

Course	Category	Subject	Subject code
B.A.	MINOR	SOCIAL STRATIFICATION	BA-SO-402
Total Credit: 6		Max.Marks:100 (Internal:40+External:60)	

Part- C Learning Resource
Text Books, Reference Books, Other Resources
<p>Bhushan Vidya, Sachdeva D.R. An Introduction to Sociology, Kitab Mahal I Chakravarti Uma gendering caste, Stree Publication Calcutta 2003</p> <p>Chaudhari Maitrayar, Feminism in India New Delhi women Unlimited. 2004</p> <p>Gupta Charu. Gendering Colonial India: Reforms, Print, Cast and Communalism Orient Black Swan 2012</p> <p>Ghosh Vishvajit, Social Movements Concept, Experience and Concerns SAGE TEXTS 6 Churye G.S. Caste and race in India SAGE TEXTS</p> <p>Hakim Susan, Gender and knowledge: Elements are Postmortem Feminism Polity press 1990 6 Hussain Nadeem, sociology of Marginalized and Weaker Section in India SAGE TEXTS</p> <p>Kundu Abhijeet, Yadav Nirupama Sociology of India SAGE TEXTS Rawat HK. Sociology Basic Concept, Rawat Publication Jaipur</p> <p>Rao, Shankar C.N. Sociology S Chand</p> <p>Rao Shankar C.N. Indian Social Problems, S. Chand</p>

Units	Topic	Duration (In Hours)	Marks
I	<p>Social stratification</p> <p>1.1 Meaning, Definition and Characteristics. 1.2 Main Base of Social Stratification 1.3 Importance and function of Social Stratification</p> <p>2. Dimension of Social Stratification 3. Class Status Group Power' Authority Prestige' Property 4. Socio Economic Status. 5. Hierarchy and Differences in Class 6. Demerits of Stratification</p>	18	20
II	<p>Theories Stratification</p> <p>1. Karl Marx 1. Marxist Perspective on Stratification 1.2. Relevance of Marxist idea on Stratification 1.3 Theory of Social Change</p> <p>2. Max Weber 2.1 Weberian Perspective on Stratification 2.2 Caste Class and Power 2.3 Weberian Perspective on Indian Studies 3</p> <p>Functionalism 3.1 Introduction 3.2 Objectives 3.3 Functional Necessity of Stratification</p> <p>4. Two Determination of Potential Rank 4.1 Differential Functional Importance 4.2 Differential Scarcity of Personal</p> <p>5. David Moore Theory of Social Stratification 6. Functionalist Perspective on Indian Studies 7. Perspective, Functionalism, Functionalism</p>	18	20

--	--	--	--

III	1. Identity and inequalities 2. Caste 3. Race and Ethnicity	18	20
IV	Feminism and Gender Stratification 1. Feminism 2. Male stream Sociology 3. Contribution for feminism 4. Gender and social stratification 5. Gender Socialization 6. Gender and Class 7. Different Feminist Perspectives on social Stratification.	18	20
V	Social Mobility 1. Social Mobility 1.1 Concept 1.2 Types 1.3 Significance of Social Mobility 1.4 Factors Affecting Social Mobility 15 Impact of Social Mobility 2. Social Mobility in India	18	20

UNIT-I

Social stratification

In all societies people differ from each other on the basis of their age, sex and personal characteristics. Human society is not homogeneous but heterogeneous. Apart from the natural differences, human beings are also differentiated according to socially approved criteria. So, socially differentiated men are treated as socially unequal from the point of view of enjoyment of social rewards like status, power, income etc. That may be called social inequality. The term social inequality simply refers to the existence of socially created inequalities.

Meanings: Social stratification is a particular form of social inequality. All societies arrange their members in terms of superiority, inferiority and equality. Stratification is a process of interaction or differentiation whereby some people come to rank higher than others.

In one word, when individuals and groups are ranked, according to some commonly accepted basis of valuation in a hierarchy of status levels based upon the inequality of social positions, social stratification occurs. Social stratification means division of society into different strata or layers. It involves a hierarchy of social groups. Members of a particular layer have a common identity. They have a similar life style. The Indian Caste system provides an example of stratification system. The society in which divisions of social classes exist is known as a stratified society. Modern stratification fundamentally differs from stratification of primitive societies.

Social stratification involves two phenomena

- (i) differentiation of individuals or groups on the basis of possession of certain characteristics whereby some individuals or groups come to rank higher than others,
- (ii) the ranking of individuals according to some basis of evaluation. Sociologists are concerned not merely with the facts of social differences but also with their social evaluation

Definitions:

1. Ogburn and Nimkoff: ‘The process by which individuals and groups are ranked in more or less enduring hierarchy of status is known as stratification’
2. Lundberg: “A stratified society is one marked by inequality, by differences among people that are evaluated by them as being “lower” and “higher”.
3. Gisbert: “Social stratification is the division of society into permanent groups of categories linked with each other by the relationship of superiority and subordinations”.
4. Williams: Social Stratification refers to “The ranking of individuals on a scale of superiority-inferiorityequality, according to some commonly accepted basis of valuation.
5. Raymond W. Murray: Social stratification is horizontal division of society into “higher” and “lower” social units.”
6. Melvin M Tumin: “Social stratification refers to “arrangement of any social group or society into hierarchy of positions that are unequal with regard to power, property, social evaluation and psychic gratification

Origin of Stratification: Regarding the origin of stratification many views have been given.

- (i) According to Davis, social stratification has come into being due to the functional necessity of the social system.

- (ii) Professor Sorokin attributed social stratification mainly to inherited difference in environmental conditions.
- (iii) According to Karl Marx, social factors are responsible for the emergence of different social strata, i.e. social stratification.
- (iv) Gumplovioz and other contended that the origin of social stratification is to be found in the conquest of one group by another.
- (v) According to Spengler, social stratification is founded upon scarcity which is created whenever society differentiates positive in terms of functions and powers.
- (vi) Racial differences accompanied by dissimilarity also leads to stratification.

Sociologists use the term social stratification to describe the system of social standing. Social stratification refers to a society's categorization of its people into rankings based on factors like wealth, income, education, family background, and power.

Geologists also use the word "stratification" to describe the distinct vertical layers found in rock. Typically, society's layers, made of people, represent the uneven distribution of society's resources. Society views the people with more resources as the top layer of the social structure of stratification. Other groups of people, with fewer and fewer resources, represent the lower layers. An individual's place within this stratification is called socioeconomic status (SES).

Most people and institutions in the United States indicate that they value equality, a belief that everyone has an equal chance at success. In other words, hard work and talent—not inherited wealth, prejudicial treatment, institutional racism, or societal values—determine social mobility. This emphasis on choice, motivation, and self-effort perpetuates the American belief that people control their own social standing.

However, sociologists recognize social stratification as a society-wide system that makes inequalities apparent. While inequalities exist between individuals, sociologists are interested in larger social patterns. Sociologists look to see if individuals with similar backgrounds, group memberships, identities, and location in the country share the same social stratification. No individual, rich or poor, can be blamed for social inequalities, but instead all participate in a system where some rise and others fall. Most Americans believe the rising and falling is based on individual choices. But sociologists see how the structure of society affects a person's social standing and therefore is created and supported by society.

Factors that define stratification vary in different societies. In most societies, stratification is an economic system, based on wealth, the net value of money and assets a person has, and income, a person's wages or investment dividends. While people are regularly categorized based on how rich or poor they are, other important factors influence social standing. For example, in some cultures, prestige is valued, and people who have them are revered more than those who don't. In some cultures, the elderly are esteemed, while in others, the elderly are disparaged or overlooked. Societies' cultural beliefs often reinforce stratification.

One key determinant of social standing is our parents. Parents tend to pass their social position on to their children. People inherit not only social standing but also the cultural norms, values, and beliefs that accompany a certain lifestyle. They share these with a network of friends and family members that provide resources and support. This is one of the reasons first-generation college students do not fare as well as other students. They lack access to the resources and support commonly provided to those whose parents have gone to college.

Other determinants are found in a society's occupational structure. Teachers, for example, often have high levels of education but receive relatively low pay. Many believe that teaching is a noble profession, so teachers should do their jobs for love of their profession and the good of their students—not for money. Yet, the same attitude is not applied to professional athletes, executives, or those working in corporate world. Cultural attitudes and beliefs like these support and perpetuate social and economic inequalities.

Systems of Stratification

Sociologists distinguish between two types of systems of stratification. Closed systems accommodate little change in social position. They do not allow people to shift levels and do not permit social relationships between levels. Closed systems include estate, slavery, and caste systems. Open systems are based on achievement and allow for movement and interaction between layers and classes. How different systems operate reflect, emphasize, and foster specific cultural values, shaping individual beliefs. In this section, we'll review class and caste stratification systems, plus discuss the ideal system of meritocracy.

The Caste System

Caste systems are closed stratification systems where people can do little or nothing to change the social standing of their birth. The caste system determines all aspects of an individual's life: occupations, marriage partners, and housing. Individual talents, interests, or potential do not provide opportunities to improve a person's social position.

In the Hindu caste tradition, people expect to work in an occupation and to enter into a marriage based on their caste. Accepting this social standing is considered a moral duty and people are socialized to accept their social standing. Cultural values reinforced the system. Caste systems promote beliefs in fate, destiny, and the will of a higher power, rather than promoting individual freedom as a value. This belief system is an ideology. Every culture has an ideology that supports its system of stratification.

The caste system in India has been officially dismantled, but is still deeply embedded in Indian society, particularly in rural areas. In India's larger cities, people now have more opportunities to choose their own career paths and marriage partners. As a global center of employment, corporations have introduced merit-based hiring and employment to the nation shifting the cultural expectations of the caste system.

The Class System

A class system is based on both social factors and individual achievement. A class consists of a set of people who share similar status based on factors like wealth, income, education, family background, and occupation. Unlike caste systems, class systems are open. People may move to a different level (vertical movement) of education or employment status than their parents. Though family and other societal models help guide a person toward a career, personal choice and opportunity play a role.

They can also socialize with and marry members of other classes. People have the option to form an exogamous marriage, a union of spouses from different social categories. Exogamous marriages often focus on values such as love and compatibility. Though social conformities still exist that encourage people to choose partners within their own class, called

an endogamous marriage, people are not as pressured to choose marriage partners based solely on their social location.

Meritocracy is a hypothetical system in which social stratification is determined by personal effort and merit. The concept of meritocracy is an ideal because no society has ever existed where social standing was based entirely on merit. Rather, multiple factors influence social standing, including processes like socialization and the realities of inequality within economic systems. While a meritocracy has never existed, sociologists see aspects of meritocracies in modern societies when they study the role of academic and job performance and the systems in place for evaluating and rewarding achievement in these areas.

The differences between an open and closed system are explored further in the example below.

Status Consistency

Sociologists use the term status consistency to describe the consistency, or lack thereof, of an individual's rank across the factors that determine social stratification within a lifetime. Caste systems correlate with high status consistency, due to the inability to move out of a class, whereas the more flexible class system demonstrates lower status consistency.

To illustrate, let's consider Serena. Serena earned her high school diploma but did not go to college. Completing high school but not college is a trait more common to the lower-middle class. After high school, she began landscaping, which, as manual labor, tracks with lower-middle class or even lower class. However, over time, Serena started her own company. She hired employees. She won larger contracts. Serena became a business owner and earned more money. Those traits represent the upper-middle class. Inconsistencies between Serena's educational level, her occupation, and income show Serena's flexibility in her social status, giving her low status consistency. In a class system, hard work, new opportunities, coupled with a lower education status still allow a person movement into middle or upper class, whereas in a caste system, that would not be possible. In a class system, low status consistency correlates with having more choices and opportunities.

Meghan Markle, who married a member of the British royal family, for years endured unceasing negative media attention, invasion of privacy, and racially abusive comments. She and her husband—Prince Harry, grandson to Queen Elizabeth—undertook a series of legal actions to push back against overly aggressive media outlets. But because of the continued harassment and disagreements with others in the royal family, Meghan and Harry decided to step down from their royal obligations and begin a disassociation from the British monarchy. In doing so, they gave up honorary positions, titles, and financial support. For Meghan, who had been born in the U.S. and had earned her wealth through a successful career, these changes may not be so jarring. Prince Harry, however, had been "His Royal Highness" since he was born; by nature of his ancestry he was entitled to vast sums of money, property, and cultural-political positions such as Honorary Air Commandant, Commodore-in-Chief, and President of the Queen's Commonwealth Trust. Harry would also lose the military rank he had earned through almost ten years of military service, including two combat deployments to

Origins Social Stratification

Human social stratification has taken on many forms throughout the course of history. In foraging societies, for example, social status usually depended on hunting and leadership ability, particularly in males (Gurven & von Rueden, 2006).

Those who brought back meat for meals were held in higher status than those who rarely succeeded at hunting.

Meanwhile, in parts of the world where agriculture has replaced hunting and gathering, land holdings often form the basis for social stratification. These holdings tend to be transmitted throughout generations.

This intergenerational transfer of wealth gave rise to what is known as estates, which were dominant in medieval Europe (Ertman, 1997). One example of stratification according to occupational classes are guilds (Gibert, 1986). More rigid occupational classes are called castes, which exist both in and outside India.

Characteristics of Stratification:

Melvin M. Tumin has mentioned the following characteristics of social stratification:

1. **It is Social:** Stratification is social in the sense that it does not represent inequality which are biologically based. It is true that factors such as strength, intelligence, age, sex can often serve as the basis on which status are distinguished. But such differences by themselves are not sufficient to explain why some statuses receive more power, property and prestige than others. Biological traits do not determine social superiority and inferiority until they are socially recognised. For example, manager of an industry attains a dominant position not by physical strength, nor by his age, but by having socially defined traits. His education, training skills, experience, personality, character etc. are found to be more important than his biological qualities.
2. **It is Ancient:** The stratification system is very old. Stratification was present even in the small wandering bands. Age and sex were the main criteria of stratification. Difference between the rich and poor, powerful and humble, freemen and slaves was there in almost all the ancient civilisation. Ever since the time of Plato and Kautilya social philosopher have been deeply concerned with economic, social, political inequalities.
3. **It is Universal:** Social stratification is universal. Difference between rich and poor, the 'haves' or 'have notes' is evident everywhere. Even in the non-literate societies stratification is very much present.
4. **It is in diverse Forms:** Social stratification has never been uniform in all societies. The ancient Roman society was stratified into two strata: the Patricians and the Plebeians. The Aryan society was divided into four Varnas: the Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and the Sudras, the ancient Greek society into freemen and slaves, the ancient Chinese society into mandarins, merchants, Farmer and soldiers. Class and estate seem to be the general forms of stratification found in the modern world.
5. **It is Consequential:** The stratification system has its own consequences. The most important, most desired and often the scarcest things in human life are distributed unequally because of stratification. **The system leads to two kind of consequences:**
 - **Life chances :** Life chances refer to such things as infant mortality, longevity, physical and mental illness, marital conflict, separation and divorce.
 - **Life style :** Life styles include the mode of housing, residential area, education, means of recreation, relation between parent and children, modes of conveyance and so on.

Examples of Stratification

The factors that define stratification vary from society to society. In many societies, stratification is an economic system based on wealth, or the net values of the money and assets a person has, and income, their wages or income from investments.

However, there are other important factors that influence social standing. In some cultures, for instance, prestige — be it obtained through going to a prestigious university, working for a prestigious company, or coming from an illustrious family — is valued. In others, social stratification is based on age.

The elderly may be either esteemed or disparaged and ignored. The cultural beliefs of societies often reinforce stratification.

1. Economic condition: the amount someone earns;
2. Social class: classification based on, for example, economy and caste;
3. Gender
4. Religion
5. Social networks: the connections that people have — and the opportunities these allow people in finding jobs, partners, and so on.

One determinant of social standing is one's parents. Parents tend to pass their social position onto their children, as well as the cultural norms, values, and beliefs that accompany a certain lifestyle. Parents can also transfer a network of friends and family members that provide resources and support.

This is why, in situations where someone who was born into one social status enters the environment of another — such as the child of an uneducated family entering college, the individual may fare worse than others; they lack the resources and support often provided to those whose parents have gone to college (Gutierrez et al., 2022).

A society's occupational structure can also determine social stratification. For example, societies may consider some jobs — such as teaching, or nursing — to be noble professions, which people should do out of love and the greater good rather than for money.

In contrast, those in other professions, such as athletes and C-suite executives, do not receive this attitude. Thus, those who are highly-educated may receive relatively low pay (Gutierrez et al., 2022).

Types of Stratification

Slavery

Slavery and indentured servitude are likely the most rigid types of social stratification. Both of these involve people being treated as actual property and are often based on race or ethnicity. The owner of a slave exploits a slave's labor for economic gain.

Slavery is one of the lowest levels in any stratification system, as they possess virtually no power or wealth of their own.

Slavery is thought to have begun 10,000 years ago, after agricultural societies developed, as people in these societies made prisoners of war work on their farm.

As in other social stratification systems, the status of one's parents often defines whether or not someone will be put into slavery. However on a historic level, slavery has also been used as a punishment for crimes and as a way of controlling those in invaded or enemy territories.

For example, ancient Roman slaves were in large part from conquered regions (Gutierrez et al., 2022).

Slavery regained its property after the European colonization of the Western Hemisphere in the 1500s. Portuguese and Spanish colonists who settled in Brazil and the Caribbean enslaved native populations, and people from Africa were shipped to the "new world" to carry out various tasks.

Notably, the United State's early gricultural economy was one intertwined with slavery, a fact that would help lead the Civil War after it won its independence from Britain.

Slavery still exists in many parts of the world.

Modern slaves include those taken as prisoners of war in ethnic conflicts, girls and women captured and kidnapped and used as prostitutes or sex slaves, children sold by their parents to be child laborers, and workers paying off debts who are abused, or even tortured, to the extent that they are unable to leave (Bales, 2007).

Even in societies that have officially outlawed slavery, the practice continues to have wide-ranging repercussions on socioeconomic standing. For example, some observers believe that a caste system existed in the southern part of the United States until the civil rights movement ended legal racial segregation. Rights, such as the right to vote and to a fair trial, were denied in practice, and lynchings were common for many decade (Litwack, 2009).

South Africa, meanwhile, had an official caste system known as apartheid until the 1990s. Although black people constituted the majority of the nation's population, they had the worst jobs, could not vote, and lived in poor, segregated neighborhoods.

Both systems have, to the consensus of many sociologists, provided those of color with lower intergenerational wealth and higher levels of prejudice than their white counterparts, systematically hampering vertical class mobility.

Caste Systems

Caste systems are closed stratification systems, meaning that people can do very little to change the social standing of their birth. Caste systems determine all aspects of an individual's life, such as appropriate occupations, marriage partners, and housing.

Those who defy the expectations of their caste may descend to a lower one. Individual talents and interests do not provide opportunities to improve one's social standing.

The Class System

Class systems are based on both social factors and individual achievement. Classes consist of sets of people who have similar status based on factors such as wealth, income, education, family background, and occupation.

Class systems, unlike caste systems, are open. This means that people can move to a different level of education or employment status than their parents. A combination of personal choice, opportunity, and one's beginning status in society each play a role.

Those in class systems can socialize with and marry members of other classes

Meritocracy (as an ideal system of stratification)

Meritocracy, meanwhile, is a hypothetical social stratification system in which one's socioeconomic status is determined by personal effort and merit.

However, sociologists agree that no societies in history have determined social standing solely on merit.

Nonetheless, sociologists see aspects of meritocracies in modern societies when they study the role of academic and job performance and the systems in place intended to evaluate and reward achievement in these areas (Giddens et al., 1991).

Systems of Stratification

Sociologists have distinguished between two systems of stratification: closed and open. Closed systems accommodate for little change in social position.

It is difficult, if not impossible, for people to shift levels and social relationships between levels are largely verboten.

For example, estates, slavery, and caste systems are all closed systems. In contrast, open systems of social stratification are — nominatively, at least — based on achievement and allow for movement and interaction between layers and classes (Giddens et al., 1991).

What is Status Consistency?

The term status consistency describes the consistency — or lack thereof — of an individual's rank across factors that determine social stratification within a lifetime. For example, a child in a class system may fail to finish high school — a trait of the lower class — and take up a manual job at a store's warehouse — consistent with the lower or working class.

However, through persistence and favor with their employers, this person may work their way up to managing the store or even joining the corporation's higher level management — an occupation consistent with the upper-middle class.

The discrepancies between someone's educational level, occupation, and income represent low status consistency. Caste and closed systems, meanwhile, have high status consistency, as one's birth status tends to control various aspects of one's life.

The Role of Intersectionality

Intersectionality is an approach to the sociological study of social stratification. Sociologists have preferred it because it does not reduce the complexity of power constructions along a single social division, as has often been the case in stratification theories.

Generally, societies are stratified against one or more lines. These include race and ethnicity, sex and gender, age, religion, disability, and social class. Kimberle Crenshaw introduced the concept of intersectionality as a way of analyzing the intersection of race and gender (2017).

Crenshaw analyzed legal cases involving discrimination experienced by African American women along the lines of both racism and sexism. The essence of intersectionality, as articulated by the sociologist Patricia Hill Collins (1990), is that sociologists cannot separate the effects of race, social class, gender, sexual orientation, age, disability, and so on in understanding social stratification (Gutierrez et al., 2022)

UNIT-II

Theories Stratification

Theories of Social Stratification

There are four hypotheses that attempt to explain the causes and effects of social stratification. When trying to make sense of the nuances of social stratification, it's vital to take into account the merits and limitations of a variety of theories.

Functionalist theory

This theory suggests that stratification is necessary for the functioning of society. It argues that stratification is beneficial because it allows for the specialization of labour and division, which leads to increased efficiency and productivity. Additionally, it suggests that stratification is necessary to maintain social order and stability.

Conflict Theory

This theory suggests that stratification results from power struggles between different social classes. It argues that those with power and wealth can maintain their positions of privilege by exploiting those with less power and wealth. This theory suggests that stratification results from the unequal distribution of resources and power in society.

Symbolic interactionist Theory

This theory suggests that stratification results from the meanings and symbols that people attach to different social positions. It argues that people's beliefs and values about social positions influence how they interact with each other and how they view their social position.

Cultural Theory

This theory suggests that stratification is the result of cultural beliefs and values.

Conclusion

Social stratification, is a method of categorising people in a society based on their economic, political, and social status. The end result of social stratification is based on merit, giving a form of organisation in which advancement is granted solely on the basis of one's abilities and credentials. Conflict and social stratification go hand in hand. Disadvantaged members of society may become resentful and angry because of the unequal treatment they receive as a result of stratification. There are four hypotheses that attempt to explain the causes and effects of social stratification: Functionalist theory, Conflict theory, Symbolic interactionist theory and Cultural theory.

Structural functionalist theory, Marxist theory, Weberian theory

1. **Social stratification** is an inherent character of all societies. It is historical as we find it in all societies, ancient and modern; and it is universal as it exists in simple or complex societies. The social differentiation on the basis of high and low is the historical heritage of all societies.
2. These social strata and layers, divisions and subdivisions have over the time been accepted on the basis of sex and age, status and role, qualification and inefficiency, life chances and economic cum political ascription and monopolization, ritual and ceremony and on numerous other basis. It is of varied nature. It is no less based on the considerations of superiority and inferiority, authority and subordination, profession and vocation.
3. Social stratification has remained despite the revolutionary ideas and radicalism, equality and democracy, socialism and communism. Classless society is just an ideal. The stratification has something to do; it appears with the very mental makeup of man.
4. The origin of the social stratification cannot be explained in terms of history. The existence or nonexistent of the stratification in early society cannot be pin pointed. The differentiation between classes existed as early as the Indus Valley society. They, it appears, had the priestly and other classes.

Meaning and Nature:

1. **By stratification we mean that arrangement of any social group or society by which positions are hierarchically divided.** The positions are unequal with regard to power, property, evaluation and psychic gratification. We add social, because positions consist of socially defined statuses.
2. **Stratification is a phenomenon present in all societies that have produced a surplus.** Stratification is the process by which members of society rank themselves and one another in hierarchies with respect to the amount of desirable goods they possess.
3. **The existence of stratification has led to the centuries old problem of social inequality.** In societies that have closed stratification systems, such inequalities are institutionalised and rigid. An individual born into a particular economic and social stratum or caste, remains in this stratum until he dies. Most modern industrial societies have open or class stratification systems. In open stratification systems, social mobility is possible, although some members of the population do not have the opportunity to fulfill their potential.
4. **The term stratification refers to a process by which individuals and groups are ranked in a more or less enduring hierarchy of status.** It refers to the division of a population into strata, one on the top of another, on the basis of certain characteristics like inborn qualities, material possessions and performance.
5. **According to Raymond W. Murray** "Social stratification is a horizontal division of society into higher and lower social units. As Malvin M. Tumin says, Social stratification refers to arrangements of any social group or society into a hierarchy of positions that are unequal with regard to power, property, social evaluation, and/or social gratification.

6. **Lundberg writes, “A stratified society is one marked by inequality, by differences among people that are evaluated by them as being lower and higher”.** As Gisbert says, “Social stratification is the division of society into permanent groups of categories linked with each other by the relationship of superiority and subordination.
7. **According to Bernard Barber,** “Social stratification in its most general sense, is a sociological concept that refers to the fact that both individuals and groups of individuals are conceived of as constituting higher or lower differentiated strata or classes in terms of some specific or generalised characteristic or set of characteristics.” Sociologists have been able to establish several strata or layers which form a hierarchy of prestige or power in a society.
8. **The consequence of layering process in a society is the creation of structural forms – social classes.** Where society is composed of social classes, the social structure looks like a pyramid. At the bottom of the structure lies the lowest social class and above it other social classes arranged in a hierarchy.

- **There are three dimensions of evaluation:**

1.Prestige: Which refers to honour and it involves the respectful behaviour. Radcliffe Brown says that among hunting societies three groups usually are accorded special prestige: the elderly, those with supernatural powers, those who have special personal attributes such as hunting skill. In the more advanced society, prestige is the commodity that is in scarce supply and it is, therefore, more valued.

2.Preferability: Those positions i.e. status roles which are preferred by majority of I the people are evaluated higher e.g. “. I would like to be a doctor.”

3.Popularity: Those status roles which are popular, about which people know to be very prestigious are evaluated higher e.g. nowadays there is fashion among students to go for Engineering job. It is the most popular occupation.

UNIT-3

Caste,Race and Ethnicity

Caste-Caste is a hierarchical social system that has existed for centuries in India, though its influence is felt in other South Asian countries like Nepal and Sri Lanka. It categorizes people into social classes based on birth, occupation, and ritual purity.

- **Core features of caste system:**
 - **Hierarchy:** Caste system is a rigid hierarchy with Brahmins at the top and Dalits (formerly untouchables) at the bottom.
 - **Endogamy:** Marriage within the caste.
 - **Occupation:** Hereditary professions.
 - **Pollution:** Concepts of purity and pollution associated with castes.
- **Impact of Caste on Identity:** Caste is a significant part of a person's identity in South Asian societies. It influences their social interactions, marriage prospects, and professional opportunities.
- **Caste and Inequality:** The caste system creates significant inequalities. Upper castes have traditionally enjoyed social, economic, and political privileges, while lower castes have faced discrimination and exclusion.

3. Race and Ethnicity

Race and ethnicity are also social constructs that categorize people into groups based on shared characteristics. However, there are key distinctions between the two:

- **Race:** Race is a categorization based on physical characteristics such as skin color, hair texture, and facial features. The concept of race is biological but its social significance is constructed.
- **Ethnicity:** Ethnicity refers to a shared cultural identity, including language, religion, traditions, and customs. It's more fluid than race and can change over time.
- **Race, Ethnicity, and Inequality:** Both race and ethnicity can create inequalities. Racial discrimination and prejudice can limit opportunities in areas like education, employment, and housing. Ethnic minorities may also face discrimination and social exclusion.

Important to Note:

- Both caste and race/ethnicity are complex and contested concepts.
- There's a growing recognition that racial categories are not based on biological fact but social meaning.
- Caste and race/ethnicity can intersect to create even greater inequalities. For example, a Dalit woman might face discrimination based on both her caste and her gender.

Efforts to Address Inequalities:

- Affirmative action programs aim to redress inequalities based on caste or race.
- Movements for social justice work to challenge discrimination and promote equality.

Caste and race/ethnicity are evolving concepts, but their influence on identity and social structures remains significant.

UNIT-IV

Feminism and Gender Stratification

In most societies the tasks of women are clearly differentiated. In the West as well as in the middle class sections of Indian society, men have been seen to be the bread winners and women were expected to take care of the house and raise children. This arrangement used to be considered as 'natural' and complementary, having roots in the biological makeup of the sexes. The economic dependence of women and sexual division of labor were closely interlinked. The ideology of 'naturalness' of division of labor has been challenged as women started entering the labour force in large numbers in the West. The rise of feminist movement in the west raised questions about division of labor and almost universal subordination of women across societies and cultures. The questions like has employment changed women's status? Are they facing double burden of performing jobs which are negatively valued. For example housework not being considered as work whereas paid work outside the household as work. Statistics show that women all over the world earn much less than men for the same work. Occupations are also segregated along gender lines. Other questions relate to women's active participation in work force, its consistent devaluation and women's exclusion from decision making. In understanding these issues we look for answers in the stratification theories. Feminist scholars resist treating the problem of women essentially an artifact of the contemporary system of economic exploitation. They have argued that the oppression of women is not to be seen as 'secondary' to class oppression as a

whole. Women are oppressed as a class by men and patriarchal structures are geographically and historically almost universal. The major axis of differentiation in prevailing society is not class but gender and it is women who wait for the 'longest revolution'. Gender in class stratification theories attempts to uncover the sources of structured inequality and social change. Both Marxists and Weber's have been engaged in empirical research which both document and attempt to explain the forms and structures of inequality. It has been widely criticized that the class situation of family members is 'derived' from that of the main breadwinner who is usually a man. The question of gender raises serious problem for both theoretical and empirical work in social stratification. The active participation of women in all walks of life, the decrease in the number of households that have only male bread winners, passage of new laws created an environment for women's location in social stratification. According to Newby (1982) the issue of gender inequality arose from women's movement

Weber, Marx and Stratification Weber observed that societies can be stratified according to their degree for class or status formation, providing the most important and basic fact of social stratification theory. The first form of inquiry concerns with the extent to which class or status systems are the predominant modes of social action at the societal level. Theories of social stratification then presuppose as their explanatory object the inter and intra-societal variability of class or status formations. At this time the question of sexual inequality treated in terms of division of labour (Marxist approach) which considers women as 'reserve army' i.e. The labour of women could be called upon to facilitate expansionary 'deskilling' clerical work as well as in periods of acute labour shortage such as in wartime. According to Max Weber economic and technological changes favour class stratification and pushes status stratification in the background. Since the determination and explanation of the variability of class and status formation have been the central concerns of the study of social stratification, the documentation of the inequality of opportunities and outcome occupied a subordinate place. It was justified on several grounds. First, because of interest in the distribution of unequal rewards, life-chances and how different social arrangements could procure 'better' outcomes and opportunities. The second reason was the importance given to the explanation of 'outcomes' of class or status differentiation, which were considered as by-product of stratification analysis. These approaches never gave serious thought to issues of gender inequality, because the emphasis was on class polarisation and status-group consolidation. Earlier it was always presumed that gender relations are usually heterosexual and therefore crosscut by class and status relations. It gave bearing on the view that gender relations are somehow similar to ethnic relations.

Patriarchy constitutes a type of social formation that has been improperly ignored by conventional stratification analysis. According to Mann (1986) the omission of gender as a basis of social stratification created a crisis in stratification theory. The five main areas of stratification theory, which have been influenced by Gender, are individual, the family and household, the division of labour between the sexes, social class and nation-states

Gender and Social Stratification in Cross

Cultural Perspective The unequal accesses to resources, opportunities and rewards and to rights between men and women are legitimised by patriarchy across societies and cultures. Status inequality between men and women is not a new phenomena which is reinforced through patriarchy and its institutions, gendered division of labour and social institutions like marriage, dowry, property and inheritance and subordination.

Sylvia Walby (1994:22-28) observes that patriarchy is not only differential distribution of power but also it is built into the very mechanism of production.

Feminist sociologists working on the concept of class have challenged its basis solely derived from man's occupations. A major concern of feminist critique has been to consider what modification of class boundaries would be necessary if women in paid work are to be considered as well. Secondly they have sought to reevaluate the contribution of women's

work to the family. Cross cultural research on sexual division of labor attempted to describe wide range of women's productive activities in societies with different mode of subsistence but also the status implications of these on status of women. For feminist anthropologists right from the very beginning the chief concern has been to explore the causes of universal gender inequality. They sought to explain its origin and perpetuation in terms of sociological, cultural and material terms. Each of these explanations rested upon a major dichotomy which was taken to be universal: public/domestic, nature/culture and production/reproductio

In feminist anthropology, the relationship of gender with social stratification has been conceptualised primarily in the way gender informs social structures as a symbolic construct and as a metaphor for social action. Gender is conceptualised as symbolic representations and the behaviour of women and men and their relations. Anthropologists like Rosaldo, Lamphere and,

Ortner identified gender and kinship as the basis of social inequality whereby recognising how women's access to property and decision making etc. are subsumed within larger ideological, material and political contexts of kinship structures. Ortner and Whitehead (1981) proposed a model of prestige structures which is defined as the set of prestige positions or level that result from a particular line of social evaluation, the mechanisms by which individuals arrive at a given level or positions, and the overall conditions of reproduction of the system of statuses (ibid..13). Gender, they argued, is one such prestige structure, and in every human society, man and woman compose two differentially valued terms of a value set, men being men, higher (ibid..16). They suggested that male prestige is linked to 'public roles', such as chief or a Brahman, while female prestige is defined in relation to men, in such roles as wife, sister and mother, in other words female structures are encompassed within the male structures. Conceptualising gender as one of the prestige structures pushed the gendered analysis of social stratification across societies.

Anthropological literature suggests that women's work outside of household and in subsistence economy indicates as well as reinforce generally egalitarian relations between women and men. Women's in Vanatinai have access to power both through their control of the economic capital of land and through their accumulation of symbolic capital in exchange and mortuary ritual. But among horticulturists in highland New Guinea, women raise staple crops but men raise prestige crops that are the focus of social exchange. Women's value is defined by their reproductive abilities rather than by their productive activities. Bride wealth is considered as compensation to the bride's parents or her kin for the productive and reproductive rights of the bride; dowry as a form of inheritance provides a bride with land and other wealth and helps her to attract a husband. In traditional patriarchal Irish family (studied by Arensberg & Kimball (1940) work was divided by gender and age. The division of labour considered "natural" and power in the hands of men. Pastoral societies are also generally characterized by patriarchy and a dichotomisation of the sexes, both symbolically and socially segregation of the sexes and gender stratification Gender and Social Stratification 140 are fundamental attributes of many pastoral societies. Campbell (1964) who studied "Sarakatsoni of Greece" says that the life of pastoral 'Sarakatsoni' revolves around three things: sheep, children and honour gender ideology is embedded in these three valued items. The ultimate authority lies with the male despite the fact that female contributes equally in all aspects of life.

UNIT-V

Social Mobility

Social mobility is the temporary movement of an individual, family, or another social unit between the positions of various benefits in a social stratification system of society. Classic authors have examined social mobility, among other things, in their contribution to the

formation of classes or status groups. Recent studies have identified the extent to which an individual's social potential depends on their social background (parental family living conditions) and the personal, institutional, and social factors involved in this.

Social mobility is related to the change in an individual's status from one class to another new class. This can be of various types; it can be lower, higher, intra-generational, intergenerational, etc. It is not always necessary to obtain it depending on whether the taking change is for bad or good.

Origin of the Social Mobility Concept

Pitirim Sorokin, a Russian-American political activist and sociologist, popularised the idea of social mobility that he mentioned and wrote in his famous book called "Social and Cultural Mobility." Sorokin believes that there is no such thing as a truly open society or a class system, or a completely closed society (like the prevailing caste system in India).

No two civilizations have a similarity in terms of movement permitted and prohibited, and the speed of social mobility can vary from one time period to the next. The level of development of society determines it.

Such a cultural change can occur over time when people migrate from one location to another due to several other social interactions. People profit from mobility in certain ways because they are pushed by many societal elements and try to achieve new jobs that provide them with a higher quality of life and larger rewards. People in society compete and work with one another to advance upwards in social mobility.

Various Types of Social Mobility

Social mobility may be of several forms, and individuals can encounter various mobility at various points of their lives. The many forms of social mobility are different and sometimes overlap. They are distinguishable for analytical purposes.

Intragenerational Social Mobility

The intragenerational transition in social rank happens throughout a single generation's existence. This can refer to a shift in status between siblings. One way is when individuals advance up the corporate ladder in their profession. For example, a person may begin their career as a receptionist and advance to a top position, such as a manager. An individual may also rise to a greater social status than his/ her brother or sister.

Intergenerational Social Mobility

Intergenerational mobility occurs when a generation's social status shifts from one to the next direction. The shift might be either in an upward direction or a downward one. For example, a parent could work in a factory while his kid pursues an education that will allow him to become an engineer or a scientist. As a result of such cultural transformation, the generation adopts a new way of life and thinking. Variations influence Intergenerational mobility in the upbringing of parents and their kids, changes in populations, and changes in the profession.

Horizontal Social Mobility

Horizontal Social Mobility occurs when a person's employment changes, but their general social position stays unaffected. For instance, if a general doctor transitions from treating patients to teaching at a medical school, their employment has changed, but their reputation and social position are likely to stay the same. In simple words, horizontal mobility is defined as a shift in religious, geographical, economic, etc.

Vertical Social Mobility

Vertical Social Mobility is related to a change in an individual's vocational, governmental, or religious class that results in a shift in their cultural position. An individual progresses from one social class to the next. Vertical mobility can occur in either upwards or lowering directions. Ascending comprises an individual migrating from a lower status to a higher one or forming a comparable group with higher societal standing rather than coexisting with its present group. The reduction in the level of mobility happens; for example, a businessman suffers losses and is compelled to declare themselves bankrupt, which results in a relocation to a lower social stratum.

Downward Social Mobility

When a person travels from a higher to a lower position in society, downward mobility is referred to as downward mobility. It can happen when someone is found doing something wrong that could lead to losing their present job. Downward mobility may be exceedingly unpleasant for people whose social position is worsening. They may struggle to adjust to the new situation since it is not similar to the quality of living they are familiar with. Downward mobility demonstrates how much people value equal chances and stability.

Upward Social Mobility

Upward Social Mobility occurs when a person advances from a lower social position. People in higher positions within the same society or group might also be included. However, while upward mobility is seen positively, it can come at a cost to individuals. When a person advances in their career, they frequently must leave behind the comforts of home, such as family and locations. They may be required to modify their thoughts and conduct. As a result of their upward mobility, an individual needs to adjust to a new environment and adopt new habits in the growing society.

Conclusion

The idea of social mobility is important in the study of societies as it implies equality: that not everyone will have the same results, they should have the same chances. Increasing equal opportunity entails tackling the several layers of disadvantage experienced by various groups within a population. Increasing social mobility is not simply an argument for equality; it is also an economic argument: encouraging equality of opportunity is critical for economic efficiency since it maximises the utilisation of individual skills.

The main concept and aim of this module are to make the flow of information related to the concept of social mobility, social mobility meaning, social mobility, and various other concepts related to Social Mobility in the field of Sociology.

