

# Intergenerational Mobility and Its Impact on Child Development-A Case Study of Faisalabad (Pakistan)

NEELAM SHEZADI<sup>1</sup>, SAIF-UR-REHMAN, RAZIA SULTANA AND ZEIB-UN-NISA  
*Department of Rural Sociology, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad–38040, Pakistan*  
<sup>1</sup>Corresponding author's e-mail: [neelumch@hotmail.com](mailto:neelumch@hotmail.com)

## ABSTRACT

The main objectives of present study were to (a) find out the bases of intergenerational mobility, (b) look into the relationship between socio-economic status and intergenerational mobility and its impact on the development of children. For this purpose, a survey was conducted in tehsil Faisalabad. Multistage sampling technique was applied for the selection of 160 respondents in the selected area. It was found that the level of education was discouraging. Majority of fathers-in-law belonged to low income group and 45.0% of spouses belonged to medium income group. Majority of fathers-in-law and spouses preferred home prepared food for their children.

**Key Words:** Intergenerational mobility; Socio-economic status; Child development

## INTRODUCTION

Children are future of any nation and we are no exception. Their development depends upon a number of factors; food, clothing and mental well-being to name a few. These needs are best met in environments, which are conducive to all these. Child development is the study or examination of processes and mechanism that operate during the physical and mental development of an infant into an adult. It includes both physical and mental development. The physical and mental achievements of children in their early years have been significantly related to the labor market earning of the parents (Paul *et al.*, 1998).

Study of the child development encompasses all the aspects of human growth from birth to adolescence. These include the progressive elaboration of the child's intellectual skills and personality development that involves the complex interaction between psychological factors and gradual development of the baby; and socialization- the process by which children adjust to their environment and its demands. Children grow, develop and learn throughout their lives. A child's development can be measured through social, physical and cognitive development milestones. If children fail to develop properly they may be un-able to reach their full potential. However health care professionals and parents can work together as partners to help children grow up healthy and strong (Wikipedia, 2003).

Sociological, psychological and pedagogical considerations on the role and position of the family seem to show the deep socializing function of the family and its impact on the development of children. As the vast pluridisciplinary literature affirms, parents play a determining role with regard to their children's future and in certain sense, it is they who write the course of their children's lives and are responsible for their successes and failures (Judith, 2001). Child care beliefs and practices evolve to meet the needs of children within changing families and societies. Production technology, economic structure, formal and non

formal institutions and ideological superstructure mediate the availability and allocation of resources for the development of children. Child development varies among pre-modern agrarian, modern industrial and post modern knowledge-based setting (Zeitlin & Megawang, 1995).

There are different factors of intergenerational mobility i.e. income, occupation and education, which influence children development. According to Sorokin (1964) social mobility means any transition of an individual or social object or value and thing that has been created or modified by human activity from one social position to another. In simple words it has pertained to upward or downward movement of persons or groups. There have been two principal types of social mobility; horizontal and vertical. By horizontal social mobility we mean the transition of an individual or social object from one social group to other situated on the same level. By vertical social mobility we mean the relations involved in a transition of an individual or a social object from one social stratum to another (Rehman, 1993). Education plays a key role in the development of any society. It seems to be one of the important variables in the explanation of social mobility. The chances of upward mobility have been directly related to education (Blau & Duncan, 1967).

Change in socio-economic status between father and son has been called intergenerational mobility. The term intergenerational mobility has been referred to an individual movement in relation to social and economic positions of his or her father (Mann, 1985).

In cotemporary society education is the main factor in the intergenerational mobility. It produces mobility aspirations, socializes for a better position and prepare for a better work role.

Occupation has been a strong variable in the explanation of social mobility and child development. If the occupation of an individual is different from his father, it would be considered as social mobility. By moving peasants into urban occupation and by enlarging the middle class

through the development of manufacturing process, the transition from agrarian to industrial economy provides social mobility (Mckee, 1969).

Kohn *et al.* (1990) compared working-class parents and middle-class parents, first in United States only, than in Poland and Japan. They found that working-class parents tended to be "traditional". They wanted their children to be neat and clean, obedient and respectful. Middle-class parents tended to be "dominant". They wanted their children to be communicative, eager to learn, ready to share and cooperate and "happy". Working-class parents focused on conformity to external standards. Middle-class parents focused on the child's internal dynamics. They value self control. Scheffler (2004) concluded that there are no differences in body development and body composition in three years old child due to social level. There are, however, differences in motor development owing to the same. Children with a low social level had lower outcomes in all motor skills. Lasker and Masico (1989) concluded that it has been possible to examine not only the well known association of social class with the size of child but also with longitudinal growth and in addition the effect of social mobility on growth.

## METHODOLOGY

The substrate of present studies comprised of rural population of tehsil Faisalabad. Multi-stage sampling technique (Nachimias & Nachmias, 1992) was used for this purpose. In the first stage, two union councils (UC # 135 & 159) were selected by using simple random method. In the second stage, two villages were selected from each union council by using the same method. In the third stage, 40 respondents were selected from each village by using systematic random sampling technique. In this way 160 respondents were selected in all. After selecting the respondents, a pre-planned questionnaire was used for interviewing the respondents.

### Statistical Techniques and Methods

**a) Percentage.** To analyze and compare data related to personal traits of the respondents simple percentage was calculated as  $P = F/N \times 100$ , where P is percentage, F is frequency and N is total population.

**b) Chi-square.** Chi-square was applied to ascertain the significance of relationship between certain independent and dependent variables. Chi-square was calculated as under:

$\chi^2 = \sum \{(O-E)^2/E\}$ , where O, E and  $\Sigma$  are observed, expected and total values, respectively.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data (Table I) revealed that majority of spouse (68.12%) were of age group between 20 - 25 years at the time of marriage, while fathers-in-law (49.37%) were of age group 26 - 30 years at the time of marriage. About half of the spouses (53.1%) have metric level of education, While 56.3% of father-in-law were illiterate. Majority of father-in-

law (80%) and spouses (71.3%) belonged to nuclear family system, while 16.3% of fathers-in-law and 26.3% of spouses were the members of nuclear family. Susan and Witt (2002) reported that the type of family, nuclear or an extended is a factor that effects child's development. Some time nuclear families provide a favorable climate for the development of children, as they are more closely knit and harmonious than extended families. A huge number of fathers-in-law (72.7%) had 3 - 6 children, while only half percent of spouses (58.2%) had 1 - 3 children. About 89.4% of fathers-in-law and 64.4% of spouses opted for non-technical education, while only 10.6% of fathers-in-law and 35.6% of spouses opted for technical education for their children. Mehmood (1990) conducted a research in Faisalabad city with the sample of 200 females, who have at least one child. He concluded that social class (occupation) proved to be a strong predicted of social mobility. The relation between occupational mobility and average family size was found to be negative. Only 58.1% of fathers-in-law and 88.8% of spouses reported that they preferred medical treatment for the children. Heckman (2000) suggested that children's tastes for education and their expectations about their life chances are shaped by those of their parents.

Results (Table II) revealed that 47.3% of father-in-law and 31.8% of spouse had land, 12.3% of father-in-law and 19.7% of spouse had cash, 24.6% of father-in-law and 36.4% of spouse had home, and only 15.7% of father-in-law and 12.1% of spouse had jewellery. Noble (2005) argues that socioeconomic status (SES) is strongly associated with cognitive ability and achievement during childhood and beyond. Little is known about the developmental relationships between socio-economic status and specific brain system or their associated cognitive functions.

Data (Table III) showed that 60.6% of fathers-in-law and 75% of spouse had saving account, 26.8% of fathers-in-law and 61.3% of spouse had committee, 11.3% of fathers-in-law and 25% of spouse had benevolent fund and G.P. fund because they were government employ, 33.7% of fathers-in-law and 41.4% of spouse had plot for the future saving of children, 19.3% of fathers-in-law and 38.7% of spouse had shops, 70.6% of fathers-in-law and 60% of spouse had property in the form of land. Breen and Goldthrop (1999) revealed that, while merits defined in term of ability and efforts, did play a part in determining individual class destination, the effect of class origin remain strong. Children of less advantaged class origins needed to show substantially more merit than children from more advantaged origin in order to gain similar class position.

Data (Table IV) showed the relationships between income v/s education and saving, education v/s education, occupation v/s nutrition were highly significant. The relationship between income v/s nutrition and recreation, education v/s gender were significant, whereas the remaining were non- significant. Data (Table V) revealed that relationship between income v/s education and saving, education v/s education; occupation v/s nutrition was highly

**Table I. Distribution of respondent's husband and father-in-law according to their social characteristics**

Socio-economic characteristics		Husband		Father-in-law	
		F	%	F	%
Age (in years)	Less than 20	37	23.12	3	1.87
	20-25	109	68.12	79	49.37
	26-30	14	8.75	78	48.75
Education	Illiterate	15	9.4	20	56.3
	Up to metric	85	53.1	50	31.25
	Up to graduation	47	29.37	15	9.4
Family Type	Above Graduation	13	8.12	5	3.12
	Nuclear	72	26.3	26	16.3
	Joint	114	71.3	128	80
Family Size	Extended	4	2.5	6	3.8
	Under 3	93	58.2	27	16.9
	3-6	63	39.4	48	72.7
Type of Education	Above 6	4	2.6	17	10.7
	Technical	57	35.6	17	10.6
	Non-Technical	103	64.4	143	89.4
Treatment	Conventional	18	11.6	67	41.9
	Medical	142	88.8	93	

**Table II. Distribution of respondent's husband and father-in-law according to their property**

Kinds of property	Husband		Father-in-law	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Land	42	31.8	69	47.3
Rupees	26	19.7	18	12.3
Home	48	36.4	36	24.6
Jewellery	16	12.1	23	15.7

**Table III. Distribution of respondent's husband and father-in-law according to the following planning for future saves of children.**

Planning for future saving	Husband		Father-in-law	
	F	Yes %	F	Yes %
Saving	120	75	97	60.6
Committee	98	61.3	43	26.8
Benevolent Fund	40	25.0	18	11.3
G.P Fund	40	25	18	11.3
Plot	66	41.2	54	33.7
Shop	62	38.7	31	19.3
Property	96	60	113	70.6
Policy	24	15	6	3.7
Insurance	40	25	18	11.3
Bonds	49	30.6	22	13.7

significant, while, others were non-significant.

Keeping in view the finding of this study it is suggested that, education at all levels should be declared compulsory. Parents should take keen interest in the activities of the offspring. Free discussion should be encouraged among the children. Parents should not be over ambitious regarding their children. They should not set such goals for children, which are not in harmony with his/her intellectual endowment, capabilities, achievements and interests.

## REFERENCES

- Blau, P.M. and P.L. Duncan, 1967. *The American Occupational Structure*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc. New York, USA
- Breen, R. and J.H. Goldthrope, 1999. Class inequality and meritocracy. *British J. Social Mar. European University Institute, Florence*, 50: 1-27
- Heckman, J.J., 2000. Policies to Foster Human Capital. *Research in Economics*, 54: 3-56
- Judith, R.H., 2001. *Theory of Nature Assumption*. [www.fmag.unict.it/annali/abstracts-stu/favara.html](http://www.fmag.unict.it/annali/abstracts-stu/favara.html)

**Table IV. Association between socio-economic characteristics of husband by child development**

Husband	$\chi^2$	d.f.	$\alpha$	$\gamma$
1 Income v/s nutrition.	11.515	2	.003**	-.403
2 Income v/s education.	18.379	2	.000**	-.536
3 Education v/s education	11.576	3	.009**	-.429
4 Income v/s recreation.	6.271	2	.043*	-.424
5 Income v/s saving	9.880	2	.007**	-.378
6 Education v/s gender	6.655	1	.010*	-.662
7 Family type v/s nutrition.	.398	1	.528	.168
8 Income v/s treatment	2.126	2	.345	.315
9 Education. v/s behavior.	7.851	6	.245	-.129
10 Family size v/s nutrition.	3.263	2	.196	.268
11 Family type v/s Islam	.386	2	.824	-.106
12 Education v/s marriage decision	1.230	1	.267	.507

\* = significant, \*\* = highly significant.

**Table V. Association between socio-economic characteristics of father-in-law by child development**

Father-in-law	$\chi^2$	d.f.	$\alpha$	$\gamma$
1 Income v/s nutrition.	3.919	2	.141	-.78
2 Income v/s education.	9.050	2	.001**	-.573
3 Education v/s education	9.865	2	.007**	-.440
4 Income v/s recreation.	.963	2	.618	-.206
5 Income v/s saving	11.482	2	.003**	-.1551
6 Education v/s gender	3.686	1	.055*	-.313
7 Family type v/s nutrition.	.232	1	.630	-1.00
8 Income v/s treatment	1.588	2	.452	-.075
9 Education. v/s behavior.	.490	2	.783	.995
10 Family size v/s nutrition.	1.097	2	.578	.120
11 Family type v/s Islam	2.750	2	.253	.133
12 Education v/s marriage decision	2.484	1	.115	.377

\* = significant, \*\* = highly significant

- Kohn, M.I., C. Naoi, C. Schoenbach, D. Schooler and K.M. Sclomczynski, 1990. Position in the class structure and psychological functioning in the United States, Japan and Poland. *American J. Sociol.*, 95: 964-1008
- Lasker, G.W. and T. Masico, 1989. Effect of social class differences and social mobility on growth in height, weight and body mass". *Ann. Hum. Biol.*, 16: 1-8. Department of Entomology, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan
- Mann, M., 1985. *Machmillan Student Encyclopedia of Sociology*. T. Pest by leaper and Gard Ltd., Bristol, England
- Mckee, J.B., 1969. *Introduction to Sociology*. Hot Rinchar and Winston, Inc. New York, USA
- Mehmood, M., 1990. Social mobility and fertility. An un-published M.Sc. Thesis, Department Of Rural Sociology University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan
- Nachimias, D. and C. Nachimias, 1992. *Research Methods in Social Sciences*. 4<sup>th</sup> edition, Pp: 386-9. New York, St. Martin Press
- Noble, K.G., M.F. Norman and M.J. Farah, 2005. Neurocognitive correlates of socio economic status in kindergarten children. *Sackler Institute for Developmental Psychobiology*, 8: 74-87
- Paul, G., H. Susan and M. Stephen, 1998. *Child Development and Family Income*. Forthcoming Joseph Rowntree Foundation Report
- Rehman, S., 1993. Intergenerational social mobility and fertility. M.Sc. Thesis, Department of Rural Sociology, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan
- Scheffler, C., K. Ketelhut and U. Morgenstern, 2004. "Physical and motor development of children with different social origion". *An Article in German Dec.*, 62: 421-8
- Sorokin, P.A., 1964. *Social and Cultural Mobility*, Pp: 495-546. London; The free press of Glencoe
- Susan, D. and P. Witt, 2002. *Family Hope*. [www.familykenya.com/familyhope/personality.html](http://www.familykenya.com/familyhope/personality.html)
- Wikipedia, 2003. *The Free Encyclopedia*. En, wikipedia. Org/wiki/child-development
- Zeitlin, M.F. and R. Megawangi, 1995. *Strengthening the Family Implication for International Development*. Tokyo: United Nation University Press

(Received 03 September 2005; Accepted 18 May 2006)