# SOCIAL PROFILE OF HIGHER BUREAUCRACY IN PAKISTAN 


#### Abstract

In this paper an attempt has been made to delineate the characteristic social background of a typical civil servant in Pakistan. For this purpose the data on social background of the civil servants of the first twent-five CTPs (Common Training Programmes) (1973-98) bas been used. The analysis bas been undertaken in three parts. First, the social background of the CSS officers (Central Superior Services) bas been examined. It covers all the officers, men and women, belonging to any one of the twelve occupation groups (see Annexure I) who entered the CSS through the annual competitive examination conducted by the FPSC (Federal Public Service Commission). In the second part, the social backeground of officers of a single occupation group, DMG (District Management Group), reputedly the elite group of all has been studied. In each of these two categories, the social background of officers bas been analyzed separately for men and women. The third part focuses on officers who were inducted in to the civil service not through the competitive examination under the FPSC but by nomination from the Armed Forces.


## Social Background of CSS Officers

In order to study the social background of the CSS officers all the CSS officers of six CTPs were selected for scrutiny. The CTPs selected are CTP number One, Five, Eight, Seventeen, Twenty and Twenty-Five. (see Annexure III). These CTPs represent different political environments in the country (Annexure II). The CSS officers of the First CTP were selected and trained under the government led by Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto. They were the first batch to be selected and trained following the introduction of radical administrative reforms in 1973. CTP Five represents the CSS officers selected and trained under the Martial Law regime of Zia-ul-Haq in 1978. CTP Eight reflects the circumstances following the installation of the first civilian government under General Zia-ul-Haq drawn from different political parties opposed to Pakistan Peoples Party. The CSS officers of the Seventeenth CTP reflect the political climate in the country following the induction of an elected civilian national government under Benazir Bhutto in 1988. CTP Twenty symbolizes political environment under the first term of Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif. CTP Twenty-Five is the last of the twenty five CTPs selected by us for study. It reflects political circumstances in the country during the second prime ministerial term of Nawaz Sharif.

The total number of CSS officers in the First CTP was 205. Five of them were women. No one was inducted into CTP that year from the Armed Forces. These

Officers were given training at the Academy of Administrative Training (later renamed as Civil Services Academy) from December 1973 to September 1974. These CSS officers had been selected by the Federal Public Services Commission through the competitive examination held in 1972. In other words, the CSS officers of the First CTP may be viewed as representing the typical young men and women who tended to opt for a civil service career before the introduction of the Administrative Reforms of 1973. (see Annexures II and III)

The total number of CSS officers in the Fifth CTP was 111. Six of them were women. No one was inducted from the Armed Forces. These officers were trained at the Academy of Administrative Training from March 1978 to September 1978. They had appeared in the competitive examination in 1976. These CSS Officers represent the young men and women who chose to join the civil service four years after the introduction of the 1973 Administrative Reforms and they were the first batch of CSS officers to be trained under the Martial Law regime of Zia ul Haq.

The total number of CSS officers in the Eighth CTP was 137. Nine of them were women and nine were inducted form the Armed Forces. (The policy to induct into CTP around 10 per cent of CSS officers - mainly in the DMG, Police and Foreign Service - from the Armed Forces was initiated from 1980). For the purpose of this paper the background of Armed Forces inductees has been analyzed separately from those CSS officers who entered civil service through the competitive examination conducted by the Federal Public Service Commission (FPSC). These CSS officers attended the Eighth Common Training Programme from December 1980 to April 1981. They had appeared in the competitive examination in 1979. These young men and women had opted to enter the civil service eight years after the introduction of the Administrative Reforms. By 1980, the military government of General Zia-ulHaq, which had overthrown the civilian government of Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto in 1977, had consolidated itself and had repealed some of the changes introduced under the Administrative Reforms. At this time, a new civilian government drawn from selected political parties was also installed in place of military officers.

The total number of CSS officers in the Seventeenth CTP was 150. Nine of them were women and nine were inducted from the Armed Forces. These CSS officers attended the Seventeenth Common Training Programme from November 1989 to July 1990. They had appeared in the competitive examination held in 1988. This period coincides with the exit of the military government of General Zia-ul-Haq and the ushering in of the elected civilian government of Benazir Bhutto.

The total number of the CSS officers of the Twentieth CTP was 126. Eight of them were women and eight were inducted from the Armed Forces. These CSS officers attended the Twentieth Common Training Programme from October 1992 to June 1993. They had appeared in the competitive examination held in 1991. This period coincides with the elected civilian government of Mian Nawaz Sharif in quick succession to its political rival Benazir's government.

The total number of CSS officers of the Twenty-fifth CTP was 168. Twenty-two of them were women and six had been inducted form the Armed Forces. These CSS officers attended the Twenty-fifth Common Training Programme from July 1998 to March 1999. They had appeared in the competitive examination in 1998. This period coincides with the second government of Mian Nawaz Sharif.

Close to two-third of the CSS officers came from families with urban origin. (Table I). This proportion is far higher for women CSS officers. Whereas 64 per cent of the male CSS officers had an urban background 84 per cent of the female CSS officers had an urban origin (Tables 3 and 2, see also Chart 1).
45.7 per cent of the male CSS officers had studied up to MA/M Sc level. Another 9 per cent had studied up to MA LLB or M Ed or double MA level. Only 1.2 per cent (10 out of 806) had studied for MPA degree (Master in Public Administration) and only 2.4 per cent ( 19 out of 806 ) had studied for MBA degree. If all these categories are combined, near 58 per cent of male CSS Officers had MA/M Sc level education. A much higher proportion of female CSS officers ( 76 per cent) fall in this category (Chart I and Table-5). 21 per cent of the male and 18 per cent of the female CSS officers had a BA/B Sc level education. Quite a substantial proportion of male CSS officers had an engineering degree (10 per cent) and MBBS degree ( 9 per cent). None of the female CSS officers had an engineering degree and only 3 per cent had MBBS degree (Chart 1).

Only two fifths of the CSS officers are First Divisioners (Table-6). 39 per cent of the female and 42 per cent of the male CSS officers fall in this category (Tables-7, 8 and Chart I). Near 56 per cent of the female and near 49 per cent of the male CSS officers passed their last examination in the Second Division. Only three out of 59 or 5 per cent of the female CSS officers but 66 out of 806 or 8 per cent of the male CSS officers are Third Divisioners (Tables-7 and 8).

Two thirds of the male CSS officers (67.4 per cent) attended ordinary schools. Relatively a smaller proportion of female CSS officers ( 37 per cent) attended ordinary schools (Table 9 and 10). Most of the female CSS officers (40 per cent) attended missionary schools. A far smaller proportion of male CSS officers (8.6 per cent) attended missionary schools. Only 68 or 8 per cent of the male CSS officers attended an elite school - Aitchison or equivalent. Similarly, only 44 or 5.5 per cent of the male CSS officers attended a cadet school. (Chart I).

Nearly half of the male CSS officers (46 per cent) are the sons of salaried employees in managerial or non-managerial positions in the public or private sector (Table-11 and Chart I). Two thirds or 67.8 per cent of the female CSS officers are the daughters of salaried employees (Table-12). Most of these employees occupied managerial positions. More of the female CSS officers' fathers ( 17 per cent) are pursuing an independent profession than the fathers of male CSS officers (7 per cent). Far more of the male CSS officers are the sons of farmers ( 21 per cent) and businessmen ( 16 per cent) than female CSS officers, 5 per cent and 8 per cent respectively (Chart 1).

According to father's annual income the male and female CSS officers have a similar background yet female officers tend to have relatively higher father's annual income. Around 12 per cent of the male CSS officers and 7.6 per cent of the female CSS officers have father's annual income of rupees thirty thousand or less (Tables-13 and 14). Around 10 per cent of the male CSS officers but 20 per cent of the female CSS officers have a father's annual income of more than rupees 120,000 but less than rupees 200,000 . Similarly, 16 per cent of the male CSS officers and 25 per cent of the female CSS officers have father's annual income above rupees 200,000 (Chart 1). If the last two income categories are combined 26 per cent of the male CSS officers and 45 per cent of the female CSS officers are the off springs of well to do fathers.

## Social Profile of DMG Officers

In the above paras we have described the social background of CSS officers - both men and women - belonging to any one of the twelve occupation groups (Annexure-1) who got selected through the competitive examination conducted by the Federal Public Service Commission (FPSC). In the following part of the paper, the social background of officers of a single occupation group, the so called elite group namely DMG is presented. This analysis excludes DMG officers inducted form the Armed Forces. It covers 493 DMG officers- i.e. all the DMG officers, both men and women, in each of the first 25 CTPs who entered the civil service through the competitive examination conducted by the FPSC. (Annexure IV)

Similar to the CSS officers, the DMG officers come largely from urban family background. 69 per cent of the male DMG officers (Table-15), and 82 per cent of the female DMG officers (Table-21) have an urban background. The corresponding figures for male CSS officers are 64 per cent and for female CSS officers 85 per cent (Chart 1).

54 per cent of the male DMG officers had studied up to MA/M Sc level including MA LLB, Double MA, MPA and MBA (Table-16). 70 per cent of the female DMG officers had received education to that level (Table-22). 58 per cent of the male CSS officers and 76 per cent of the female CSS officers had studied up to that level (Chart-1). More or less an equal proportion (18 to 21 per cent) of DMG and CSS officers of either gender had studied up to BA, B Sc and BA LLB level. 12 per cent of the male DMG officers and 6 per cent of the female DMG officers had MBBS degree. 9 per cent of the male CSS officers and 3 per cent of the female CSS officers had MBBS degree. In other words more male than female MBBS graduates seek job in the civil service and their proportion is relatively higher in the DMG than in the CSS, in general. Similarly, mainly the male engineering graduates seek job in the civil service including the DMG (Chart-1).

Near 71 per cent of the female DMG officers had First Division in their last examination (Table-23). Around 52 per cent of the male DMG officers were First Divisioners (Table-17). Relatively, lower proportion of female and male CSS officers were First Divisioners - 39 per cent and 42 per cent respectively (Tables- 7 and 8 )

29 per cent of the female DMG officers were Second Divisioners and none Third Divisioner (Table-23). 42 per cent of male DMG officers were Second Divisioner and 4 per cent Third Divisioner. 56 per cent of the female and 49 per cent of the male CSS officers were Second Divisioner. 5 per cent of female and 8 per cent of the male CSS officers were Third Divisioner (Chart-1).

47 per cent of the female DMG officers attended Missionary schools; 35 per cent had attended ordinary schools (Table-24). 60 per cent of the male DMG officers were educated at ordinary schools; 12 per cent at the Aitchison or equivalent schools, 11 per cent at Missionary schools and 8 per cent in Cadet schools (table18). 67 per cent of the male CSS officers went to ordinary schools. The school background of female CSS and female DMG officers appears to be similar. 41 per cent of the former attended Missionary schools followed by 37 per cent going to ordinary schools. The school background of male DMG officers also is more or less similar to that of male CSS officers. Whereas 60 per cent of the former had attended ordinary schools 67 per cent of the latter did so. The remaining officers had attended missionary, elitist and cadet schools in that order (Chart-1).

The fathers of 40 per cent of the male DMG offices were salaried employees in the public or private sector in managerial positions, 14 percent were working in nonmanagerial positions, 19 per cent were farmers, 16 per cent were businessmen, and 8 per cent were in an independent profession (Table-19). The fathers of 62 per cent of female DMG officers were working in managerial positions in public or private sector; 21 per cent were engaged in business and 12 per cent were pursuing some independent profession (Table-25). The proportion of non-managerial employees and farmers among fathers of female DMG officers was negligible. Fathers of 29 per cent of the male CSS officers were occupying managerial positions in public or private sector, 21 per cent were farmers, 17 per cent were holding non-managerial positions, 16 per cent were businessmen (Table-11). The fathers of 58 per cent of female CSS officers were managerial level employees, 17 per cent were pursuing an independent profession, 10 per cent were non-managerial employees, 8 per cent were businessmen and 5 per cent were farmers (Table-12 and Chart I).

The father's annual income of 19 per cent of the male DMG officers was more than rupees 120,000 but less than rupees 200,000 . Around 23 per cent of the male DMG officers' fathers' annual income was over 200,000 rupees (Table-20). If we combine these two categories around 41 per cent of male DMG officers may be considered to be sons of well-to-do fathers. The father's annual income of 8 per cent of the male DMG officers was 30,000 rupees or less. The annual income of another 14 per cent of the male DMG officers' fathers was 60,000 rupees or less. Combining the two categories one may say that around 22 per cent of the male DMG officers were the sons of fathers of modest means.

The father's annual income of around 13 per cent of the female DMG officers was more than 120,000 rupees but less than 200,000 rupees (Table-26). Around 33 per cent of the female DMG officers' fathers' annual income was over 200,000 rupees. In
other words 46 per cent of the female DMG officers may be considered to belong to the well-to-do class. None of the female DMG officers falls in the category of officers whose father's annual income was rupees 30,000 or less. Around 27 per cent of the female DMG officers' fathers' annual income is 60,000 rupees or less. Thus 27 per cent of the female DMG officers, as compared to 22 per cent of the male DMG officers happen to be the children of fathers of relative modest means.

Around 11 per cent of the male CSS officers' father's annual income is more than 120,000 rupees but less than 200,000 rupees. The father's annual income of around 16 per cent of the male CSS officers is over 200,000 rupees. Thus about 27 per cent of the male CSS officers may be described as sons of well-to-do fathers (as compared to 42 per cent of the male DMG officers 46 per cent of the female DMG officers and 46 per cent of the female CSS officers). The father's annual income of 12 per cent of male CSS officers is 30,000 rupees or less and that of 20 per cent 60,000 rupees or less. Thus 32 per cent of the male CSS officers, are the sons of fathers of modest means. This proportion is relatively higher as compared to male DMG officers ( 22 per cent), female DMG officers (27 per cent) female CSS officers ( 25 per cent) (Chart-1). It seems the daughters and sons of relatively better off fathers are more likely to get selected in to elite occupation groups like the DMG.

## Social Background of Armed Forces Inductees into CSS

All the Armed Forces inductees into CSS are male. Around 62 per cent of them come from urban families (Table-27). This proportion is slightly less than the male CSS officers, 64 per cent of whom have an urban background and far lower as compared to female CSS officers ( 84 per cent) and female DMG officers ( 82 per cent) (Chart-1). The proportion of Armed Forces inductees with rural background ( 38 per cent) is relatively higher than male DMG officers of rural background (31 per cent) and male CSS officers of rural background ( 36 per cent). (Tables- 27, 15 and 3)

On the basis of the level of education, the Armed Forces inductees are distinct in the sense that a large majority of them ( 89 per cent) have studied up to $\mathrm{BA} / \mathrm{B} \mathrm{Sc}$ level (Table-28). Just 6 per cent of them had studied up to MA/M Sc level. Only four Armed Forces inductees ( 2.7 per cent) had an engineering degree and only two or 1.3 per cent had MBBS degree. Armed Forces officers enter military service after passing the Intermediate examination for FA or F Sc. They receive graduate degrees of BA or B Sc on completion of their military training. This explains the presence of a large proportion of $\mathrm{BA} / \mathrm{B} \mathrm{Sc}$ level officers among the Armed Forces inductees. As compared to them the proportion of $\mathrm{BA} / \mathrm{B}$ Sc level officers is much lower and that of MA/M Sc level officers much higher among CSS officers and DMG officers both male and female (Chart-1).

58 per cent of the Armed Forces inductees went to ordinary schools for schooling (Table-30). 67 per cent of male CSS officers and 60 percent of the male DMG officers attended ordinary schools. Relatively much lower proportion of female CSS Officers
( 37 per cent) and female DMG officers ( 35 per cent) attended ordinary schools (Chart-1). Large proportions of them (41 and 47 per cent respectively) received their early schooling at missionary schools. Only 9 per cent of the Armed Forces (AF) inductees had attended cadet schools which is not a high percentage as compared to male CSS officers ( 6 per cent) and male DMG officers ( 8 per cent) (Chart-1).

38 per cent of the Armed Forces inductees are the sons of managerial level employees in the public or private sector (Table-31). 12 per cent are the sons of non-managerial employees. The corresponding figures for male CSS officers are 29 and 17 per cent. 40 per cent of the male DMG officers are the sons of managerial level employees and 14 per cent the sons of non-managerial level employees. In general, women more than men, tend to be children of managerial level employees. Similarly, AF inductees and DMG officers more than male CSS officers are the children of managerial employees (Chart-1).

Father's annual income of 16 per cent of the Armed Forces inductees is 30,000 rupees or less (Table-32). The proportion of male CSS officers and male DMG officers in this category is relatively smaller -12 per cent and 8 per cent respectively (Chart-1). The proportion of female CSS officers in this category is further smaller ( 8 per cent). Not a single female DMG officer falls in this category. (Table-26). 19 per cent of the AF inductees' fathers' annual income is more than 30,000 rupees but less than 60,000 rupees (Table-32). More or less the same proportion of male CSS officers but a lower proportion of male DMG officers fall in this category ( 20 per cent and 14 per cent respectively). Combining the two lowest levels of father's annual income, around one third of AF inductees and one third of male CSS officers are the sons of fathers of modest means. Around one quarter of female CSS officers, female DMG officers and male DMG officers have such a background.

If we combine the two highest levels of father's annual income, around one quarter of AF inductees and one quarter of male CSS officers fall in this category which may be described as well-to-do fathers. The proportion of well-to-do fathers is far higher among male DMG officers, 41 per cent of whom have an annual income of not less than 120,000 rupees and in many cases exceeding 200,000 rupees. The proportion of such officers among women officers is even higher. 46 per cent of female CSS officers and 47 per cent of female DMG officers fall in the category of well-to-do families.

## Conclusion

In general, most of the top civil servants come from families of urban background. Among the three categories of officers (CSS, DMG and AF inductees) the proportion of urban origin officers among the AF inductees is relatively the lowest ( 62 per cent). Far higher proportion of female CSS officers ( 85 per cent) and female DMG officers ( 82 per cent) are drawn from families of urban origin.

Only 6 per cent of the AF inductees have studied up to MA/M Sc level. Over fourfifths of them have attained only BA/B Sc level education. A majority of CSS
officers and DMG officers possess a post-graduate degree. The proportion of postgraduates among women is even higher. 76 per cent of female CSS officers and 71 per cent of the female DMG officers happen to be postgraduates. Significant proportions of male CSS officers ( 9 per cent) and male DMG officers ( 12 per cent) happen to be trained as medical doctors. The representation of MPA/MBA's is modest. Around 4 per cent of the male CSS officers, 5 per cent of female CSS officers, 4 per cent of the male DMG officers and 12 per cent of the female DMG officers have MPA/MBA level of education.

Most of the top bureaucrats tend to have their early schooling in ordinary schools than in elite schools, missionary schools or cadet schools. The proportion of such persons is the highest among male CSS officers ( 67 per cent), followed by male DMG officers ( 60 per cent). The proportion of such officers among AF inductees is 58 per cent. Female officers tend more to have attended missionary schools than other type of schools. 41 per cent of the female CSS offices and 47 per cent of the female DMG officers had attended missionary schools.

The academic achievement of women officers in examinations is relatively better than that of men. 71 per cent of the female DMG officers were First Divisioners. None of the female DMG officers was placed in the Third Division. Third Divisioners were 4 per cent among male DMG officers, 8 per cent of male CSS officers, 5 per cent of female CSS officers and 18 per cent of AF inductees. The proportion of First Divisioners among the AF inductees was the lowest of the three categories of officers i.e. 20 per cent. (Chart I)

Most of the top civil servants are the children of managerial or non-managerial employees in the public or private sector. Relatively a high proportion of female DMG officers ( 62 per cent) are the daughters of managerial level employees.

A high proportion of female CSS officers (58 per cent) also are the off springs of managerial level employees. The proportion of such officers is relatively much lower among male DMG officers ( 40 per cent), AF inductees ( 38 per cent) and male CSS officers ( 29 per cent). Only 3 per cent of the female DMG officers and 5 per cent of the female CSS officers are the daughters of farmers. 21 per cent of the female DMG officers are the daughters of businessmen. 12 per cent of them are the daughters of men pursuing independent professions. 22 per cent of the AF inductees are the sons of farmers, 12 per cent the sons of businessmen and only 5 per cent the sons of fathers from independent professions (Chart-1).

A substantial proportion of top civil servants are the children of fathers of modest financial income. Around one third of the male CSS officers and the same proportion of AF inductees fall in this category. Around one quarter of the female DMG officers, male DMG officers and female CSS officers belong to this category. A high proportion of female DMG officers ( 47 per cent) are the daughters of relatively well-to-do fathers. An equal proportion of female CSS officers belong to this category. A far smaller proportion of male CSS officers ( 26 per cent) and AF inductees ( 25 per cent) are the sons of well-to-do fathers.

Chart 1: Social Background of CSS Officers, DMG Officers and AF Inductees 1973-98

| Background |  | CSS |  | AF <br> Inductees Male | DMG |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Male | Female |  | Male | Female |
| Rural Urban Origin | Urban Origin | 64.1 | 84.7 | 61.7 | 69.1 | 82.4 |
| Level of | MA MSc | 58.4 | 76.3 | 6 | 55.1 | 70.5 |
| Education | BA BSc | 21.2 | 18.6 | 88.6 | 22.6 | 23.5 |
| Type of School | MBBS | 9.4 | 3.4 | 1.3 | 12.2 | 5.9 |
|  | BSc <br> Engineering | 10.2 | - | 2.7 | 10.5 | - |
|  | Ordinary <br> School | 67.4 | 37.3 | 58.4 | 59.7 | 35.3 |
|  | Missionary School | 8.6 | 40.7 | 10.1 | 11.1 | 47.1 |
|  | Aitchison/ Equivalent | 8.4 | 1.7 | 8.7 | 11.6 | - |
| Division in Exam | Cadet School | 5.5 | - | 8.7 | 7.8 | - |
|  | First Division | 41.8 | 38.9 | 20.1 | 51.6 | 70.6 |
|  | Second <br> Division | 48.6 | 55.9 | 61.7 | 42.2 | 29.4 |
| Occupation of Father | Third Division | 8.2 | 5.1 | 18.1 | 4.1 | - |
|  | Service <br> (Managerial) | 28.8 | 57.6 | 37.6 | 39.5 | 61.8 |
|  | Service (Non- <br> Managerial) | 17.4 | 10.2 | 13.4 | 13.5 | 2.9 |
|  | Agriculture | 21.2 | 5.1 | 21.5 | 19.4 | 2.9 |
|  | Business | 16.5 | 8.5 | 12.1 | 15.7 | 20.6 |
| Father's <br> Annual <br> Income | Independent Profession | 7.4 | 16.9 | 5.4 | 8.1 | 11.8 |
|  | Upto 30,000 | 12.3 | 7.6 | 15.9 | 8.3 | - |
|  | Upto 60,000 | 20.2 | 17.9 | 18.8 | 13.5 | 26.7 |
|  | Upto120,000 | 27.5 | 28.2 | 27.5 | 24 | 26.7 |
|  | Upto200,000 | 10.5 | 20.5 | 14.5 | 18.8 | 13.3 |
|  | Over 200,000 | 15.7 | 25.6 | 10.1 | 22.5 | 33.3 |

Occupation Groups in the Central Superior Services of Pakistan
Commerce and Trade Group (CTG)
Customs and Excise Group (CEG)
District Management Group (DMG)
Foreign Service of Pakistan (FSP)
Income Tax Group (ITG)
Information Group (IG)
Military Land and Cantonment Group (MLCG)
Office Management Group (OMG)
Pakistan Audit and Accounts Service (PAAS)
Police Service of Pakistan (PSP)
Postal Group (PG)
Railways (Commercial and Transportation) Group (RG)
Annexure II

Year of Examination and Year of Training of Selected CTPs (1973-98)

| CTP | Examination <br> year | Year of Training | Head of Government |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 1972 | Dec 1973 - Sep 1974 | Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto |
| 5 | 1976 | Mar 1978 - Sep 1978 | Gen. Zia-ul-Haq |
| 8 | 1979 | Dec 1980 - Apr 1981 | Military Council replaced <br> by civilian government |
|  |  |  | Benazir Bhutto |
| 17 | 1988 | Nov 1989 - Jul 1990 | Nawaz Sharif |
| 20 | 1991 | Oct 1992 - Jun 1993 | Narif |
| 25 | 1998 | Jul 1998 - Mar 1999 | Nawaz Sharif |

Annexure III
Number of CSS Officers in Six Selected CTPs (1973-98)

| CTP | Women | Men | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 5 | 200 | 205 |
| 5 | 6 | 105 | 111 |
| 8 | 9 | 119 | 128 |
| 17 | 9 | 132 | 141 |
| 20 | 8 | 110 | 118 |
| 25 | 22 | 140 | 162 |
| Total | 59 | 806 | 865 |

Annexure IV
CTP-wise Number of DMG Officers 1973-98

| CTP | Men | Women | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 32 | 1 | 33 |
| 2 | 20 | 1 | 21 |
| 3 | 19 | 1 | 20 |
| 4 | 12 | 0 | 12 |
| 5 | 10 | 2 | 12 |
| 6 | 14 | 1 | 15 |
| 7 | 18 | 2 | 20 |
| 8 | 27 | 2 | 29 |
| 9 | 25 | 2 | 27 |
| 10 | 26 | 2 | 28 |
| 11 | 33 | 0 | 33 |
| 12 | 19 | 1 | 20 |
| 13 | 27 | 2 | 29 |
| 14 | 16 | 2 | 18 |
| 15 | 28 | 0 | 28 |
| 16 | 17 | 0 | 17 |
| 17 | 12 | 0 | 12 |
| 18 | 19 | 1 | 20 |
| 19 | 7 | 5 | 12 |
| 20 | 14 | 0 | 14 |
| 21 | 12 | 0 | 12 |
| 22 | 15 | 3 | 11 |
| 23 | 17 | 1 | 16 |
| 24 | 12 | 2 | 19 |
| 25 | 459 | 3 | 15 |
| Total |  | 34 | 493 |
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Table 1: Rural -Urban Background of CSS Officers for selected CTPs

| Background/ <br> CTP | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 55 | 38 | 35 | 42 | 57 | 71 | 298 |
|  | 26.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 34.5 |
| Urban | 150 | 73 | 93 | 99 | 61 | 91 | 567 |
| Total | 73.1 |  | 111 | 128 | 141 | 118 | 162 |

Table 2: Rural - Urban Background of Female CSS Officers for selected CTPs

| Background/ <br> CTP | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | - | - | - | - | 2 | 7 | 9 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 25.0 | 31.8 | 15.3 |
| Urban | 5 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 15 | 50 |
|  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 68.1 | 84.7 |
| Total | 5 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 22 | 59 |

Table 3: Rural - Urban Background of Male CSS Officers for selected CTPs

| Background/ <br> CTP | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rural | 55 | 38 | 35 | 42 | 55 | 64 | 289 |
|  | 27.5 | 36.2 | 29.4 | 31.8 | 50.0 | 45.7 | 35.9 |
| Urban | 145 | 67 | 84 | 90 | 55 | 76 | 517 |
| Total | 72.5 | 63.8 | 70.6 | 68.2 | 50.0 | 54.3 | 64.1 |
|  | 200 | 105 | 119 | 132 | 110 | 140 | 806 |

Table 4: Level of Education of Male CSS Officers for selected CTPs


Table 5: Level of Education of Female CSS Officers for selected CTPs

| Education <br> Level/CTP | 1 | \% | 3 | 4 | 5 | \% | 7 | 8 | \% | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | \% | 19 | 20 | \% | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | \% | 27 | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MA MSc | 4 | 80.0 |  |  | 5 | 83.3 |  | 7 | 77.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 66.7 |  | 6 | 75.0 |  |  |  | 14 | 63.6 |  | 42 | 71.2 |
| MA LLB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| M Ed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Double MA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MPA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MBA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 12.5 |  |  |  | 2 | 9.0 |  | 3 | 5.1 |
| BA BSc | , | 20.0 |  |  | 1 | 16.7 |  | 2 | 22.2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 22.2 |  | 1 | 12.5 |  |  |  | 3 | 13.6 |  | 10 | 16.9 |
| BA LLB |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4.5 |  | 1 | 1.7 |
| B Ed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BSc (Eng\%) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MBBS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 11.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4.5 |  | 2 | 3.4 |
| Other Professional |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 4.5 |  | , | 1.7 |
| Not specified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |
| Total | 5 |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  | 22 |  |  | 59 | 100 |

Table 6: Division of CSS Officers in Last Examination in selected CTPs

| Division/ CTP | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 56 | 32 | 34 | 68 | 65 | 105 | 360 |
|  | 27.3 |  |  |  |  |  | 41.6 |
| II | 131 | 64 | 74 | 59 | 44 | 53 | 425 |
|  | 63.9 |  |  |  |  |  | 49.1 |
| III | 18 | 15 | 19 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 69 |
|  | 8.8 |  |  |  |  |  | 7.9 |
| Not specified | - | - | 1 | 7 | 3 | - | 11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 205 | 111 | 128 |  | 118 | 162 | 865 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.0 |

Table 7: Division of Women CSS Officers in Last Examination in selected CTPs

| Division/ CTP | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | - | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 9 | 23 |
|  |  | 66.7 | 33.3 | 55.6 | 25.0 | 40.9 | 38.9 |
| II | 5 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 33 |
|  |  | 33.3 | 55.6 | 44.4 | 62.5 | 54.5 | 55.9 |
| III | - | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 3 |
|  |  |  | 11.1 |  | 12.5 | 4.5 | 5.1 |
| Total | 5 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 22 | 59 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100.0 |

Table 8: Division of Male CSS Officers in Last Examination in selected CTPs

| Division/ CTP | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | 56 | 28 | 31 | 63 | 63 | 96 | 337 |
|  | 28.0 | 26.7 | 26.0 | 47.7 | 57.3 | 68.6 | 41.8 |
| II | 126 | 62 | 69 | 55 | 39 | 41 | 392 |
|  | 63.0 | 59.0 | 57.9 | 41.7 | 35.5 | 29.3 | 48.6 |
| III | 18 | 15 | 18 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 66 |
|  | 9.0 | 14.3 | 15.1 | 5.3 | 4.5 | 2.1 | 8.2 |
| Not specified | - | - | 1 | 7 | 3 | - | 11 |
| Total |  |  | 0.8 | 5.3 | 2.7 |  | 1.4 |

Table 9: Type of School attended by Male CSS Officers in selected CTPs

| School Type/ CTP | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ordinary | 142 | 81 | 98 | 77 | 78 | 67 | 543 |
|  | 71.0 | 77.1 | 82.3 | 58.3 | 70.9 | 47.8 | 67.4 |
| Missionary | 18 | 13 | 7 | 14 | 4 | 13 | 69 |
| Aitchsion/ Equivalent | 9.0 | 12.4 | 5.8 | 10.6 | 3.6 | 9.3 | 8.6 |
|  | 15 | 3 | 5 | 15 | 11 | 19 | 68 |
| Cadet | 7.5 | 2.8 | 4.2 | 11.4 | 10.0 | 13.6 | 8.4 |
|  | 6 | 1 | 4 | 17 | 5 | 11 | 44 |
| Model | 3.0 | 0.9 | 3.4 | 12.9 | 4.5 | 7.9 | 5.5 |
|  | 13 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 23 | 59 |
| Private/ Unknown | 6.5 | 3.8 | 1.7 | 6.1 | 8.2 | 16.4 | 7.3 |
|  | 6 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 23 |
| Total | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 5.0 | 2.8 |
|  | 200 | 105 | 119 | 132 | 110 | 140 | 806 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |

Table 10: Type of School attended by Women CSS Officers

| School Type/ CTP | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ordinary | 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 22 |
|  | 20.0 | 16.7 | 55.6 | 77.8 | 50.0 | 18.2 | 37.3 |
| Missionary | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 24 |
|  | 60.0 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 22.2 | 37.5 | 40.9 | 40.7 |
| Aitchsion/ Equivalent | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.5 | 1.7 |
| Cadet | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Model | 1 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 7 | 10 |
|  | Private/ Unknown | - | 1 | - | - |  | 1 |

Table 11: Father's Occupation of Male CSS Officers for selected CTPs

| Occupation/ CTP | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Service (Managerial) | 50 | 18 | 23 | 44 | 39 | 58 | 232 |
|  | 25.0 | 17.1 | 19.3 | 33.3 | 35.5 | 41.4 | 28.8 |
| Service (Non-Managerial) | 37 | 19 | 24 | 20 | 26 | 14 | 140 |
|  | 18.5 | 18.1 | 20.2 | 15.1 | 23.6 | 10.0 | 17.4 |
| Agriculture | 37 | 32 | 25 | 33 | 18 | 26 | 171 |
|  | 18.5 | 30.5 | 21.0 | 25.0 | 16.4 | 18.6 | 21.2 |
| Business | 35 | 19 | 19 | 21 | 13 | 26 | 133 |
|  | 17.5 | 18.1 | 15.9 | 15.9 | 11.8 | 18.6 | 16.5 |
| Independent Profession | 15 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 10 | 13 | 60 |
|  | 7.5 | 5.7 | 7.6 | 5.3 | 9.1 | 9.3 | 7.4 |
| Occupation (not specified) | 10 | 8 | 14 | 2 | - | 3 | 37 |
|  | 5.0 | 7.6 | 11.8 | 1.5 |  | 2.1 | 4.6 |
| Service (not specified) | 16 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 2 | - | 29 |
|  | 8.0 | 2.8 | 4.2 | 2.3 | 1.8 |  | 3.6 |
| Overseas employee | - | - | - | 2 | 2 | - | 4 |
| Total |  |  |  | 1.5 | 1.8 |  | 0.5 |
|  | 200 | 105 | 119 | 132 | 110 | 140 | 806 |

Table 12: Father's Occupation of Women CSS Officers for selected CTPs

| Occupation/ CTP | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Service (Managerial) | 2 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 12 | 34 |
|  | 40.0 | 83.3 | 77.8 | 55.6 | 37.5 | 54.5 | 57.6 |
| Service (Non-Managerial) | 1 | - | 2 | 1 | 2 | - | 6 |
|  | 20.0 |  | 22.2 | 11.1 | 25.0 | 1 | 10.2 |
| Agriculture | 1 | - | - | - | 1 | 4.5 | 3 |
|  | 20.0 |  |  |  | 12.5 | 4 | 5.1 |
| Business | - | - | - | 1 | - | 18.2 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  | 11.1 |  | 5 | 8.5 |
| Independent Profession | 1 | 1 | - | 1 | 2 | 22.7 | 10 |
|  | 20.0 | 16.7 |  | 11.1 | 25.0 |  | 16.9 |
| Occupation (not specified) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Service (not specified) | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Overseas employee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 1 |

Table 13: Father's Annual Income of Male CSS Officers for selected CTPs

|  | CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | \% | 19 | 20 | \% | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | \% | 27 | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | No Income/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 31 | 23.5 |  | 15 | 13.6 |  |  |  | 7 | 5.0 |  | 53 | 13.8 |
|  | Not specified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Up to 30,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22 | 16.7 |  | 12 | 10.9 |  |  |  | 13 | 9.3 |  | 47 | 12.3 |
|  | Up to 60,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 33 | 25.0 |  | 25 | 22.7 |  |  |  | 19 | 13.6 |  | 77 | 20.2 |
| $\stackrel{5}{5}$ | Up to 120,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 28 | 21.2 |  | 31 | 28.2 |  |  |  | 46 | 32.8 |  | 105 | 27.5 |
| $\omega$ | Up to 200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 4.5 |  | 14 | 12.7 |  |  |  | 20 | 14.3 |  | 40 | 10.5 |
| $\stackrel{\text { 上 }}{ }$ | Above 200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 9.1 |  | 13 | 11.8 |  |  |  | 35 | 25.0 |  | 60 | 15.7 |
| 三 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 132 | 100 |  | 110 | 100 |  |  |  | 140 |  |  | 382 | 100 |

Note: Information on father's annual income is available only from $16^{\text {th }}$ CTP.
Table 14: Father's Annual Income of Women CSS Officers for selected CTPs

| CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | \% | 19 | 20 | \% | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | \% | 27 | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Income/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | - |  |
| Not specified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upto 30,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 11.1 |  | - |  |  |  |  | 2 | 9.1 |  | 3 | 7.6 |
| Upto 60,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 11.1 |  | 3 | 37.5 |  |  |  | 3 | 13.6 |  | 7 | 17.9 |
| Upto 120,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 44.4 |  | 3 | 37.5 |  |  |  | 4 | 18.2 |  | 11 | 28.2 |
| Upto 200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 33.3 |  | 1 | 12.5 |  |  |  | 4 | 18.2 |  | 8 | 20.2 |
| Above 200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  | 1 | 12.5 |  |  |  | 9 | 40.9 |  | 10 | 25.6 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 100 |  | 8 | 100 |  |  |  | 22 |  |  | 39 | 100 |

Table 15: Rural - Urban Background of Male DMG Officers 1973-98


Table 16: Level of Education of Male DMG Officers 1973-1998

| Level of Education/ CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MA, M Sc | 19 | 16 | 12 | 9 | 8 | 6 | 12 | 16 | 12 | 15 | 11 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 14 |  | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 187 | 40.7 |
| MA LLB, M Ed | 5 | 2 | 3 |  | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 33 | 7.2 |
| Double MA | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 1.9 |
| MPA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 8 | 1.7 |
| MBA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 12 | 2.6 |
| BA, B Sc | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 3 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 |  | 4 | 2 | 3 | 72 | 15.7 |
| BA LLB, B Ed | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 32 | 6.9 |
| B Sc (Engg) | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 48 | 10.5 |
| MBBS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 4 | 4 | , | 11 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  | 56 | 12.2 |
| Other Professional |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.22 |
| Not specified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0.22 |
| Total: | 32 | 20 | 19 | 12 | 10 | 14 | 18 | 27 | 25 | 26 | 33 | 19 | 27 | 16 | 28 | 17 | 12 | 19 | 7 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 17 | 12 | 459 | 100.0 |

Table 17: Division in which last examination passed by Male DMG Officers 1973-1998

| Division/ CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| First | 10 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 16 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 9 | 11 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 15 | 12 | 10 | 237 |
| \%age | 31.2 | 40.0 | 36.8 | 33.3 | 40.0 | 35.7 | 33.3 | 29.6 | 44.0 | 38.5 | 48.5 | 52.6 | 37.0 | 75.0 | 46.4 | 82.3 | 75.0 | 57.8 | 71.4 | 71.4 | 91.6 | 75.0 | 100 | 70.5 | 83.3 | 51.6 |
| Second | 22 | 12 | 11 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 15 | 13 | 15 | 12 | 8 | 14 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 194 |
| \%age | 68.7 | 60 | 57.8 | 66.7 | 40.0 | 57.1 | 50.0 | 55.6 | 52.0 | 57.7 | 36.4 | 42.1 | 51.8 | 18.7 | 53.6 | 17.6 | 8.3 | 31.6 | 28.6 | 28.6 | 8.3 | 25.0 |  | 23.5 | 16.7 | 42.3 |
| Third | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 19 |
| \%age |  |  | 5.3 |  | 20.0 | 7.1 | 16.7 | 11.1 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 12.1 |  | 3.7 |  |  |  | 8.3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.9 |  | 4.1 |
| Not Given | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.7 |  |  | 3.0 | 5.3 | 7.4 | 6.2 |  |  | 8.3 | 10.5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.9 |
| Total: | 32 | 20 | 19 | 12 | 10 | 14 | 18 | 27 | 25 | 26 | 33 | 19 | 27 | 16 | 28 | 17 | 12 | 19 | 7 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 17 | 12 | 459 |

Table 18: Type of School attended by Male DMG Officers (1973-1998)

| Type of School/ CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aitchison or equivalent | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 53 |
| \%age | 6.2 | 5.0 | 5.2 | 33.33 | 0 | 0 | 5.5 | 7.4 | 8.0 | 7.7 | 6.06 | 10.5 | 7.4 | 6.2 | 7.14 | 5.88 | 16.6 | 36.8 | 0 | 28.6 | 41.67 | 25.0 | 13.3 | 23.5 | 16.7 | 11.6 |
| Ordinary | 24 | 15 | 12 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 14 | 18 | 18 | 20 | 22 | 9 | 16 | 11 | 16 | 11 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 274 |
| \%age | 75.0 | 75.0 | 63.1 | 50.0 | 70.0 | 71.4 | 77.8 | 66.7 | 72.0 | 76.9 | 66.67 | 47.4 | 59.3 | 68.8 | 57.14 | 64.71 | 41.6 | 36.8 | 57.1 | 42.8 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 40.0 | 41.2 | 25.0 | 59.7 |
| Missionary | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 51 |
| \%age | 6.2 | 5.0 | 21.0 | 8.33 | 30.0 | 14.3 | 5.5 | 14.8 | 8.0 | 7.7 | 15.15 | 15.8 | 18.5 | 6.2 | 7.14 | 17.65 | 16.6 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 7.14 | 8.33 | 0 | 13.3 | 0 | 16.7 | 11.1 |
| Cadet School | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 36 |
| \%age | 6.2 | 0 | 5.2 | 0 | 0 | 7.1 | 0 | 7.4 | 4.0 | 0 | 3.03 | 10.5 | 7.4 | 18.8 | 14.29 | 5.88 | 8.3 | 10.5 | 28.5 | 7.14 | 8.33 | 25.0 | 12.5 | 11.8 | 25.0 | 7.8 |
| 'Model' School | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 38 |
| \%age | 3.1 | 15.0 | 0 | 8.33 | 0 | 0 | 11.1 | 0 | 8.0 | 7.7 | 9.09 | 15.8 | 3.7 | 0 | 10.71 | 5.88 | 16.6 | 5.7 | 14.3 | 7.14 | 16.67 | 0 | 20.0 | 23.5 | 16.7 | 8.3 |
| Not specified | , | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | , | 0 | , | 1 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| \%age | 3.0 | 0 | 5.2 | 0 | 0 | 7.1 | 0 | 3.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.7 | 0 | 3.57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.5 |
| Total: | 32 | 20 | 19 | 12 | 10 | 14 | 18 | 27 | 25 | 26 | 33 | 19 | 27 | 16 | 28 | 17 | 12 | 19 | 7 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 17 | 12 | 459 |

Table 19: Father's Occupation of Male DMG Officers 1973-1998

| Occupation/ CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Service (managerial) | 8 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 5 | 11 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 10 | 11 | 6 | 12 | 16 | 7 | 182 | 39.6 |
| Service (Non-Managerial) | 6 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 |  | 3 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 3 |  | 5 | 2 | 3 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 62 | 13.5 |
| Independent Profession | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 3 | 1 | 5 |  | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 |  | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 37 | 8.1 |
| Business | 5 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 |  | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 72 | 15.7 |
| Agriculture | 9 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 89 | 19.4 |
| Not specified |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 4 |  | 3 | 1 | 2 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 3.7 |
| Total: | 32 | 20 | 19 | 12 | 10 | 14 | 18 | 27 | 25 | 26 | 33 | 19 | 27 | 16 | 28 | 17 | 12 | 19 | 7 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 17 | 12 | 459 | 100.0 |

Table 20: Father's Annual Income of Male DMG Officers 1988-1998

| Income/ CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 12 | 9.0 |
| Income not specified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 4 |  | 5 | 3.7 |
| Upto 30,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 3 | 1 |  | 3 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 11 | 8.3 |
| Upto 60,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 18 | 13.5 |
| Upto 120,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 32 | 24.0 |
| Upto 200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 25 | 18.8 |
| Over 200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 6 | 4 | 5 | 30 | 22.5 |
| Total: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17 | 12 | 19 | 7 | 14 | 12 | 8 | 15 | 17 | 12 | 133 | 100.0 |

Table 21: Rural - Urban Background of Female DMG Officers 1973-98

| Back-ground/ CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rural |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17.6 |
| Urban | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 4 |  |  | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 28 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 82.4 |
| Total: | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 5 |  |  | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 34 |

Table 22: Level of Education of Female DMG Officers 1973-1998

| Level of Education/ CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MA, MSc |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 | 20 | 58.8 |
| MPA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.9 |
| MBA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8.8 |
| BA, BSc | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 7 | 20.6 |
| BA LLB, BA B Ed |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.9 |
| MBBS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 | 5.9 |
| Total: | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 5 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 34 |  |

Table 23: Division in which last examination passed by Female DMG Officers 1973-1998


Table 24: Type of School attended by Female DMG Officers (1973-1998)

| Type of School/ CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ordinary |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 12 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35.3 |
| Missionary | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 16 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47.1 |
| 'Model' School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17.6 |
| Total: | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 5 |  |  | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 34 |

Table 25: Father's Occupation of Female DMG Officers 1973-1998

| Occupation/ CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Service (managerial) |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 21 | 61.8 |
| Service (Non-Managerial) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.9 |
| Independent Profession | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 4 | 11.8 |
| Business |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 7 | 20.6 |
| Agriculture |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2.9 |
| Not specified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total: | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 5 |  |  | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 34 | 100.0 |

Table 26: Father's Annual Income of Women DMG Officers 1988-1998

| Income/ CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income not specified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Up to 30,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Up to 60,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 4 | 26.7 |
| Up to 120,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 4 | 26.7 |
| Up to 200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 13.3 |
| Over 200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 5 | 33.3 |
| Total: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 5 |  |  | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 100.0 |

Note: Information on father's annual income is available only from $16^{\text {th }}$ CTP. No woman was selected in DMG in CTP 16, 17, 20 and 21.
Table 27: Rural - Urban Background of Armed Forces Inductees into CSS* 1980-98

| Back-ground/ CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 57 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44.4 | 37.5 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 55.5 | 30.0 | 40.0 | 60.0 | 20.0 | 44.4 | 45.4 | 25.0 | 37.5 | 0 | 50.0 | 70.0 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 38.3 |
| Urban |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 92 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 55.5 | 62.5 | 75 | 75 | 44.4 | 70 | 60 | 40 | 80 | 55.5 | 54.5 | 75 | 62.5 | 100 | 50 | 30 | 83.3 | 83.3 | 61.7 |
| Total: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 16 | 8 | 8 | , | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 4 | . | , | + | 10 | 6 | , | 149 |

*Induction of Armed Forces officers into CSS under the Common Training Programme started from the $8^{\text {th }}$ CTP in 1980.
This analysis is made on the basis of background data of all the Armed Forces Inductees of $8^{\text {th }}$ to $25^{\text {th }}$ CTP.

Table 28: Level of Education of Armed Forces Inductees into CSS 1980-98

| Level of Education/ CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BA/B.Sc. or equivalent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 16 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 132 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 77.7 | 100 | 87.5 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 90 | 80 | 80 | 66.7 | 72.7 | 100 | 100 | 83.3 | 100 | 80 | 83.3 | 100 | 88.6 |
| MA/M.Sc. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.1 | 0 | 12.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 22.2 | 9.1 | 0 | 0 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 16.7 | 0 | 6.0 |
| B.Sc. Engineering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 11.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 2.7 |
| MBBS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.3 |
| BA LL.B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.3 |
| Total: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 16 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 8 |  | 4 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 149 |

Table 29: Division in which last examination passed by Armed Forces Inductees 1980-98

| Division/ CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 30 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.1 | 12.5 | 0 | 12.5 | 22.2 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 0 | 60.0 | 22.2 | 36.4 | 0 | 25.0 | 50.0 | 0 | 30.0 | 33.3 | 50.0 | 20.0 |
| $2^{\text {nd }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 92 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 77.8 | 50.0 | 37.5 | 50.0 | 44.4 | 80.0 | 60.0 | 70.0 | 40.0 | 77.8 | 63.6 | 100.0 | 75.0 | 16.7 | 100.0 | 70.0 | 66.7 | 50.0 | 61.7 |
| 3 rd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | , | 0 | 27 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.1 | 37.5 | 62.5 | 37.5 | 33.3 | 10.0 | 30.0 | 30.0 | - | - | - | - | - | 33.3 | - | - | - | - | 18.1 |
| Total: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 16 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 149 |

Table 30: Type of School attended by Armed Forces Inductees into CSS 1980-98

| Type of School/ CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aitcheson or equivalent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 13 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 12.5 | 0 | 12.5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 9.1 | 0 | 0 | 16.7 | 0 | 20 | 16.7 | 33.3 | 8.7 |
| Ordinary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 87 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 88.9 | 56.2 | 75 | 50 | 55.5 | 60 | 70 | 60 | 100 | 66.7 | 72.7 | 25 | 37.5 | 33.3 | 25 | 50 | 66.7 | 16.7 | 58.4 |
| Missionary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 18.7 | 12.5 | 0 | 11.1 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 0 | 22.2 | 9.1 | 25 | 0 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16.7 | 10.1 |
| Cadet School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 13 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.1 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 25 | 11.1 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11.1 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 16.7 | 0 | 8.7 |
| Model School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 21 |
| \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12.5 | 22.2 | 20 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 9.1 | 50 | 37.5 | 33.3 | 75 | 20 | 0 | 33.3 | 14.1 |
| Total: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 16 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 149 |

Table 31: Father's Occupation of Armed Forces Inductees into CSS 1980-98

|  | Occupation/ CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\infty$ | Service (Managerial) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 56 |
|  | \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22.2 | 31.2 | 62.5 | 50 | 22.2 | 50 | 40 | 10 | 20 | 33.3 | 18.2 | 75 | 50 | 16.7 | 75 | 40 | 33.3 | 83.3 | 37.6 |
|  | Service (Non-Managerial) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
|  | \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 33.3 | 18.7 | 12.5 | 0 | 11.1 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 40 | 0 | 9.1 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 25 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 13.4 |
| $\stackrel{\square}{0}$ | Independent Profession |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| $\sim$ | \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11.1 | 18.2 | 0 | 12.5 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 5.4 |
| $\underline{\omega}$ | Business |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 18 |
| 三 | \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 12.5 | 25 | 11.1 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 22.2 | 18.2 | 0 | 25 | 33.3 | 0 | 10 | 33.3 | 0 | 12.1 |
|  | Agriculture |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 32 |
|  | \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11.1 | 37.5 | 0 | 12.5 | 22.2 | 10 | 40 | 40 | 20 | 33.3 | 36.4 | 25 | 12.5 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 16.7 | 0 | 21.5 |
|  | Not specified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
|  | \%age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22.2 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 33.3 | 20 | 10 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10.1 |
|  | Total: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 16 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 149 |

Table 32: Father's Annual Income of Armed Forces Inductees 1980-98

| Income/ CTP | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | Total | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 4.3 |
| Income not specified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 6 | 8.7 |
| Upto 30,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 11 | 15.9 |
| Upto 60,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  | 4 | 2 | 2 | 13 | 18.8 |
| Upto 120,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |  | 19 | 27.5 |
| Upto 200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 3 |  | 10 | 14.5 |
| Over 200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 10.1 |
| Total: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 9 | 11 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 69 | 100.0 |

