

Md. Nurul Islam

SOCIAL MOBILITY AND ELITE FORMATION IN RURAL SOCIETY OF BANGLADESH

1. Introduction

Modern society demands a greater degree of mobility on the part of its member. This calls for an increasing measure of freedom from the restraints of kith and kin. In the present day society, individuals are valued on the basis of their achievement rather than their family or parental status. Education and employment opportunities are related to objective, universalistic criteria than that of caste, creed, kinship etc. (Gore, et al, 1970,7).

People are not born modern but are made so by achievement and experience. Modern political and economic institutions make certain general demands on the individuals within their jurisdiction. They are in need of a greater acceptance of personal mobility; occupational and physical; a greater readiness to adapt changes in their mode of living and working. They favour persistent effort and confident optimism rather fatalism.

From the dawn of civilization it is almost a common feature of social structure that it is divided into many strata, classes or hierarchical orders, the most rigid being the Indian caste system, other being slavery, estate and serfdom (Bottomore, 1962; 179). There is hardly any society found by the anthropologists where each and every human being is treated equal. These hierarchical orders

depend on the types and structure of society and its development. In its simplest form, it may be in the form of sex, age and physical strength. In the medieval period, it was on the basis of birth, religion, family and wealth, In the present day society, social hierarchy is based on economic terms, social background, knowledge, skills and personal quality. With social development, social hierarchy is based on achievement rather than birth or ascription. Educational achievement is taken as a means of social mobility and hierarchy in the present day society. Karim (1976; 115-138) finds in Bangladesh emerging of an educated middle class who is ascending the society in all aspects of political, social and cultural milieu. To him this is the class who is responsible for political, social and cultural change in contemporary Bangladesh society. He also finds such a class in the West Bengal society of India. Rao (Gore, et al, 1967; 138) finds the families with higher economic status are not held high in public esteem if their children are not correspondingly educated.

Education changes the status of lower castes to some extent (Dube; 1955). Deighton (1971) mentions education as the primary inroad to certain social position. Milner (1972; 24) finds that education changes the social status. In all India field survey in sociology of education it is found that new elite group is formed with the attainment education (Gore, et al, 1970). In Bihar, Panday (Panday, 1975) finds education as a source to climb social hierarchy. In villages of Bangladesh Arid (Maron; 1957) found that education was recognized as a status hierarchy. Education challenges the traditional hierarchy (Shipman, 1971; 259). Gold Thorpe (Hall, 1969) finds educated men of different racial status enter into social relations. Education brings change about social status, behavior, life style and dress pattern. In Kerala, India it was found (Alexander, 1968) that due to education there had been changes in behavior pattern, mode of dress, eating and drinking habits. The process of 'Sanskritization' was there. Education changes role and status of a person. Educated persons are climbing up higher status by marriage (Gore,etal:1967).

As the traditional societies modernize, old habits, old patterns of authority, old relationships and values are challenged, disrupted and replaced. The technological society of mass consumption has little in common with the traditional society from which it is developed (Shipman, 1971; 13). Once a minority, generally, with the help of education, bands on change the path to modernization is open. Slowly other groups also come to accept the path.

Social mobility is a process that matters a substantial section of people moving from traditional to modern ways of living (Deutsch, 1961:493). It is a concept that acts together a number of processes of change as occupations, residence, associations and institutions, role and status, experiences, expectations, habits and needs, group affiliation, political behaviour and stages of economic development. Social mobility increases the range of occupation. Once these are open to competition on the basis of achievement and quality, kin of the same generation can achieve different positions. Educated son of a farmer moves to the city having change in status, role, occupation, whereas his illiterate brother or cousins remain with the land following the same occupation, role and status (Inkeles and Smith, 1974; 24). Children no longer move automatically into the occupation of their fathers. Successive generations can have different status and different levels of income and prestige. Simultaneously, marriages increasingly occur between persons in similar occupations or with similar education rather than similar family background.

Bangladesh, historically speaking, is and was an agricultural country. Social hierarchy, social mobility and social stratification are dependent on land ownership pattern. Western social scientists like Max Weber, Karl Marx and Wittfogel (Karim, 1976:14) categorized different types of civilizations based on land ownership pattern. They identified the Indian social system as prebendalization, Asiatic mode of production and oriental despotism respectively in comparison to feudalism in western European societies. But Professor Karim contradicted their views on Bengal. Karim identified different system for Bengal unlike other part of India due to her social, geo-political

and strategical situation. The rule was military and fiscal. He coined the term 'waddadarization' for Bengal. The word *waddadarition* is of Persian origin means contract. Here in Bengal the rulers would not collect land revenue directly from the tillers. A class of middle men would collect land revenue on behalf of the king through contract. He identified this class as predecessors of political elite in Bengal developed in the 20th century (Karim 1980:14-15,18).

The British rulers also followed this policy. The British being more diplomatic introduced Permanent Settlement in land in 1793. Mostly the revenue contractors of the earlier regime were the beneficiaries of this settlement. In course of time, due to state the patronage they held the highest status in social hierarchy. This was the class of people who adopted English education and availed job opportunities particularly after 1837 when English was adopted as the official language in India. Unfortunately the majority of this class were non-muslims. With the partition of Bengal in 1905, establishment of high schools in rural areas, establishment of Dhaka University in 1921, better price for jute (Sen, 1997:76) and formation of A.K.Fazlul Huq ministry in Bengal in 1937 a substantial number of muslim community formed middle class elite attaining English education and appropriating the government services .

However, it is to be kept in mind that during the pre-British period there was a muslim elite class in Bengal. But most of them claimed foreign ancestry. They had not the minimum link with the general masses of Bengal in general and east Bengal in particular. They are termed as structurally alien (Karim, 1972:157). They would identify themselves as *Asharf/Sharif*(gentleman) and the general muslim as *Atraf/non-sharif*(Karim,190:130-131). At the fall of muslim dynasty and the foundation of British *Raj* this *Asharf* muslim community decayed in course of time particularly at the introduction of English as official language. With the formation of an indigenous muslim middle class elite of rural origin particularly with the attainment of education there established a bridge with the *Ashraf* muslim mostly by matrimonial relation. Social mobility and status

were transferred to education and wealth. E.A. Gait said, "An *Ashraf* family which has lost its money is occasionally willing, for a consideration, to form (marriage) alliance with a wealthy *Ajlaf* family" (Karim, 1980:136)).

Moulvi Abdul Wali, as quoted by Karim (Karim, 1980:136-137), classified the muslim community as follows:

- (a) The Muhammadans whose ancestors were originally aborigines or Hinduised aborigines.
- (b) The Muhammadans whose forefathers were generally non Arabs and who emigrated into Bengal and contracted marriages with the above class. They are, in fact, persons of mixed descent.
- (c) The descendants of above two classes who, during a period of forty or sixty years, have succeeded in contracting marriages with the daughters of genuine *Ashraf* (from father's side their children are *Chasis* [peasants] or *Atraf*)
- (d) The *Ashraf* who contracted marriages with daughters of the members of the above classes (their children are tainted *Ashraf*).
- (e) The genuine *Ashraf*, descendants of Arabs (*Sadat* and *Mashaikh*), or *Ajam* (Mughuls and Pathans or the people of Central Asia) who have [unlike class (d) not hitherto contracted marriages with any other classes. Speaking about the rise of the Bengali Muslim middle class, Moulvi Abdul Wali says that 'Musalman employees' (meaning government servants and such other) are generally recruited from the non-*ashrafs* who have been able to contract marriages with the *Ashrafs* or tainted-*Ashrafs*. At present time most of the Muhammadan employees in Bengal are drawn from (c) and (d) classes, and are destined to rise in education and material prosperity as a new elite class.

Western education in the sub continent produced a class which led the nationalist movement. The three most educationally advanced communities, the Bengalee *Bhadralok*, the 'Chita Pavans' of Maharashtra, the Tamilian 'Brahmins' had assumed the political and

cultural leadership in their respective regions (Basu, 1974; 232). The rising muslim middle class elite fought for independent Pakistan in 1947. But immediately after the independence they were frustrated in every sphere of life both civil and military. In British India they had to face non-muslim elite class. Unfortunately in Pakistan they had to face their co-religionists mostly migrated from India. This frustration reached highest form in the sixties. The educated middle class in Bangladesh roused to the occasion in ushering political and social change in national life. Ultimately under the leadership of this middle class elite both civil and military the nation achieved independence after a bloody war in 1971. After independence empirical studies show that virtually in all villages power has been transferred to a new elite class consisted of educated and newly acquired wealth by any means from the old traditional elite mostly consisted of land owning and aristocratic origin (Karim, 1980:235).

Earlier village was regulated by the elderly and high family background personnel through their informal authority. Law, court, police, political party all these were almost unheard by the traditional villagers. Leaders would be selected rather elected. The government did not penetrate into and function in the village. With the growth of national government, the villagers are an integral part of the political and administrative machinery of the state. The villagers are to vote for electing village to national level leaders. The political parties are active even in the interior part of the country. In Bangladesh parliamentary democracy is in practice. Elections are held on the basis of universal adult franchise. The villagers are to be conscious for their political rights and privileges and the importance they held. They are to exercise vital power and privilege and to safeguard their own interest as well as national one. The newly formed elite class, as mentioned earlier, play a crucial role in this regard having linkage with the urban elite class.

For the present study, it is assumed that education will have an impact on social hierarchy and social mobility in the villages of Bangladesh. With this assumption 12 questions were included in the

interview schedule on "Social hierarchy and social mobility". The interview schedule was administered to 319 respondents in four villages. The responses, out of these questions, were categorized as "more change-oriented" or positive/modern scoring two and negative or traditional as less change-oriented responses scoring one (Gore) et al; 1970: 136-137 Maximum scores out of total twelve questions were 24 (2×12) while minimum were 12 (1×12) (appendix).

After such evaluation, the total scores were dichotomized as high and low around mean (arithmetic mean 16.6) as 18 and above as high and 17 and below as low (appendix).

The hypothesis that has been put forward for testing reads as follows : "The more educated a person is, the more he/she will prefer a change in social hierarchy and mobility".

2 Change in Social Hierarchy and Social Mobility

Data in table-1 reveal that 30 respondents of the total 31 of higher level of education score high change, percentage being 96.78 and only one respondent scores low change, percentage being 3.22; 38 of the total 54 respondents of the S. S. C. level of education score high change, percentage being 70.38 and 16 score low change, percentage being 29.62; 28 of the total 81 respondents of the primary level of education score high change, percentage being 34.57 and 53 score low change, percentage being 64.43; 31 of the total 153 illiterates respondents score high change, percentage being 20.27 and 122 scores low change, percentage being 79.73.

Table-1 Association between levels of Education and Change in Hierarchy and Social Mobility

Change	Levels of Education								Total
	Higher		S. S. C.		Primary		Illiterate		
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
High	30	96.78	38	70.38	28	35.57	31	20.27	127
Low	1	3.22	16	29.62	53	64.43	122	79.73	192
Total	31	100.00	54	100.00	81	100.00	153	100.00	319

(Source : Table in appendix)

The data reveal certain direction in the sense that percentage of high change grows up with the growth of the levels of education, higher percent (96.78) for higher level of education and lowest (20.27) for the illiterates. It also indicates the direction that though in smaller proportion, some illiterates possess change-oriented attributes and some educated also possess low change attributes. These data can be put in clear, precise and simple way by dichotomizing the total respondents into literates, consisting of higher, S. S. C. and primary levels of education on the one hand and the illiterates on the other. This follows a 2x2 contingency table.

Data in table 2 confirm the hypothesis. Among 166 literate respondents 96 score high in change, percentage being 57.83 and 70 score low change, percentage being 42.17, among the 153 illiterate respondents, 31 score high change, percentage being 20.27 and 122 low change, percentage being 79.73, respectively. The association ($\chi^2 = 46.899$) is significant at .001 positive level ($Q = 0.687$).

Table 2. Association between Education and Change in Social Hierarchy and Social Mobility

Change	Literate Illiterate		Literate Illiterate		Total
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
High	96	57.83	31	20.27	127
Low	70	42.17	122	79.73	192
Total	166	100.00	153	100.00	319

$$Q = 0.687$$

$$\chi^2 = 46.899, \text{ df. } 1, p .001$$

Now the question arises that how far this positive association between education and trend of change in social hierarchy and mobility is genuine. This may be due to some other antecedent variables as sex, age, *bari* status, occupation and income. In order to find out an answer to such a question and to find out independent

relative and cumulative effects of the variables of education, sex, age, *bari* status, occupation and income regarding the trend of change in hierarchy and mobility, data are presented according to cross tables that follow as the techniques suggested by Hirschi and Selvin (1967; 73) and Morris Rosenberg (1968; 169-182).

3. Change in Social Hierarchy and Social Mobility When Controlled for Sex

Data in table-3 show that among 152 female respondents, 45.67 percent (74) are literates and 51.31 percent (78) are illiterates and among 167 male respondents, 55.09 percent (92) are literates and 44.91 (75) percent are illiterates. Thus the percentage of literates is more (55.09) among males than that of females (48.67). The data show that education and change in social hierarchy and social mobility are positively associated for both male respondents ($\chi^2 = 20.707$, $Q = 8.634$) and female respondents ($\chi^2 = 25.631$, $Q = 0.743$), though there is small variation in percentage between males and females, males being more change-oriented (61.96%) than females (52.70%). The table also shows that in both the male and female groups, literates have high percentage of change (61.96) for males and (52.70) for females, respectively. This indicates the effect of education on social change in social hierarchy and mobility independent of sex.

Within both males and females, literates have larger proportion of change than illiterates. The percentage difference for males is 35.29 (61.96-26.57) and 38.60 (52.70-14.10) for females. In other words, when sex is controlled, education has an independent effect on social hierarchy and mobility. Conversely, within each of literate and illiterate groups, sex is also related to change to some extent. Among both literates and illiterates, males are more change-oriented than females. The percentage difference is 9.26 (61.96-52.70) for literates and 12.57 (26.67-14.10) for illiterates. Thus, when education is controlled, sex has also some independent effect on change though the proportion is smaller in comparison to that of education.

Table : 3 Association between Education and Change in Hierarchy and Mobility When Controlled for Sex.

Change	Male					Female				
	Literate		Illiterate		Total	Literate		Illiterate		Total
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
High	57	61.96	20	26.67	77	39	52.70	11	14.10	50
Low	35	38.04	55	73.33	90	35	7.30	67	85.90	102
Total	92	100.00	75	100.00	167	74	100.00	78	100.00	152

$$Q = 0.634$$

$$\chi^2 = 20.707, \text{ df. } 1, p .001$$

$$Q = 0.743$$

$$\chi^2 = 25.631, \text{ df. } 1, p .001$$

Now, relatively which variable is more effective, education or sex? This is the question of relative effect and Rosenberg (1968) suggested to compare the proportion in two "counter directional" groups. the proportion of change among male illiterates is 26.67 and that of female literates is 52.70. Thus female literates are more change-oriented than male illiterates. The same fact can be represented by ranking the percentage :

Groups	Change in percentage
1. Male literates	61.96
2. Female literates	52.70
3. Male illiterates	26.67
4. Female illiterates	14.10

Above figures can be used to calculate the average percentage difference. The average effect of education, controlling sex, is 36.95. It is the average of (61.96-26.67) and (52.70-14.10). Conversely, the average effect of sex, controlling education, is 10.92. It is the average of (61.96-52.70) and (26.67-14.10.)

The cumulative effect of education and sex is 47.86. It is the difference of (61.96-14.10) of two 'extreme consistent' groups (Rosenberg, 1968; 180).

Thus, education has an independent and higher effect on change in social hierarchy and social mobility irrespective of sex difference.

4. Change in Social Hierarchy and Social Mobility When Controlled for Age

Among the 176 low age (18 to 33 years) group of respondents, 54.54 percent (96) are literates and 45.45 percent (80) are illiterates and among the 143 high age (34 years and above) group of respondents, 48.96 percent (70) are literates and 51.84 percent (73) are illiterates. Thus, the percentage of literates is more (54.54) in low age group than that of high age group (48.96). The data in table-4

reveal that education and change in social hierarchy and mobility are positively associated for both low age group ($\chi^2 = 26.912$, $Q = 0.691$) and high age group ($\chi^2 = 19.304$, $Q = 0.671$), though there is variation in percentage. The table also shows that irrespective of age groups, the literates have high percentage of change, percentage being 52.86 for high age and 61.46 percent for low age group. This indicates the effect of education, independent of age.

Within both the groups of high age and low age, literates are more change-oriented than illiterates. The percentage difference is 38.96 (61.46-22.50) for low age and 35.06 (52.86-17.80) for high age. In other words, when age is controlled, education has an independent effect on change in hierarchy and mobility. Conversely, within each of the literate and illiterate groups, age is also related to change.

Among both literates and illiterates, low age group is more change-oriented than high age group. The percent difference is 8.60 (61.46-52.86) for literates is 4.70 (22.50-17.80) for illiterates. Thus, when education is controlled age has also some independent effect, though proportion is smaller in comparison to that of education.

Which one of these two variables is more effective? This is the question of relative effect. It is the proportion in two "counter directional" groups (Rosenberg, 1986; 169-182). The proportion of change among low age illiterate is 22.50 while that of high age literates is 52.86. Thus the high age literates are more change-oriented than low age illiterates. The same fact can be represented by ranking the percentage.

Groups	Change in percentage
1. Low age literates	61.46
2. High age literates	52.86
3. Low age illiterates	22.50
4. High age illiterates	17.80

Table : 4 Association between Education and Change in Social Hierarchy and Mobility, When Controlled for Age

Change	Low Age					High Age				
	Literate		Illiterate		Total	Literate		Illiterate		Total
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
High	59	61.46	18	22.50	77	37	52.86	13	17.80	50
Low	37	38.54	62	77.50	99	33	42.14	60	82.20	93
Total	96	100.00	80	100.00	176	70	100.00	73	100.00	143

$$\chi^2 = 26.912, \text{df. } 1, \text{p} .001$$

$$Q = 0.691$$

$$\chi^2 = 19.304, \text{df. } 1, \text{p} .001$$

$$Q = 0.676$$

Above figures can be used to calculate the average percentage difference. The average effect of education, controlling age is 37.01. It is the average of (61.46-22.50) and (52.86-17.80). Conversely, the effect of age, controlling education, is 61.46. It is the average of (61.46-52.86) and (22.50-17.80.)

The cumulative effect of education and age is 43.66 (61.46-17.86). It is the difference of two "extreme consistent" groups (Rosenberg, 1968; 180).

Thus, education is positively associated with change in social hierarchy and social mobility irrespective of age.

5. Change in Social Hierarchy and Mobility When Controlled for Bari (family/bangsha) Status:

Among 170 respondents of *nichchu bari* (lower family status) group 50 percent (85) are literates and 50 percent (85) are illiterates, among 149 respondents of *unchu bari* (higher family status)-group, 54.37 percent (81) and 45.63 percent (68) are literates and illiterates respectively. Thus, the percentage of literates is more (54.37) in *unchu bari* group than in social *nichchu bari* group (50.0). Data in table-5 reveal that education and change in hierarchy and mobility are positively associated for both *unchu bari* group ($\chi^2 = 21.934$, $Q = 0.695$) and *nichchu bari* group ($\chi^2 = 25.098$, $Q = 0.683$) though there is variation in *bari* groups. The table shows that irrespective of *bari* groups, the literates have higher percentage of change, it is 58.82 for *nichchu bari* and 56.80 for *unchu bari*. This indicates the effect of education independent of *bari* status.

Within both the groups of bari status, literates have larger proportion of change than illiterates. The percentage difference is 37.64 (58.82-21.18) for *nichchu bari* and is 37.69 (56.80-19.11) for *unchu bari*. In other words, when *bari* status is controlled, education has an independent effect on social hierarchy and mobility. Conversely, within each of the literate and illiterate group *bari*

Table : 5 Association Between Education and Change in Social Hierarchy and Social Mobility When Controlled for *Bari* (family) Status

Change	<i>Unchu Bari</i>					<i>Nichchu Bari</i>				
	Literate		Illiterate		Total	Literate		Illiterate		Total
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
High	46	56.80	13	19.11	59	50	58.32	18	21.18	68
Low	35	43.20	55	80.89	90	35	41.18	67	78.82	102
Total	81	100.00	68	100.00	149	85	100.00	85	100.00	170

$$Q = 0.695$$

$$\chi^2 = 21.934, \text{ df. } 1, p .001$$

$$Q = 0.683$$

$$\chi^2 = 25.098, \text{ df. } 1, p .001$$

status is also related to change. Among literates the percentage of difference is 2.02 (58.82-56.80) and among illiterates, it is 2.07 (21.18-19.11). Thus, when education is controlled, *bari_status* has some effect on change in hierarchy and mobility though the proportion is smaller in comparison to that of education.

Which one of these two variables is more effective? This is the question of relative effect. It is the proportion in two "counter directional" groups (Rosenberg, 1968; 179-182). The proportion of change among *unchu bari* illiterates is 19.11 and that of *nichchu bari* literates is 58.82. Thus, *nichchu bari* literates are more change-oriented than *unchu bari* illiterates. The same fact can be represented by ranking the percentage.

Groups	Change in percentage
1. <i>Unchu bari</i> literates	56.80
2. <i>Nichchu bari</i> literates	58.82
3. <i>Unchu bari</i> illiterates	19.11
4. <i>Nichchu bari</i> illiterates	21.18

The above figures can be used to calculate the average percentage difference. The average effect of education, controlling *bari* status, is 37.67. It is the average of (58.82-21.18) and (56.80-19.11). Conversely, the average effect of *bari*, controlling education, is 2.05. It is the average of (58.82-56.80) and (21.18-19.11).

The cumulative effect of education and *bari* is 35.62 (56.80-21.18). It is the difference of two "extreme consistent" groups (Rosenberg, 1968; 180).

Thus, education and change in social hierarchy and social mobility are positively associated irrespective in variation *bari* status.

6. Change in Social Hierarchy and Social Mobility When Controlled for Occupation:

Among 220 agricultural occupants, 41.37 percent (91) are literates and 58.63 percent (129) are illiterates and among 99 non-

agricultural occupatnts, 75.76 percent (75) are literates and 24.24 (24) are illiterates. Thus, the percentage of literates is more in non-agricultural group (75.76) than that of agricultural group (41.37). The data in table-6 reveal that education and change in social hierarchy and mobility are positively associated for both non-agricultural group ($\chi = 10.467$, $Q = 0.658$) and agricultural group ($\chi = 25.099$, $Q = 0.634$) though there is variation among groups of occupations. The table reveals that irrespective of occupations, literates have high percentage of change, it is 66.67 for non-agriculturists and 50.54 for agriculturists, Thus the data in the table-6 indicate the effect of education on social hierarchy and mobility independent of occupation.

Within both non-agricultural and agricultural occupation literates have larger proportion of change than illiterates. The percentage difference is 37.50, (66.67-29.17) for non-agriculturists and is 31.94 (50.54-18.60) for agriculturists. In other words, when occupation is controlled, education has an independent effect on change in social hierarchy and mobility. Conversely, within each of the literates and illiterate groups, non-agriculturists are more change-oriented than agriculturists. The percentage difference for literates is 16.13 (66.67-50.54) and 10.57 (29.17-18.60) for illiterates. Thus, when education is controlled, occupation has also some independent effect on social hierarchy and mobility.

Which one of these two variables is more effective? This is the question of relative effect. It is the proportion in two "counter directional" groups (Rosenberg, 1968; 179-182). The proportion of change among non-agricultural illiterates is 29.17 and that of agricultural literates is 50.54. Thus the agricultural literates are more change-oriented than non-agricultural illiterates. The same fact can be represented by ranking the percentage.

Groups	Change in percentage
1. Non-agricultural literates	66.57
2. Agricultural literates	50.54
3. Non-agricultural illiterates	29.17
4. Agricultural illiterates	18.60

Table : 6 Association Between Education and Change in Social Hierarchy and Social Mobility When Controlled for Occupation

Change	Non-agricultural occupation					Agricultural occupation				
	Literate		Illiterate		Total	Literate		Illiterate		Total
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
High	50	66.67	7	9.17	57	46	50.54	24	18.60	70
Low	25	33.33	17	70.33	42	45	49.46	105	81.40	150
Total	75	100.00	24	100.00	99	91	100.00	129	100.00	220

$$Q = 0.658$$

$$\chi^2 = 10.467, \text{df. } 1, p .001$$

$$Q = 0.634$$

$$\chi^2 = 25.099, \text{d.f. } 1, p .001$$

The above figures can be used to calculate the average percentage difference. The average effect of education, controlling occupation is 34.72. It is the average of (66.67-29.17) and (50.54-18.60). Conversely, the average effect of occupation, controlling education is 13.85. It is the average of (66.67-50.54) and (29.17-18.60).

The cumulative effect of education and occupation is 48.07 (66.67-18.60). It is the difference between two "extreme consistent" groups (Rosenberg, 1968; 180).

Thus, education is positively associated with change in social hierarchy and social mobility irrespective of variation of occupational groups.

7.Change in Social Hierarchy and Mobility When Controlled for Income

Among 183 low income(up to taka 4000/) group respondents 38.26 percent (70) are literates and 61.74 percent (113) are illiterates and of 136 high income (taka 4001& above) group respondents, 70.51 percent (96) are literates and 29.41. percent (40) are illiterates. Thus, the percentage of literates is more in high income group (70.51) than that of low income group (38.26). The data in table-7 reveal that education and change in social hierarchy and mobility are positively associated for both high income group ($\chi^2 = 7.949$, $Q = 0.495$) and low income group ($\chi^2 = 29.711$, $Q = 0.727$) though there is variation in percentage between high and low income groups. The table also reveals that irrespective of income groups, the literates have higher percentage of change, it is 61.46 for high income and 52.86 for low income group. This indicates the effect of education independent of income.

Within, both high income and low income groups, literates are more change-oriented than illiterates. The percentage difference is 26.46 (61.46-35.0) for high income group and 37.82 (52.86-15.04) for low income group. In other words, when income is controlled,

Table : 7 Association Between Education and Change in Social Hierarchy and Mobility When Controlled for Income

Change	High Income					Low Income				
	Literate		Illiterate		Total	Literate		Illiterate		Total
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
High	59	61.46	14	35.0	73	37	52.86	17	15.04	54
Low	37	38.54	26	65.0	63	33	47.14	96	84.96	129
Total	96	100.00	40	100.0	136	70	100.00	113	100.00	183

$$Q = 0.495$$

$$\chi^2 = 7.949, \text{ df. } 1, \text{ p } .001$$

$$Q = 0.727$$

$$\chi^2 = 29.711, \text{ df. } 1, \text{ p } .001$$

education has an independent effect on social hierarchy and mobility. Conversely, within each of literates and illiterate groups, income is also related to social hierarchy and mobility. Among both literates and illiterates, high income group is more change-oriented than low income group. The percentage difference is 8.60 (61.46-52.86) for literates and for illiterates, it is 19.96 (35.0-25.04). Thus, when education is controlled, income has also some independent effect on social hierarchy and mobility.

Which one of these two variables is more effective, education or income? This is the question of relative effect. It is the proportion in two "counter directional" groups (Rosenberg, 1968). The proportion of change among high income illiterates is 35.00 and that of low income literates, is 52.86. Thus, low income literates are more change-oriented than high income group illiterates. The same fact can be represented by ranking the percentage.

Groups	Change in percentage
1. High income literates	61.46
2. Low income literates	52.86
3. High income illiterates	35.00
4. Low income illiterates	15.04

The above figures can be used to calculate the average percentage difference. The effect of education, controlling income, is 32.14. It is the average of (61.46-35.0) and (52.86-15.04). Conversely, the effect of income, controlling education, is 14.28. It is the average of (61.46-52.86) and (35.0-15.04.)

The cumulative effect of education and income is 46.42 (61.46-15.04). It is the difference of two "extreme consistent" groups (Rosenberg, 1968; 180).

Thus, the association between education and change in social hierarchy and mobility is positively associated irrespective of variation due to income.

These findings are in consonance with other studies mentioned in the introductory section of this analysis.

8. Summary and Conclusion

Thus, the foregoing analysis reveals the impact of education on change in social hierarchy and mobility. Other variables as sex, age, *bari*, occupation and income have also some effect on change but in every case that of education is found in higher proportion.

These findings are supported by other studies as Rao (Gore, et al, 1967), Dube (1955, 1958), Pandey (1975), Shipman (1971), Gore, et al (1970, 1967), Hall (1969), Karim (1964, 1972, 1976, 1980), Srinivas (1966), Beteille (1966), Huq (1978), Milner (1972), Savarimuthu (1978), Ottaway (1976) and Sen (1997) as mentioned in the introductory section.

The discussions, analysis and findings reveal that the hypothesis is confirmed. Education has an impact on social hierarchy and social mobility in these villages under study in Bangladesh. Education is helping the individuals in taking up new roles and status with changed values and attitudes. There emerges a elite class in rural communities. The rural elite with change in status and role would be found participatory in rural development and nation building activities. They can serve the national goal to their optimum capacity as potential human resource. The planners and administrators both civil and military may find some insight into the rural social structure for their course of action in the making of the nation.

REFERENCES

1. Alexandar, K.C : *Social Mobility in Kerala Village*, Poona : Dissertation Series, 29, 1968.
2. Beteille, Andre : *Caste, Class and Power*, Bombay : Oxford University Press, 1966.

3. Bottomore, T. B. : *Sociology*, London : George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1962.
4. David, B. Wilbur : *A Sociology of Education*, New York : American Book Company, 1969.
5. Deighton, L. (ed) : *The Encyclopedia of Education*, Vol. 8, London : Mac Milan and the Free Press, 1971
6. Deutsch, Karl,W : "*Social Mobilization and Political Development*" *The American Political Science Review*, vol. LV, No.3, 1961
7. Dube, S. C. : *India's Changing Villages*, Bombay : Allied Publishers Ltd. 1958.
8. Dube. S. C. : *Indian Villages*, 1955.
9. Dube, S. C. : "Tradition, Social Structure and Agricultural Development", New Delhi, Ministry of Commerce, Govt. of India, 1955.
10. Gore, M. S. et al (eds.) : *Papers in the Sociology of Education in India*, New Delhi : N. C. E. R. T., 1967
11. Gore, M. S. et al : *Field Studies in the Sociology of Education, All India Report*, New Delhi : N. C. E. R. T., 1970.
12. Hall, Aiden South (ed) : *Social change in Modern Africa*, London : Oxford University Press, 1969.
13. Hirschi, Trawis and Selvin, C. H. : *Principles of Survey Analysis*, London : The Free Press, 1967.
14. Huq, Ameerul (ed): *Exploitation and the Rural Poor*, Comilla : BARD, 1978.
15. Karim, A. K. Nazmul : *Changing Society in India, Pakistan and Bangladesh*, Dhaka : Nowroze, 1976 (3rd ed.).
16. Karim, A. K. Nazmul : 'The Methodology for a Sociology in East Pakistan', in Pierre Bessaignet (ed.) *Social Research in East Pakistan*, Dhaka : Asiatic Society of Pakistan, 1960.
17. Karim, A. K. Nazmul : *Samaj Vigyan Samikshan*, Dhaka : Nawroze, 1972.
18. Karim, A. K. Nazmul : "Changing Patterns of an East Pakitsan Family" in Barbara, Ward (ed) *Women in New Asia*, Paris : Unesco, 1964, 196-322.
19. Karim, A.K. Nazmul : *The Dynamics of Bangladesh Society*, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House, 1980
20. Maron, Stanely (ed), *Pakistan : Society and Culture*, New Haven, Human Area Files, 1953.
21. Milner, M. J. : *The Elusion of Equality*, London : Jossey and Brass Inc. 1972.
22. Ottaway, A. C. : *Education and Society*, London : Routeledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.

23. Pandey, S. N : *Education and Social Change in Bihar*, Delhi : Motilal Banarsidas, 1975.
24. Rosenberg, Morris : *The logic of Survey Analysis*, New York : Basic Books, 1968 : 159-183.
25. Savarimuthu, V : *Education and Social Mobility in Tamil Nadu*, Loyola : University of Chicago, PH. D. thesis, 1978.
26. Sen, Ranglal : *Bangladesher Samajik Sthar Vinnas (in Bangla)*, Dhaka, Bangla Academy, 1997
27. Srinivas, M. N. : *Social Change in Modern India*, Delhi : Allied Publishers, 1966.
28. Tharpe, J. Gold : "Educated Africans, some conceptual and Taxonomical Problems" in Aidan South Hall (ed.) *Social Change in Modern Africa*, London : Oxford University Press, 1969.
29. Ward, Barbara : *Women in New Asia*, Paris : UNESCO, 1964.

APPENDIX**SOCIAL HIERARCHY AND SOCIAL MOBILITY**

Q. Nos.		Scores
1	Basing on education, social work and the like	2 (Two)
	Family, religion, physical strength, otherwise influential etc.	1 (One)
2	Basing on education, social work, and the like	2 (Two)
	Family, religion, physical strength otherwise influential	1 (One)
3	C) High Education	2 (Two)
	A, B, C, D	1 (One)
4	If prefer for a change	2 (Two)
	Not change	1 (One)
5	Status loosing due to education or social spirit	2 (Two)
	Others	1 (One)
6	Late mornings tea, afternoon, night meals times	2 (Two)
	Early morning, noon, evening	1 (One)
7	Types of dress, change	2 (Two)
	Not change	1 (One)
8	Metal, China clay, watch, transistor, curtains and the like	2 (Two)
	Other like	1 (One)
9	Yes; Yes	2 (Two)
	No; No	1 (One)
10	Contact Yes	2 (Two)
	Contact No	1 (One)
11	For education, jobs and transactions	2 (Two)
	Others	1 (One)
12	A, B, C, as new things	2 (Two)
	D, E.	1 (One)

Maximum = 24 (2×12)

Minimum = 12 (1×12)

High scores stand for more change-oriented.

Dichotomized at arithmetic mean = 16.6

18 and above high change-oriented.

17 and below as low change-oriented.

APPENDIX**Table Education and Score in Social Hierarchy and Social Mobility**

Level of Education	Scores			Total
	12-16	17-20	21-24	
Higher	2	11	18	31
S. S. C.	16	21	17	54
Primary	46	20	15	81
Illiterate	121	26	6	153
	185	78	56	319