "prestige" alludes to honor and personal style, such as how exquisite one's lifestyle is. Power is the capacity to direct or influence the course of the events that constitute social life. Therefore, in a community, positions are rated according to how many desirables are associated with them. Since one might become more desired by holding a job with a higher rank, stratification thus implies inequality [1], [2].

When examining rural social stratification, we either place a strong emphasis on the method of production that is, the kinds of peasants, landowners, and the use of technology in production, surplus for the market, and the movement of laborers or on other factors. As an example, the study of Peasants, Migrants, and Paupers by Jan Breman in the area of south

Gujarat uses the method of production as the fundamental foundation for his examination. Andre Beteille's work, *Caste, Class and Power*, is a great example of researching rural stratification from a Weberian point of view. Weberian thinkers regard class, status, and power as fundamental causes of stratification or ranking. Another example of using the Weberian method to the study of rural stratification may be found in K.L. Sharma's famous paper, *The Changing Rural Stratification System*. In most communities, there is a graded social hierarchy. Conceptions of difference provide the basis for yet another method of grouping the people. "If inequality is the key characteristic, then the stratificatory system can be described as a hierarchical one," explains Dipankar Gupta. The different social hierarchies confront one another as horizontal and equal blocs if difference is more significant. A ranking hierarchy is not really necessary in this situation. It is obvious that differences in status or wealth fit into a hierarchical system of stratification. On the other hand, language distinctions, for instance, cannot be arranged in a hierarchical sequence. However, in general, inequalities between men and women are viewed as being "ranked" vertically rather than horizontally. Therefore, social stratification encompasses both "inequality" and "difference," and the two have an impact on one another.

"Social stratification is not just about categorizing people into diverse strata," says Dipankar Gupta. An analytical foundation for understanding social order and social mobility is provided by social stratification. Therefore, social stratification reveals social dynamics and statics principles. We get insight into the static ranking order and fluidity of social reality. Understanding social structure and social mobility is essential. When natural differences are seen as sociological categories, they get the "social" label. While "difference" suggests "dynamics" in the static social order, "hierarchy" often refers to a static rank order. Societal stratification encompasses both diversity and hierarchy. In a hierarchical culture like India, where the caste system is rigorous, social mobility is possible. Class-based civilizations are often seen to be more mobile. In terms of pathways and opportunities for social mobility, open and closed systems of social stratification are compared [3]–[5].

### **Open Social Stratification System**

An aspirant's mobility is what defines an open system of stratification. A closed system, on the other hand, inhibits movement inside its rank hierarchy. People work hard in both systems to promote upward mobility. To put it another way, those who want to advance publicly declare their claims to new positions or to those who have previously had privileged status and honor in the community, challenging the structure of social stratification that has persisted. More difference and distinction emerge under the open system due to mobility, and claimants are able to defend them. According to Gupta, one may advance in an open system of stratification by merely adhering to the internal order or rank distinction. A person may advance from the lower position they now have in an organization, workplace, or sector if they earn the requirements for higher jobs during the course of their lifetime.

## **DISCUSSION**

A common feature of an open stratification system is mobility. Typically, in such a system, horizontal movement takes place without endangering the ideological or structural foundation of the system. The system doesn't change, but the people shift vertically up or down. Mobility is always done on an individual basis, never in a group or as a family. In order to assess quantitative differences in this variable in a rank order, "In an open system of stratification, a single variable must be the hierarchy." For instance, it is possible to measure continuously from 0 to 100. Within the stratification system, such mobility or gradations do not produce categorical differences. Numerous characteristics that may be measured and quantified may

be included in a continuous hierarchy, including employment, education, housing, and income source. The American population was divided into upper class, higher middle class, lower middle class, upper lower class, and lower lower class by L. Warner et al. using a composite index. assigned those factors like income, influence, or the amount of land a person owns are much more easily quantifiable and measurable, it's possible that one will disagree with the criteria that Warner and his collaborators set with respect to the weight assigned to various and varied jobs, education, etc. Mobility and class status should, or should, be plotted on a single measurable variable for an open system of stratification to work effectively. "Once elements of incommensurable differences are superimposed on an open system, it becomes complicated."

"In general, America is seen as the model for an open social stratification structure. The individual is king in America. As a result, it is the perfect place for a system of stratification to manifest. America tolerates a degree of similarity among its citizens. According to Gupta, "upward mobility does not necessarily imply that someone else must lose status as a consequence in an open system of stratification." The underlying premise is that everyone is equal and that mobility exists to the degree that potential is realized.

### **Closed Social Stratification System**

Caste, race, religion, ethnicity, and other factors are important factors in a closed system of stratification. In a system like this, ascribed attributes are given top priority. Such factors are, however, often contested and questioned. In a closed system of stratification, quality serves as the primary criteria, similar to how quantity serves as the primary yardstick in an open system. In the closed system, distinctions between social groupings like castes and races are developed. Such a system is distinguished by both diversity and hierarchy. Together, they make the system stiff, which makes moving about more difficult. There have been several campaigns for social mobility to alter India's strict caste structure. According to Gupta, disparities are fundamental in a closed system of stratification, and hierarchy develops as a result. The foundation of hierarchy is difference. As a result of the fundamentally unrankable and incomparable inequalities, there are significant barriers to upward mobility. Because of this, movement is an uncommon and challenging possibility, and even if it does, it cannot be measured. In closed systems of stratification like caste and race, mobility is not a common occurrence [6], [7].

To be clear, neither an open system nor a closed system are simply the antithesis of one another. A closed system has never remained completely static. A closed system, when subjected to intense stresses and pressures, will bend toward change and movement, while an open system sometimes develops a propensity of resistance to change and mobility. Even the caste system saw resistance and dynamism throughout the ancient and medieval times. Intercaste ties, the foundation of the caste system, are no longer present. Commensal connections are almost extinct. Connubiality is deteriorating. Caste identities, however, are strengthening for non-caste reasons, notably for political and economic advantages. Because the two systems of social stratification are relative and share certain characteristics, they are not diametrically opposed.

### **India's Social Mobility**

Social mobility in India is mostly centered on the caste system because of how important it has been. According to its definition, social mobility denotes either a danger to an ongoing, largely static system, little changes to the statuses and responsibilities of a society's members, or, as a radical measure, the displacement of the current system and its replacement with a new one. Horizontal mobility, often known as positional change, refers to modifications and

shifts within a certain stratification structure. The provided system is threatened by the fundamental alterations since they are vertical and structural in character. Vertical and horizontal mobility have both been seen in Indian culture. Positional changes within the caste system are known as such, while vertical or structural changes within the caste system are known as such. Sanskritization, westernization, universalization, and parochialization are words used to describe social mobility, which indicates positional shifts in the cultural sphere of Indian society.

The structural-historical, Marxist, and modernization/culturological schools of thought are the three primary schools of thought on social mobility. The structural-historical approach places a strong focus on the replacement of the former urban dominant population with a new group of individuals derived from the more developed rural components. Such a societal change has been made possible by political awareness and the democraticization of politics. The pre-independence period's tenants have been embourgeoised as a consequence of land reforms and extensive irrigation projects. In rural India, the end of landlordism has woven a new social web. When it comes to the gaps between affluent and poor, rural and urban, and local, regional, and national formations, structural change brings about a number of new tensions and contradictions. A new class of power elite and white-collar professionals have emerged from the once marginalized segments of Indian society as a result of the reservation policy in education, employment, and elections. The modernization/cultural approach places a strong emphasis on how values and norms are changing through time. Cultural mobility has been described by M.N. Srinivas and McKim Marriott using the notions of sanskritization and westernization, as well as universalization and parochialization, respectively. The Marxist perspective talks about how relationships between groups are founded on the method of production, social classes, and the state. The key idea of this strategy relates to the relationships between the core and the periphery in the framework of the function of the capitalist economy [8], [9].

In the caste system, social mobility is often seen as a shift in the factors that determine status, inherited professions, jajmani responsibilities, observance of certain rituals, and acceptance of contemporary jobs, education, migration, and leadership positions in political organizations. Even in terms of the caste system, social mobility is not uniform. It happens on the family, group, and individual levels. By analyzing mobility at various levels, it is possible to comprehend mobility in its whole better. By considering the person, family, and community as analytically separate but connected social mobility units, one may gauge the scope, amount, and quality of social mobility. Each of the three mobility levels is different and has an impact on the others. In general, three patterns of caste structure mobility can be outlined as follows: those families and groups that have marginally improved their status within their own castes; those families and individuals that have marginally declined; and those families and groups that, despite challenging circumstances, have maintained their status by obtaining formal power, paying jobs, and education.

Education, migration, contemporary jobs, technical improvements, political awareness and engagement, and reservation policies for the SC, ST, OBC, women, physically challenged, etc. have all contributed to the increase in social mobility during the last several decades. Positional change is still occurring more quickly than fundamental structural change. The whole system continues to be stable. The system is changing, not the system itself. The caste system's resilience, the reshaping of caste identities, the perpetuation of economic and educational means and procedures, and the retention of a select few in positions of power prevent India's society from changing fundamentally structurally.

### **Caste and Class Mobility Patterns**

There are four possible perspectives on caste structure mobility. First, Srinivas stressed the significance of sanskritization and westernization as theoretical frameworks for comprehending caste mobility. According to him, family mobility does not get public attention, therefore "corporate mobility" nevertheless remains fundamental at the caste or jati level. Second, despite this, Stein notes that there was significant family and individual movement in medieval South India, which should aid in the analysis and comprehension of the current mobility in caste structure. Thirdly, caste might be interpreted in terms of frames of reference, such as rural vs urban and traditional varna versus contemporary national frames of reference for ranking, according to Marriott. Fourthly, reference group theory is used by Lynch and Damle to analyze caste and individual mobilities in India. These caste mobility theories are singularistic and do not account for all of the current caste system movement. One would concur with Lynch's remark that there was no consensus over the definition of caste and the organizational units that make it up. If this misunderstanding continues, it is unclear which units are moving. I would also agree with Lynch that there is little difference between reform to the caste structure and mobility within it. Unless one considers mobility as the sole major kind of change in Indian society, movement within or between castes does not always imply mobility within the caste system. Changes in ritual hierarchy should be a more significant kind of mobility than the increased authority of a single caste.

The aforementioned theories of caste mobility are insufficient because none of them can adequately explain the whole range of mobility within the caste system. 'Group mobility' of a caste is the sole facet of change that Sanskritization addresses. Individual borders of mobility, as well as the causes and influences that support such movement, are not taken into consideration. Although Stein's examination of mobility in medieval India is undeniably insightful and expands our knowledge of the caste system, it has weakened caste ethnocentrism or group unity based on caste loyalty. In actuality, Marriott's method is "confusing," and its relevance to the distinction between caste divisions in rural and urban areas is still unclear. The analyses of Lynch and Damle undoubtedly add to our understanding of caste mobility, but it is still unclear how to turn a "culture bound," ad-hoc concept of sanskritization into one that is structural or how to use the reference group theory to explain structural changes and their implicit and explicit effects on caste mobility. Here, it may be suggested that analyzing caste mobility on several levels namely, family, community, and individual will help us better understand it. Additionally, this would clear up any confusion about the movement or immobility of the troops. This further aids in defining mobility's scope, as well as its level and quantity. In this perspective, the difference between non-caste and caste structures also becomes pertinent, and their interaction becomes clear. The whole caste system's mobility is divided into these three tiers. The effects of structural improvements might be used to better explain mobility at the family level. Individual mobility is analyzed using reference group theory, while corporate mobility is better understood using the notion of sanskritization and other related ideas [10], [11].

### **Mobility of a Group or the Preponderance of a Group's Families**

Mobility within a caste or among the majority of its households is not always in opposition to mobility at the level of the family. The same family may be mobile at both levels at the same time. The main difference between the two levels is that at the caste level, the interests of the "corporate" are prioritized, but at the family level, the interests of the particular family are prioritized. Collective effort is included in the former, while personal performance is emphasised in the latter for status uplift. A further distinction is that while mobility at the family level occurs in the socio-economic and political spheres and is focused on actual



power and influence in the village community, mobility at the caste level typically operates with regard to socio-cultural customs or issues regarding pollution-purity. In the six villages the author researched, members of the castes of Khatis, Nais, Meenas, Chamars, Naiks, and Brahmins have worked to elevate their social status by abandoning customs and professions they deemed dirty and demeaning. For instance, until approximately fifteen years ago, the Khatis of Roopgarh, Sabalpura, and Harmara would take kucha food and water from the majority of the clean peasant castes, including Jats, Malis, Gujars, Kumhars, and Ahirs. They now identify themselves as the "Jangir" Brahmins the direct descendants of the Lord Viswakarma and refuse to accept kucha food from these agricultural castes. They have also begun donning the holy thread. With the exception of two families, the Nais have abandoned washing desecrated plates for the last 10 years because they believed that doing so would decrease their caste status. Since the end of the zamindari and jagirdari systems, the Jats of Roopgarh, Sabalpura, and Bhutera have begun referring to themselves as "Singh". In a similar vein, the Meenas have given chowkidari and theft a pass in an effort to advance their caste status. With the exception of three families one each in Roopgarh, Sabalpura, and Bawarithe Chamars have abandoned their customary jobs disposing of carcasses, skinning the dead, patching worn-out shoes, and other menial and 'forced' labor. In two villages in Bharatpur, the Chamar people now refer to themselves as "Jatav" a term that sounds similar to "Jat," a local caste that owns property.

Women worked as midwives among the Naiks at Roopgarh and Sabalpura around fifteen years ago. As midwives, they were required to care for the mothers of newly born infants and clean up the waste, including the mother's and the child's pee and feces. The Naiks unanimously resolved to abolish midwifery because they saw these services as polluting and socially inferior. The castes shown in the aforementioned examples have attempted to adopt Sanskrit behavior patterns by giving up filthy and demeaning behaviors and callings in favor of those of the superior castes, which promised better social position. Here, we may state that corporate mobility often characterizes the caste system. There are efforts made to elevate the caste, but people also work to elevate their sociocultural standing within the caste by giving up meat and alcohol or by taking frequent baths, participating in prayer, and wearing the holy thread.

In spite of their ad hoc nature, the ideas of sanskritization and dominant caste are important for understanding corporate mobility in caste structure, thus we'd like to include them here. Sanskritization has been described as a collective process that aids in comprehending group movement. Sanskritization does not lessen 'economic inequities' or undermine the ruling caste. Sanskritization, according to Bailey, is a business activity that attacks hierarchy and is consequently a step towards the "general leveling of culture." However, the dominant castes are not completely in the dark regarding the activities of the castes who practice sanskrit. By articulating new status grounds that are often out of the reach of those from lower castes and classes, they use defensive mechanisms to preserve or generate greater status disparities than there were before. As a result, the favoured caste groupings barely give the sanskritized castes any more respect. The non-privileged castes that practice sanskritization lack the resources and tools necessary to compete with the dominant caste groupings. As a result, sanskritization intensifies often ineffectual caste differences without addressing the caste system as a whole. For instance, the Nais who do not polish jutha dishes see those who cling to the traditional vocation as inferior. All of the sanskritized castes have such intracaste disparities. The privileged sections of rural society do not make up a uniform status group, but they are generally better off than those who have not been, and the former continue to hold power because they have access to larger landholdings, better educations, and well-paying jobs that the less fortunate sections of rural society cannot. So, sanskritization does



not lessen economic inequality, but it may promote cultural leveling, we can state with certainty. Sanskritization is not often a business operation in the political realm. There are status disputes amongst the leading families within the same castes. Sanskritization is thus inappropriate for political analysis in the hamlet. As a result, it is incorrect to assert that sanskritization does not apply in situations where caste hierarchy is contested and ambiguous, where there is no dominant caste, or when members of other castes are not motivated to sanskritize their behavioral patterns. Srivastava contends that a more useful reference group for comprehending mobility is the "progressive family." He is referring to the Koiris of Barigaon who mimicked their own caste from a neighbouring hamlet rather than the behavior patterns of the Chhatris, who were the dominating caste, instead. He recalls the absence of a dominating caste in the hamlet of Asalpur and how the Raigars there copied the Raigars who resided in Ahmedabad.

In our opinion, sanskritization aids in the comprehension of group mobility. However, group mobility may not fully represent caste structural mobility. Groups may move around, although this is mostly due to sociocultural factors. Although there may be clearly one or more dominating castes or subcastes, the presence of dominant groups, castes, or subcastes is supported by the predominance of hierarchy. Since this is impacted by the rank of the dominant caste, sanskritizing castes often cannot emulate the behaviors of twice-born dominating castes or other higher castes. The living styles of the nearby upper castes are imitated by the lower castes, and this pattern holds true for all the sanskritizing classes. As a result, Sanskritization is a contextual process. Sanskritization is not a meaningless idea in the context of group migration. The claim put out by Srivastava that the 'advanced families' of the Koiris and the Raigars served as model castes. However, it is unclear whence or how these reference group families acquired the better status indices. Srivastava most likely means that the 'complex culture' of towns and cities offered these reference families better surroundings. The reference to a Koiri family was in a neighboring hamlet, therefore if this family was impacted by the industrial-urban complex culture, other Koiris families may have also been influenced by this "external culture." As a result, this is not the proper perspective. The mythological ruler Raghu has been adopted by the Raigars of Asalpur as their ancestral figure.

These instances demonstrate cultural emulation of the Kshatriya and Brahmanic traditions. In addition, pretending to be a member of a higher caste is not a difficult endeavor in urban areas. Instead of religious adaptations, the effects of complex culture may be seen more in terms of higher education, the abolition of untouchability, migration, etc. In actuality, what Srivastava examines is heavily sanskritized. He makes reference to the business operations and sociocultural modifications that constitute the core of sanskritization. Sanskritization may thus be used to comprehend group mobility in relation to caste structure, especially with regard to sociocultural behavioral patterns. In order to analyze dominating castes or groups, caste rankings, and the ranks of the castes that are sanskritizing, one must utilize the technique of sanskritization. Although caste hierarchy and 'economic inequities' are not always reduced or challenged by 'sanskritization,' it does signify a greater feeling of awareness among the underprivileged groups.

## CONCLUSION

Social stratification that is both restricted and open to movement is still a complicated and nuanced phenomenon. Closed institutions, such as caste-based cultures, create difficult obstacles for anyone trying to escape the limitations of their birth. Open systems, such those seen in capitalist countries, however, promise mobility based on ability and effort. However, since structural injustices and prejudice still exist, this promise is not always kept.

Deconstructing repressive institutions and advancing social justice must be the main goals of initiatives to increase mobility in closed systems. In open systems, the difficulty is in removing institutional and structural constraints that deny everyone the same chances. The goal of inclusive settings that celebrate diversity and provide avenues for social growth for all people, regardless of background, must be pursued by policymakers and society at large. We can only expect to achieve a more fair distribution of chances and lessen the negative effects of social stratification on both individuals and society as a whole via such initiatives.

## REFERENCES:

- [1] B. Western, D. Bloome, B. Sosnaud, and L. Tach, "Economic insecurity and social stratification," *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2012. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-071811-145434.
- [2] M. Ehn, "Temporal Discounting Leads to Social Stratification," *J. Math. Sociol.*, 2012, doi: 10.1080/0022250X.2011.597015.
- [3] G. Ballarino and C. Vezzoni, "Social stratification and church attendance in contemporary Italy," *Res. Sociol. Work*, 2012, doi: 10.1108/S0277-2833(2012)0000023016.
- [4] J. Heintz and R. Balakrishnan, "Debt, power, and crisis: Social stratification and the inequitable governance of financial markets," *Am. Q.*, 2012, doi: 10.1353/aq.2012.0035.
- [5] R. Flores and E. Telles, "Social Stratification in Mexico: Disentangling Color, Ethnicity, and Class," *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, 2012, doi: 10.1177/0003122412444720.
- [6] R. Stoilova, "The Influence of Gender on Social Stratification in Bulgaria," *Int. J. Sociol.*, 2012, doi: 10.2753/ijS0020-7659420301.
- [7] M. Szydlik, "Generations: Connections across the life course," *Adv. Life Course Res.*, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.alcr.2012.03.002.
- [8] D. Carr, "The Social Stratification of Older Adults' Preparations for End-of-Life Health Care," *J. Health Soc. Behav.*, 2012, doi: 10.1177/0022146512455427.
- [9] C. D. Peoples, "A comparative review of stratification texts and readers," *Teaching Sociology*. 2012. doi: 10.1177/0092055X11430400.
- [10] S. Heilbrunn, K. Abu-Asbeh, and M. A. Nasra, "Difficulties facing women entrepreneurs in Israel: A social stratification approach," *Int. J. Gend. Entrep.*, 2014, doi: 10.1108/IJGE-02-2013-0007.
- [11] J. Liang, B. Wu, B. Plassman, J. M. Bennett, and J. Beck, "Social stratification, oral hygiene, and trajectories of dental caries among old americans," *J. Aging Health*, 2014, doi: 10.1177/0898264314534891.