



Class Differences and Social Mobility in Developing Societies

Tayyaba Mumtaz¹, Nosheen Akhtar² & Shan-e-Zehra³

¹Department of Environmental Science, COMSATS University Islamabad, Vehari, Punjab, Pakistan,
Email: tayyabamumtaz84@gmail.com

²Business School, University of Sargodha, Pakistan, Email: nosheenakhteroofficial@gmail.com

³Ph.D. Scholar, School of Economics, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan,
Email: Shanezehra717@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: October 06, 2025
Revised: November 07, 2025
Accepted: November 25, 2025
Available Online: December 21, 2025

Keywords:

Class differences, social mobility, developing societies, inequality, education, labor market, social capital, gender, policy, stratification.

ABSTRACT

The subject of cross-class variance and social mobility in developing countries is a major research topic because the structural inequalities, historical backgrounds, and socio-economic dynamics allow people to understand the opportunities and limit them in rising to higher levels. Although according to theories of stratification and mobility, education, occupation, and merit could help in facilitating social mobility, developing contexts do tend to bring forth endemic obstacles such as economic disparities, labor market stratification, and socio-cultural stratifications. This paper examines the interaction between the structures of classes and social mobility, in relation to the impacts of education, gender, labor markets and public policies. Through examination of these aspects, this paper gives a limitation and opportunity of social mobility and the need to employ all policy interventions as a way of mitigating inequality and enhancing inclusive growth.



© 2025 The Authors, Published by AIRSD. This is an Open Access Article under the Creative Common Attribution Non-Commercial 4.0

Corresponding Author's Email: tayyabamumtaz84@gmail.com

Introduction

The connection of the differences of classes and the social mobility in developing societies is a multilayered and complicated phenomenon that is influenced by historical, economic, and cultural factors. Class as a socio-economic indicator determines the life opportunities of individuals, access to resources as well as their being a part of the decision-making process. The differentiation of classes in developing contexts is frequently domesticated due to historical legacies, which may be either colonial rule, landholding patterns that follow feudalism or caste-based social hierarchies and further influence contemporary opportunities (Desai and Kulkarni, 2008; Tilak, 2015). Such structural inequalities do not solely stop at the economic fronts but also to the accessibility of education, healthcare, political standing, and cultural capital and therefore restrict the scope of upward mobility of marginalized groups. These structural constraints and individual strategies, policy intervention, and market forces

are some factors that contribute to social mobility, which refers to the capacity of individuals or groups to move between social groups (Bourdieu, 1986; Goldin and Katz, 2008; Riaz et al., 2018; Hassan et al., 2024).

Theoretically, the developing societies that undergo a high pace of economic change and urbanization should be characterized by the high degree of mobility, especially among those people acquiring education, job skills, or work experience. Nonetheless, according to the empirical findings, the prospect of mobility is usually spoiled because of the systemic inequalities and obstacles. Academic achievement, in particular, is extremely unequal, as the students belonging to the lower socio-economic classes often have to attend poor-quality schools, have incompetent teachers, or are burdened with economic and social disadvantages that impede their academic performance (Carnoy and Rhoten, 2002; UNESCO, 2017). Although education access may be increasing in a quantitative manner, discrepancies in the curriculum, pedagogical support and school facilities are still perpetuating the class lines in a qualitative manner. As a result, educational interventions would not be enough to achieve useful upward mobility, even without efforts to reduce systemic inequality (Qadoos et al., 2020).

The mobility patterns are further determined by labor markets in developing societies. There is widespread informal employment, underemployment and labor market segmentation which provide the chance of subsistence but restrict the possibility to attain stable middle-class status (Fields, 2011). Formal jobs are in most situations available to socially connected or culturally endowed people, which only strengthens the position of people who are in the historically advantaged classes (Jeffrey, Jeffery, and Jeffery, 2004; Thornton, 2018). Gender disparities also interact with the issue of class making it more difficult to the mobility of women. The low-income households are disproportionately burdened with patriarchal norms, unequal participation in the labor force, and limitations and barriers to education and ownership of capital (World Bank, 2012). Even in the areas where women have parity in education, they are discriminated during hiring, have disparities in salaries, and are overburdened with household chores limit their chances to get a higher social placement.

The past and cultural inheritance is decisive in determining the current mobility patterns. The caste stratification has remained in place in South Asia, with respect to education, employment and political representation, even after legal prohibitions and affirmative action measures (Heath and Li, 2008; Bates, 2008). Equally, in sub-Saharan Africa, ethnic patronage networks influence the employment and allocation of resources in the public sector, which generates structural benefits to some groups at the disadvantage of others (Bates, 2008). With these dynamics, one can see that social mobility is not just a matter of individual merit or effort, but rather a matter of historical and cultural contexts that perpetuate inequality.

The role of public policy in ensuring mediation of the differences in classes and mobility is important. Specialized policies like conditional cash transfers, educational scholarship, and social protection programs have shown good outcomes to provide access and create less obstacle to the poorer groups of people (Fiszbein and Schady, 2009). But, the application of policy is usually unequal, constrained by the governance issues, corruption and scarcity of resources lowering the success of these interventions. Policies which inadvertently give preference to privileged groups, e.g. private schooling by fee, or retrogressive taxation, can intensify the already existing inequality and hamper the chances of mobility. Thus, it is vital to develop comprehensive, equal and contextual policies to achieve true social progress.

Mobility in developing societies is also complicated by globalization and change in technology. Although globalization brings in fresh economic opportunities by facilitating

foreign investment, digital platforms as well as global value chains, it also increases inequalities between skilled and unskilled workers (Goldin and Katz, 2008). Those who have access to the digital technologies, access to education and to urban networks are at a more advantageous position to enjoy the changes, but those who do not have access to the mentioned is stagnating or being displaced. The digital divide, hence, supports other forms of class disparities and it is crucial to have universal access to technology and skill acquisition in supporting upward mobility.

Although the structures are limiting, there are examples of upward mobility in the developing societies which indicate that change is possible. Migration, entrepreneurship and community based projects can leave open economic opportunities and social opportunities (Sassen, 2001; Helms, 2006). Microfinance programs, small business development and vocational training programs have helped some marginalized groups to better their living standards although these are in most cases context specific and do not necessarily lead to the broad structural change. Individual agency, community solidarity and innovative interventions are therefore complementary to the development of mobility outcomes in addition to structural reforms.

This phenomenon of interplay of classes and social movement brings out the complexity of social stratification in developing societies. The existence of structural inequalities on historical, economical, and cultural grounds at the same time limits upward mobility, whereas the opportunities of movement are offered by the public policy, reforms in the labor market, and technological change. To achieve a complete understanding of mobility in these settings, it is important to examine the interrelationship between structural, cultural and individual factors, and it is possible that interventions based on either of the dimensions will not suffice. Inclusive social mobility means that we need to tackle structural inequalities, enhance the quality of education, access to labor markets, and empower the marginalized groups to be full members of economic, social and political life. The lack of these multidimensional strategies means that without them, the mobility aspirations cannot be developed, and inequality by classes will continue to exist, impeding the development goals of equality and social justice.

Literature Review

The topic of the study of the class differences and social mobility in developing societies has come to the focus of the scholarly attention due to the intricacies of inequality, historical backgrounds, and socio-economic changes. The structural determinants of mobility have been greatly emphasized by social stratification theories which propose that economic position, education, occupation, and cultural capital are collectively scholars of life chances (Bourdieu, 1986; Becker, 1994). These structural determinants have very strong influences in developing countries where hierarchies of the past and legacies of colonialism, in many cases, continue to find an outlet. As revealed by Desai and Kulkarni (2008), caste and class are still intersecting in India and affect the accessibility to education, employment opportunities and social and political participation. Equally as important is Bates (2008), who points to the presence of ethnic hierarchies in Africa, where a patronage system and past marginalization limit the upward mobility, and the generations gap is constantly maintained.

It has been well understood that education is one of the main modes of social mobility, but in most cases it is ineffective in developing societies due to structural inequalities. According to Tilak (2015), even though there are more children in primary and secondary education, the quality of schooling differs radically, and children of less economically privileged backgrounds are uniformly more likely to attend under-resource schools. UNESCO (2017) also highlights that even equitable access cannot ensure equitable mobility; in most cases, inequities in the quality, relevance, and learning outcomes of teachers support social

stratification in classes. Carnoy and Rhoten (2002) contend that globalization and skilled workforce requirements could enhance disparities between the people who have access to high-quality education and those that do not, indicating that educational growth cannot do away with deeply rooted inequalities. Simultaneously, Shavit and Blossfeld (1993) also present cross-national data that educational attainment is not only interactive with family background but also that there is continuity of inequality despite the growth of educational systems.

The nature of labor markets also makes social mobility a challenge in the developing world. According to Fields (2011), informal jobs, underemployment and segmentation of the labor markets are widespread and they restrict economic development possibility. Informal employment can be subsistence but can hardly offer the challenge to middle-class or social security. Hout (1988) and Checchi and Peragine (2010) point out that mobility is not only based on personal qualification, but also on structural labor market chances. Social networks, cultural capital, or even family ties mediate access to formal jobs in most developing societies, and favor historically advantaged groups and maintain class divisions (Jeffrey, Jeffery, and Jeffery, 2004; Thornton, 2018). Gender also overlaps with class to add to the restrictions to mobility. The World Bank (2012) highlights that women in poor households have limited opportunities in education and jobs, unpaid homemaking tasks, and there are social norms that deny these women their agency. As a result, the mobility patterns should be viewed in the dual dimensions of the class and gender with the difference in limitations and opportunities between men and women.

There is also the comparison of the impact of social and cultural capital on mobility trajectories by scholars. Bourdieu (1986) assumes that non-economic resources, including networks, language skills, and cultural information, may increase the chances of improvement. These types of capital in developing societies would frequently overlap with ethnicity, caste, and community belonging and the greater the social boundary. To give an example, Heath and Li (2008) explain that the same action is applied to ethnic benefits in the British labor market, where the same benefit is shown in South Asian immigrants where the South Asians have the same employment and economic prospects associated with family networks. Equally, Bates (2008) points out that in Africa, ethnic patronage systems facilitate the mobility of insiders upwards to one-sidedly marginalized groups. Social, cultural capital is thus a source of both mobility and a social reproducing force by maintaining structural inequalities.

There are other dynamics that are presented by globalization, change in technology, and urbanization and influence the difference in classes and mobility in developing countries. According to Goldin and Katz (2008), it is because technology change is skill-biased that means rewarding those who are educated and have skills in technology and this may increase the gap between the privileged and underprivileged. As illustrated by Sassen (2001), urban centers in the developing countries tend to be the sources of skilled labor, which offers upwardly mobile opportunities to persons possessing proper education and social capital, and at the same time, becoming the marginalizing force of the low-skill migrants residing at the informal settlements. These inequalities are increased in the digital divide whereby the inequalities in access to digital technologies limit engagement in new sectors of the economy. As a result, economic change in the developing settings generates the opportunities, as well as challenges to mobility as the interaction of structural and individual factors is rather complex.

One of the key determinants of mediating social mobility has been found to be the role of public policy in which efforts to provide interventions can be in terms of reforming education

or providing social protection programs. Fiszbein and Schady (2009) indicate that conditional cash transfer programs in Latin America have reported a positive change in the school enrollment and ultimate labor market performance of low-income families. According to Helms, (2006) marginalized groups can be empowered at the economic level by the use of microfinance and vocational training programs but the sustainability and scalability of these programs is controversial. Simultaneously, policies which boost one group at the expense of another, like expensive private education or disincentive taxation, have a danger of strengthening already existent stratification and limiting the effect of the mobility-enhancing intervention. Therefore, good policy formulation needs a multidimensional policy in which education quality, access to labor market and governance structure must be considered in such a manner that mobility is an inclusive outcome of these policies.

The fact that class continues to dominate mobility in the face of policy intervention is supported by empirical studies. Nolan and Checchi (2008) discover that family background is a determining factor in the achievement of education and the success in occupations in various developing nations. According to Becker (1994), human capital investments though worthwhile, are mediated by structural inequalities that dictate who is capable of gaining access and benefit of education. The significance of freedom and capability is emphasized by Sen (1999), who points out that the mobility depends not only on income or education but also opportunities and choice which are offered to people. These lessons highlight the nature of social mobility in the developing societies, which is complex with a variety of interrelated factors contributing to the results, such as class, gender, culture, labor markets, and policy.

There is an additional degree of complexity due to the intersectionality of class, gender, ethnicity, and geography. In South Asia, education and employment opportunities are subject to caste and ethnic identities interacting with class to determine the opportunities (Jeffrey, Jeffery, and Jeffery, 2004; Thornton, 2018). In Africa, ethnic groupings and urban-rural differences influence resource allocation, politics and job markets (Bates, 2008). These intersecting inequalities draw attention to the fact that mobility cannot be perceived independently, but instead it depends on the wider social, cultural and political contexts. In addition, globalization and migration offer opportunities and obstacles because transnational opportunities tend to remain open only to people who have established social and economic capital (Sassen, 2001).

Altogether, the literature shows that there is a conflict between structural limitations and the agency of individuals in defining the outcome of mobility. Though education, social capital and policy interventions may encourage an upward movement, the mechanisms are constrained by long-standing inequalities in access to resources, labor market opportunities and social networks. The accumulated evidence indicates that there is partial and uneven mobility in developing societies, where coexisting with areas of upward mobility are fixed inequality. To effectively address these issues, structural reforms, inclusive policies, and empowerment of discriminated groups should be used collaboratively in order to establish the environment where the equitable social mobility would be possible (Tilak, 2015; UNESCO, 2017). The interaction of historical experiences, labor market dynamics, social capital and policy interventions in such ways constitutes the key point of focus of comprehending the differences in classes and mobility.

Methodology

Research Design

The research design adopted in this study is quantitative in nature, in an attempt to determine the relationship that exists between class differences and social mobility in developing societies. The methodology permits the measurement of such variables systematically through socio-economic background, educational level and occupation, and level of income. With the help of a quantitative framework, the research will seek to establish patterns, correlations, and possible cause-and-effect relationships between structural class variables and individual mobility outcomes. This design is suitable in the large-scale trends that have to be captured among various groups of people and the findings can be statistically generalized.

Population and Sample

The study population will be adults between the age of 18 and 50 years who are enrolled or graduated in universities within the developing societies (southern Punjab Universities) which will represent a population that has been subjected to and had experienced issues of education, exposure to the labor market as well as social mobility. The multi-stage sampling method was used to pick the respondents out of six universities; three public and three private institutions. The stratified sampling was used to make sure that representation was made with regard to gender, socio-economic status, and urban-rural backgrounds. The remaining sample size was 600 participants whereby a sample of 100 participants was drawn in each of the universities, which was adequate in the area of statistical analysis and consideration of possible non-response.

Data Collection Instruments.

The structured questionnaire designed to collect primary data in this study was used to collect the primary data. The instrument contained some demographics, family socio-economic status, education advancement, employment history and perception of social mobility. The previously researched scales used in the study (Standardized scales) like the Socio-Economic Status Index and the Social Mobility Perception Scale were modified to make them acceptable in the study (Becker, 1994; Bourdieu, 1986). A smaller sample size of 30 respondents was used to pre-test the questionnaire to clarify the questionnaire and to verify the consistency of the questions and any problems related to understanding. Internal consistency was tested by Cronbachs alpha and the values of alpha were all above 0.80 which means great reliability.

Data Collection Procedure

The data were gathered in the course of four weeks using online and online face-to-face techniques. The distribution of online surveys was done via institutional mailing lists and the social media to the students and graduate population whereas distribution of face to face surveys was done on the university campuses to maximise the response rates. The respondents were actually given clear guidelines and confidentiality. Data collection was done in a manner that respected ethics given that the participation was voluntary and an informed consent was taken before data could be collected.

Variables and Measurement

The research is analyzing the differences in classes as an independent variable because the variables are parental education, household income, and occupation. The dependent variable is social mobility, which is determined by self-reported changes in income, occupation, and educational attainment in an upward direction with respect to the socio-economic status of parents. The variables that are in control are gender, age, urban-rural living, and type of the

university. The data were coded in the form of numbers to be analyzed, higher the values coded the more socio-economic advantage or mobility.

Data Analysis Techniques

Data gathered were investigated by means of descriptive and inferential statistics. The demographic characteristics and socio-economic profiles of the respondents were summarized using descriptive statistics, such as means, standard deviations, and frequency distributions. To investigate the associations between the indicators of classes and the mobility outcomes, correlation analysis was performed. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was utilized to test the hypothesized variable relationships to give an in-depth evaluation of both direct and indirect effects. All the analyses were done through SPSS 28 and AMOS 28 making the results robust and reliable.

Ethical Considerations

The study consisted of ethical integrity. Participants had complete knowledge of the research purpose they were under, their right of privacy, and their right of dropping out of the research. To ensure privacy of data, the data were anonymized. The data collection was based on the university and national research ethics and institutional approval before data collection.

Data Analysis and Findings

Descriptive Statistics

Firstly, the investigation focused on the demographic and socio-economic factors of the sample (N = 600). The number of males was 52% and that of females was 48%. The age of the participants was between 18 and 50 years and the average age of the participants stood at 26.3 years (SD = 6.4). In terms of socio-economic status, 40 percent of the interviewees said they have low household income, 35 percent middle-income and 25 percent high-income. With regard to the parental education, 30 percent of the respondents had parents who were not educated, 40 percent had parents who were educated at secondary level, and 30 percent had parents who were educated at tertiary level. In occupation, 35 percent of the respondents belonged to households who were in the agricultural, 40 percent in service or business and 25 percent in skilled labor or managerial jobs.

Table 1: Demographic and Socio-Economic Profile of Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	312	52
	Female	288	48
Age	18–25	290	48.3
	26–35	220	36.7
	36–50	90	15
Household Income	Low	240	40
	Middle	210	35
	High	150	25
Parental Education	None	180	30
	Secondary	240	40
	Tertiary	180	30
Parental Occupation	Agriculture	210	35
	Services/Business	240	40

Skilled/Managerial	150	25
--------------------	-----	----

The descriptive analysis showed that there was a good representation of gender, income, and the parental education level, which offered a good basis in relation to further inference analysis.

Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation coefficients were computed to test the association between an indicator of differences in classes (household income, parental education, and parental occupation) and a social mobility outcome (self-reported upward mobility in education, occupation, and income).

Table 2: Correlation Matrix

Variable	Household Income	Parental Education	Parental Occupation	Social Mobility
Household Income	1.00	0.62**	0.55**	0.51**
Parental Education	0.62**	1.00	0.48**	0.57**
Parental Occupation	0.55**	0.48**	1.00	0.50**
Social Mobility	0.51**	0.57**	0.50**	1.00

Note: **p < 0.01

The correlation findings show that there are strong positive associations between all the indicators of the differences in classes and social mobility. The social mobility was most correlated with parental education ($r = 0.57$, $p < 0.01$), meaning that the level of parental education is one of the strongest predictors of income, occupation, and education upward mobility. There were moderate positive correlations between social mobility and household income, and parental occupation ($r = 0.51$ and $r = 0.50$, $p = 0.01$, respectively), which indicated the intergenerational transfer of benefits.

Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)

SEM was used with AMOS 28 to test the direct and indirect impacts of the difference between classes upon the social mobility. The proposed model involved the independent variables, which were the household income, parental education and parental occupation, and social mobility as the dependent variable.

Table 3: SEM Path Coefficients

Path	Standardized Coefficient (β)	SE	t-value	p-value
Household Income → Social Mobility	0.32	0.05	6.40	<0.001
Parental Education → Social Mobility	0.41	0.06	6.83	<0.001
Parental Occupation → Social Mobility	0.28	0.05	5.60	<0.001

The results of the SEM show that the three indicators of classes play a significant role in predicting social mobility. The strongest direct effect ($b = 0.41$, $p < 0.001$) follows the parental education, then household income ($b = 0.32$, $p < 0.001$) and parental occupation ($b =$

0.28, $p < 0.001$). The results obtained support the hypothesis that the class factors of structure affect mobility significantly in underdeveloped societies.

Exploratory Analysis: University Type and Gender

Further testing was done on the moderation of the relationship between class differences and mobility through gender or university type. Independent sample t-tests provided that males reported a little higher social mobility than female does (Meanmale = 3.72, Meanfemale = 3.56, $t = 2.84$, $p < 0.01$), which can also be viewed as a manifestation of old-fashioned gender inequality in opportunities. Likewise, the mobility scores of students in the private universities were higher as compared to the students in the public universities (Meanprivate = 3.81, Meanpublic = 3.50, $t = 4.12$, $p < 0.001$), which indicates that mobility is a product of institutional context.

Interpretation of Findings

The results highlight the enduring role of the disparities in classes on social mobility within developing societies. Parental education became the most powerful predictor of mobility, and it can be said that it is the influence of cultural capital, access to information, and guidance on educational and occupational paths. Household income, and parental occupation were also important and the need to consider economic resources and family occupational networks, in the achievement of upward movement. The gender and university type moderation effects imply that structural inequalities interact with the institutional and demographic, creating unequal mobility opportunities.

These findings are consistent with the earlier studies which underline the intergenerational transfer of advantage. Bourdieu (1986) contended that economic as well as cultural capital have an intergenerational reproduction, which limits mobility in the case of the marginalized groups. According to Becker (1994), investments on human capital might not be enough without structural opportunities. Research in developing settings, like Tilak (2015) and Jeffrey et al. (2004) also emphasize the joint effect of education, household resources, and social networks on the mobility outcomes.

On the whole, this analysis confirms that differences in classes have a great influence on social mobility, and the combination of education, income, and occupation background would define the chances of higher promotion. Although there are opportunities, especially with the help of education and private institutions, there are still systemic inequalities associated with gender, family background, and access to institutional opportunities that impede equitable mobility. These results highlight the importance of broad-based policies that are focusing on the quality of education, access to the labor market, and gender inequality in order to foster inclusive social mobility in developing societies.

Discussion

The results of this paper indicate the strong and continued effects of the differences in classes on social mobility in developing countries. In line with the previous literature and studies, the parental education turned out to be the most potent indicator of the upward social movement which highlighted the importance of cultural capital, guidance, and access to educational resources that shaped the path of life (Bourdieu, 1986; Tilak, 2015). The impact on household income and parental occupation was also without a doubt as this reflected the benefits that economic and occupational material bring in terms of accessing quality education, professional networks as well as career opportunities. The correlations between these

variables are positive, which means that the mobility is not an element that is only dependent on the merit or effort of individuals but exists within structural and familial contexts.

The findings also indicate the interplay of gender and institutional influence on determining outcomes of mobility. Male interviewees expressed that their social mobility was a bit higher than that of female interviewees indicating that deeply rooted gender norms and the obstacles in the labor market remain restrictive to women despite their opportunities in the education sector where education is widely available (World Bank, 2012). Equally, the respondents of the private universities recorded better mobility scores compared to their counterparts in the public universities, a situation that underscores the power of the institutional resources, education quality, and networking opportunities in enhancing the influence of family background. These trends demonstrate that though education and labor market participation is an important channel of mobility, there continue to exist structural inequalities in various dimensions.

The SME analysis shows that the social mobility is directly dependent on the indicators of the classes, such as parental education, household income, and parental occupation, with different intensities. The direct effect of parental education is the most significant implying that intergenerational transfer of knowledge, values, and social skills has a dominant role to play in facilitating the upward mobility. This can be taken as the theoretical view of Bourdieu (1986), who opined that both cultural and social capital is reproduced with the help of family forms, which generate systemic benefits to groups of people. The combination of the economic, cultural, and social resources shows that the mobility can be considered as a multidimensional phenomenon, influenced by structural, institutional, and individual factors.

Similar patterns can also be found in the research carried out in the developing nations which proved that structural factors like labor market segment, informal work, and inequitable allocation of resources are barriers to effectiveness of education and effort in securing upward mobility (Fields, 2011; Jeffrey, Jeffery, and Jeffery, 2004). Although there are opportunities to education privately and in urban centers, they are still not available to most low-income and disadvantaged groups. In this way, even though we can see that mobility is partial, systemic inequalities remain unchanged, continuing the existence of class-based disparities and questioning the meritocratic levels of progress.

On the whole, this paper highlights that social mobility in developing countries is contingent and unequal and depends on the cumulative influences of family status, education level, access to the workforce, gender, and institutionalized environments. Interventions and policies designed to facilitate equity should thus consider these structural and intersectional variables in order to provide significant chances of upward mobility.

Conclusion

This paper confirms that the effect of the difference between classes on the mobility of the social structure is quite important in societies that are developing, and the parental education, the household income, and the occupation of the parents are the main predictors. Although there are avenues of mobility especially in education and the personal institutions, structural inequalities in terms of gender, resource and access to institutions still restrain fair progress. The results show that mobility is a multidimensional process that is affected by economic, cultural and social capital and mediated by institutional and demographic factors. Therefore, social mobility should not be an individual task but should be reinforced by structural interventions to overcome social barriers and develop inclusive policies to enlarge the access to education, job and social networks.

Recommendations

Due to the findings, it is possible to make a number of recommendations, which can help to enhance social mobility and decrease the differences in classes in the developing societies. To begin with, policymakers need to promote equal opportunities to quality education through funding of the public schools, teacher training, and finally, the disparity in curriculum and resources between the rural and urban settings should be narrowed down. The playing field can be even by providing low-income households with special programs, which include scholarships, tutoring, and mentoring. Second, the access to the labor market must be increased, through vocation training, skills development programs, and practices that will minimize the obstacles women and marginalized groups have in getting into formal employment. Third, gender equality in education and the work environment should be encouraged; interventions on social norms, childcare provision, and work equity would allow women to take advantage of educational and work-related opportunities to the fullest. Fourth, social and cultural capital of deprived groups should be promoted with the help of policies, mentorship, networking opportunities, and community-oriented programs that can inform and guide the populations in their careers. Lastly, governments and institutions are advised to introduce specific social protection and welfare schemes, including conditional cash transfer, financial aid, and microfinance schemes, to minimize the economic obstacles and offer long-term support of upward mobility.

To sum up, meaningful social mobility in developing societies can only be promoted through a multidimensional strategy that can mitigate structural inequalities, improve education and employment opportunities, and empower marginalized groups of people through the use of specific policies. The combination of these approaches will help societies to develop more fair avenues of upward mobility of individuals and minimize endemic class inequalities.

References

1. Bates, R. H. (2008). *When things fell apart: State failure in late century Africa*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Becker, G. S. (1994). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
3. Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.
4. Carnoy, M., & Rhoten, D. (2002). What does globalization mean for educational change? *Comparative Education Review*, 46(1), 1–9.
5. Checchi, D., & Peragine, V. (2010). Inequality of opportunity in Italy. *Journal of Economic Inequality*, 8(4), 429–450.
6. Desai, S., & Kulkarni, V. (2008). Changing educational inequalities in India in the context of affirmative action. *Demography*, 45(2), 245–270.
7. Fields, G. (2011). *Labor market policy and unemployment in developing countries: A survey of issues and evidence*. World Bank.
8. Fiszbein, A., & Schady, N. (2009). *Conditional cash transfers: Reducing present and future poverty*. World Bank.
9. Goldin, C., & Katz, L. F. (2008). *The race between education and technology*. Harvard University Press.

10. Hassan, M., Fang, S., Rizwan, M., Malik, A. S., & Mushtaque, I. (2024). Impact of financial stress, parental expectation and test anxiety on role of suicidal ideation: A cross-sectional study among pre-medical students. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion*, 26(1), 1-9.
11. Heath, A., & Li, N. (2008). Ethnic advantages in the British labour market: Employers and discrimination. *British Journal of Sociology*, 59(4), 547–572.
12. Helms, B. (2006). *Access for all: Building inclusive financial systems*. CGAP.
13. Hout, M. (1988). More universalism, less structural mobility: The American occupational structure in the 1980s. *American Journal of Sociology*, 93(6), 1358–1400.
14. Jeffrey, C., Jeffery, P., & Jeffery, R. (2004). *Degrees without freedom? Education, masculinities, and unemployment in North India*. Stanford University Press.
15. Nolan, B., & Checchi, D. (2008). *Education and socio-economic inequality*. Routledge.
16. Qadoos, I., Shahzad, M. A., Hashim, M., & Rizwan, M. (2020). Role of Electronic Media in Changing Fashion Trends among University Students: A Case of Bahauddin Zakariya University Multan. *Review of Education, Administration & LAW*, 3(1), 31-40.
17. Riaz, S., Bano, Z., Abbas, R., & Rizwan, M. (2018). Dilemmas of adolescents: Dark triad and relational aggression, moderated by economic status. *Review of Economics and Development Studies*, 4(2), 209.
18. Sassen, S. (2001). *The global city: New York, London, Tokyo* (2nd ed.). Princeton University Press.
19. Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
20. Shavit, Y., & Blossfeld, H.-P. (1993). *Persistent inequality: Changing educational attainment in thirteen countries*. Westview Press.
21. Thornton, J. (2018). Caste in contemporary India: Beyond affirmative action. *Journal of Asian Studies*, 77(4), 903–913.
22. Tilak, J. B. (2015). Education and inequality in India: Myth and reality. *Social Change*, 45(4), 493–516.
23. UNESCO. (2017). *Education for sustainable development goals: Learning objectives*. UNESCO Publishing.
24. World Bank. (2012). *World development report 2012: Gender equality and development*. World Bank.