



Stratification in the World System

Patrick D. Nolan

Current Anthropology, Volume 23, Issue 2 (Apr., 1982), 193-194.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0011-3204%28198204%2923%3A2%3C193%3ASITWS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-M>

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

Current Anthropology is published by The University of Chicago Press. Please contact the publisher for further permissions regarding the use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html>.

Current Anthropology

©1982 The University of Chicago Press

JSTOR and the JSTOR logo are trademarks of JSTOR, and are Registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. For more information on JSTOR contact jstor-info@umich.edu.

©2002 JSTOR

RESEARCH CONCLUSIONS¹

[The Editor welcomes short statements—normally from 300 to 1,000 words—of research results and conclusions. Such statements should not include detailed supporting data, but should make clear reference to the location of such data (published and unpublished) so that interested readers may refer to the material. Sentences should be specific rather than vague. Abstracts of these may be included, provided they present conclusions rather than only describe what was done. The date of submission will be included, as well as the address of the contributor, so that colleagues may correspond.—EDITOR.]

Stratification in the World System

by PATRICK D. NOLAN

Department of Sociology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C. 29208, U.S.A. 4 VIII 81

According to world-system theory (Wallerstein 1974), the nations of the world comprise a three-level stratification system. Nations occupying different levels in this system play different roles in the "world division of labor" and consequently manifest very different structures and rates of social and economic development (e.g., Wallerstein 1974, Galtung 1971, Chase-Dunn 1975, Rubinson 1976, Chirot 1977). International economic (and social) interactions reflect the unequal power and influence of these statuses and consequently are structured in such a way that economic benefits of trade and exchange accrue disproportionately to the higher-status nations (Galtung 1971, Chase-Dunn 1975). Economic gains flow largely from the lower-status nations (the "periphery") to the dominant ("core") ones. Those of intermediate status often act as "middlemen" or buffers between them (Hopkins and Wallerstein 1977).

The theory predicts, therefore, that economic differences between nations will be maintained, and perhaps increased, through economic interaction over time. Further, the greater wealth and more developed economy of high-status nations allow a more egalitarian distribution of income, while in lower-status nations income is expected to be much more unequally distributed. In noncore nations a relatively large proportion of income is expected to be concentrated in the upper segments

¹ Permission to reprint items in this section may be obtained only from their authors.

of the income distribution, whereas larger shares of income are expected to accrue to the middle-income levels of core nations (Chase-Dunn 1975, Rubinson 1976).

An analysis of four international networks of interaction—trade relations, the sending of diplomats, treaty memberships, and military interventions—has recently provided a suggestive identification of the hypothesized three-level structure, as well as a means of determining the status of individual nations (Snyder and Kick 1979). This analysis allows the empirical assessment of three world-system hypotheses:² (1) that relative levels of wealth and development correspond to the hypothesized three-level stratification system, (2) that relative rates of economic growth maintain (or recreate) these inequities in wealth and development, and (3) that levels of income inequality within nations display the hypothesized inverse relationship to status. Economic and development data from the World Bank (1980) and Taylor and Hudson (1973) can be used to evaluate the first two hypotheses, and data on household income distribution reported by Paukert (1973) can be used to evaluate the third.

Measures of relative wealth and development evidence the predicted rank ordering (table 1).³ It should be emphasized that this is not a simple "development" tautology. Per capita wealth and development were not among the criteria used to classify nations. Average annual rates of per capita economic growth (1960–70) evidence the same rank ordering, suggesting that net economic growth rates maintain and recreate initial levels of economic inequality between nations. Finally, there is evidence that intranational income inequality is inversely related to status in the world economy. Both measures of inequality indicate that there is least inequality in the core nations and successively higher levels of inequality in the semi-periphery and periphery nations.

These findings are, therefore, consistent with the three hypotheses examined and add to the plausibility of world-system theory. We have not examined the mechanisms and processes that effect these observed differences, however, and have not determined to what extent these features of nations and national development are "causes" or "consequences" of

² Other tests of these hypotheses have not used a discrete three-level measure of status (as suggested by the theoretical concept) and have recently been criticized as statistically and methodologically suspect (Weede 1980, Jackman 1980).

³ Data upon which the status determination is based (Snyder and Kick 1979) are ca. 1965, as are the Paukert (1973) data.

TABLE 1

WEALTH, DEVELOPMENT, ECONOMIC GROWTH, AND INEQUALITY BY STATUS IN WORLD SYSTEM

	STATUS OF NATION			\bar{X}	<i>F</i>	<i>R</i> ²	<i>P</i> ^a
	High	Middle	Low				
Energy consumption per capita 1965 (Kg coal equivalent)	3,524.10 (21)	1,250.24 (29)	669.78 (65)	1,337.38 (115)	20.932	.272	.001
GDP per capita 1965 (U.S.\$)	1,585.15 (13)	477.38 (13)	258.45 (22)	677.06 (48)	32.947	.594	.001
GNP per capita 1977 (U.S.\$)	6,517.62 (21)	1,757.14 (21)	962.96 (54)	2,351.77 (96)	61.698	.570	.001
GNP per capita growth rate 1960–70	4.42 (21)	3.63 (21)	1.86 (53)	2.82 (95)	17.941	.281	.001
Gini index of income inequality 196540 (13)	.43 (13)	.49 (22)	.45 (48)	4.643	.171	.015
Equalization percent measure of income inequality 1965	29.54 (13)	32.37 (13)	38.14 (22)	34.25 (48)	5.961	.209	.005

SOURCES: For GDP figures and income inequality measures, Paukert (1973); for GNP figures, World Bank (1980); for energy consumption figures, Taylor and Hudson (1973).

NOTE: Numbers in parentheses are *N* for each measure.

^a Since this is not a probability sample (all nations for which comparable data are available are included) and nations have not been randomly assigned to status positions, significance values do not indicate the "generalizability" of the observed differences. They do, however, indicate how likely one would be to observe differences as great as those found if observations were arbitrarily assigned to status categories. In some sense, then, they indicate departure from "chance."

national status. These questions remained to be resolved, but the present analysis suggests that they might be fruitfully investigated from the world-system perspective and that network analysis provides a useful measure for this purpose.

References Cited

- CHASE-DUNN, CHRISTOPHER. 1975. The effects of international economic dependence on development and inequality: A cross-national analysis. *American Sociological Review* 41:660-75.
- CHIROT, DANIEL. 1977. *Social change in the twentieth century*. New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich.
- GALTUNG, JOHAN. 1971. A structural theory of imperialism. *Journal of Peace Research* 8:81-117.
- HOPKINS, TERRANCE, and IMMANUEL WALLERSTEIN. 1977. Patterns of development of the modern world-system. *Review* 1:111-45.
- JACKMAN, ROBERT W. 1980. A note on measurement of growth rates

- in cross-national research. *American Journal of Sociology* 86:604-17.
- PAUKERT, FELIX. 1973. Income distribution at different levels of development: A survey of evidence. *International Labor Review* 108:97-125.
- RUBINSON, RICHARD. 1976. The world-economy and the distribution of income within states: A cross-national study. *American Sociological Review* 41:638-59.
- SNYDER, DAVID, and EDWARD L. KICK. 1979. Structural position in the world system and economic growth 1955-70: A multiple-network analysis of transnational interactions. *American Journal of Sociology* 84:1096-1126.
- TAYLOR, CHARLES LEWIS, and MICHAEL C. HUDSON. 1973. 2d ICPR edition. *World handbook of political and social indicators*. Ann Arbor: Inter-University Consortium for Political Research.
- WALLERSTEIN, IMMANUEL. 1974. *The modern world system*. New York: Academic Press.
- WEED, ERICH. 1980. Beyond misspecification in sociological analyses of income inequality. *American Sociological Review* 45:497-501.
- WORLD BANK. 1980. *World tables: The second edition*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.

Women's Participation in Agriculture in India

by URSULA M. SHARMA

Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, University of Keele, Keele, Staffordshire ST5 5BG, England. 2 x 81

Recent research on women's participation in agriculture involved a comparison of two areas: Punjab, where development in agriculture has been very rapid and women today play a relatively small role in agricultural production, and the lower foothills of Himachal Pradesh, where agricultural development has been slow and women play, if anything, a greater role than before because of the absence from home of large numbers of male migrants. Fieldwork was conducted in two villages in 1977-78 and was funded by the Social Science Research Council (U.K.).

The aims of the research were twofold: (1) To explore the nature of female roles in rural Indian society through an investigation of the part women play in production. (Most studies hitherto have approached the problem by starting from a consideration of female roles in the Indian kinship system or of ideologies concerning the proper role of Indian women.) The reason for taking production as the starting point was that many feminists have assumed that women's role in production is the key to an understanding of the degree of power they wield and status they enjoy in society. What is the relationship between women's productive activities and other aspects of their roles? (2) To make a contribution to the growing body of data on the effects of economic development on women. Much of this information indicates that development of new methods in agricultural production and capitalist farming do not automatically ensure an increase in economic benefits to women. How does economic change affect rural Indian women?

In Punjab, where class differentiation is more distinct and obvious than in Himachal, the kind and degree of participation in agriculture depend on a woman's class. The wives of the new class of capitalist landowners do not play any direct part in farming as a rule. They may be involved in some kinds of decision making regarding land management, but the management and cultivation of these highly profitable farms is becoming more and more a "male" profession even though the farms are still run as "family" businesses. More and more

technical training is required, and girls are not sent to agricultural colleges. At the other end of the social scale, the wives of labourers and small farmers still participate in agriculture as day labourers at harvesting, weeding time, etc., but there is less work available to them because of the mechanization of agriculture. Women in middle peasant households play a relatively small part in cultivation, although they still take the main responsibility for the care of cattle and are involved in agriculture indirectly in various ways. There has been a withdrawal of women from outdoor work in some households in recent times, but not so dramatic a withdrawal as some of the literature would suggest.

In Himachal women at all levels of the social scale are involved in agricultural production very directly. In some households the absence of male wage workers who have migrated to the cities of Punjab or joined the army means that the women have to shoulder the main burden of farm work and management. The price of a greater cash income and a better standard of living is a heavier burden of labour in the fields. Women can move somewhat more freely in public in Himachal than in Punjab, where the segregation of the sexes in public is very pronounced, but they do not see this as a privilege.

In both areas the key factor proved to be not the actual amount and nature of farm work carried out by women, but the pattern of farm management and ownership. In both areas land is still largely registered in the names of men. Women may be more or less involved in day-to-day decision making about the land, but ultimately men have the final say. Recent legislation increasing the rights of women to inherit land has not yet had any great effect on the distribution of landed property in the household. In both areas, but especially Punjab, rules about the behaviour of women in public inhibit the participation of women in the marketing of produce, consultation with agricultural experts, etc. In both areas, but especially Himachal, women are further dependent upon men for whatever cash income the household enjoys, since there are few opportunities for rural women to earn cash incomes of their own. As most of the households studied (apart from a few wealthy capitalist farmers in Punjab) relied on the combination of cash income (derived from the wage work of the male members) and food production (derived from family labour), agricultural production could not be considered in isolation from other sources of income in rural households.

This research involved a consideration of processes of house-