

Conceptual Framework in Sociology of Education

Dr. Vikramendra Kumar

Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Delhi School of Economics, University of Delhi, New Delhi

Bardhan.vikramendra@gmail.com

Abstract

Education has frequently been portrayed as an optimistic human pursuit marked by hopes for advancement and improvement. Many see it as a path to financial success, social advancement, and overcoming physical limitations. Many people believe that schools should cater to each student's individual needs and abilities so that they can reach their full potential. Furthermore, it is thought of as a top method for attaining more equitable societal conditions. A lot of people think that schools should help students reach their maximum potential by providing them with opportunities to excel in areas where they're naturally strong (meritocracy). Nobody would claim that any school system manages to achieve this aim flawlessly. Some people have a very pessimistic outlook on the matter, claiming that educational institutions actively work to perpetuate socioeconomic inequality. Schooling is not an independent entity. We need to assess our society to find out where we excel and where we fall short so that we can tailor our educational initiatives to make it better. Many nations' educational systems ought to mirror their guiding philosophies. In order for it to work, it needs to be founded on what society wants, needs, and hopes for. It need to be associated with factors like cultural maturity, industrialisation, urbanisation rate, political structure, religious atmosphere, family dynamics, and social stratification. It ought to satisfy not just the necessities of life but also the hopes and dreams of those involved for the future.

Keywords: education, society, stratification, homogeneity, curriculum, institution.

Introduction

Sociologists believe that education is fundamentally social and occurs throughout society. As Durkheim contended in 1950: "It is society as a whole and each particular social milieu that determine the ideal that education realizes. Society can survive only if there exists among its members a sufficient degree of homogeneity; education perpetuates and reinforces this homogeneity by fixing in the

child from the beginning, the essential similarities that collective life demands. But on the other hand, without certain diversity all cooperation would be impossible; education assumes the persistence of this necessary diversity by being itself diversified and specialized" According to Durkheim, education unites the "I" and the "we" (individual and collective identities) in a regulated, stable, and meaningful way. As a kid grows up, he

or she becomes a part of society via internalising rules and ideals. This is why sociological methods of investigation and analysis of education are so important.

Swift (1969) noted that:

1. Everything that makes up a culture or people's way of life is taught in school. Biological inheritance has no role in any of it.

2. New experiences have a profound impact on human infants. That is, he has the potential to form a diverse set of worldviews, abilities, and values in relation to his perception and manipulation of the environment.

3. A newborn is completely reliant on other people from the moment of his birth and for a considerable amount of time afterward; in other words, he cannot form a human personality without receiving substantial assistance, either unintentional or intentional, from those around him.

Thus, according to him, education is "the process by which the individual acquires the many physical, moral social capacities demanded of him by the group into which he is born and within which he must function." The term used by sociologists to describe this process is socialisation. Socialisation is only one aspect of education. Everything that happens in a society, whether planned or not, includes some form of instruction or learning that shapes a youngster into an asset to that community. In order to demonstrate its gratitude for education, sociology must first articulate its sociological stance. According to Manheinn (1940), sociologists see education not just as a way to achieve cultural objectives like humanism or technological specialisation, but also as an integral aspect of shaping individuals.

Knowing the society and socioeconomic situation of the students is essential for understanding education.

Sociology of education, in a nutshell, is the study of how different social factors impact educational institutions and practices. It delves at the social processes that occur within a school. According to Ottaway (1962), it falls within the umbrella of social science as it is a scientific study of society. Economic, political, religious, social, and cultural elements are the focus as they pertain to educational goals, techniques, institutions, administration, and curriculum. When it comes to personal development, the sociology of education places an emphasis on how one's social life and interactions shape their personality. Sociology of education, then, is concerned with the study of educational institutions and phenomena through a social lens. The issues that have been identified are mostly seen as sociological concerns, rather than ones related to educational practice.

The field known as "sociology of education" focusses on studying educational systems through a scientific lens, specifically looking at the social processes and patterns at work inside them. They (Brookover and Gottlieb) think that "this assumes education is a combination of social acts and that sociology is an analysis of human interaction." There are both formal and informal settings in which learning can take place. Theorising scientific generalisations about human connections in the educational system may be guided by sociological research on human interaction in education, which might encompass both scenarios. Sociology of education examines the ways in which both formal educational systems and

personal histories shape students' educational paths and subsequent achievements. The expansion of adult, continuing, higher, and further education as well as public schooling in contemporary industrial societies are the primary foci. A philosophical and sociological notion, it denotes educational approaches, curriculum, and ideologies for the administration and inculcation of knowledge, as well as the social reproduction of cultures and personalities. The focus is on the dynamics between instructors and students as well as their behaviours and reactions within the classroom, drawing attention to the sociological issues within the field of education.

As a field of study, sociology of education has worked hard to deconstruct the concept of schooling and its relationship to socialisation and interpersonal dynamics. "The sociology of education has concerned itself with an understanding of the structures that shape educational processes and their outcomes as well as examined the processes themselves," comments Meenakshi Thapan. Nevertheless, the human being, her actuality, and her experience have received very little consideration (Thapan, 2015, p. 2). In this piece, I want to show how human subjects' varied experiences inform and shape the educational process. Understanding various theoretical perspectives on power and schooling is essential to my investigation into the nature and operation of power inside the educational institution and education more generally. Consequently, this chapter delves into current and Indian philosophical opinions as well as functionalist, Marxist, and postmodern

theories on power and education. That is, by situating education in a social framework, it becomes clear how different sociological perspectives have addressed the topic of education. In contrast to other viewpoints, the functionalists saw education as a beneficial force that could be harnessed via its many good outcomes, such as the development of moral sensibilities, the maintenance of social order, and the reduction of egotism.

Functionalist's Perspective on Education

A significant sociological viewpoint that rose to popularity in the 1800s is functionalism. It holds that common values and standards are necessary for society to function well, which is why it may be called a consensus theory. Every social institution, such as the family, the school, etc., serves a certain purpose and has a well-defined function. This permits social change to occur in an orderly fashion and guarantees widespread agreement on societal ideals and norms. To describe the connectivity and interaction of society's diverse parts, functionalists employ the notion of organic analogy or the human body. In addition, functionalists hold that dysfunction in other sections of society might be the cause of any issue in one sector of society. Functionalism was substantially impacted by thinkers such as Talcott Parsons and Emile Durkheim.

To put it simply, functionalists and their ideas hold that society as a whole relies on each and every one of its constituent parts to keep things running smoothly. In their view, society as a whole is more important than any one component, even if those components are all necessary for the society to function. Various social institutions

make up society, according to the functionalist. Particular implications for the efficient operation of society result from the fact that every institution is purpose-built to meet a wide range of needs. Every single institution in any given society is there mainly to serve a purpose or aid in the operation of that society. Without a clear mission, the institution will eventually crumble. Institutions change throughout time in response to societal demands. Emile Durkheim envisioned society as a being or organism in an effort to draw a comparison between the two. Every portion of a human or other organism has a certain purpose, but no one part can do it alone. Similarly, when one aspect of society experiences a crisis or failure, other aspects should adapt to fill the void.

Education was seen by the renowned French sociologist and trailblazing academic Emile Durkheim via a sociological lens. A "Tabula Rasa" that society crafts its own history, he called children. The 'basic commonalities' required by 'collective life' are, in his view, education's primary goal. Education, in his view, plays a pivotal role in passing on cultural standards and values; he wrote this in the nineteenth century. There must be uniformity among the people of the community for it to endure, in his view. This may be maintained and strengthened via education. In this way, education may aid in the restoration and feeling of a sense of collectivity. Imagine for a moment that kids are interested in developing an attachment to a certain item. Only by placing it in its proper historical perspective will they be able to think about or experience it as genuine and living. As a result, it strengthens the bond between

people and their community. In this setting, kids learn that they are an integral part of a bigger, more advanced civilisation. Education, in his view, is crucial for children's social development since it helps them be ready for the responsibilities of adulthood. Societies, in Durkheim's view, were more than the sum of their parts, and he argued against individualism and utilitarianism in his discussions of education. Specifically, he presented three:

1. Because it is socially constructed, education cannot be universally abstract. Education means different things to different societies at different points in history. The goal of education in the contemporary day should be to help students develop their unique strengths and areas of expertise. However, regardless of them, everyone has to learn a set of common standards and values. Both of these goals are advanced from one generation to the next via educational opportunities.

2. The purpose of educating a kid is to help them develop into contributing members of society; this process does not occur naturally. A person becomes a part of a larger whole as a result. Unlike biological factors, kids acquire a language and a set of cultural norms and values via their formative years. Education has a crucial role in instilling morality and discipline. Morality - Conforming to societal expectations and following a predetermined code of conduct is not a utilitarian pursuit. This is the root of discipline, which is the ability to rein in one's own behaviour so as not to impede the progress of others. A lesson of self-control is an essential component of abstract universalist principles, which are taught in school. In

such a state, the classroom takes on the characteristics of a holy space, a miniature civilisation complete with its own set of laws, values, traditions, and customs. Adherence to all of these teaches self-control. A key component of discipline is punishment as well. According to Durkheim, physical violence is not punishment. The purpose of punishment is to bring social order back into play by bringing about self-awareness through infractions of holy values.

3. In education, the function of the teacher is paramount. How much power does the educator have? This does not come from innate intelligence, charm, or athletic prowess. Because they represent the greater whole, teachers have sway over their students. They must carry on the traditions, customs, and legacy that have been passed down through generations. They stand for the moral collective's transforming force. School, he said, fulfils a number of crucial roles in industrial societies—often described as complex—that other main socialising institutions, such as families and peer groups, are unable to fulfil. By providing this setting, the school allowed students to see society in microcosm. Instilling the habits of "restraint" and "self-control" in youngsters is the school's policy of observing its norms and rules. He was a functionalist who understood that people need communities that embrace them in order for there to be harmony and peace. People are born into communities, and it is these communities that provide for and nurture them. Society also perpetuates and exacerbates existing disparities and schisms. Schooling has a significant role in children's socialisation since it introduces them to the social reality's dichotomies.

In his seminal work "Moral Education," he argued that a stable society requires values and that schools have a critical role to play in instilling these values in its pupils. He aimed to explore the interdependent nature of schools and social institutions, the connection between social transformation and education, and, most importantly, the roles played by social systems in society through this work. He adhered to positivism and placed an emphasis on the superiority of group strength above individual strength. Moral education rationalisation was necessary, in his view, to free individuals from intellectual or rational enslavement and to hone and improve their moral sensibility. Here, he wants instructors and educators to be proactive in anticipating the development of new attitudes. Durkheim argues that one of the primary roles of schools is to instill in students an awareness of and adherence to society's moral authority in order to foster the formation of a new individual who conforms to societal norms and expectations. Some researchers who focus on children may see it as too controlling and limiting. But Durkheim would argue that setting restrictions is necessary to protect children from the inevitable disappointments of being unique. To sum up, moral education is crucial in addressing the problem of extreme individualism in schools, which threatens both societal disorder and personal failure. There is no theological underpinning to morality, says Durkheim. So, he was referring to a secular morality that teaches children nothing in particular. The focus instead shifts to the area of social responsibility and discipline, which seeks to normalise behaviour, on the grounds that the person is incomplete apart from it.

"Teaching for morality" and "moral education" are two separate concepts that he defines. Moral education helps shape one's mental models, emotions, and behaviours in a positive way. Educators engage in what is known as "teaching for morality" when they provide pupils with a thorough explanation of moral principles rather than just dictating them or repeating them. Understanding morality is crucial, according to Durkheim, since it is dynamic. There are several kinds of morality, and kids need to know that. Teachers have a responsibility to help their students embrace the morality that exists now as well as any future morality that may emerge.

Durkheim had a highly optimistic view of schools, viewing them as ideal venues for teaching moral principles. Even the church was beyond of his reach since, in his view, a complete moral framework must be based on revelation and reason. Belonging is based on blood relations in the family and on an individual's free will in the peer group. Members of a society are not chosen based on their own preferences or familial connections. So, everyone in society should work to get along with everyone, not just their close friends and family. Schools impart these abilities because they serve as tiny representations of social systems and societies. There was no way, in his view, to start moral teaching at a young age, let alone transmit it to adult agencies. The first portion of childhood, according to his book "Moral Education," occurs within the home. The second part, during primary school, occurs when the kid leaves the home and gradually integrates into society. This second stage, when the kid leaves the home, is crucial for the development of

moral principles, but it is not enough. His main point was that schools had a tremendous responsibility to play in shaping students' moral character. If this were to happen, an integral part of the culture would go. Because if the family is uniquely able to instill and organise the warm feelings essential to morality and, more broadly, to even the most fundamental interpersonal connections, then it is not the agency structured to teach children to conform to societal norms. It is, practically speaking, an unsuitable agency for the job. Thus, by centring our research on the school, we have arrived at the very place that ought to be considered the epicentre, if not the exclusive centre, of moral growth for children of this age. In our schools, we will teach students a fully logical moral code, free from any notions based on religion. This is a promise we made to ourselves. At this juncture in history, the issue of moral education becomes crystal evident (Durkheim, 1961, pp. 18-19). Consequently, this moral education should be taught and studied in schools. All students are expected to adhere to the school's established laws and norms in order to facilitate their interactions with their fellow students. This is one method that schools prepare students to be contributing members of society. According to Durkheim, children internalise society norms in general when they follow the regulations of school. Additionally, kids begin to understand the need of self-control and restraint. Children take their responsibilities, roles, and lives seriously from this point on.

Schools and their social duties were also part of his discussion of morality, punishment, and discipline. The goal of

instilling morality in children is to foster regularity in their behaviour by fixing and regulating it and by excluding individual doubt. He held the view that morality is essentially static; that is, it does not change over very long time periods. No matter the actor's biases, a moral act should remain unchanged from one day to the next. Following this line of reasoning, morality assumes the ability to behave similarly under comparable conditions, which in turn implies the ability to form habits and the necessity for regularity. According to Durkheim (1961, p. 27), "all social customs almost inevitably have a moral character" because of how closely customary behaviour is linked to moral conduct. Integral to morality is the idea of authority, which explains the ways in which moral power shapes our actions and the extent to which we recognise its superiority. Therefore, out of respect, one ought to observe moral order. By "authority," we mean the force that makes us submit to any and every moral authority that we see as being above us. We comply with authority's demands not because we find the behaviour desirable or because we have an intrinsic or learnt bias towards it, but because the authority figures imposing the rules are so powerful. According to Durkheim (1961, p. 29), obedience is composed of this kind of submission. Thus, Morality is more than just a set of rules for how people should act, according to Durkheim. As Durkheim put it, "it is a system of commandments" (1961, p. 31). Here, we can see how disciplining ethos brings these two aspects of morality back together. Authority and the regulation of behaviour are the hallmarks of discipline. For Durkheim, the core of the discipline is morality in this setting. But such a result

offends a common human feeling. We are compelled to obey its dictates not because of the importance of the deeds we are required to perform, but simply because it commands us, and this leads us to believe that moral discipline should be valued independently (Durkheim, 1961, p. 35). Within this framework, children learn discipline from the moral actors in society. "Morality is essentially a discipline," he stated. Discipline has a dual purpose: first, it encourages a particular level of regularity in people's behaviour; second, it gives them clear objectives that restrict their potential. Constraints and reinforcement of the conventional are hallmarks of discipline. It limits and standardises. In other words, it addresses the perennial and recurrent issues plaguing human interactions (Durkheim, 1961, p. 47). While punishment is an inevitable part of discipline, it does not confer power but rather prevents discipline from relinquishing it. Emile Durkheim penned voluminous works on the subject of punishment and its function in the educational system. He holds the moral authority of society in the highest regard. This power loses its holiness if it is violated. The moral harm caused by misbehaviours is clear: they destroy the trust that students have in the school's rules and regulations. So, the law should constantly remind them that it won't stand for any kind of defiance or rebellion. To restore children's trust in school laws and their moral authority, punishment is a vital tool. Teachers here have a moral obligation to assist, explain, and enforce compliance with the school's policies and procedures. The moral authority, according to Durkheim, is with the educators. They do it in the name of a God that he knows personally and feels a

deeper relationship with than the average person in the audiences he speaks to. The lay instructor, then, is free to and even encouraged to feel this way. Also, the kid connects with a tremendous moral reality via him, but he has a more direct line of communication with this reality than the child has since he acts as an intermediary. The priest, like a prophet, translates the lofty moral ideals of his nation and period into words that the people can understand. Since he represents and personifies these concepts to children, anything associated with them—including the weight and importance placed on them—invariably follows him and anything emanating from him (Durkheim, 1961, p. 155). Therefore, instructors exercise moral authority within the classroom.

The idea of individual unity or collectiveness and the development of a shared moral conscience were central to Durkheim's work. Be mindful that Durkheim never downplayed the importance of the individual in favour of the group. Instead, he argued that the continuation of society as a cohesive whole depended on people tending to their deepest, most fundamental selves. There are three main components of morality, in his view. The first is self-control, which aids in regulating aggressive, self-centred conduct; the second is attachment, which shows how dedicated an individual is to a certain social group; and the third is autonomy, which entails taking responsibility for one's own acts. Education, he made plain, is a wellspring of ethics. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that education has the power to alter people's morals and usher in societal transformation.

Max Weber once claimed, in reference to the Chinese literati, that the purpose of education is to inculcate a "life conduct" in students, which may be either religious or secular. He held the view that "the conduct of one's status group" genuinely dictates how one lives their life. Weber argues that the ultimate goal of education is to produce a certain type of man whose conduct is dictated by the specific layer of ideals associated with education. There is a shift in emphasis from the idea that society's goodness predominates in human education to the role of a particular status group in an effort to teach individuals. Weber is making special reference to the warrior class, the intelligentsia, and other social strata of China here. His educational philosophy, which he maintains by continually highlighting certain status groups, reveals that it does not promote societal cohesiveness but rather creates opportunities for various status groups to exercise their power and affect the allocation of resources. Given this setting, it is reasonable to assume that Weber considered "educational credentials" to be a valuable asset, as they convey "cultural capital" that contributes to the maintenance of the status quo while facilitating social mobility for various demographics. In this respect, Weber's views are similar to those of Karl Marx on education, according to whom schools serve primarily to inculcate the ideals and interests of the ruling class. The dominant groups in society use and control educational processes for their own ends and to maintain the status quo. Yet, by elucidating social action through the eyes of social actors, Weber further establishes his theory of society. Therefore, society is not just about institutions and how they impact

human behaviour, but also—and perhaps most importantly—about the meaning that social players ascribe to their actions.

Although he avoided discussing it in class, Max Weber's writings on bureaucratic organisations show that he was interested in educational businesses. While discussing formal organisations, Weber presented his bureaucratic theory. He read up on bureaucratic theory's professional ethics and political neutrality. In spite of his strong conservative leanings, he was far more pragmatic and progressive in his views. In a bureaucratic society, he perceived a danger to individuals and a fall of liberalism. There are three distinct kinds of authority that he covered:

1. Traditional authority (present in family) – Derives its legitimacy from acceptance from the existing masses. One who takes pleasure in authority is called a master. There are no established policies, duties, or guidelines here. In addition, the personnel here lacks formal and technical understanding, and they justify their acts by using cultural norms.

2. Charismatic authority (present in feudalism) – In such a situation, the leader develops distinctive traits, and his followers adhere to him on the basis of their faith in those traits.

3. Legal rational authority (present in bureaucracy) – It is also called the "ideal type of bureaucracy" by Weber. Here, the appropriate norms and policies are in place. Weber maintains that each of these authorities must be examined independently in order to identify and understand their traits.

That "the concept of rationality and efficiency are intertwined in the bureaucratic analysis of Max Weber" holds

water requires an examination of the bureaucracy's defining features. Some of the key aspects of bureaucracy that Max Weber emphasised are listed below:

- Impersonal order
- Rules should be followed in rigid manner
- People have obligation towards their assigned duties
- Decisions and actions are taken on the basis of written rules
- Officials can gain expertise through systematic and professional training
- It should be impersonal and neutral
- Strict discipline must be maintained within this hierarchical structure
- Any professional should not use its official power for personal gains
- Official business should be conducted in a continuous basis which means that it should not matter which government comes or goes but the work of the officials should continue.
- Every official and office should be a part of hierarchical structure
- According to Weber, it is permanent and indispensable

In light of the aforementioned merits, Weber concludes that bureaucratic firms constitute the optimum type model for modern, complex organisations due to their rationality and efficiency.

According to him, a large portion of people's daily lives in contemporary cultures are characterised by bureaucratic processes. All the parts of a bureaucracy, in his view, work together to make it the most efficient and reasonable kind of organisation. He provided a model for the school's culture by outlining his "ideal type" organisational structure, complete with rules and regulations, administrative

hierarchy, division of labour, "formalistic rationality," and rational behaviour. He sees this "ideal type" as belonging to a conceptual category rather than an actual construction. In his description of the "ideal type," he stressed the importance of explicit norms that control major choices made by any organisation. But it doesn't take into account the fact that these regulations are routinely disregarded and broken in practice. The establishment of bureaucratic organisations, in his view, serves primarily to accomplish predetermined objectives in the most efficient and logical way feasible. Reducing each activity to smaller, more manageable pieces allows for better management and organisation. According to him, bureaucratic organisations are able to promote specialisation and take on complicated duties by implementing division of labour. This division of labour is accompanied by a real hierarchy of power, which is represented by a pyramid structure. Every level of management is defined precisely, and many companies even have written policies and procedures to follow. An example would be the rules and regulations laid down in an academic institution's handbook or almanack. Within the context of his "social action theory," his ideal model of bureaucracy becomes clear. All human acts are guided by meanings, he says, and it's necessary to infer a meaning from an action if you want to explain or comprehend it. Different from one another, he explains three distinct kinds of activity. There are three types of actions: rational, affective, and traditional. Rationality is a natural metaphor for contemporary culture and the educational system. This logical step aids the ideal official in carrying out their responsibilities with a "formalistic

impersonality" that is free from animosity and emotion. Rather than relying on subjective factors like emotional connection or sentiments, these tasks are carried out according to established protocols. Everything is governed by this idea of instrumental rationality in schools as well. The logical, ever-present processes and policies discourage rash decisions and test the imaginations of both educators and their pupils. There is no direction in the learning process, and the end result is the spiritless output of specialists. Schools in this context see themselves as models of "bureaucratic organisations" (as Weber would call them) and are constructing a "iron cage"¹ to limit and confine its agents so that they can come up with new and creative ideas. According to him, we run the risk of becoming ensnared in the bureaucratic organization's web of specialised procedures that provide consistency at the expense of individual rationality. Furthermore, it has a tendency to do away with conventional morality and values that provide direction and significance to an individual's life. He mainly wanted to know how this system may work against people's ability to break free of their humanity and their eventual domination over this bureaucratic way of life.

When it comes to school bureaucracy, conflict and functionalist theorists couldn't be more divided. According to conflict theorists, the bureaucratisation of schools prioritises the needs of the privileged over those of the working class. This bureaucratically planned education, on the other hand, is seen by functionalist thinkers as being consistent with industrialisation. Locating the complete process of schooling

in modern countries becomes crucial when investigating its domain and the workings of bureaucracy. In old culture, there were several types of schools, but they were not often divided up among themselves. A bureaucratic atmosphere is being created as a result of this institutionalisation of schooling as a result of societal advancement, an upturn in the division of labour, city development, and fast industrialisation. As classrooms get increasingly specialised and the grading system becomes more rigid, schools establish hierarchies and establish lines of power. Taking into account factors such as age, experience, duties, and credentials, it creates a hierarchical structure in which certain instructors are placed over others in the workforce. Within the school, there was a shift towards standardising processes and an emphasis on measuring efficiency as they were followed. The division of labour between teaching and administrative duties is a common feature of today's schools. Central administrative power is exercised over them by those who are not involved in the teaching process, even if instructors have administrative tasks inside their own classrooms. Decisions about school activities, classroom dynamics, and discipline are made by the principal, who also serves as the official administrative head of the school. Additionally, the administrator keeps an eye on instructors by comparing their classroom performance to pupils' test scores. Thus, yearly student performance serves as an indirect measure of a teacher's effectiveness. The principal's authority is not unchecked in this context, however, due to the numerous limitations imposed by various regulatory organisations and education boards, etc.

The ideal-typical bureaucratic paradigm that he espoused held that power did not reside with people but with the office itself. The scope of this power is severely limited to matters that directly affect the organization's ability to run efficiently. Consequently, the two most prominent features of bureaucratic settings are control and order, which are also present in schools. Schools are concerned with managing pupils' actions, whereabouts, mental processes, and physical discipline. The rules and regulations of any given school inform the students on how the school operates, such as the appropriate time to enter, the locations of the restrooms, the permitted activities, and the foods that are allowed. Standardised curricula, examination patterns, textbooks, etc. are provided to teachers by the school regulations, which they are supposed to adhere to. This has a negative effect on instructors' ability to express themselves creatively in the classroom.

The educational process is dynamic in modern civilisations, argues Karl Mannheim, due to the ever-changing character of society itself. Human connection and involvement, in his view, is an ever-present component in practice. According to him, "Education has to prepare members of a society to conform on the one hand and, it is a democratic society, to have the opportunity and scope for individuality on the other" (Mannheim and Stewart, 1962, page ten). Sociology, in Mannheim's view, was an essential discipline for comprehending the reciprocal relationship between the social and the philosophical and psychological in the context of education. "Based upon the plasticity of human nature and which aims

at a selection of social and personal experiences for concentrated presentation" (Mannheim & Stewart, 1962, p. 10). In this perspective, the educational process is dynamic. Education, instruction, training, and learning are all quite different things. Promoting the idea of agencies and schools as integral parts of "an educative society" is central to the educational process. According to Mannheim, education not only helps individuals adapt to society, but also changes society itself. Here, Mannheim discussed the "sociology of education" by highlighting the dynamic link between education and three crucial societal functions: democratisation, environmental control, and community involvement. Part of democratising is making sure that everyone pitches in when needed. An individual can have more strong influence over society if they are able to expand media, social services, and numerous social strategies via controlling their surroundings. The 'community concern' for Mannheim highlights the fact that education is provided not just by schools but by the entire community. A strong advocate for the idea that "the coat must be cut according to the cloth, but it also must be cut according to the would-be wearer" (Mannheim & Stewart, 1962, p. 32), he argued that the interaction between society and individuals formed the educational core. Considering people's potential as agents of social change, this demonstrates his interest in the educational process for people and their function, as well as the enabling aspect of such a structure to educational practice.

Political philosopher John Dewey was an early proponent of what is now known as "progressive education," an approach to

teaching that places an emphasis on the learner rather than the teacher. Learning by doing, activity-based learning, and child-centered education are all tenets of Dewey's pedagogical philosophy. He worried about the way pupils learn in school and paid attention to both more conventional ways of knowing and more modern approaches that provide students more flexibility. According to him, there are two poles of extreme philosophy here: one advocates for conservative and authoritarian methods of education, while the other advocates for complete freedom for kids. He believes that teaching students to be accountable members of a democratic society is one of education's broader societal purposes. John Dewey offered his theory of experience, which addresses students' sense-making about their school, at this point in the learning process, and the importance of "experience" becomes clear. He held the view that teachers' prior experiences shape their present ones. Consequently, it paves the way for the youngster to have future encounters inside this rapidly expanding realm of knowledge. Therefore, in Dewey's opinion, the two most important aspects of a kid's school experience, "interaction" and "continuity," are present and necessary for the child to reach his or her full potential as an engaged citizen.

John Dewey set up his "Laboratory School" in 1896 to try out several "progressive" approaches to education. He cared about the results in the classroom and tried many approaches to learn how education might strengthen democracies. Like Durkheim, he published "The School and Society" and held the view that the purpose of education is to restore discipline and order in society. Any reforms implemented in schools, in his

view, would be either short-lived or unfair if they did not adapt to the changing needs of society. Students, in his view, should participate in extracurricular activities because of the vital role they play in the educational institution. He emphasised that when different types of active activity are introduced into the school, it revitalises the overall spirit of the institution. It has the potential to become an integral part of the child's life, his home away from home, where he learns by doing, rather than just a location to study things that have some vague, faraway connection to how he could live in the future. It has the potential to develop into a little society in its early stages. Continuous and ordered streams of teaching come from this fundamental reality (Dewey, 1915, p. 15). He believes that today's youth lack knowledge of the fundamental abilities that laid the groundwork for modern civilisation. Here, schools should provide a solid groundwork for students to build upon as they grow into productive members of society. A person's intellect and body are strong tools that they should be able to use to benefit oneself and society.

Dewey argued that children were relegated to the role of passive learners in the previous educational system. The educational program back then was also quite generic and one-size-fits-all. However, with an open mind and a love of discovery, every youngster possesses inherent creativity, originality, and curiosity. Children lose interest and pay less attention when information is passed down to them with the expectation that they will replicate it. Instead than trying to force knowledge on youngsters, his educational philosophy emphasises their innate

curiosity and motivation to study. He emphasised the need of testing and critical thinking in getting to the bottom of things. A child's mind is never idle; he is constantly thinking of something new to share, and an idea isn't really an idea unless it is one's own. In the conventional approach, the youngster is required to recite an item that he has new knowledge of. "Having something to say is completely different from having to say something," (Dewey, 1915, p. 50). He takes children's perspectives and limits into account when he explains that teachers should not let students pursue their hobbies without direction, but rather should have predetermined objectives in mind.

He thought that the best way to encourage people to realise their greatest potential was by formal education. He advocated for learning by experience rather than the traditional method of "rote learning" in schools. In addition to assisting with information acquisition, this sort of learning exercise also aids in the development of positive attitudes, habits, and skills in youngsters. Kids learn to handle life's challenges on their own when they do this. He thinks that active learning is good for kids because it makes them value their abilities and think critically. Here, this "Progressive Education" plays a crucial role in the efficient operation of democracies by encouraging independent thought. Additionally, he believed that the development of critical thinking skills would serve as a springboard to protect society against the dangers of tyranny. If they want to get the incentive to study pleasantly, students should participate meaningfully.

When looking at education from a

functionalist angle, the work of American sociologist Talcott Parsons is essential. To investigate societal stability and functioning, he created the renowned AGIL model. According to his AGIL model, schools, like other social systems, should carry out four main roles. The letters "A," "G," "I," and "L" make up the acronym AGIL, which stands for adaptation, goal achievement, integration, and latency, respectively. One is "adaptation," which entails gathering enough resources. As a second stage, there is the 'target accomplishment' that entails putting plans into action. The third component of any social system is its "integration," which entails keeping the many parts of that system working together in harmony. Finally, there is the 'latency' phase, which entails passing on and protecting the unique way of life of the system. He used his AGIL model on several levels. He portrayed the institution of higher learning as a "social system" that imparts values and principles while preserving societal harmony. His idea of schools as society in "miniature" was similar to Durkheim's. In contrast to universalistic ideas, the idea of accomplishment in modern industrial society is based on attributing particularities. By encouraging students to think critically about how society works, schools help shape the next generation for success. He made the interesting observation that when families have fulfilled their socialisation responsibilities, the school steps in as a "formal agency of socialisation" for children. As a community, we work together via the school to help kids get ready for adulthood. As part of his analysis of schools as a social institution, he draws distinctions between

primary and secondary school classrooms. In light of its fundamental functions as a socialisation and allocation agency, he also examined its structure. According to him, classrooms are just one small aspect of a much bigger institution called a school. People and the educational system alike see classrooms as the site of formal instruction in action. "In elementary schools, pupils of one grade are typically placed in a single 'class' under one main teacher. However, in secondary school and sometimes in the upper elementary grades, the pupil works on different subjects under different teachers. Here, the complex of classes participated in by the same pupil is the significant unit for our purposes" (Parsons, 1968, p. 198). He goes on to explain that this is not usually the case. To paraphrase, "our main interest, then, is the dual problem: first of how the school class functions to internalise in its pupils both the commitments and capacities for successful performance of their future adult roles and second of how it functions to allocate these human resources within the role structure of adult society." (Heidegger, 2018). Our major points of reference will be the principal ways in which these two issues are connected to one another (Parsons, 1968, p. 199). 'Particularistic values' are applied by the family, the children's principal socialising agent, whilst 'universalistic values,' which are universal and do not take familial links into account, are applied by the school. In this regard, he held the view that the school facilitates the transition from a particularistic to a universalistic, achievement-based society. "The classroom can be seen as a socialisation agency from a functional perspective," says Parsons. In other words, it is a system that helps shape

people's personalities so that they are capable of carrying out adult responsibilities both emotionally and intellectually.

In addition to official training programs, informal networks such as "peer groups," churches, and other volunteer organisations play an important role. But the classroom may be considered the central socialising agency from the time a child enters the first grade until they enter the workforce or get married (Parsons, 1968, p. 199). The process by which people acquire the knowledge, skills, and values essential to carrying out their roles effectively in the future is, hence, the socialisation function. "Commitment" is a two-part word. An individual's dedication to seeing through the society's overarching principles comes first. The second is the resolve to carry out a certain function inside the established framework of society. "Thus a person in a relatively humble occupation may be a 'solid citizen' in the sense of commitment to honest work in that occupation, without an intensive and sophisticated concern with the implementation of society's higher level values" (Parsons, 1968, pagination 199). However, there are two parts to the word "capabilities" as well. A person's ability to carry out the duties associated with their position should be considered first. Second, the ability to adapt one's interpersonal conduct to fit certain social positions, sometimes known as "role-responsibility," is crucial. "Thus a mechanic as well as a doctor needs to have not only the basic 'skills of his trade', but also the ability to behave responsibly towards those people with whom he is brought into contact in his work" (Parsons, 199).

The transition from the primary socialising

agency—their families—to the secondary agency—the official schooling system—occurs when children are compelled to attend school. As a social group, families are structured primarily according to biological factors such as generation, sex, and age. They are rewarded or penalised based on how well they do in relation to these, which leads to various character development. However, there is no institutionalised social status that validates these distinctions. For children, the formation of social stratification based on factors other than biology takes place first and foremost in the classroom. In addition, this status is not bestowed but acquired; rather, it is 'earned' by unequal completion of the assignments given by the educator, who is functioning as a representative of the community's educational system (Parsons, 1968, p. 202). From particularistic to universalistic standards, that is the direction the school teaches its students to go. The norms and regulations of the school are taken into account when evaluating a child's behaviour and conduct, and the results of their exams reveal how well they did in school. All students are subject to the same regulations and expectations regardless of their gender, socioeconomic level, or any other label assigned to them. Under the 'meritocracy' ideas, which govern school operations, students' accomplishments are seen as the foundation of their merit.

Schools fulfil their socialising role by teaching children fundamental social ideals in this way. According to Parsons, "value consensus" is essential for the health of any community. Two important ideals that he identified in American schools—the value of "achieving" and "equality of opportunity"—were the focus of his

analysis. By praising and rewarding students for their academic success, the school fosters this sense of accomplishment. Approximately twenty-five male and female classmates from the surrounding neighbourhood make up the class. At the outset, there is no official foundation for status differential within the school class, with the exception of sex in certain areas. Gradually, along a single accomplishment axis, the primary structural distinction emerges. There are four fundamental aspects of the circumstance that guarantee the differentiation will happen along one main axis. One is the initial levelling of the "contestants' status" according to age and "family background," with the neighbourhood usually being considerably more homogenous than society as a whole. The second scenario is the forced standardisation of a set of activities that is remarkably bland in comparison to other domains of work. When compared to other contexts including role performances, the school setting is quite similar to a race in this regard. Third, the students' initial equality with the adult instructor who stands in for the adult world causes a rapid polarisation. Finally, fourthly, the students' work is assessed in a very organised fashion. Report card grades in particular serve as a means of rewarding or punishing students based on their prior performance; from the perspective of the school system as an allocation agency, they serve as a foundation for determining their social standing in the future (Parsons, 1968, pp. 203-204).

He asserts that people are chosen by society's educational system with their future duties in mind. Schools assign children human resources according to the

role structure of adult society. Assessments and examinations are used by schools to assess students' abilities, talents, and capabilities in order to determine if they are qualified for a certain job. As a tool for assigning responsibilities, schools play a crucial role. He also differentiates between two kinds of schools while he's on the subject. The difference between more "traditional" and more "progressive" institutions is the most significant sort of diversity here. In contrast to progressive schools, which allow for more indirect instruction through projects and wider thematic interest, conventional schools place a greater focus on distinct units of subject-matter. In progressive schools, student-teacher collaboration takes precedence over the more conventional model of one-on-one instruction.

This is connected to the changing focus from students competing with one another to working together, from a more lenient approach to punishment to a more relaxed one, and from official grading to informal feedback. Depending on the school, one of these factors may have a larger role than the other. Still, the fact that it represents a sizable variety is obvious (Parsons, 1968, pp. 203-204). Nevertheless, the significance of the primary shape is unaffected by this separation. He draws on these differences to argue that, unlike in a family, there is no opportunity for individual attention in a school classroom because of the large number of students. As a result, unlike parents, instructors rarely get the opportunity to show any pupil any special treatment. He makes an effort to dissect the idea of "accomplishment" commonly associated with primary school pupils. First, there is the "cognitive"

acquisition of facts, knowledge, mathematical reasoning, written language, and reference frames associated with technical expertise and empirical understanding. The cognitive abilities required for each of these tasks are higher-level and more generalised than those of a pre-schooler. Gaining a deeper understanding of the world and its facts is possible with the help of these foundational abilities. Next, we have the 'moral' aspect. 'Deportment' was the name given to this moral component in past educational generations, he remarked. Responsible citizenship in the school community is a more generic term that might be used (Parsons, 1968, p. 206). Good work habits, respect for instructors, and care for one's fellow students are all part of it. In primary school, these aspects of success are rarely explicitly defined; rather, kids are evaluated using a variety of vague phrases, which makes it difficult to demonstrate their ability to take the lead or demonstrate initiative. "A good pupil is defined in terms of a fusion of the cognitive and the moral components, in which varying weight is given to one or the other" (Parsons, p. 206, 1968).

American culture has long been engaged in a process of cultural upgrading, with the school system playing a significant part in this process. In keeping with a more diverse and technologically advanced society, we have witnessed the specialised agency of education grow into a major route of socialising agency. Because it is often believed that formal education is the exclusive path to success, the idea of a "self-made man" has been romanticised or even mythological in our educational system. Public school analysis and

structure, according to Parsons, help to socialise and assign responsibilities to individuals in American society.

Education and social reproduction

In contrast to structural functionalist theory, conflict theory maintains that society is rife with competing social groupings, each with its own set of goals, opportunities, and incentives. Societal relations, according to this theory, revolve around dominance, subordination, exploitation, and oppression. For some kids, the presumption that their families would have a middle-class background isn't borne out by their classroom experiences. After school, some kids are expected to pitch in and help out around the house, especially in homes where there is only one parent. Their academic performance suffers since they are unable to complete all of their assignments due to the high demand for domestic employment.

Some students' skills were brought to light in classrooms where professors were able to relax the rules of regular study and include individuals' preferred ways of work within the curriculum. Nevertheless, the majority of educators stick to the tried-and-true curriculum, which reveals the state's and powerful people's views on what counts as knowledge. A large portion of the student body views this information as irrelevant and unimportant. The students understand, according to Wilson and Wyn, that their coursework has little bearing on their future careers. It's not uncommon for these kids' awareness of their own interests to inform their anti-school stance. Sargent thinks that working-class kids who want to be successful and acquire the ideals of the middle class are just as likely to accept their

social inferiority as if they were hell-bent on failing. Fitzgerald claims that economically disadvantaged pupils "have relatively little chance of securing success" regardless of their intellectual aptitude or want to learn. Conversely, there is minimal work involved for children from middle-class and affluent families to keep their social status quo. So that the wealthy may afford a "good education," the federal government subsidises "independent" private schools. This "good education" helps the children of the wealthy do better in school, climb the corporate ladder, and reap bigger benefits. This ensures that the wealthy and privileged may enjoy their status for the foreseeable future.

According to conflict theorists, the dominant group's ideology permeates every aspect of the educational system, ensuring that this social reproduction will continue. Essentially, what they do is keep spreading the idea that anyone can get rich and famous by simply getting a degree. According to the story, if you don't succeed in reaching your objective, it's all your fault. When asked about the impact of the myth on individuals, Wright acknowledged that it prevents people from realising that their problems are interconnected with larger societal concerns. Because the deceit is so effective, many parents put their children through terrible occupations for years on end, thinking that this will provide them chances they never had. A social confidence trick has taken advantage of these low-income and disadvantaged people. They have been led to believe that education's primary purpose is to promote equality, but the truth is that schools mirror society's will to preserve the existing power and status imbalances. Opponents of this

outlook, however, see it as fatalistic and deterministic. But keep in mind that it's only a model—a representation of reality that's integral to the whole picture.

Conclusion

Pierre Bourdieu has made substantial theoretical contributions to this notion of social reproduction. But the duality of structure and agency—the objective and the subjective—has long preoccupied Bourdieu in his work as a social theorist. Thus, habitus, field, and cultural capital are the cornerstones of Bourdieu's theoretical framework. The primary premise upon which these ideas rest is that, via the habitus process, objective structures dictate an individual's prospects. On the other hand, one's family, daily life, and professional and academic roles all contribute to the development of one's habitus. That is why, although there are other elements at play, a person's social status is not the exclusive determinant of their future opportunities. Bourdieu investigated the disparities in educational achievement across socioeconomic groups in France by way of the concept of cultural capital. The conflict between conservative reproduction and creative knowledge and experience generation was something he investigated. He discovered that the question of whose cultural history and traditions should be preserved and passed on in schools exacerbates this tension. According to Bourdieu, schools serve as a repository for the cultural capital of the dominant groups, which in turn causes social reproduction. The school normalises the dominant group's cultural capital by assuming it is the sole valid kind of cultural capital, which

manifests itself in the dominant group's activities and relationships to culture. It requires all pupils to have what it does not provide, according to Bourdieu. Students with this valid cultural capital are able to acquire educational capital in the shape of credentials. Less fortunate pupils are thus at a disadvantage. In order to advance in their careers, individuals need to trade in their own cultural capital—typically that of the working class—for respectable cultural capital. The lower-class pupils' class attitude makes this conversation more complicated than it has to be. The individual attitudes and subjective expectations towards one's school and culture make up one's class ethos. The objective probabilities of that class have a role in determining it. This implies that kids have it tough at school because they have to fight against their natural inclinations and expectations while simultaneously learning a new way of "being," or interacting to the world—and particularly, a new way of relating to and utilising language. Less fortunate students are encouraged to withdraw from the system as one moves through the levels due to the subjective expectations shaped by the objective structures present in the school, which in turn perpetuates social reproduction. Despite the fact that social reproduction is far from flawless, only a tiny percentage of kids from disadvantaged backgrounds succeed. In order to thrive academically, most of these kids have adopted the norms and practices of the ruling class, which has meant abandoning their own cultural heritage and way of life.

Thus, Bourdieu's perspective reveals the crucial role of objective institutions in determining academic achievement, while

also allowing for the exercise of agency to overcome these obstacles—albeit with consequences.

References

- [1] Alam, Arshad. 2013. Controlling Minds, Disciplining Bodies: Life inside a Madrasa. In Geetha Nambissan and Srinivas Rao. (ed.) *Sociology of Education*. Delhi, OUP.
- [2] Apple, M. (1982). *Education and Power*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- [3] Apple, M. (1987). *Teachers and Texts: A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education*. Routledge.
- [4] Apple, M. W. (1979). *Ideology and Curriculum*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Aurobindo, S. (1950). *The Human Cycle*. New York: The Sri Aurobindo Library.
- [5] Apple, Michael. 1982. Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education. *Essays on Class, ideology and the state*. London, RKP. (Chapter 1 and 9).
- [6] Aurobindo, S. (1992). *A New Education for a New Consciousness*. Pondicherry: Sri Aurobindo Ashram.
- [7] Batra, Poonam. 2014. Probalematizing Teacher Education Practices in India. *Developing a Research Agenda. Education As change*. Vol. 18, No. S1: S5-S18
- [8] Bernstein, Basil. 1996. *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity*, London, Tylor and Francis. (Chapter 1)
- [9] Bourdieu, Pierre. 2008. *A Sketch for Self-Analysis*. Cambridge, Polity Press
- [10] Bourdieu, P. (1974). The School as a Conservative Force: Scholastic and Cultural Inequalities. In J. (. Eggleston, *Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education* (pp. 32-46). London: Methuen.

- [11] Bourdieu, P. (1977). Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction. In J. a. Karabel, Power and Ideology in Education. Oxford University Press.
- [12] Bourdieu, Pierre and J. C. Passeron. 1978. Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture. London, Sage (Book 1).
- [13] Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. The Forms of the Capital. In Richardson (ed.) Handbook of Research in the Sociology of Education, New York, Greenwood.
- [14] Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational reforms and the contradictions of economic life. New York: Basic Books.
- [15] Dewey, J. (1915). School and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- [16] Dewey, John. 1916. Democracy and Education. New York, Free Press.
- [17] Durkheim, E. (1961). Moral Education: A Study in the Theory and Application of the Sociology of Education. New York: The Free Press.
- [18] Durkheim, Emile. 1961. Moral Education. New York, The Free Press.
- [19] Foucault, M. (1977). DISCIPLINE AND PUNISH: The Birth of the Prison. (T. f. Sheridan, Trans.) New York: Vintage Books.
- [20] Freire, P. (1972). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Penguin Books.
- [21] Friere, Paulo. 1970. Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York, Continuum.
- [22] Gandhi, M. (1953). Towards new Education. Ahmadabad: Navjivan Publishing House. Gandhi, M. (1953). Towards New Education. Ahmadabad: Navjivan Publishing House.
- [23] Gramsci, A. (1971). Selections from the Prison Notebooks. London: Lawrence and Wishart. Illich, I. (1984). Deschooling Society. Penguin Books.
- [24] Gupta, Latika. 2015. Formation of Religious Identity in Early Childhood. In Thapan, Meenakshi. (ed.) Education and Society. Themes, Perspectives, Practices. Oxford University Press.
- [25] Henry A Giroux (2011) On critical pedagogy, Continuum International Publishing Group, UK
- [26] Illich Ivan (2013). Deschooling Society KKIEN Publ. Int.
- [27] Jeffrey, Craig. 2010. Timepass. Youth, Class and time in India. CA, Stanford University Press.
- [28] Krishna Kumar, 2002. Prejudice and Pride. New Delhi, Viking.
- [29] Krishna kumar. 2004. What is Worth Teaching? Delhi, Orient Blackswan.
- [30] Krishna Kumar. 2015. Texts and Values. In Thapan, Meenakshi. 2015 (ed.) Education and Society. Themes, Perspectives, Practices. Oxford University Press
- [31] Krishnamurti, J. (n.d.). Krishnamurti on Education.
- [32] Manjrekar, Nandini. 2013. Gender, Childhood, and Work in the Nation: Voices and Encounters in Indian School. In Geetha Nambissan and Sriniva Rao. (ed.) Sociology of Education. Delhi, OUP
- [33] Mannheim, K., & Stewart, W. (1962). An Introduction to the Sociology of Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- [34] Muller, Thomas, Ulrike Lichtinger, Ralf Girg. 2015. The MultiGrade MultiLevel- Methodology and its Global Significance Immenhausen near Kassel / Germany. Prolog- Verlag.
- [35] Nambissan, Geetha. 2003. Social Exclusion, Children's Work and Education:

A View from the margins, in NailaKabeer, Geetha B. Nambissan and Ramya Subramaniam (eds.) Child Labour and the Right to Education in South Asia. Delhi, Sage: 109-141.

[36] Parsons, T. (1968). The School class as a system: Some of its functions in American society. In R. R. Bell, & R. H. Stub, *The Sociology of Education: A Sourcebook*. Homewood: The Dorsey Press.

[37] Peter McLaren (1995) *Critical pedagogy and predatory culture : Oppositional politics in apostmodern era.*, Routledge, London

[38] Pinar, William F. 1975. The Method of "Currere". Address to the American Research Association. April 1975.

[39] Pinar, William F. 2015. (ed.) *Curriculum Studies in India*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

[40] Tagore, R. (1961). A Poet's School. In Rabindranath Tagore *Pioneer in Education: Essays and Exchanges between Rabindranath Tagore and L.K. Elmhirst* (pp. 44-65). London: Visva Bharati.

[41] Tagore, R. (1961). The Art of Movement in Education. In Rabindranath Tagore *Pioneer in Education: Essays and Exchanges between Rabindranath Tagore and L.K. Elmhirst* (pp. 101-111). London: Visva Bharati.

[42] Tagore, R. (1961). The Parrot's Training. In Rabindranath Tagore *Pioneer in Education: Essays and Exchanges between Rabindranath Tagore and L.K. Elmhirst* (pp. 96-100). London: Visva Bharti.

[43] Thapan, M. (2006). *The Life at School: An Ethnographic Study*. Oxford University Press.

[44] Thapan, M. (2014). School Experience: An Autobiographical Approach. In M. Thapan, *Ethnographies of Schooling in Contemporary India* (pp. 333-355). Sage.

[45] Thapan, M. (2015). Introduction: Understanding Education - Ideas, Practice, and Outcomes. In M. (. Thapan, *Education and Society: Themes, Perspectives, Practices* (pp. 1-56). Oxford University Press.

[46] Thapan, Meenakshi. 1991 (2006, 2nd edition). *Life at School. An Ethnographic Study*. Delhi, Oxford University Press.

[47] Thapan, Meenakshi. 2014. (ed.) *Ethnographies of Schooling in Contemporary India* Sage.(1-7).

[48] Thapan, Meenakshi. 2014. Chapter 8. School experience. An Autobiographical Approach. In M. Thapan(ed.) *Ethnographies of Schooling in Contemporary India*. Sage

[49] Thapan, Meenakshi. 2015. (ed.) *Education and Society. Themes, Perspectives, Practices*. Oxford University Press. (Chapters 4 and 10)

[50] Timothy Scrase, *Image, Ideology and Equality. Cultural Domination, Hegemony and Schooling in India*. New Delhi, Sage. Chapters 3-7.

[51] Willis, Paul. 1977. *Learning to labour. How Working Class Kids get Working Class Jobs* Surrey, Saxon House.

[52] www.ddceutkal.ac.in