

Examining Indian Diversity: Case For An Index Based Intervention

Joydeep Biswas

Associate Professor and Head, Department of Economics, Cachar College, Affiliated to Assam University, Silchar, Email: joydbiswas@gmail.com

Introduction

India is a land of diversity. The very concept of Indianness since time immemorial has rallied around stitching the diversity through a thread of unity. Unlike European nationalism Indian one is not planked on any single identity of say language. (Sen A 2006) The heterogeneity of language, culture, religion, ethnicity, caste and creed has beautifully woven the Indian social fabric. Like biodiversity this typical Indian social diversity is also a resource which needs to be preserved, practised and promoted. The greatest strength of the largest democracy in the world is also its plural society. This eternal truth about the Indian civilization was perhaps best captured by Rabindranath Tagore in his Bharat Tirtha (The Indian Pilgrimage) when he chanted:

‘None can tell, at whose beckoning,
vast waves of humanity
... merge into the Great Sea! ...
All shall give and take, mingle and be
mingled in,
none shall depart dejected
From the shores of the sea of
Bharata's Great Humanity’

The makers of the Indian Constitution were very much concerned about this diverse nature of Indian society and were equally committed to creating a just and inclusive polity. The very Objective Resolution, moved in the Constituent Assembly on 13 December 1946 by Jawaharlal Nehru and unanimously adopted on 22 January 1947 had confirmed

the embryonic structure of a just, equal, inclusive and plural polity for India to be born. The Preamble to the Constitution also reconfirms the inclusive and non-discriminatory character of the Indian state. The set of Fundamental Rights enumerated in the Part III of the Constitution, especially and particularly, Articles 14, 15, 16, 19 and 32 thereof, guarantee not only the plural fabric of Indian society, but more than that, equal access to both public and private space for the citizens transcending sex, religion, language, caste, creed, ethnicity and place of birth. The Directive Principles of State policy enshrined in Part IV of the Constitution, though not legally enforceable in nature, also make the Indian State morally bound to work for an inclusive and just society.

With this liberal, democratic character of the Constitution as its source of sustenance, since Independence, India has achieved significant growth and development. It has also been successful in reducing poverty and improving crucial human development indicators such as levels of literacy, education and health. But there are tensions among groups and individuals stemmed from the development deficit which is interpreted in the social and political spaces as deprivation of a particular socio-religious group leading to creation of a fertile ground for sub-regional identity formation around that deprivation.

In the background of the startling revelations of the Sachar Committee in 2006, and on the recommendation of the Committee, that the

Ministry of Minority Affairs, Government of India appointed the “Expert Group to Propose ‘Diversity Index’ and to Work out the Modalities for Implementation” (EG) on 28 August 2007. The EG was headed by Amitabh Kundu. The other members of the Group were Ashwini Deshpande, Md Abdul Kalam, Ajay K Mehta, Haseeb Drabu and Sugata Marjit. The EG submitted its 75 Page Report to the Ministry on 24 June 2008. The terms of reference of that EG were limited to three specific areas where diversity should be measured, namely, work, education and living spaces.

Even though Sachar Committee worked solely on its brief, i.e., documentation of the deprivation of the Muslims in the country, thereby calling for an urgent action on the ground to assess and quantify the diversity gap along religious dimension in both public and private spaces, the EG considered that, apart from this deficit in the religious diversity there is plethora of social groups exhibiting extreme form of unevenness in access to development dividend in the country. Needless to say, it is not a naïve understanding of the issue from the majority-minority point of view. Even the demographic majority notwithstanding a group may have experienced the exclusion from the development drive. The women in India are a case in point. Available dataset and voluminous literature bear testimony to the genderized development-divide in India. The existing literature on the subject provides ample evidence that devising anti-discriminatory practices or identification of the domains of discrimination require a much deeper understanding of social, historical and political environments. Yet, in the end, one requires statistical measures for policy targeting.

The idea is that the diversity of the country or a region must be reflected in micro level institutions and social spaces. An incentive structure can, and should be, built into the

system so that those making efforts to meet the goal of increasing diversity are rewarded. Similarly, a system of disincentives should be devised such that institutions that do not make adequate effort to increase diversity are penalized. We believe that this approach has greater flexibility than the system of reservations. The diversity-based incentive system, first and foremost, creates awareness. It sets the goal towards which the institutions would work, and while these goals may not be achievable immediately, institutions must try and achieve them gradually, within a reasonable period of time. It might be easier for certain institutions, say, a university, to implement the index at the overall institutional level, rather than make it mandatory for each department, since the efforts to increase diversity might be hampered by small numbers. (Kundu A et al 2008)

Statement of the Problem

Concentration or clustering of populations with common socio-economic, religious and ethnic affiliations in geographical, social, political and institutional spaces has emerged as an area of concern in recent years. It can be argued that such a concentration in, say, a housing complex, an educational institution or a production distribution unit, reflects the preferences of the concerned decision makers or administrators for people belonging to certain groups and an implicit or explicit prejudice against certain other groups. While a certain degree of concentration can be attributed to the voluntary choice for togetherness of the stakeholders, in many spheres this is due to discrimination and the denial of opportunities to groups that are different, not on grounds of merit, but, disturbingly, on grounds of their group affiliations. (Kundu A 2008) Unequal access to public institutions, job market, and social sector benefits is a cause of concern in many developing countries. In the neoliberal reform process, which has already earned both academic and political consensus across the

globe, this stark reality of unequal access remains by and large unaddressed. Policy interventions have been resorted to in order to bring about a kind of inclusive growth paradigm retaining the core issues of deprivation, inequality, homogenization and hegemony inbuilt in the neoliberal set up.

Affirmative actions in our country have mostly taken the route of caste-based reservations in public recruitments and admission in the public funded academic institutions. Distribution of doles and freebies to the economically disadvantaged sections like those in the BPL category is the only other intervention Indian State resorts to in order to bring about a semblance of social justice. While such practices may appear politically correct on the part of a welfare state like India, a mechanism to devise a more meaningful and effective intervention is the call of the hour. Unequal access to basic services primarily stems from unequal representation of different social groups in the public spaces like education, employment and housing. The core area of problem is that the macro diversity of Indian society is not being reflected in the micro level. And what is worse, there is no official mechanism or institutional level database to capture that diversity deficit.

The EG basically sought to target this problem area with a pointed suggestion of construction of diversity indices across socio-religious-gender dimensions for three spheres of development, viz, education, employment and housing, to begin with. Later on, more areas of development like health, sanitation etc can be included.

In the present context, we seek to problematize the whole issue as shrinking diversity in public spaces in Indian society. To begin with, at a very modest scale, we would like to capture the extent of social diversity in the public funded institutions of higher education in the District of Cachar in the State of Assam. This district presents a fit

case for showcasing religious, linguistic, caste and ethnic diversity that India exhibits. In such a 'Mini India', it would be worthwhile to capture diversity in higher education through the EG methodology of diversity index.

Review of Literature

This review of literature centring on a broad idea of Indian diversity may well start from an Oxford India paperback, entitled *Politics and Ethics of the Indian Constitution* (2008). This ambitious edited compilation is culled from select sixteen of the scholarly articles presented, discussed and debated at a conference on the Political Philosophy of the Indian Constitution held in Goa in September 2001 under the aegis of the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies (CSDS), New Delhi.

Thematically divided into four sections, the book carries insightful and diverse articles captioned, *The Constitution as a Statement of Indian Identity* (Bhikhu Parekh), *Gandhi and the Constitution: Parliamentary Swaraj and Village Swaraj* (Thomas Pantham), *Institutional Visions and Sociological Imaginations: the Debate on Panchayati Raj* (Peter Ronald de Souza), *Outline of a 'Theory of Practice' of Indian Constitutionalism* (Upendra Baxi), *A Text Without Author: Locating the Constitution Assembly as Event* (Aditya Nigam) in Section I; *The Indian State: Constitution and Beyond* (Suhas Palshikar), *Citizenship and the Indian Constitution* (Valerian Rodrigues), *Citizenship and the Passive Revolution: Interpreting the First Amendment* (Nivedita Menon), *Democracy and Constitutionalism* (Sanjay Palshikar), *Constitutional Justice: Positional and Cultural* (Gopal Guru) in Section II; *Containing the Lower Castes: The Constituent Assembly and the Reservation Policy* (Christophe Jaffrelot), *Affirmative Action for Disadvantaged Groups: A Cross-constitutional Study of India and the US* (Ashok Acharya) in Section III; *Religion and the Indian Constitution: Questions of Separation and Enquiry*

(Gurpreet Mahajan), *Passion and Constraint: Courts and the Regulation of Religious Meaning* (Pratap Bhanu Mehta), *Rights versus Representation: Defending Minority Interests in the Constituent Assembly* (Shefali Jha), *Minority Representation and the Making of the Indian Constitution* (Rochana Bajpai) in Section IV.

The thirty-nine-page introduction of the book by the editor, Rajeev Bhargava, puts the objective of the publication in perspectives: 'In 1950, for the first time in their history, a diverse collection of individuals and groups became the people of a single book, one that reflects their commitment to protect their mutual rights and which articulates a collective identity. This volume deals with some aspects of that unique document.'

The book under review is a unique attempt at a search for an 'Indian political theory'. It is a quest for a possible construction of an alternative theoretic paradigm suitable for Indian context not by looking away from, but by looking beyond the Western political thought. And for doing so a re-reading of the Indian Constitution in conjunction with the Constituent Assembly Debates (CAD) is resorted to. The compiled articles in unison try to make a case for what the Introduction says 'A Political-Theoretic Reading of the Constitution' along with the justification for the study of the CAD. The central focus of the discourse that follows the Introduction is the attempt at theorizing independent India's society and polity in the midst of religious, linguistic, ethnic and cultural diversity. And it is in this specific context of diversity that only two of the articles, authored by Mahajan (2008) and Bajpai (2008), both found in Section IV, are picked for the present review. In the recent past, some more attempts have been made in the mainstream scholarship to re-read the CAD and come to a political theorization. Mention may be made of Agnihotri (2015).

The members of the Constituent Assembly (CA), in their collective wisdom, reflected in the debates and discussions spanning over 165 days in 11 meetings between 9 December 1946 and 24 January 1950, were very much sensitized about the Indian diversity. Even as the political ethos 'Unity in Diversity' does not appear in black and white in the body of the Indian Constitution, it is very much palpable in the Objective Resolution moved by Jawaharlal Nehru in the Assembly, along with the Preamble and the Chapters on Fundamental Rights and Directive Policy of the State. As the political independence of the country was achieved in the unfortunate, but perhaps not unavoidable, backdrop of bloody partition of the country on 'Two Nation Theory', the makers of the Indian Constitution had to be doubly watchful about retaining the secular, inclusive and liberal character of Indian polity. In their bid for accommodating the minority interests, provisions were made in the first draft of the constitution for reserved seats in legislatures and quotas in government employment for religious minorities. But Bajpai (2008) informs us that 'by the time of the final draft these provisions were dropped and legislative and employment quotas came to be restricted mainly to the Scheduled castes and tribal groups.' In this context, Mahajan (2008) makes an interesting reading of the place of religion in Indian polity. Drawing references from the CAD and by citing individual deliberations of Patel, Pant and Nehru in the CA at different points of time, she remarks that CA 'favoured a system in which the citizen rather than her community identity would receive priority.' While the debate between the contesting views of separation of religion from politics and presence of religion in the public domain was resolved somehow in the CA, the accommodation of interests of religious minority is still a potent political issue in the contemporary India. This, in turn, leads to the question of access. Inclusive polity calls for equal access for all across religion, caste and language.

The knowledge as a nation we learnt from the findings of the Sachar Committee that the diversity of this country or any region thereof must be reflected in micro level institutions and social spaces. Therefore, an incentive structure can, and should be, built into the system so that those making efforts to meet the goal of increasing diversity are rewarded. Similarly, a system of disincentives should be devised such that institutions that do not make adequate effort to increase diversity are penalized.

The EG also felt that ‘the diversity index approach has greater flexibility than the system of reservations. The diversity-based incentive system, first and foremost, creates awareness. It sets the goal towards which the institutions would work, and while these goals may not be achievable immediately, institutions must try and achieve them gradually, within a reasonable period of time. It might be easier for certain institutions, say, a university, to implement the index at the overall institutional level, rather than make it mandatory for each department, since the efforts to increase diversity might be hampered by small numbers.’

A reading of Kundu (2009, 2008, 2007, 2003, 1983) reveals that since Independence, India has achieved significant growth and development. It has also been successful in reducing poverty and improving crucial human development indicators such as levels of literacy, education and health. But there are tensions among groups and individuals stemmed from the development deficit which is interpreted in the social and political spaces as deprivation of a particular socio-religious group leading to creation of a fertile ground for sub-regional identity formation around that deprivation. It is clear that the poverty rates computed at national or state levels have only limited utility. These do very little by way of targeting policy towards the poor, or targeting those who need special assistance. In

order to fine-tune targeting, Kundu (2008) argues that we would need poverty figures at district or even lower levels. This is precisely the reason why the Diversity Index becomes an essential device for policy targeting, especially when there is plenty of field evidence suggesting discrimination. The need is to devise a quantitative measure that will provide a working estimate of exclusion in specific areas, a measure that can be used for inter institutional comparisons as well as to assess patterns over time.

Policy intervention in the form of affirmative action for the disadvantaged sections of the Indian society has only taken the way of reservation. But reservation as a form of preferential discrimination has created more social tension, at times violence than actually successfully targeting the beneficiaries. The Movement against Mandal Commission awards in the early nineties may be referred to here. In fact, some have made counter-argument that the decades of reservation regime have done pretty little to ameliorate the socio-economic status of the backward segments in any significant manner (Thorat, 2002). As a result, some of the contemporary debates on inequality have transcended the reservation in the form of policy interventions. Khaitan (2008) has mapped the entire debate with the mention of the EG proposal of an index-based intervention, and hopes that the ‘new proposals have the potential of bringing about significant changes in the lives of many, thereby achieving more meaningful equality for a wider population.’ Hasan (2009) discusses the possibility of ensuring equality in both public and private sphere in the context of the proposed Equal Opportunity Commission. Menon (2009) introduces the main features of the proposed EOC, and informs ‘how it is different from other commissions that are in place and what it can possibly do to mitigate the grievances of the deprived groups who are denied equal opportunity, particularly in relation to

education, employment and other basic necessities of life.’

In more recent times, Mehta, et al (2017) found in the context of the Indian labour market that more women are now engaged in high-paid jobs, while social groups such as Schedules Caste, Scheduled Tribe and Muslim are still more visible in menial low-paid jobs. Over the years, according to their observation, there has been a decline in gender inequality, but a rise in socio-religious inequality. Their decomposition analysis reveals that education is an important component contributing to the inequality in the workplace.

Shariff (2017) has first computed the ‘district development index’ for all districts of India, as well as ‘diversity’ (of the components of development) indices according to socio-religious community (SRC) groups, especially created from the raw data drawn from Government of India sources. Using these indices, he has developed a methodology that supports a ‘research-cum-action’ programme that enables better implementation of a number of components of the government’s poverty alleviation initiatives and allows their monitoring and evaluation.

Relevance of the Study

The present study is a modest attempt at construction of a diversity index based on the available data set. The EG has proposed the index for three spheres of development, viz., employment, education and living space (meaning housing) for three social dimensions, viz., religion, caste and tribal, and gender. But till date, since the submission of the Report back in 2008, neither the Government of India nor any state government has ever attempted to take the initiative for construction of the diversity index at institutional levels. Similarly, no applied research either at an institution level or by any individual researcher to actually construct this index is known to have taken

place even as the Report has been in the public domain for all these years. This is all the more surprising because the index along with the methodology and the justification for such an index-based intervention has been duly acknowledged by the academic fraternity as is evident from the flurry of literature on the subject a glimpse of which is only available in the foregoing section of review of literature.

It is in view of this academic nonchalance that this study is called for. The indices we have tried to prepare- albeit at a micro level and that too for only seven public funded degree colleges in a district- this at least could well be a good beginning. As expected in the EG Report, a modest beginning not only widens the avenues for preparation of the indices at more and higher levels of institutions, both public and private, this will surely expose the methodology to a real-world testing. These indices surely give us an idea as to whether the district level human diversity is reflected in the main stream of higher education in the same location. Once we have a quantified picture of diversity gaps and the resultant diversity indices in the sphere of general higher education in the public funded colleges in the district of Cachar, a strong forward linkage in second stage research will surely emerge. The reasons for a vertical drop outs, for example, can be investigated into. Again, the same methodology can be used to expand the research horizon to other spheres of development like say employment and housing.

Limitation of the Study

The EG has proposed construction of the diversity index along three social dimensions, viz, religion, caste and tribal and gender for three spheres of development, viz, employment, education and housing. But our work has incorporated only higher education at the public funded colleges located in the district of Cachar. Education has multiple layers like primary, secondary, senior

secondary, higher etc. Even higher education certainly does not imply only general under graduate education. It does have other equally important components like technical education, professional education etc. Even across institutions of higher learning-both technical and non-technical-there are both quality and benefit differentials. For example, the IITs cannot perhaps be equated with the NITs in terms of quality of education imparted, entry level eligibility, prospect of on campus placements etc. Similarly, even for general degree education like BA, B Sc, and B Com etc perhaps a district college cannot be compared on an equal footing with a college in a state capital or say in the National Capital Territory. Naturally, the diversity gap or otherwise in the Cachar public funded colleges cannot be reflective of the state of affairs in the whole of the higher education scenario of the country, not even for other centres of higher education located in the very District like say Assam University or NIT, Silchar.

We have taken only religion and gender dimensions in our study, and kept out caste and tribal dimension. The reason of exclusion is two-fold.

First, we do not have population data for caste dimension as caste census has been ruled out by the Union Government. Both in the Supreme Court and in the Parliament the Central Government in the recent times has made three points very clear. One, the Government will not go for caste census beyond the traditional SC and ST counting. Two, the Centre will not bring in any amendment to the Constitution to transfer Census exercise from the Union List to the Concurrent List, thereby setting at rest any speculation around the possibility of some states making their own caste census. Three, the Centre will not release the data of the SECC, 2011.

Second, in the presence of the policy of reservation for SC, ST and OBC etc in the matter of admission to general degree programmes in Provincialised Colleges in Assam, results from a fresh study on the extent of diversity along caste and tribal dimension are bound to be biased. There is a likelihood of a high quantum of diversity along caste and tribal dimension already present in these colleges.

The methodology, proposed by the EG, ideally calls for construction of the index for two different time periods-Stage I (current period) and Stage II (8 to 10 years from now). This is obvious for comparison of the diversity index values at two points of time a decade apart. In this particular case, the index could have been prepared for say 2010 and 2020. But non-availability of appropriate data set, as gathered from pilot surveys across the colleges, have not allowed the present researcher to venture into the preparation of the indices for some reasonably distant time period in the past. Hence comparison of the diversities over a times span has been avoided in the present study.

Research Questions

The present study is addressed to find answers to the following questions:

1. Is the coefficient of diversity index along religious and gender dimensions in respect of 1st Semester enrollment in each of the seven public funded degree colleges of the Cachar District reflective of the corresponding social diversity visible at the District, Assam and India levels?
2. Do these indices for the seven colleges show any uniform pattern, or there exist inter-institutional differentials?
3. Do these indices show defining differences when compared with the attainment levels of the social groups as reflected in the eligible pool?

Data Source and Methodology

In the present study we have used the Diversity Index proposed by the EG. This index is intuitively obvious, computationally simple and something that can be calculated with the available data or with some marginal data collection. Our particular focus is on education. We have excluded employment and housing from our proposed study. We have measured diversity along the following two dimensions.

Religious dimension: We have categorized the population in the institutions into seven groups such as R_1 to R_7 . The Population Census defines seven categories (Hindus, Muslims, Christians, Sikhs, Buddhists, Jains and Other religions).

Gender dimension: We have taken two groups to reflect this dimension - men and women: G_1 and G_2

Let x_i be the actual proportion of the 1st Semester enrolled students in a college under study belonging to Group i (say, the proportion of Muslim in the student population in the college) and y_i be the proportion of the i th group in the population who are eligible to enter the college as a student. At any given point of time, entry to an under graduate course in a college can only be from the eligible pool of individuals for each social group. The varying size of this pool (in relation to the population) for different groups might reflect discrimination (or its opposite) in the society. To cite an example, passing a HS examination is essential for gaining entry into a BA/B Sc/B Com course at a college. Understandably, the number of higher secondary pass outs who could be applicants will define the eligible population for admission to the under graduate courses. Thus, y_i is say the proportion of HS passed Muslim students to all HS passed in the Cachar District who can potentially be considered for admission in a general degree college in the district, because

they comply with the minimum eligibility conditions. Then, z_i is the proportion of group i in the total population for the relevant universe (say the proportion of Muslim in the population of Cachar). Now, the diversity gap or absence of diversity for the i th group, DG_i , can be represented as follows.

$$DG_i = \frac{(y_i - x_i)z_i}{y_i}$$

One can see that $(y_i - x_i)$ would be greater than zero for the underrepresented groups indicating a 'gap' in diversity or extent of sub optimality. This would be less than zero for the over-represented social groups. When $x_i = y_i$, there is no deprivation for the group and the gap between entitlement and realization is zero, implying ideal condition of perfect diversity. In an extreme situation, when $x_i = 0$, implying that the i th group is not represented at all, the value of DG_i would be z_i . Since the aim of the index is to capture the extent of exclusion of the groups, it must capture only the aspect of under-representation adequately. So, for example, if a college has an over representation of any community or social group (defined as x greater than y), then the index should not reward the institution by giving it a high value due to this over-representation. Taking this into account the diversity gap is redefined as when y_i is greater than or equal to x_i . However, when $x_i > y_i$, $DG_i = 0$. Thus the DG_i computed for each group for a given dimension will have a minimum value of zero and a maximum value of z_i . The DG_i has been computed for each group separately. Thus, ideally, we have 7 values of DG for religious dimension and two for gender dimension. For each college we have then 9 DG values, and for all the 7 colleges, we arrive at 63 DG values.

The Diversity Index D for m th dimension can be stated as follows.

$$D_m = 1 - \sum_i DG_i$$

This means that we have calculated two indices (one each for religious and gender dimensions) for each college. In all, then, we have arrived at 14 such indices for the 7 colleges under study.

Now a situation of perfect diversity will mean $D = 1$. This hypothetical case can occur when all the groups have representation equal to their eligibility. On the other hand, complete exclusion of certain groups (zero representation) and inclusion of others at higher levels (shares being higher than eligibility) would give the value of the index as 0, when the over represented communities claim a negligible proportion of the total relevant population. In case these over represented communities claim a proportion of population equal to P , the lower value of D_m would be P . Typically, the index lies between 1 and P , higher values implying higher diversity for a given social category. This implies that there will be lower diversity in the society if the overrepresented groups claim a smaller share in the population, in a hypothetical situation when the other groups have zero representation.

The EG proposes three ranges for the Diversity Index to facilitate designing of the index-linked interventions, for launching the measures in initial years. The ranges are proposed as follows:

Low diversity- Between 0 and $1/3^{\text{rd}}$

Middle diversity- Between $1/3^{\text{rd}}$ and $2/3^{\text{rd}}$

High diversity- Between $2/3^{\text{rd}}$ and 1

In the absence of any better suggestive ranges of diversity available in the literature, we have also accepted these three critical values for drawing conclusions.

Since the whole exercise of construction of the diversity indices appears to be a firsthand experience in India, appropriate data set is not very easy to come across. We have used Census data for the z series.

But y series has posed a problem. We have gone for the use of proxy set of data for the y series, in the absence of official data for the eligible pool. In this case, we needed the proportion of HS passed ith category students in the pool of all the HS passed students in a certain year in the district of Cachar. Assam Higher Secondary Education Council Results booklets provide disaggregated data on students' performance only along gender and caste and tribal dimensions. Religious distribution is not available there. Same is the case with the Central Board of Secondary Education. In view of this data desideratum, we have collected primary data for the y series. Admission Registers from digital College Management System of the seven general degree colleges have generated x series data for us.

Major Findings and Conclusions

1. Religious diversity as reflected through the index values for the HEIs under study is indicative of presence of high diversity in the higher education population.
2. Religious diversity quotients are not uniform across institutions and even across streams (Arts, Science, Commerce) within the same institution.
3. Religious diversity scenario on the campuses of the HEIs explored for study is fairly reflective of the religious distribution of population in Cachar district.
4. Gender diversity in the HEIs covered for the study is fairly representative of the population and also the eligible pool.

5. But gender diversity is not uniform across streams of study, i.e, Arts, Science and Commerce.
6. Unlike in the case of social dimension as caste, where a study in search of the extent of diversity could be vitiated by the presence of caste-based reservation already in place in the HEIs in Assam, the present study on diversity across religious and gender dimensions (where there is no policy of positive discrimination by the government) has brought to the fore a fairly authentic presence of diversity in the general degree education in Cachar.

Based on some very simple yet intuitive indices we have been able to capture the degree of diversity along only two dimensions in the higher education institutions we selected for study. The results so arrived have helped us arrive at a very crucial conclusion that social diversity at the micro level is calculable. One we are successful at getting some cardinal numbers and can transfer them to ordinal scaling, the same technique can be repeated at institutional levels for other public spaces like job market, housing etc. as well. If an ecosystem of such diversity data is developed in a foreseeable future, policy targeting for affirmative action could be made more effective.

Bibliography

1. Agnihotri, Rama Kant (2015) : "Constituent Assembly Debates on Language", Economic and Political Weekly, 21 February 2015, Vol I, No 8
2. Allam, Z., Zaki Akhtar and Nasir Ali (1995) "Problems of Muslims in India" in Indian Journal of Secularism, 10:4, Jan-Mar., 80-81
3. Bajpai, Rochana (2008): 'Minority Representation and the Making of the Indian Constitution' in Bhargava, Rajeev (ed) Politics and Ethics of the Indian Constitution, OUP, New Delhi
4. Bertrand, M. and Sendhil Mullainathan (2003): "Are Emily and Greg More Employable Than Lakisha and Jamal? : A Field Experiment on Labor Market Discrimination", NBER working paper series no. 9873.; Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2003
5. Bhargava, Rajeev (ed) (2008): Politics and Ethics of the Indian Constitution, Oxford University Press, New Delhi.
6. Black, D.A. (1995): "Discrimination in an Equilibrium Search Model", Journal of Labor Economics, 13:2, 309-34
7. Borooah, K. Vani and Sriya Iyer: "Vidya, Veda and Varna: The Influence of Religion and Caste on Education in Rural India", The Journal of Development Studies
8. Darity, W.A. Jr., J. Dietrich and D.K. Guilkey (1997): "Racial and Ethnic Inequality in the United States: A Secular Perspective", American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings, 87:2, 301-5.
9. Darity, W.A.Jr., J. Dietrich and D.K.Guilkey (2001): "Persistent Advantage or Disadvantage? Evidence in Support of the Intergenerational Drag Hypothesis", American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 60:2, 435-70.
10. Darity, W.A. Jr. and P.L.Mason (1998): "Evidence on Discrimination in Employment: Codes of Color, Codes of Gender", Journal of Economic Perspectives, 12:2, 63-90.
11. Deshpande, Ashwini (2001): "Caste at Birth? Redefining disparity in India", Review of Development

- Economics, 5:1, February, pp. 130-144.
12. Deshpande, Ashwini (2007): "Overlapping identities under liberalization: gender and caste in India", *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, Volume 55:4, July, pp. 735-760.
 13. Deshpande, Ashwini and Katherine Newman (2007): "Where the path leads: the role of caste in post university employment expectations", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42:41, October, pp. 4133-4140.
 14. Hasan, Zoya (2009): 'Equal Opportunity Commission and the Possibilities of Equality', *Indian Journal of Human Development*, Vol. 3, No. 2
 15. ----- (2017): 'Saffron storm in Uttar Pradesh', *The Hindu*, March 16, 2017
 16. Heckman, J. (1998): "Detecting Discrimination", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12:2, 101-16.
 17. Hoff, Karla and Prinyanka Pande (2004): "Belief Systems and Durable Inequalities: an experimental investigation of Indian caste", *World Bank Working Paper* http://econ.worldbank.org/working_papers/36689/
 18. Human Rights Watch (1999): "Broken People: Caste violence against India's "untouchables", *Human Rights Watch*, New York.
 19. Kalam, M.A. (2007): "Conditioned Lives?" In *Economic and Political Weekly Special Issue on Symposium on the Sachar Committee Report*, Vol XLII No. 10, March 10-16.
 20. Khaitan, Tarunabh (2008): 'A Paradigm Shift in the Debate on Equality', *Economic and Political Weekly*, September 20
 21. Kundu, A., Shariff, Abu Saleh and Ghosh, P. K. (2007): "Indexing Human Development in India", *Indicators, Scaling and Composition*", in *State, Market and Inequalities*, Abu Saleh Shariff and Krishnaraj, M (eds.) *Orient Longman*, New Delhi, 2007
 22. Kundu, A. (2003) "Measuring Inequality in Education", *Tilak, J. B. G. (ed.) Education, Society and Development: National and International Perspectives*, A. P. H. Publishing Corporation
 23. Kundu, A. et al (2008) "Report of the Expert Group to Propose a Diversity Index and Work out the Modalities of Implementation" , *Ministry of Minority Affairs, Government of India*
 24. Kundu, A. (2009): *Achieving Diversity in Socio-economic Space: An Alternative Strategy of Intervention through the Diversity Index'*, *Indian Journal of Human Development (Vol 3, No 2, 2009)*
 25. ----- (1983): "An Impossibility Theorem on Poverty Indices" (with Tony Smith), *International Economic Review*, 24:2
 26. Loury, G.C. (1998): "Discrimination in the post-Civil Rights Era: Beyond Market Interactions", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12:2, 117-26.
 27. Madheswaran, S. and Paul Attewell (2007), "Caste discrimination in the Indian urban Labour market: evidence from the National Sample Survey", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42:41, October 13, 2007.
 28. Mahajan, Gurpreet (2008): 'Religion and the Indian Constitution: Questions of Separation and Enquiry' in *Bhargava, Rajeev (ed) Politics and*

- Ethics of the Indian Constitution, OUP, New Delhi
29. Mason, P.L. (2000): "Persistent Discrimination- Racial Disparity in the US, 1967-1988", American Economic Association, Papers and Proceedings.
30. Massey, Douglas S. and Garvey Lundi (1998): "Use of Black English and racial discrimination in urban housing markets: new methods and findings", <http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/inequality/Seminar/Papers/Massey.PDF>
31. Mehta, Balwant Singh and Shree Megha (2017): 'Inequality, Gender, and Socio-religious Groups', Economic and Political Weekly, February 25, 2017, p 56-60
32. Menon, N R Madhava (2009): 'Report on the Proposed Equal Opportunity Commission', Indian Journal of Human Development, Vol. 3, No. 2
33. Sachar Committee (2006): High Level Committee for Preparation of Report on Social, Economic and Educational Status of the Muslim Community of India, Government of India, New Delhi
34. Sen, Amartya (2006): Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny, Norton, London
35. Shah, A M (2017): 'The Mirage of a Caste-less Society in India', Economic and Political Weekly, March 4, 2017, p 61-66
36. Shariff, Abusaleh (2017): 'District Development and Diversity Index: A Methodology that Promotes Evaluation and Assessment of Development and Welfare Programmes in India', Journal of Development Policy and Practice, Vol 2 No 1, January 1, 2017, p 1-23
37. Sikand, Yoginder (2006): "Behind their plight", Frontline, December 15
38. Thorat, Sukhdeo (2002): 'Oppression and Denial: Dalit Discrimination in the 1990s', Economic and Political Weekly, February 9, p 572
39. ----- (2006): 'Paying the Social Debt', Economic and Political Weekly, June 17, p 2432
40. Weisskopf, T.E. (2004): Affirmative Action in the United States and India: A Comparative Perspective, Routledge, London.
-