IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)
Volume 31, Issue 11, Series 4 (November, 2026) 19-25
e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.
www.iosrjournals.org

The Dual Faces of Social Stratification: A Comparative Sociological Analysis of Inequality, Development, and Social Mobility Across Developed and Developing Societies

Srija Chakraborty
Academic Researcher, Former M.Phil. Scholar, University oof Calcutta, Alumnus of Former Presidency College under CU, later M.A. from Presidency University, Kolkata. Alumnus of CUES, University of Calcutta and IR Dept. of Jadavpur University too.

Abstract
Social stratification is a fundamental feature of social organisation, shaping the distribution of wealth, power, prestige, and opportunities across societies. Although sociological theories have traditionally examined stratification through competing functionalist and conflict perspectives, its relationship with economic development and social mobility remains a complex subject of debate. This article examines the dual consequences of social stratification, considering how unequal social arrangements may facilitate specialised occupational roles and economic coordination while simultaneously reproducing disadvantage and restricting access to opportunities. Drawing on the theoretical contributions of Karl Marx, Max Weber, Kingsley Davis and Wilbert Moore, Melvin Tumin, and Pierre Bourdieu, the article develops a comparative analytical framework for understanding stratification across different institutional and socioeconomic contexts. It proposes examining India, the United States, and Sweden as contrasting cases that illustrate the interaction between inherited social positions, market inequalities, educational institutions, and social protection. The article adopts a conceptual, literature-based approach rather than presenting new empirical findings. It argues that the consequences of stratification cannot be adequately explained by the degree of inequality alone; they must also be understood through the institutions governing access to resources, the reproduction of social advantages, and opportunities for intergenerational mobility. The article concludes by identifying a research agenda for investigating when stratification becomes an incentive for productive participation and when it operates as a mechanism of social exclusion.

Keywords: *Social stratification, social inequality, economic development, social mobility, institutional arrangements, comparative sociology, social reproduction*

Date of Submission: 23-10-2026 Date of Acceptance: 04-11-2026

I. Introduction

Social stratification remains one of the central concerns of sociological inquiry because it shapes how societies distribute material resources, social recognition, and opportunities for individual advancement. Differences in income, wealth, occupational status, caste, gender, and educational attainment influence people's life chances and their capacity to participate in social, economic, and political institutions. Although these inequalities take different forms across societies, their consequences extend beyond individual circumstances to affect the broader organisation and development of social systems. A fundamental question arises from this observation: should social stratification be understood primarily as an obstacle to social progress, or can it also perform functions that contribute to economic development and institutional coordination? Functionalist approaches have suggested that differentiated rewards may encourage individuals to acquire specialised skills and occupy positions considered important for society. In contrast, conflict perspectives emphasise that unequal access to resources enables powerful groups to preserve their advantages and reproduce existing hierarchies. These explanations offer different interpretations of the relationship between inequality and social organisation, creating a theoretical problem that remains relevant to contemporary societies. The issue becomes particularly significant when stratification is examined comparatively. Societies differ in their economic structures, political institutions, welfare arrangements, histories of social exclusion, and opportunities for upward mobility. Consequently, similar levels or forms of inequality may have different implications depending on how institutions distribute opportunities and regulate access to resources.

For example, economic inequality may coexist with extensive public education and social protection in one society, while in another it may be reinforced by restricted educational access, inherited social status, and

limited institutional support. The consequences of inequality therefore cannot automatically be assumed to be identical across contexts.

- This article examines the dual relationship between social stratification and social development. Its central argument is that stratification may contribute to certain forms of economic coordination while simultaneously generating disadvantages that restrict social mobility. Whether its consequences are predominantly enabling or exclusionary depends on the interaction between institutional arrangements, the distribution of resources, and the mechanisms through which social advantages are reproduced.
- The article has three objectives. First, it critically examines classical and contemporary sociological interpretations of stratification. Second, it develops a comparative framework for investigating stratification across societies with different institutional arrangements. Third, it identifies questions for future empirical research concerning the relationship between inequality, development, and social mobility.

Rather than assuming that stratification is either inherently beneficial or universally harmful, the article treats its consequences as an empirical and theoretical problem requiring comparative investigation.

Conceptualising Social Stratification

Social stratification refers to the structured and relatively enduring inequalities through which individuals and groups occupy different positions within a social hierarchy. These positions are associated with unequal access to economic resources, political influence, social prestige, and opportunities. Stratification differs from temporary inequality because it is embedded in social relationships and institutional arrangements. A temporary difference in income does not necessarily constitute a stable hierarchy. However, when economic advantages are inherited, institutionalised, or systematically reproduced, inequality becomes part of a broader stratification system.

Several dimensions are particularly relevant to the present analysis.

- **Economic stratification** concerns inequalities in income, wealth, property ownership, and occupational opportunities.
- **Social stratification** includes hierarchies based on caste, race, gender, ethnicity, education, and social status.
- **Political stratification** concerns unequal access to decision-making, representation, and institutional power.
- **Global stratification** refers to inequalities between countries and populations in economic resources, technological capabilities, international influence, and access to development opportunities. These dimensions frequently intersect. An individual's economic position may be influenced by inherited wealth, educational access, gender, caste, or racial discrimination. Accordingly, stratification should not be reduced to income differences alone. Weber's (1978) multidimensional analysis is particularly useful because it distinguishes class, status, and political power as related but analytically distinct sources of social advantage. This perspective enables researchers to examine situations in which economic resources, social prestige, and political influence do not necessarily coincide.

The present article adopts a relational understanding of stratification. Rather than examining inequality solely as a distribution of resources, it considers how social positions are created, maintained, and challenged through institutions and social interactions.

Theoretical Framework

Functionalism and the organisation of social roles

- Davis and Moore (1945) proposed that social stratification performs an important function by ensuring that positions considered necessary for society attract appropriately qualified individuals. In their explanation, unequal rewards can encourage people to undertake training and accept responsibilities associated with specialised occupations.
- This argument offers a possible explanation for why societies differentiate rewards across occupational positions. Complex economic systems require specialised knowledge, professional training, and the coordination of diverse activities. Differential rewards may therefore influence occupational choices and investments in skills.
- However, the functionalist explanation raises an important distinction between the necessity of specialised roles and the necessity of unequal rewards. Even if particular occupations require extensive training, it does not follow that every existing inequality is necessary or proportionate to social contribution.
- Tumin (1953) challenged the functionalist argument by questioning whether stratification reliably identifies and rewards talent. He argued that unequal access to opportunities can prevent individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds from developing their abilities. A system that reserves educational and occupational advantages for privileged groups may therefore exclude potentially capable individuals.

This criticism is particularly important for the proposed comparative study. If access to education, professional networks, and training depends heavily on family resources, the resulting occupational hierarchy may reflect inherited advantages as much as individual competence. The functionalist perspective consequently provides a hypothesis to investigate rather than a universal justification for inequality.

Conflict theory and the reproduction of inequality

- Marx's analysis of class relations places ownership, production, and control over economic resources at the centre of social inequality. From this perspective, stratification reflects unequal relationships between groups with different positions within the economic structure.
- Those who control productive resources may exercise disproportionate influence over employment, working conditions, and the distribution of economic benefits. Inequality can therefore become self-reinforcing when economic power allows privileged groups to protect their interests.
- This perspective draws attention to the distributive consequences of economic development. Growth in national income does not necessarily indicate that the benefits of growth are shared widely. Economic expansion may improve living standards for many people while allowing wealth and decision-making power to become increasingly concentrated.
- Conflict theory also encourages researchers to examine whether apparently neutral institutions reproduce unequal opportunities. Educational selection, recruitment practices, property ownership, and political participation may operate within broader relationships of power.

However, a conflict-based explanation must also account for institutional differences and social change. Stratification does not produce identical outcomes in every society, and collective action, public policy, and institutional reform can alter the distribution of opportunities.

Weber: Class, status, and power

Weber's (1978) approach broadens the analysis beyond economic ownership. Class positions influence people's market opportunities, while status groups are distinguished by social honour, prestige, and patterns of social recognition. Political organisation provides another basis for collective influence. These dimensions may reinforce one another. Wealth can facilitate access to prestigious education, social networks, and political institutions. Conversely, inherited status may provide advantages even where direct economic resources are limited. This framework is especially relevant when comparing caste-based and class-based stratification. In India, caste has historically structured social status and access to occupations, while economic class and educational attainment also shape contemporary opportunities. In the United States, class, race, wealth, and social networks interact in ways that cannot be explained by income alone. Weber's framework therefore supports a multidimensional comparative analysis of stratification.

Bourdieu and social reproduction

Bourdieu's work provides a further explanation of how inequalities persist across generations. His concepts of economic, cultural, and social capital highlight the different resources individuals can use to navigate educational and occupational institutions. Economic capital includes material resources and wealth. Cultural capital encompasses culturally valued knowledge, competencies, and dispositions. Social capital concerns resources accessible through relationships and networks. Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) examined how educational institutions can contribute to the reproduction of social class inequalities. Students do not enter educational settings with identical resources, and institutions may reward forms of knowledge and behaviour that are more familiar to privileged groups. Consequently, educational achievement cannot always be interpreted as a straightforward measure of individual merit. It may also reflect unequal access to preparation, guidance, institutional familiarity, and social support. This perspective helps connect household-level inequalities with broader patterns of social mobility. Even when formal barriers are removed, differences in resources may continue to influence who can take advantage of available opportunities. Taken together, these theoretical perspectives suggest that the consequences of stratification depend on more than the existence of hierarchy. They also depend on how rewards are distributed, how institutions operate, and whether inherited advantages can be converted into continuing privilege.

II. Review of the Literature

The literature on social stratification contains a longstanding debate between explanations that emphasise social coordination and those that emphasise inequality and domination. Davis and Moore (1945) offered a functionalist explanation of stratification, connecting differential rewards to the allocation of individuals to socially important positions. Their approach raised a central question about the relationship between occupational differentiation and inequality. Tumin (1953) challenged the assumption that stratification necessarily performs this function effectively. His criticism directs attention to the possibility that inherited privilege restricts the

development and selection of talent. This disagreement remains relevant when examining whether unequal rewards improve social performance or reproduce existing advantages. Marx's analysis offers a different emphasis by locating inequality within relations of production and ownership. It encourages researchers to investigate how the distribution of economic resources influences power and how economic structures reproduce class differences. Weber's multidimensional approach complicates purely economic explanations by demonstrating the analytical importance of status and political power. Stratification may therefore persist through social recognition and institutional influence even when income differences alone do not fully explain observed hierarchies. Bourdieu and Passeron's (1977) analysis of educational reproduction further demonstrates how inequalities can be transmitted through institutions. Educational systems may facilitate mobility, but their outcomes can also depend on resources acquired through family background and social environment. Contemporary research on social mobility extends these theoretical debates by examining the relationship between childhood circumstances, unequal opportunities, and later-life outcomes. Balestra and Ciani (2022), for example, discuss challenges to equality of opportunity and social mobility across OECD countries, including the effects of unequal upbringing, wealth inequality, and geographical differences in opportunity. The literature therefore identifies several mechanisms through which stratification can influence development: occupational incentives, unequal resource distribution, institutional selection, social reproduction, and differential access to opportunities. Nevertheless, a conceptual distinction is necessary. The existence of these mechanisms does not establish that stratification produces a net social benefit or that inequality necessarily reduces economic performance. Such conclusions require evidence about specific institutional conditions and outcomes.

Proposed research gap.

The present article identifies an analytical question for further investigation: how do institutional arrangements influence the relationship between social inequality and social mobility across societies with different histories and economic structures? This should be treated as a provisional research gap rather than a demonstrated absence of previous research. Establishing its originality requires a systematic search of relevant journal articles, books, doctoral theses, and comparative studies. The article's proposed contribution is to bring together functionalist arguments about differentiated rewards and critical explanations of social reproduction within a comparative framework that examines institutional conditions as a possible mechanism connecting stratification to development and mobility.

Research Objectives and Questions

The article is guided by the following objectives:

1. To examine competing sociological explanations of social stratification.
2. To analyse the potential relationship between stratification, economic development, and social mobility.
3. To identify how institutional arrangements may influence the consequences of inequality.
4. To develop a comparative framework for studying stratification across contrasting societies.

The principal research question is:

How do institutional arrangements shape the relationship between social stratification, economic development, and social mobility across different societies?

Four subsidiary questions follow:

- Under what conditions might unequal rewards encourage specialised employment and economic activity?
- How do inherited advantages and institutional barriers reproduce social inequality?
- How do education, welfare provision, and labour-market institutions influence opportunities for upward mobility?
- Why might similar forms of stratification produce different outcomes across societies?

These questions are exploratory. They do not assume in advance that stratification produces positive outcomes in one country and negative outcomes in another.

Research design

The proposed study adopts a comparative qualitative design based on sociological literature, theoretical analysis, and secondary sources. This approach is appropriate for examining competing explanations and identifying mechanisms that may connect social stratification with development and mobility. The present manuscript is conceptual. It does not report original fieldwork, interviews, surveys, or statistical analysis. Any subsequent empirical investigation should clearly distinguish its findings from the arguments developed here.

Selection of comparative cases

Three countries are proposed for further investigation: India, the United States, and Sweden. India offers a context in which caste, class, gender, regional inequality, and affirmative action can be examined in relation to social mobility. The United States provides a setting for investigating wealth inequality, educational access, racial stratification, labour-market outcomes, and the relationship between individual achievement and family background. Sweden offers a contrasting institutional context for examining welfare provision, public services, redistribution, and the extent to which these arrangements mediate socioeconomic disadvantage. These countries should not be treated as internally uniform or as representatives of all developing or developed societies. Their selection is intended to facilitate a theoretically informed comparison of different institutional arrangements. The cases should be refined after reviewing data availability and the existing comparative literature.

Sources and literature selection

- Relevant material may be collected from peer-reviewed sociology journals, academic books, doctoral theses, and institutional publications.
- Potential sources include the OECD, the World Bank, and the World Inequality Database. Relevant indicators include income and wealth distribution, educational attainment, intergenerational mobility, and access to social protection.
- A full literature review should document its search terms, databases, publication period, inclusion criteria, and exclusion criteria. Such documentation would make the selection of evidence more transparent and reproducible.

Analytical strategy

The comparative analysis should examine four dimensions:

1. **Distribution of resources:** How wealth, income, education, and occupational opportunities are distributed.
2. **Institutional mediation:** How education systems, welfare arrangements, labour markets, and public policies influence access to resources.
3. **Social reproduction:** How advantages and disadvantages are transmitted across generations.
4. **Social mobility:** How far individuals can change their socioeconomic position relative to their family background.

Comparisons should distinguish between individual mobility, changes in the overall distribution of social positions, and changes in absolute living standards. For example, individuals may experience upward mobility even when overall wealth inequality increases. Conversely, a society may achieve economic growth without substantially reducing the influence of inherited social advantages. These distinctions are essential to avoid treating economic growth, equality, and mobility as interchangeable measures of social progress.

III. Comparative Analytical Discussion

India: Caste, class, and institutional change

India provides an important setting for investigating how multiple systems of stratification interact. Caste has historically shaped social status, occupational opportunities, and patterns of exclusion. Class differences, educational inequalities, gender relations, and geographical disparities further influence access to resources. At the same time, constitutional protections, affirmative action policies, educational expansion, and economic change have created avenues through which historically disadvantaged groups can pursue greater representation and mobility. The sociological question is not whether caste or class is universally beneficial or harmful. Rather, it is how specific institutional arrangements maintain or challenge inherited inequalities. Economic expansion may generate new occupations and opportunities, but the extent to which these opportunities become accessible to disadvantaged groups requires empirical examination. Differences in educational quality, household resources, social networks, and discrimination may influence who benefits most from economic change. India therefore illustrates why economic development and social mobility must be studied together rather than assumed to progress at the same rate.

United States: Wealth inequality and the promise of meritocracy

The United States provides a useful context for examining the relationship between class inequality and meritocratic ideals. The idea that individuals can advance through talent, effort, and achievement occupies an important place in American social discourse. However, the ability to pursue these opportunities may depend on family wealth, educational preparation, neighbourhood conditions, and access to social networks. From a functionalist perspective, differentiated rewards may encourage educational investment and occupational specialisation. From a conflict perspective, concentrated wealth can enable privileged groups to preserve advantages across generations. Bourdieu's framework adds another dimension by directing attention to the cultural

and social resources that influence educational outcomes. The relevant empirical question is whether institutions provide sufficiently open pathways for individuals from different socioeconomic backgrounds to realise their abilities.The answer should not be assumed in advance. It requires evidence concerning educational access, wealth transmission, labour-market outcomes, and intergenerational mobility.

Welfare institutions and the mediation of inequality

Sweden provides a contrasting case for investigating whether public institutions can reduce the disadvantages associated with unequal family circumstances. Public education, social protection, and redistributive policies are relevant to understanding how states may influence access to resources and opportunities. From the perspective developed in this article, the central issue is whether such arrangements weaken the transmission of socioeconomic disadvantage across generations. However, the existence of welfare institutions does not establish that all forms of stratification disappear. Differences in wealth, occupational status, family background, and access to social networks may continue to influence life chances. A comparative study would therefore examine whether institutional arrangements moderate the relationship between social origins and later outcomes, rather than treating welfare provision as proof of equality.

What does the comparison reveal?

The three cases suggest a common analytical framework, although the proposed comparisons require empirical testing.

Analytical dimension	India	United States	Sweden
Major questions about stratification	Caste, class, gender, and regional inequality	Wealth, class, race, and educational access	Class, wealth, and institutional mediation
Institutions to investigate	Education, affirmative action, labour markets, and social policy	Education, labour markets, taxation, and social policy	Public education, welfare provision, and redistribution
Central mobility question	How do inherited social positions influence access to new opportunities?	How far can achievement overcome unequal family resources?	How effectively do institutions moderate disadvantages associated with social origins?

The table identifies research questions, not established comparative findings.

A systematic investigation could determine whether particular institutions weaken or reinforce the relationship between social origins and life chances. It could also reveal whether mechanisms identified in one society operate differently in another. The comparison should therefore avoid simplistic conclusions that developed societies necessarily provide greater equality or that developing societies experience a single, uniform pattern of stratification.

The Dual Consequences of Social Stratification

The preceding discussion suggests that the consequences of stratification should be examined across several interconnected dimensions.

- First, unequal rewards may provide incentives for specialised training and occupational participation. However, such incentives do not establish that existing reward structures are fair, necessary, or effective.
- Second, stratification may coordinate complex social systems while restricting access to the positions those systems create. If access to training and advancement depends on inherited advantages, occupational hierarchies may reproduce inequality rather than allocate positions solely according to ability.
- Third, stratification may coexist with economic development. Yet growth alone does not establish whether its benefits are widely shared. Researchers must examine the distribution of income, wealth, public services, and opportunities alongside changes in economic output.
- Fourth, social institutions can influence how inequality is transmitted. Education, social protection, labour-market regulation, and anti-discrimination policies may alter the relationship between family background and individual outcomes. The effectiveness of these arrangements remains an empirical question.

These observations suggest that the consequences of stratification are conditional rather than universal. The same broad form of inequality may operate differently depending on the institutions governing access to resources and the opportunities available to individuals. An important distinction follows: **the existence of social differentiation does not necessarily justify structural inequality, and the presence of inequality does not establish that it contributes to development.** A stronger sociological explanation must identify the mechanisms connecting stratification to particular outcomes and determine whose interests those outcomes serve.

IV. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The principal limitation of this article is its conceptual and literature-based design. It proposes an analytical framework but does not establish causal relationships through original empirical evidence. The selection of India, the United States, and Sweden also limits the generalisability of any future conclusions. Each country has distinct historical experiences, political institutions, demographic characteristics, and patterns of inequality. Findings from these cases should not automatically be extended to all developing or developed societies. Further research could address these limitations through a transparent comparative design incorporating longitudinal data, policy analysis, and evidence on intergenerational mobility. A particularly useful direction would be to investigate whether institutional arrangements moderate the relationship between socioeconomic origins and adult outcomes. Researchers could compare the influence of family background on educational attainment, occupational position, and income across the selected countries. Such research would help distinguish between the effects of inequality itself and the effects of institutions that shape access to opportunities. Another avenue would be to examine whether the relationship between stratification and development differs across historical periods. Changes in technology, labour markets, public policy, and educational access may alter how social advantages are accumulated and transmitted. These directions would provide a stronger empirical foundation for evaluating the article's central proposition.

V. Conclusion

Social stratification is neither adequately explained as a necessary mechanism of social organisation nor fully understood through an exclusive focus on domination and exclusion. Its consequences emerge through the interaction of economic resources, social status, institutional arrangements, and opportunities for mobility. Functionalist theory highlights the possible role of differentiated rewards in specialised occupational systems, while conflict theory draws attention to the unequal distribution of power and resources. Weber's multidimensional approach and Bourdieu's account of social reproduction further demonstrate why stratification cannot be reduced to economic inequality alone.

The article's central proposition is that the consequences of stratification depend not only on the existence or extent of inequality but also on how social institutions distribute resources, regulate access to opportunities, and reproduce or challenge inherited advantages. This proposition requires systematic empirical testing before it can be treated as an established finding. For doctoral research, its value lies in providing a focused question that connects competing sociological theories with comparative institutional analysis. Ultimately, the sociological challenge is not simply to determine whether stratification exists, but to understand **when, how, and for whom its consequences become enabling or exclusionary**. Addressing that question can contribute to a more nuanced understanding of inequality, development, and social mobility in contemporary societies.

References

[1]. Balestra, C., & Ciani, E. (2022). *Current challenges to social mobility and equality of opportunity*. OECD Papers on Well-being and Inequalities, No. 10. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/a749ffbb-en
[2]. Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (R. Nice, Trans.). Sage.
[3]. Davis, K., & Moore, W. E. (1945). Some principles of stratification. *American Sociological Review, 10*(2), 242–249.
[4]. Marx, K. (1976). *Capital: A critique of political economy* (Vol. 1, B. Fowkes, Trans.). Penguin Books. (Original work published 1867)
[5]. Tumin, M. M. (1953). Some principles of stratification: A critical analysis. *American Sociological Review, 18*(4), 387–394. https://doi.org/10.2307/2087551
[6]. Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology* (G. Roth & C. Wittich, Eds.). University of California Press.