INTRODUCTION

A JOURNEY OF A REFLEXIVE QUEST

This research project is an outcome of my creative and reflexive quest. Often my own experiences of life entail me to think about my surroundings, my struggles and strengths, and creation or recreation of my own identity. This perpetual inner reflection makes me realize the worth of my life and livelihood. As a result, a research scholar’s (i.e. me) continuous engagement with the discipline of sociology is going deeper and stronger. At this juncture, I am claiming it as a progress, a victory, a success.

Education, ideally speaking, is all about relatedness. It enables a student to relate one discipline with another and then all disciplinary knowledge with the experiential realities. This connectivity of relationships produces creativity and criticality. It transforms a human being into a responsible rational human being. Education opens one’s faculties of mindset and provokes him to think, to take lead in the society towards awareness, sustainability and development. These are not mere philosophical reflection of education while these are the moral, divine characters of education which aims for the larger purposes- ‘inner-transformation’, ‘self-sufficiency’, and ‘man-making’.

Sociology; a study of web of relationships, repeatedly argues for the collectivity, and visualizes the necessity of connectivity of relationships in the society; the relationship of individual to individual, individual to institutions, and individual to society. Hence, sociology of education provides a scope to understand simplicities to complexities of these relationships and signifies the sacred meaning of collectivity over individuality where education institutions (from schools to universities) play a pivotal role to communicate this real meaning of education. Therefore, schooling as a learning process and school, in modern times, as a major source of socialization (yet it’s a secondary form of socialization) becomes a dependency element for the individual growth as well as for societal development. In school, children learn to understand the matrix of relationships in terms of teacher-taught relationship and learn to imbibe the structure and culture of school. Through the light of understanding, a child explores his
thinking ability and power of imagination and develops the understanding of socio-cultural and symbolic world along with the physical universe.

School education favors cognitive information and analytical aspect of knowledge that acquires importance also. For that matter different disciplines offer various forms of knowledge about the world. This requirement of the formal learning penetrates the demand of modern legitimate school education which are philosophically suppose to produce universal character of learning through the uniformity of rules, regulations and discipline. Modern schools have become significant institutions to cope up with the various societal changes and to absorb the emerging demands of the society and mould the knowledge system accordingly. With the larger motive of communicating and transmitting the ideology of education/knowledge, schools are assumed to create new human beings based on the equality aspect, in a sense they are centralized in the structure of society to practice the principle of equality and liberty.

Presently, modern school education is far beyond the aspect of equality and liberty. Schools are continuously reproducing the inequality. In a sense, individuality, self-interests and unequal representation of some cultures are ruling the whole structure and culture of school. Consequently, modern schools are becoming more technical, instrumental and selective about teaching and practicing. This pertinent change brings fragmentation in the knowledge system and deteriorates the ideological conception of school education. Major dilemma of real education arises when the diversion from philosophy of education dominated by marketization and commodification of modern schooling system occurs in the society. This changing dimension of learning process insulated new definitions of school education into the body and mind of the society, which automatically mould aspirations and attitudes of young generation and creates new parameters of success and failure. Therefore, this research project is actually an effort or a sociological outcome, of redefining some definitions of achievers or non achievers, from general to particular.

To trace the actual roots of this diversion is not an easy task for Indian education system. Because, history reveals that various roots/ways/causes are responsible for the present situation of Indian educational system. From the terrible experiences of
colonization to cherishing moments of independence, education precisely formal school education was continuously faced negligence of the country of India or we can say that it could not defined as mass education. A few percentile of Indian population was fortunate enough to avail the opportunity of education. Gradually, post independence, education became a concern for the masses of the nation. Many argued that that concern was the result of need of the country’s economical demands and requirements for future economical stability and development. Therefore, leaders, thinkers, policy makers of India started targeting development of educational institutions for the future prospects. Ultimately, on the bases of economical demands demarcation of sciences and social sciences turned out to be broader and a hierarchical disciplinary system got established, continued and uninterrupted by the Indian schooling system. Surprisingly, its existential domination can be still observed. With time and space various economical changes occurs in the structure of Indian society such as industrialization, liberalization, globalization with strong association of modernization and westernization and then neo liberalization, which affects entire structure of nation from economy to political, social to cultural and of course educational system. Surprisingly, those economical changes easily moulded the meaning of education and at the same time highly influenced level of aspirations on the one hand and spread anxieties of school children on the other hand. By drawing the understanding of this whole networking of economical changes and education system, I am trying to situate a debate about the reconstruction of success and failure in school education and critically analyzing the situation of school children in it, in their own perceptions, through their original voices and in their expressive imaginations.

This study is not a result of temporal thunder of questioning while it has emerged out from a continuous process of sociological inquiry that force me to reassess prevalent changes of the environment I am surrounded by. Presently, a depiction of education, as a main fore of the Indian social structure is highlighting a concern for the society. The rationale behind contemporary agony of Indian society is visualizing a new creation of the relationship of education and economy where Indian economy itself dominated by market forces, consumption culture and international networks. Neo liberal economy of India, therefore, is favoring liberation, organization, skilled labourers and efficiency
effect. Ideally, these elements are the additional factors in enhancing the level of country’s progress in economical terms. Naturally, it broadens investment and production level and increases national income. But the philosophy of economy is not a simple statistical broad view of Gross Domestic Production (GDP), National Investment, and National Income; it also explains vital relationships of production and producer, consumption and consumer, and distributor and distribution which reflect a society’s structure as well as culture. For instance, the mode of relationships in Capitalist society is purely different then Socialist society so the structuration and culture of those respective societies.

In this scenario, the purpose of the study is to analyze the situations of school as an educational institution in the new form of economy. Economical changes bring diversions in the whole structure of society and educational institutions per se are not the exception to it. Thus, school as educational institution has began to focus on collecting and organizing information, efficiency improvements, skill development, freedom of choice and enhancing capacity to fit into the environment; competitive spirit, targeting aims and ambitions. This whole definition of school education, in modern times, has taken a larger shift from its philosophy and strongly imbibes in the culture and structure of the school where school curriculum and pedagogy are enthusiastically practicing it. By following this new meaning of education, the whole notion of achievements and non-achievements have changed for schools as well as students. So, schools are competing for their zone-ranking which is based on how many number of students have secure their places in competitive examinations and big colleges of central universities with specific courses. Schools, in cash those numbers and rankings while advertising their achievements. And, surprisingly, those advertisements cater major attraction of students and their families, therefore continuous emphasis on ‘ensuring success through securing places’ define the new meaning of school education. As following advertisement strongly recommended this argument:

‘FIITJEE Associate School, Punjabi Bagh’, claims that by the selection of highest numbers of students in IITJEE, AIEEE and many other competitive examinations, they are holding first position from last two
years i.e. 2010-11 and 2011-12, they are the best option for Delhi students. They say;

“Our often Wonder

Which School is the Best School in Delhi!!!

Wise answer to that should be

‘Any School which can help you unravel your full Potential

by helping you Achieve your Goals’.

FIITJEE: where winning is a habit! FIITJEE School Programs are revolution in School Education. These programs prepare a student for IIT-JEE, AIEEE, Olympiads, KYPY, NTSE and much more within a school schedule ensuring top success in these exams as well as School/Board Exams. Integrated School Programs are designed in a way to ensure success for students irrespective of any future changes in the pattern of any competitive exam.”

In this process, generally educationists and economists both overshadow two main aspects of school education; (a) changing scenario of success and failure among students and (b) unending inner struggle and pain among students out of it. This entire quest for redefining the meaning of education through the self reflections of all participants of school education; students, teachers, family members and the staff members of the school, is an effort towards the creation of a hope to understand the meaning of self satisfaction, inner development and awakening through the learning process.

In the journey of this research work, many thinkers, theories and ideas enlighten me and provide me a great insight to understand the new definitional derivation of schooling process. In this respect one cannot deny the great thinker/philosopher Emile Durkheim’s ‘moral’ (1961) aspect of education where he describes morality in terms of
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1 From Hindustan times, Thursday, July 05, 2012.
collectivity over excessive individualism and he shows significance of the relationship of individual and society bringing collectivity in the ‘social structure’ and ‘structuration’ of the society. Here, the term social structure refers to *any recurring pattern of social behavior, or, more specifically, to the ordered interrelationships between the different elements of a social system or society. Thus for example, the different kinship, religious, economic, political, and other institutions of a society may be said to comprise its social structure, as might such components as its norms, values, and social roles.*  

Further the term in the views of Raymond Firth (1951) designed to understand how men behave in their social life, which seems to be critically important for the members as well as for the existence of the society. In continuation, Anthony Giddens’s (1993) structuration theory reveals actual happenings of the society by studying how a particular society actually works. While emphasizing the importance of unity of relationships Karl Marks (1977) also focuses upon collective existence and criticizes ‘alienation’ and ‘estrangement’.

An individual finds himself within the structure of the society, so a society needs to be vigilant about the flourishing of the individual. As John Dewey’s long life interest with the practical application of his theory in the classroom demonstrates Hegelian doctrine in naturalistic terms; “experience” and “learning by doing” became the watchwords of his new pedagogical theory where he believes that education proceeds by the participation of the individual in the social consciousness of the societal processes which continuously shaping individuals powers, consciousness, ideas, habits, feelings and emotions. (Baskin,W. 1996). With the changing scenario of education modernity holds a special place in the domain of education in general and Indian education in particular. In the whole conception of modern education school seems a pivotal part of it as in a form of socialization in modern life which entails one to assess the dynamism of classroom, changing patterns of discipline and punishment, social significance of teaching community (Durkheim 1961). With modernity some new concepts have been reflected such as freedom inherited in critical consciousness; it means: ‘Don’t take things for granted. Question it, verify it, and subject everything to critical scrutiny’ (Pathak, 2011), mobility; upward/downward; that is, movement up or down a hierarchy of
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privilege, where the role of education has been considered as an important tool in attaining upward mobility and in a reversal situation experiencing downward mobility. As Sorokin’s (1927) prime interest in the role of educational institutions describes allocation of people to the various occupational positions which determine their mobility in the social structure. He argued that schools function primarily as a ‘testing, selecting, and distributing agency’; in other words, they merely certify children for particular positions in the labour market, rather than promote each individual’s abilities or encourage the development of talent. In addition, Peter M. Blau and Otis D. Duncan (The American Occupational Structure, 1967) describe social mobility within the status-attainment tradition. In continuation, the proposed study also deals with the notion of individualism as individual freedom and choice, and emotional expression; such as anxiety, disillusionment, pleasure and conflicts are not described purely in psychological form but more in sociological sense where they are derived from social changes of society. Therefore, in the projection of arguments, present study deeply engage with the theories of ‘zations- like liberalization to neo liberalization’ from the economical trends to the sociological perspectives. It also stresses upon the Indian philosophy and understanding of school education by highlighting Gandhian, Nehruvian, and Krishnamurthy’s philosophies. The whole research project is based on the detail analysis of theories and concepts in making the understanding of emerging concepts of success and failure in neo liberal economy of India.

This present study of Private and Public School, is mainly trying to analyze the emerging notion of success and failure in school education in the prevalent society. The significance of the study can be easily seen when the study is trying to derive the sociological meaning of the school education in the neoliberal society. And as a general phenomenon of the modern education children spend most of the time in the school as a major part of their learning, therefore it is necessary to examine the new emerging meanings of the education. On the other hand, these days the school education has become an important source for the aspiring urban middle class for their mobility where the meaning of the education has taken a different turn altogether for example: school education as a status symbol, school education as a need for the better employment, school education in favor of elite culture etc. This ‘hidden culture’ of urban schools
automatically regenerate/ reproduce the notions of education and gradually becomes a major worry for the parents, schools and students. However, when the entire nation is debating on the economic and political development and more specifically, on the name of education our planning framers are still targeting the literacy rate, at that time, this study will try to focus/highlight the vitality of these changing aspects of the education sociologically.

These pertinent changes of school education have became the central theme of the sociology of education and every time I read something on school education (whether it’s a sociological text, a research article or a newspaper article or survey) that arouses many questions in me and this is really surprising that with reading the same thing again and again the formations of questions appear differently to me. For instance, at the time of my first week of field work, I was reading John Halt (1968), “how school children fail”, that title itself poses the significance of the negativity of educational system. With every reading, I realized that despite the fact of its negative inclination of the title, the book is not at all negative in its character. The book is focusing on some vital issues related to the concept of ‘fail’ and ‘failure’, its construction and its effects on children’s lives inside the school as well as outside the school.

Apart from some administrative complexities my field work started at a positive note where teachers as well as students both were always welcoming to every interaction. To keep in mind the nature of my research study (which is qualitative), I didn’t prepare a particular format of questions while I always tried to cover certain issues such as dreams and desires, significance of money, importance of mannerism, changing aims and ambitions with age, influencing role models, making of habits, vitality of a book or books, a beautiful day in your dream world, reflection of self etc. The reason to pose such kind of questions was that I wanted them to be liberal in their thoughts and ideas, free in their expressions, creative in their imaginations and critical in their realizations. Because, in my views, after that only they could understand the meaning of education and they could develop their own understanding of its significance. Secondly, with one week of experiences of mine, I learnt one thing that to bring out the real understanding of schooling and its effects on them I have to use a different approach where they should not
be feel restricted and hesitant and to put those issues for open discussions I got surprisingly tremendous results. For example, one day we were communicating on the issue of self reflection (which was not exactly about the terminology of great Sociologist Mead) where everybody was sharing their thoughts on how they look themselves as an individual, initially students were hesitant to open up but eventually they all were participating in the discussion.

In the beginning, for this research work, as a researcher I have multiple methodological perspectives in mind regarding the social construction of the notion of success and failure in neo-liberal economy in India. Indeed, this research work was field based\(^3\) and qualitative\(^4\) in nature, where I mainly used the ‘narratives’ as a methodological tool through participant observation\(^5\) with intensive and rigorous field work. The field work was held in two phases, in first phase for the period of 8-10 months (i.e. from the month of August, 2010 to March 2011) and then in second phase for 1 and half months (i.e. from the month of April 2012 to mid of May 2012). As the topic was itself emphasizing on social construction, therefore, the need for the participant observation was automatically arise where it helped to sensitize the researcher to understand and to develop intensity towards the topic. At this stage, great sociologist A.W. Gouldner’s work (1971) really appeals to me where he talks about the methodological dualism in research which lies in the realm of objectivity and the subjectivity in research. He challenges basic methodological aspects of sociology and emphasizes that while objectifying the world one needs to look at his own situation in the system. Therefore, in the process of my research work; like interactions with students, teachers and parents, my presence was deeply involved and often evolved with intimate anxieties for understanding of social construction of success and failure and time and again, I was critically examining my own situation into the prevalent knowledge
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\(^3\) Classical meaning of Field work has been derived from the work of Brainslaw Malinowski, which he says is a scientific method for collecting primary information from people.

\(^4\) Qualitative research, generally associated with interpretative epistemology, tends to be used to refer to forms of data collection and analysis which rely on understanding, with an emphasis on meanings.

\(^5\) A major research strategy which aims to gain a close and intimate familiarity with a given area of study through an intensive involvement with people in their natural environment. The social researcher watches, observes and talks to people in order to understand their interpretations, social meanings and activities. The classical notion behind such practices is to discover the gap between what people think, do and say.
economy. Though those continuous curiosities were the pushing factor of this research but to maintain the scientity in the research, their interventions were very minimal.

To analyze the social reality, the discipline of sociology takes many shapes on the methodological front to collect information and data collection where the discipline with the perceptions and views with their analysis derive the understanding of the reality. While the various modes of knowledge gathering have been changing over time, there is also an interlinking of various disciplines in the analysis. Narrative is one such school. Earlier the more and more emphasis on narratives as data gatherings took place in historical studies but recent development reveals that it has emerged out as a reliable and more authentic source for data gatherings in sociological understandings, especially with the coming of the post modernist trend. Thus, for the subjective understanding of the study the narrations of individuals as well as groups are holding special places in research. Earlier, narratives dignifies only as grand narratives in sociological thoughts but today multi vocals as well as multiple narratives are increasingly employed to understand the multifaceted reality of modern society.

Narrative, often understood in terms of causal explanations, making sense of past experiences and sharing it with others. It can be considered an interactive process of jointly constructing and interpreting experience with others. In social sciences, causal explanations in the form of experiments as mechanism asserts the unity in it where it mainly concern with the relationship between cause and correlation, mechanism and association, routinely seeks both logical and empirical measures to validate explanations drawn from associations (Stinchcombe, A. 2005). Stinchcombe writes: ‘A mechanism is a little theoretical machine, a mere “device” out of which larger structures of theory can be attributed. It translates causes into effects’6. But the presentation and perpetuation of the world takes up many forms and spaces. It lies in the linkages of human beings with the continuation and traditions where those seems to be dominating denominators in social spheres. Therefore, narrative can be studies in terms of ‘adjective’ or ‘noun’. The former is the narrated account of a story and the art, technique, or process of narrating. It is like a message that tells the particulars of an act or occurrence or course of events.
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Narrative as an adjective refers to consisting of or characterized by the telling of a story: narrative poetry and/or relating to narration: narrative skill.

“Narrative is present in every age, in every place, in every society.”\(^7\) Thus as a mode of knowledge transformation it takes a significant part in human lives. The art and skill of narration is timeless indeed. Thus, from times immemorial, there always has been narration of deeds and heroic tales, intrigue of royal courts as well as narration of everyday doings. All these narrations from the rubric by which our stock of knowledge increased and grew in bounds.

Traditionally, narrative as a mode of datum gathering holds special place in the discipline of history or one can say it was taken as an authentic form of transferring information with the problematic aspect of data gathering and paucity of facts, from the forefathers to next generation. It’s a recent development where the discipline of sociology has started taking it as a form of data gathering usually with interview method. As Jane Elliot’s also explains that to examine the scope of narrative in social science is to bridge the divide between explanation and meaning. He says, ‘A narrative can be understood to organize a sequence of events into a whole so that the significance of each event can be understood through its relationship to the whole.’\(^8\) Narrative, in this sense is made up by the narrative statement which is closely interrelated with the fictional aspect of life as well as real life happenings. With the narrative text an agent can relate with it. Narrative theory describes the narrative aspects of a text and not all the characteristics of a given text. Thus, from all the definition of narrative, it can also be inferred that there is problem of pinpointing what exactly is the ideal definition of narratives as the definition given are very ambiguous.

Roland Barthes (1915-1980), the French semiologist and literary critic describes the central role of narratives in social life:

“The narratives of the worlds are numberless. Narrative is first and foremost a prodigious variety of genres, they distributed amongst different substances- as though any material were fit to receive man’s stories. Able to be carried by articulated language, spoken or written, fixed or moving images, gestures, and the ordered mixture of all these substances; narrative is present in myth, legend, fable, tale, novella, epic, history, tragedy, drama, comedy, mime, painting...stained glass windows, cinema, comics, news items, conversations. Moreover, this almost infinite diversity of forms, narrative is present in every age, in every place, in every society; it begins with the very history of mankind and there nowhere is nor have been a people without narrative. All classes, all human groups, have their narratives... Caring nothing for the division between good and bad literature, narrative is international, transhistorical, and transcultural: it is simply there, like life itself.”

In a way, narrative is a resource by which the researcher accesses the life behind the words.

As per the requirement of the study the observer should participate in the activities of the field (that is school). For that purpose, I as an observer used to initiate my research with experiencing the everyday school activities where I observed each and every activity of the school in detailed form. In the starting, the observer interacted with students, teachers and the other staff members in formal terms which helped to develop the rapport with them to communicate freely. The observer should be very careful about her own biases and prejudices as she could not impose or forced her ideas on them and at the same time she should welcome their ideas and thoughts whether they were relevant or not. That freeness during the interactions could only help to bring the study closer to the reality.

By selecting narratives, I mainly deal with students’ and teachers’ self-perceptions towards the notions of success and failure. Through their engagement and
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experiences within the school and with the disciplinary knowledge, they develop some percep-
tions of particular discipline, school curriculum, hierarchization of knowledge and pedagogical
differences etc that force them to see some dreams within the domain of education. Self-
perceptions are basically a great source of exploring one’s emotions related to any discipline
because those emotions have been building up in the light of intellectualism and understanding of disciplines. Though, self perceptions towards school education and pupil’s hopes, anxiety, and disillusionment and future projects reflect the actual situation of school education in the hierarchy of school curriculum.

To collect narratives, I visited Delhi schools to sensitize my observational and analytical skill for the research work. One was Kendriya Vidyalaya, J.N.U, being a public educational institution and Laxman Public School, Hauz Khas, Ryan International School, Deep Public School, Ganga International School; the selected private educational institutions; as the other sight of educational system in Delhi particularly. The basic purpose that drove me towards choosing these two types of schools is to exemplify the variations in relation to the reconstruction of success and failure. While analyzing the curriculum of these two types of schools, I collected narratives of students, teachers, parents as well as school staff members in the form of interviews. They experienced disciplinary knowledge as an essential part of their lives through the engagement with teachers, school texts and school activities and therefore, I also examine their experiences with school texts. The whole physical structures of school were also significant part for the study as it shows difference of their approaches in philosophy of education.

Interactive session of my field work started with 9th to 12th class students of Kendriya Vidyalaya, J.N.U. As, to recall my experiences, first day of my field work was a formal engagement with participants of my research and my mind set was purely bounded with the theoretical connotations, though I did not bombard with thick expectations of answers in the form of questionnaires and interviews on them. The logic behind this approach was simply to sensitize my own understanding of school education and to understand the rationale behind subjectivity and objectivity. With some formal administrative norms such as getting permission for entering into the school, I entered into the premise of J.N.U. Kendriya Vidyalaya with open mind, welcoming thoughts and
curious attitude. The whole day I simply observed every activity very quietly. From the morning assembly to interval period, the movements of the principal, the teachers and non-academic staff’s and of course the behaviors of pupils in school to prepared myself for the next day with the set of questions. And not only as a researcher but as a learner the journey for months had started from that day. Therefore, everyday ecstasy of my research work aroused several questions, hampered my critical consciousness and gave new meanings to my thoughts and sociological understanding in the domain of school education.

At this point broadly I can recollect few significant components of education- a) moral and ethical-according to Durkheim; a major role of education in society was to create unity by providing a common moral code necessary for social cohesion. Moral values are, for Durkheim, the foundation of the social order, and society is perpetuated through its educational institutions, which help instil values and a sense of moral order in the youngest members of the society b) social transformation, where Durkheim gives importance to the collective character of learning and at the same time criticizes the alienation and estrangement. He asserts that through school socialization an individual is capable of leading a moral and social life which is not only his responsibility to himself but to the society also. c) Dialogic education, this component is passionately brought by Paulo Freire in his writings where he emphasized the significance of the dialogic education: a system of learning and teaching that overcomes the ‘culture of silence’ and d) economic aspect of education; as we can see that today the world is largely dominated by the economic activities and forces and educational institutions are not the exception to it. Therefore, the needs and demands of the society are influencing the structure as well as culture of the educational institutions which directly or indirectly recreates the notion of success and failure.

These few components of education, was continuously analyzing by me at the sight of inquiry- Private and Public Schools and I realized that the moral and ethical character of school education got fragmented these days in schools where it has been replaced with the heightened sense of individuation and the significance of smart professionals. As I mentioned above also, I do agree with the fact that students are fully
encouraged by the teachers and the family to overcome from the dark side of disciplinary boundaries and pursue their interested field to excel their talent and surprisingly not necessarily in academics. But the hidden reality is, in this race a learner/a student/a child, is the most suffocated person as his/her family and teachers want him/her to achieve the highest position in every field. The strength or the courage of participation is simply ignorant in the new emerging ideology of education and as John Halt highlighted in his fabulous writing- ‘how children fail’, the fear of failure penetrated into the consciousness of the student and murdered the learner’s spirit where he/she actually failed. This small desire of our educational institutions and the social world actually pushed a child to struggle with his own dreams and desires.

On the student’s part, they are availing the facilities to choose their learning fields but somewhere down the line they are not able to understand the significance of the dialogic factor of the school education, as they are lacking the pivotal point of relatedness and critical learning of the education. There many other eye opening facts can be reflected through the narratives of my field work such as the importance of elitism, established hierarchy of disciplines, significance of textual knowledge, ignorance of Indian languages and heightened sense of English language along with the learning of European languages and so on. And all together these factors are denoting or describing the notions of success and failure in school education. Therefore, with my continuous engagement with my research work, I must say that if an individual or a student decides to follow his/her interest in any field for creating his/her future that moment itself declares an achiever or non-achiever.

These days, social scientists, theories and experts explore ideas of storytelling and methods of narrative analysis as they have emerged across diverse traditions of inquiry and in connection with a variety of media, from film and television, to storytelling in the “real-life” contexts of face-to-face interaction, to literary fiction. In terms of it, field based chapters of this research, each chapter presents a survey of scholarly approaches to topics such as character, dialogue, behavior patterns, etc shows how those approaches can be brought to bear on a relatively well-known illustrative example, and indicates directions for the research. Though, my Chapter 1 is totally a theoretical reflection of
new economy of India; neo liberal economy of India where I try to draw historical link of neo liberalism by highlighting the economy of it which started from classical liberalism and highlighted some other associated economical processes like globalization, industrialization, modernization and westernization. In this chapter, these economical explanations are not only concentrated on their economical aspects but they have been analyzed from the sociological perspectives as they brought wider social-cultural changes in the society. Therefore, chapter seeks to examine that how they have influenced the entire social structure of Indian society. In this respect, to analyze the cultural changes, the chapter majorly focuses on consumer culture and the emergence of middle class/urban middle class as a result of it. Within the economical changes, matrix of relationships whether it’s about the relationship of school with society (where the society is largely dependent on school socialization) or situating the situation of school children within the school also diverted. In this whole context, the first chapter is about the exploration of meanings of achievers and non-achievers in Neo liberal India.

Chapter 2 is opening the theoretical debate with practicality of Indian educational system. This chapter is entirely field based and proposes strong original arguments in the form of narrations of research participants. It begins with the exploration of Kendriya Vidyalaya, JNU as a public site of educational inquiry, where elaboration of the school from infrastructure to culture pleads for analytical expedition in terms of emergence and implication of new concepts of school education i.e. success and failure. Therefore, deep insights of students, parents and teachers provoke many arguments in regard to understand the significance of social, cultural, economical changes in deriving aspirations of school children.

Chapter 3 is basically a continuation of the 2 chapter but here the site of inquiry is different in terms of exposure of private schooling. The chapter deals with five private Delhi schools- LPS, RI, Deep Public School, Ganga International School, and Heritage Public School. The basic theme of analysis of this chapter is same as the earlier chapter, so we can say in continuity it’s the expansion of horizon of the field.

Chapter 4 in continuation of the debate is the soul of the proposed study as it is the great exploration of deep narratives of eight selected students from both the inquiry
sites. Here, students with detailed narratives voiced their experiences, pressures, freedom, control, liberation, agonies, anxieties, joy and victories which provide a larger scope to understand the actual relationship of education and economy in terms of theory and practice and more than that it indicates the need to redefine the meaning of school education.

Chapter 5 as a chapter of concluding remarks is not actually an expression of reaching at the end while it’s a beginning towards a hope; a hope which lies in the philosophy/ideology of school education. It is an appeal towards the rethinking of sociology. The chapter with the critical analysis of the entire study provides a great scope to understand the social significance of it in sociological domain at present times. With reflexive comments it believes in the continuity of the debate, that announces the need of participation of the entire society in it.
SOCIOLOGY OF NEO LIBERAL ECONOMY:
WORLDVIEWS AND ASPIRATIONS

A simple poem that touches our soul; a story of a beautiful relationship of a man and a flower but people call that flower a weed and confusion starts:

Once in a golden hour

I cast to earth a seed.

Up there came a flower,

The people said, a weed.

To and fro they went

Thro’ my garden bower,

And muttering discontent

Cursed me and my flower.

Then it grew so tall

It wore a crown of light,

But thieves from o’er the wall

Stole the seed by night.

Sow’d it far and wide

By every town and tower,

Till all the people cried,
“Splendid is the flower!”

Read my little fable:

He that runs may read.

Most can raise the flowers now,

For all have got the seed.

And some are pretty enough,

And some are poor indeed;

And now again the people

Call it but a weed.”

This poem titled “The flower”¹ can be imaginatively related to the relationship of a pupil and philosophy of education where experimentations are rarely appreciated and named after that differently. Though, the philosophy of education lies in the journey of life itself, to love the environment one has not to be compulsorily an environmentalist or if a farmer is experiencing inflation in everyday life then he has not to be compulsorily an economist, the poetry of life can be feel or understand through the experiential realities. Sant Kabir as a great Indian Philosopher, Bule Shah as a revolutionary and Baba Amte as a propagator of equality are few milestones in Indian History who dared to understand the society through everyday experiences and real learning. But beyond this experiential existence of knowledge, the complexities of modern society required a legitimate place to deliver all sorts of information to the next generation precisely in a more legitimate form, however school as an institution came into the existence and since then baring the larger responsibility for the societal development. For the real development, a society has to incorporate with the legitimate education which is essentially a historical product which cannot be separated from the philosophy of the age.² For that, modern school education should take the charge for the appropriate ways to build a dialogic relationship between

ideology of education and technocratic and systematic society. By accepting the vitality of school education in modern times a great educationist and thinker Emile Durkheim\(^3\) promotes compulsory education and described it as ‘an initiation ceremony’ that makes of the initiate ‘an entirely new man’, ‘a man and a citizen’. Since his times this extended initiation rite has developed into a fundamental societal institution promising to transform children into modern individuals, capable of rational calculation, self-discipline, political astuteness, and religious righteousness required to make the national policy both successful and just.

Indeed, education, as Krishnamurthy explains to his students:

“It is not only learning from books, memorizing some facts, but also learning how to look, how to listen to what the books are saying, whether they are saying something true or false. All that is part of education. Education is not just to pass examinations, take a degree and a job, get married and settle down, but also to be able to listen to the birds, to see the sky, to see the extraordinary beauty of a tree, and the shape of hills, and to feel with them, to be really, directly in touch with them.”\(^4\)

This elevated thought of him reflects moral/ethical engagement with education and defines that it must be conceived as a continuing reconstruction of experience\(^5\): that the process and the goal of education are one and the same thing. But, presently, the trajectory of Indian educational system is revealing the crisis of it which has brought out through the bridging gap of above mentioned dialogic relationship. In result, this philosophical explanation of education has taken a larger shift towards modern, technical and instrumental education.

Historically, modern education has its roots in the enlightenment era which appeals to rationality, awakening thoughts, logical actions, scientific temper, and

technological supremacy. Hence, enlighten thoughts and ideas of the modern education inspired the Indians to come out from the darken phase of society almost in every aspect. For that matter, the popularity of science has been continuously favored by the Indian society, where supreme form of knowledge has started to link with the logic and science, and that gradually established the disciplinary boundaries in the school education. With this demarcation of knowledge, the language of English as the popular medium of instruction got the popularity among Indians. In result, those prevalent changes of the Indian social structure reflected the new emerging symbolic culture of the Indian education system.

Contemporary education is often equalizing with the progressivism. It is best to start this story in the present time, where the meaning of progressivism is well defined. Today progressivism means pedagogical progressivism. It means basing instruction on the needs, interests and the development stage of the child; it means teaching students the skills they need in order to learn any subject, instead of focusing on transmitting a particular subject; it means promoting discovery and self directed by learning by the student through active engagement; it means having students work on projects that express student purposes and that integrate the disciplines around socially relevant themes; and it means promoting values of community, co-operation, tolerance, justice and democratic equality. In the shorthand of educational jargon, this adds up to ‘child-centered instruction’, ‘discovery learning’ and ‘learning how to learn’. And in the current language of modern education schools there is a single label that captures this entire approach to education: constructivism.

Similarly, in the era of neoliberal economy the Indian economy and culture, politics and policies and ideology and thoughts are getting influenced. Through this new set of ideas the whole meaning of education has been shifted from moral and inner development to the availability of career opportunities which directly or indirectly set certain notions of ‘success’ and ‘failure’. As this new set up of neoliberal economy emphasized more on the vitality of the science and technology which are helpful in the development of the economy, respected science oriented subjects and they also received high degree of attention. For that matter the economy needs more and more better skills
in the fields of science and technology. So those students whose interests lies in the related fields considered to be successful as they have more opportunities to brighten up their future in comparison to the other disciplines. This freedom of choice of interests in the school education directly or indirectly cultivated in the school curriculum through their regular practices and that reproduce the notion of success and failure; for example prize distributions, scholar badges, and hierarchical representation of students in the name of organizing committees and so on.

In the beginning of this research project, this chapter is an effort to understand the sociology behind the economical theories of neo liberal economy in the creation of educational aspirations of school children. In this sense, with the proper visualization of worldviews of liberal, neoliberal, global neoliberal and of course welfarism I would try to sketch down some significant queries of a social researcher in terms of emergence of Indian middle class and its socio-cultural implications on pupils’ perceptions about ‘success’ and ‘failure’. Unlike next three chapters, this chapter is mainly a manifestation of theoretical engagement in the making of the understanding of the overall research project.

[I]

ECONOMICS OF NEOLIBERAL ECONOMY

Analyzing the social, political and cultural history of the world in the last two centuries, Wallerstein argues that the ideological cement of the world capitalist economy from 1789 to 1989 was liberalism (together with its partner, scientism). The years are entirely precise. The French revolution marks the emergence of liberalism on the world political scene. The world believed in the positive elements of the open economy at that time, such as freedom, liberty and democracy, which parallely became primary values of liberalism in the nineteenth century. The word ‘liberal’ took on a specifically political meaning with the establishment of liberal parliamentary caucuses in Sweden and Spain, and later on throughout Europe, in the first decades of the nineteenth century. The

---

associated meaning of this term and word (freedom) clearly signals the favorable assessment of the emerging democratic system with the reflection of minimal role of government/state. Eventually this ideology known as classical form of liberalism which is often associated with the belief that the state ought to be minimal, which means that practically everything except armed forces, law enforcement and other ‘non-excludable goods’ ought to be left to the free dealings of its citizens, and the organizations they freely choose to establish and take part in.

Therefore, it is best understood as ‘a political programme or ideology whose goals include most prominently the diffusion, deepening and preservation of constitutional democracy, limited government, individual liberty, and those basic human and civil rights which are instrumental to any decent human existence.’

Many philosophers of that time for example John Locke, David Hume, Jeremy Bentham, and John Stuart Mill emphasized a world where human beings are guided by enlightened self-interest, rationality, and free choice and argue for the minimum intervention of the state in the lives of individuals. It is strongly associated both with economic doctrines of laissez-faire and with constitutional guarantees and representative democracies, in which all citizens are held to hold inalienable rights to certain freedoms such as the rights to life, to property, to free speech, association, and religion, along with the right to have some say in the running of the country (usually the right to vote).

With the ideological connotation of liberalism (in many forms such as classical liberalism, modern liberalism etc.) much have been discussed about the groundings of liberty in it; it means freedom of individuals to lead lives of their own which eventually initiates the larger discussion of Isaiah Berlin’s distinction between positive liberty or negative liberty where earlier is all about the absolute freedom and absence of constraints and the other is about freedom according to one’s capacity/affordability, by which an individual possesses the capacity to pursue some end or course of action. With this important demarcation between two forms of liberties, Berlin simultaneously warns against the associated danger of positive liberty which reflects towards the redistribution of resources to those with minimal resources, and that requires the state and the state

---

8 folk.uio.no/daget/what%20is%20neo-liberalism%20FINAL.pdf.
intervention which represent the greatest threat to the liberty in its more fundamental, negative sense. But here one should be aware about the fact, as Tomy Fitzpatrick suggests that Berlin is not actually advocating the abandonment of positive conceptions of freedom; he was, however, suggesting that we proceed carefully whenever the state is called on to perform redistributive and interventional roles. But presenting suggestion does not put a pause here as this argument highlights differing opinions of the Radical Rights and the Left; for the Rights, redistribution does not enhance anybody’s freedom because freedom and the lack of it have got nothing to do with the distribution of income and wealth and for the Left, being prevented from doing something implies more than physical constraints, it also implies financial constraints.

Even after this conflicted version of both forms of liberty the fact has been attested that nobody is pleading for against to freedom or democracy anymore or we can say that freedom and democracy as the primary values of liberalism have been applauded worldwide. The project and order of liberalization initially took care of human rights and liberties in the political sphere but then gradually its tendencies fall into supreme denial of capital control, state intervention and restricted market in terms of economic strategies. And when the larger part of the world (especially developed countries) was experiencing completely free flow of capital and seeing that as a new favorable regime for investment and development, at the other end many thinkers/philosophers/economists/political leaders were arguing on the equations of opportunity and equality, power relations of the society, strategic ways for the economy and instrumentality and functionality of the society. Basically, both concerned for the change; former was visualizing the change in the nature of the capitalist state and the later was imagining the change in understanding state-society relationship. Here, proponents of the state-society relationship are trying to convey that it’s all about balancing the relationship of two dependent variables, by which members of the society can hope for the desired alternatives for sustainability and development on the bases of equality. As Prabhat Patnaik also asserts:

---

“The objective basis of this opacity in the state-society relationship, it may be thought, lies in the “self-acting”, “self-regulating” nature of the capitalist order, which Classical Political Economy had emphasized even before Marx, and which requires of the State only the maintenance of the “rules of the game” of the system. But this notion of a “self-acting” “self-regulating” economic order is a myth……the basis of the capacity of State-Society relationship then lies not in the fact of capitalism’s being “self-acting” and “self-regulating”, independent of the State, but in fact that State intervention itself has usually been carried out in the name of society as a whole, rather than in the ostensible interests of the capitalist class.”\textsuperscript{11} Therefore, he continues, the separation of the State from civil society must mean a parallel separation between the leading agencies of the two domains, at least in their motivations and basic ideologies.”\textsuperscript{12}

With much emphasis on flourishing of individual on the name of autonomy/liberty, and vitalizing conception of free market, developed countries were experiencing advantages of free capital flow and the whole world was labeling them as \textit{spender, investor and producer} in the era of liberalism. On the other hand the world especially developing world was experiencing intense and more frequent financial crises and has created a more balanced view of advantages of completely liberalizing capital flows. In fact, later growing recognition could be noticed as the world started believing that such liberalization can create more problems than benefits, especially for the markets of developing countries. But this is not the only case of developing countries but IMF (International Monetary Fund) which earlier was most active pushing factor of liberalization for developing countries, also accepted that there can be many problems with capital account liberalization, which can create highly volatile flow of capital that destabilize the economy. The reason behind this stability or de-stability of the economy

\textsuperscript{11} Patnaik, Prabhat (2010, October 10), \textit{The State Under Neoliberalism}, published by Macroscan at macroscan.com.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
was capital flow; depending upon the lesser or greater capital flow for the progress. For instance, in the decade of the 1990s, which was when all countries liberalized massively, developing countries as a group actually got less capital inflow (as a share of GDP) than they did in the 1970s, when capital movements were much more controlled. However, this major emphasis on political liberalization to economic liberalization clearly indicating the significance of the state control or state intervention for the countries’ development, where the intervention (depending on the degree) can be used for the welfare of the society and to minimize inequalities of the society.

Simple terminology of welfare means a government affair towards the wellbeing of the people and through analytical theoretical perspective it can be define as a form of transcendence or an attempt to transcend our immediate contexts, to look beyond what is apparent, visible, common and easily knowable: we understand the social world by trying to look at it from the outside. Therefore, welfare theory can be defined as follows:

“Welfare theory is a means of gaining both a transcendent and an immanent knowledge of the concepts and principles that underpin the design and delivery of social policies in order to understand the ways in which those policies affect the well being of individuals and society as a whole.”

However, technically speaking, to propose a standard format of welfare for any specific society has been a difficult task for theorists and thinkers. Out of many years continuous debatable struggle for defining the definition of welfare the term can be defined in various ways but here we can go with Fitzpatrick’s conversation on welfare where his insightful review of welfare highlights six main perspectives of it: happiness, security, preferences, needs, desert, relative comparisons. In regard to this, he mainly differentiates between private goods and public goods that are based on consumption level. Every state holds some sectors to itself for the security purposes such as defense services, and the dichotomy begins with the inclusion of some services; health services,

---

education, food security, and minimum income level and so on whether such services should be part of public sector or private sector or semi-public or semi private sector.

As we all know that private sector is actually dictated or highly influenced by the market forces or market economy, therefore having understood this economic phenomena above mentioned few service sectors should not be fully left to private sector because it can create imbalance and inequalities in a society on the bases of individuals’ consumption capacities, depending upon their purchasing power and affordability. Because of this pre-assumption of market economy, a welfare society demands collective action and necessary intervention of the state in terms of investment, production, and distribution. With these responsible aims, a welfare state can be stated as a ‘protective state’, which takes up a protective role in favor of the victims of the inequalities and by controlling the dominant/powerful sections of the society justice can be practice in the society at its maximum level. As Rawls also insists that in ‘original position’ we would choose to live in a society that protects our freedom but also maximizes the well being of the least well-off. For his kind of society he would argue embody two principles of justice: 1) each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty for all. 2) Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both; a) to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged, and b) attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity. He argues that the first principle is most important when it comes to deciding how society should be governed and he insists that a just society cannot restrict liberty in the name of either equality or utility- he is therefore opposed to utilitarianism. Favoring second principle he insists that the equality of opportunity must take precedence. In the name of arranging inequalities Rawls argues for liberal egalitarianism where he justifies for people’s interests to wealthy life if interests of poor demand it. Yet, a collective compassion of a particular society to the larger motive of peoples’ well being in the forum of equality known as Welfarism but in front of a society moot question lies- what will be an appropriate way towards welfare, means, is it Socialism or Capitalism? Capitalism, as Marx had shown, differs from all previous

---

modes of production in the sense that, unlike the earlier modes, the relations of production underlying it are opaque. Whereas Socialism as a reaction to the capitalism, denied the establishment of the equality of condition and simply demanded a genuine equality of opportunity. It had a great craving for the social justice. But it was not a counter-system at all. Instead it represented a bold, but ultimately failed strategy to gain ascendance within the global capitalist system. Indeed, Marxists out rightly criticize Rawls approach by believing that a neutral position cannot be taken between socialism and capitalism because they are based upon incommensurable conceptions of justice. And for Marxist and socialist exploitation is never justified therefore Welfare capitalism may rejected on the similar grounds. Therefore, we can say that humans are rational agents but often they also directed by their individual interests and selfish motives so it’s necessary to control them buy some superior agency such as welfare state which can check that whose liberty will be at stake.

But after not very fruitful compatible experiences of Socialism and even Welfare capitalism in the capitalist-world economy focus of attention firmly directed to trade flows among nations, technological strength and geopolitical advantages. Hence, entire world started approaching global boundaries to make easy access of capital flow with the motive of maximization of profit making and this time especially for the economical strategies. Through this global approach larger part of the political world has began in strengthening their already determined relative positions of countries in the international hierarchy. Above all, the decade of 1990s has been marked by a new phase of intense competition between multinationals based in various advanced countries and the rise of novel strategies of capital accumulation linked to space-bridging technologies.

The period of 1990s brought a phenomenal change in to the world where main emphasis was on connecting the world or establishing the well defined networking of world economy, therefore global conception and processes known as Globalization, swiftly became the buzzword of the 1990s, constantly invoked by academics, politicians, policy makers and journalists. Globalization has been defined in terms of economic, cultural and political processes of increasing spatial and temporal interdependency and it might be thought of the outcome of such processes. Based on the development purpose,
globalization has an association of competitive and risky environment that brings various dynamic changes, therefore, theorists have preferred to define it as a series of processes.

Giddens (1991) and Harvey (1989) both draw attention to the ways in which space and time shrink and compress, distances become annihilated as globalization takes hold, meaning that events in one part of the world can have immediate and far-reaching effects on other parts. This progressive interdependent approach attracts the whole world and offered a platform to attain highest levels of benefits. This international connectivity of globalization here mainly concerns with the econometrics of the international system which encompasses multinationals, international trade, financial markets, investment and labor market. This thesis of economics of globalization invites both kinds of responses-for and against; those who strongly believe in its high potential of maximizing profits from the expansion of international boundaries obviously they are the great followers of it and those who consider its benefits opaque, artificial and temporary and take it as a responsible factor for widening inequalities nationally or internationally, reject it majorly.

Indeed, the social affiliation of above mention concepts such as liberalization, welfarism, socialism, globalization gives us a wider scope to understand the dynamic changes of world and its implications; in terms of political affiliations and especially its economic connotation. From the changing scenarios of the world views the country of India also got affected from its influential impacts at its own speed and if not fully then has some relevance at least in their political, economical and social scenarios, thinking waves of the leaders, and in policy making.

Historically, after colonization Indian economy at the beginning of the twentieth century had realized the significance of the internal development of the country. As Indian economists had highlighted that except for massive investment in the Indian railways which at this stage mostly benefited British investors, the British had not done much for India’s development, but they had linked the country to the world market. This linkage of the Indian economy with the world economy favored to increase the exports of raw produce and imports of industrial commodities. Therefore, after this drain of wealth, it’s natural for nationalists who were interested in the internal development of India and criticized the “open economy.”
Though, from the awful experiences of colonization Indian government, at the time of independence, was holding great responsibilities towards country’s growth and development. At that time country’s main concern was to attain minimum basic level of overall development especially economic development as Indian economy was ridden with various structural constraints. Therefore, the economic planners were facing a very tough task of putting the economy on the development trajectory. The problem was two-fold. First they needed to improve the basic performance of economy in generating income and fighting with poverty and then secondly they wanted to remove all the constraints which were the real hindrances and a difficult task in front of Indian government in the economical progress such as shortage of physical capital in relation to the availability of employable persons, weak infrastructure of industrial sector, over burden of unemployed/ under employed persons on agriculture sector, and feudal character of agrarian sector, high population, food insecurity, defence sector and so on.

Indian economy at the time of independence was in a very critical situation because of colonization impact and its basic foundation which was the agricultural aspect. Therefore, the larger portion of national income was dependent on the performances of agriculture and even accepting this fact of dependency, Indian government was not able to convert its limitations into productivity. For instance, agriculture performance was largely dependent on the monsoon which was not controllable at all, in that case an economy demands to create some better alternatives to control such high dependencies as a remedy at which Indian economy got failed and in result economic problems’ accumulation started with the multiplication of social, political and economical disparities overall in that particular phase. At that moment Indian economists, thinkers, leaders and policy makers thought that for the sustainability of Indian economy, India needed to control fluctuations in the national income. For that they had two options; one to reform the entire agriculture sector and second; to enhance countries economical growth through rational use of available resources, thoughtful investment and increasing efficiency. Yet, time and again, both the options had been explored and experimented for the countries development but with the desire of speeding benefits the later options appealed the most.
Historical details reveal, in the first half of the twentieth century, India tried to understand the link between investment and technology by which some improvements was seen in the economy. Irrigation facilities got benefited with investment pattern, but, improvements and expansion in irrigation facilities were only confined to three major regions namely- British Punjab, Western Uttar Pradesh and Madras belt. Improvements in irrigation facilities resulted into high land prices of those specific areas, availability of improved version of wheat and cotton seeds which entailed the economy to experience high-improved productivity. Eventually, those lead to the Green Revolution in India in late 1960s. Similarly, understanding towards exploration of the market has been discussed in the country before independence, at the time of independence and even post independence. Probably, the reason for the major emphasis on market is, it is a clear reflection of an economy. It reflects one thread relationship of investor, producer and consumer. Before British Raj, Indian market i.e. agriculture market was highly fragmented, mainly known for its self consumption attitude and having purpose for meeting local needs. But then British colonization (for own benefits) with spreading railway tracks brought commercialization of agriculture which includes long distance national trade and foreign trade that ultimately encouraged exports of goods. Because, British colonizers’ all significant changes had artificial motives with full of smoke of exploitation for the country of India and its people. At last burst in the smoke happened and the entire colonized India began to demand reforms and revival in the economy of/for Free India. With a negative attitude to export possibilities, perceptions of Indian planners had already rejected the significance of export in trade. They believed that only manufactured goods can make a mark in the trading and international economy. And because Indian economy at the time of independence had a very weak industrial structure, so they preferred to postpone it until they will acquire sufficient export capabilities. In this scenario, planning in India was started, and after few years of independence, Indian economy for its development had taken a thoughtful step further in the form of Five Years Planning, where planning commission took the responsibility for deciding aims and objectives of the country with the specific targets, agendas for the particular period.

After experiencing various flows of the economy, post-independent India as a nation had started targeting development of the economy which was considered as a
building stone for the country’s overall growth and progress and as above mentioned five years planning was also a part of it. In this process three approaches can be analytically discussed - the Bombay Plan, the Gandhian approach and Nehruvian approach. The Bombay plan, as S. K. Singh emphasizes, was a strategy of industrialization with the participation of private players. Ultimately, this plan was chalked out with the massive involvement of the big industrial house of that time like the Tatas and Birlas. This plan was not accepted as the capitalist class was seen with suspicion. There were strong economic arguments against this mind set. Since capital was identified as a scarce resource, a prudent and planned utilization was considered better. Secondly, Gandhian approach was based on voluntary limitations of wants and development of a self-sufficient village community. The idea was that the village should be developed as an economy which can produce enough to meet its demand, create employment opportunities for the villagers and at the same time, create a better balance between man and nature. This approach was largely termed as impractical and was not given serious attention. Thirdly, Nehruvian approach which was most likely appreciated from the all. Nehruvian approach was considered to be modern, rational and scientific and believing in these elements followers of that approach, claimed that a shift in the surplus of labour (which was prominent in agriculture sector) to the industrial sector can bring remarkable profits in the economy. This profit can invested and reinvested into the economy further to increase and speed up the profits and continuous investment of profit generated by the industrial sector in industries will start a self-sustaining growth process. At that time, along with the rapid industrial growth many great changes occurred in the economy for example: the growth of new job ventures, the growth of new demand structures and the growth of new aspirations. In this changing scenario suddenly the whole nation started focusing on industrial sector as they all were very hopeful towards it and unfortunately Indian agriculture had to pay the price by baring ignorance. Here I am not at all rejecting the rationality behind exploration of new alternatives, newness and modern perspectives but yes at that same time my rationality suggests that one should be very cautious to the adaptability of new alternatives especially when dependency of the future was entirely


upon them. And I think India without understanding and analyzing the larger perspective of the industrial sector started thinking about the appropriate ways to it. For instance, the nation was facing the major question that who will take the responsibility of this new sector-industrial sector, capitalist class or the government? As we know that government as a public sector played the significant role. Because, Indian government especially Nehru as a great proponent of industrialization, thought that Indian economy for the stability factor and aiming for acceleration of profits needs to invest in heavy industries such as iron, steel, coal and cement etc. It demands heavy investment and not promising immediate profits. Secondly, Indian government was little suspicious about the possibility of increasing inequality structure. Therefore, attraction of private sector seems to be unfeasible and inapplicable in the eyes of Indian government and then the idea of Mixed Economy emerged.

In this form of economy private and public sector, both share nation’s responsibility and work for it equally. The nature of production was the defining line for its sector, such as heavy industries finally taken into the public sector whereas the production of consumer goods was left open to the private sector, with some regulations. In result, simultaneously proper bureaucratic structure of licensing and regulation created and gradually the whole taxation system also took a shape. The main motive behind this mixed approach of that time to create a structure which could maximize the profit level and it was the desire as well as demand of the country also. As far as benefit to the masses was concerned, it was expected to happen through the ‘trickle down’ effect. This means industrialization will increase the income of a section of the society and, as a result, they will demand various kinds of goods and services and these will be provided by the masses. So, the masses will benefit indirectly by the growth of the economy. Thus we can see that India basically adopted a mixed economy approach. The idea was to keep the good elements of both socialism and capitalism.\(^\text{19}\)

After independence, another association of India was Modernization; a high acclamation of modernity, an urge for a change, a desire for specificity, a quest for upward mobility. It’s absolutely true that the period of post independence was not the

\(^{19}\) Ibid, 2011:15.
prime encounter of India with modernity, because India’s independence somewhere is a result of close association of Rajarammohan Roy, Dadabhai Noraoji and Gandhi’s modernity. Therefore, we can say that post independence is a continuation of that modernity with more possibilities and practicalities. Post independence, Indian leaders of the country like J. Nehru and B.R. Ambedkar started fascinating by the associated meaning of modernity—freedom. Hence, they proclaimed for practicing it in every sphere of the society whether it’s a making of the Indian constitution, or favoring science-modern education for the country’s development. Of course modernity lies in broader views and open outlooks which enhances one’s thinking ability and criticality but at the same time it encourages individuation, self interests and arrogance. And this basic definition of modernity has been ignored tremendously in Independent India, in result the whole nation got confused between modernization and Westoxication\footnote{Gupta, D. (2000), 
*Mistaken Modernity* in Pathak, A. (2006), *Modernity, Globalization and Identity: Towards a Reflexive Quest*, New Delhi: Aakar Books: 53.}; it is about superficial consumerist display of commodities and fads produced in the west and this form of modernity, sociologist Dipankar Gupta’s terms it as ‘*Mistaken Modernity*’ which he suggests that India should prefer to understand it deeply. Thus, on the name of modernity India without authentic understanding, consciences and rational thoughts got involve with the concept and high acceptance enforced the nation to practice it also. Consequently, the nation started believing in liberal thoughts and world wide connectivity or world networking as per the basic requirement for the development. And like the whole world the country of India also slowly accepted the vitality of neoliberalism in theory as well as in practice.

Yet, liberalism, with its roots in enlightenment thoughts, have the tendency to favors laissessz-faire economic policies, portrayed as leading proponents of “neoliberalism”. Neoliberalism, theoretically, is a revival of liberalism and it shares some historical roots and some of the basic vocabulary with liberalism in general. As Clarke, suggested that neoliberalism’s foundation can be traced back to the classical liberalism advocated by Adam Smith, and to the specific conception of man and society on which he founds his economic theories. In continuation, Saad-Filho and Johnston in their book ‘Neoliberalism- A Critical Reader’ view that power and wealth are, to an ever increasing
degree, concentrated within transnational corporations and elite groups, as a result of the practical implementation of an economic and political ideology they identify as ‘neoliberalism’, further they describe it as “the dominant ideology shaping our world today” 21

Therefore, neoliberalism is a thought of as an entirely new paradigm for economic theory and policy making- the ideology behind the most recent stage in the development of capitalist society -and at the same time a revival of the economic theories of the Smith and his intellectual heirs in the nineteenth century. Similarly, David Harvey sees it, not as a continuation of liberalism ‘proper’, but as something which lives independently of mainstream liberal values and policies. 22

Besides this whole economic connotation of neoliberalism, it could also include a perspective on moral virtue; the good and virtuous person is one who is able to access the relevant markets and function as a competent actor in these markets. He or she is willing to accept the risks associated with participating in free markets, and to adapt to rapid changes arising from such participation. Individuals are also seen as being solely responsible for the consequences of the choices and decisions they freely make: instances of inequality and glaring social injustice are morally acceptable, at least to the degree in which they could be seen as the result of freely made decisions. As Bourdieu emphasized the restricted form of it, where he says that, *in the name of a narrow and strict conception of rationality as individual rationality, it brackets the economic and social of rational orientations and the economic structures that are the condition of their application* 23 and thus, it adds its own ‘symbolic forces’ to relations of forces of these social and economic structures which eventually influence/ effect all the institutions and society as a whole. Therefore, in this case Indian school as an educational institution is not the exception to it.

---

22 Harvey, David. (2005), A Brief History of Neoliberalism. Oxford: OUP.
The ascendancy of neoliberalism and the associated discourses of ‘new public management’, during the 1980s and 1990s have produced a fundamental shift in the way universities and other institutions of education have defined and justified their institutional existence. The traditional professional culture of open intellectual enquiry and debate has been replaced with an institutional stress on performativity, as evidenced by the emergence of an emphasis on measured outputs: on strategic planning, performance indicators, quality assurance measures and academic audits. In a global neoliberal environment, the role of education for the economy is seen by governments as having greater importance to the extent that education has become the new star ship in the policy fleet of governments around the world. Education; school education and university education are seen as a key driver in the knowledge economy and as a consequence education institutions have been encouraged to develop links with industry and business in a series of new venture partnerships. The recognition of economic importance of education and the necessity of economic viability has been initiatives to promote greater entrepreneurial skills as well as the development of new performative measures to enhance output and to establish and achieve targets.

At the economic level, neoliberalism is linked to globalization especially as it relates to the ‘freedom of commerce’, or to ‘free trade’. In this sense neoliberalism is a particular element of globalization in that it constitutes the form through which domestic and global economic relations are structured. Yet, neoliberalism is only one dimension of globalization, which is to say, it is not to be seen as identical to the phenomenon of globalization as such. Globalization is a much broader phenomenon in that should neoliberalism not have replaced Keynesianism as the dominant economic discourses of western nations, it would still constitute a significant process. This is the sense that it has partly occurred as a consequences of changes in technology and science, which have brought many parts of the world closer together through developments in forms of technology as they have influenced information, communications and travel.

The advent of neo-liberalism would not have prevented this process from occurring, and thus, it must not be confused with globalization as such. Rather it must be seen as a specific economic discourses or philosophy which has become dominant and
effective in world economic relations as a consequence of super-power sponsorship. Neoliberalism is a politically imposed discourse, which is to say that it constitutes the hegemonic discourse of western nation states. As such it is quite independent of the forms of globalization that we have spoken of above, based as they are not on changes in technology and sciences, nor can it be seen as part of their effects, although this is not to say that there is no relationship at all. Its major characteristics emerged in the US in the 1970s as a forced response to stagflation and the collapse of the Bretton Woods system of international trade and exchange, leading to the abolition of capital controls in 1974 in America and 1979 in Britain. This made it extremely difficult to sustain Keynesian demand management. Financial globalization made giant strides. Exchange rates were floated and capital controls abolished, giving money and capital the freedom to move across national boundaries. The changes in technology did certainly facilitate these changes, for developments in microelectronics and computers made it possible to shift financial reserves within seconds.

Within education neoliberalism has introduced a new mode of regulation or form of governmentality. In order to understand this it is necessary to understand that the welfare liberal mode it replaced maintained fundamentally different premises at the level of political and economic theory, as well as at the level of philosophical assumption. The central defining characteristics of this new brand of neoliberalism can be understood at one level as a revival of many of the central tenets of classical liberalism, particularly classical economic liberalism.

Notwithstanding a clear similarity between neo and classical liberal discourse, as we repeatedly arguing the two cannot be seen as identical, and an understanding the differences between them provides an important key to understanding the distinctive nature of the neoliberal revolution as it has impacted on OECD countries over the last thirty years. Whereas classical liberalism represents a negative conception of state power in that the individual was taken as an object to be freed from the interventions of the state, neoliberalism has come to represent a positive conception of the state’s role in creating the appropriate market by providing the conditions, laws and institutions necessary for its operation. In classical liberalism the individual is characterized as
having an autonomous human nature and can practice freedom. In neoliberalism the state seeks to create an individual that is an enterprising and competitive entrepreneur. As Graham Bruchell (1996:23-24) puts this point, while for classical liberalism the basis of government conduct is in terms of ‘natural- private-interest-motivated conduct of free, market exchanging individuals’, for neoliberalism;

“...the rational principle for regulating and limiting government activity must be determined by reference to artificiality arranged or contrived forms of free, entrepreneurial and competitive conduct of economic- rational individuals.”

This means that for neoliberal perspectives, the end goals of freedom, choice, consumer sovereignty, competition and individual initiative, as well as those of compliance and obedience must be constructions of the state acting now in its positive role through the development of the techniques of auditing, accounting and management. It is these techniques, as Berry et al. (1996, p. 14) states;

.....[that] enable the marketplace for services to be established as ‘autonomous’ from central control. Neoliberalism, in these terms, involves less a retreat from governmental ‘intervention’ than a re-inscription of the techniques and forms of expertise required for the exercise of government.”

In his own analysis, Bruchell is commenting on and articulating Foucault’s perspective on liberalism as a form of state reason or ‘governmentality’. For Foucault (1991a), neoliberalism represents an art of government of form of political reason. A political rationality is not simply an ideology but a worked out discourse containing theories and ideas that emerge in response to concrete problems within a determinate historical period. For Foucault, like Weber, political reason constituted a form of disciplinary power containing forms and systems of expertise and technology utilizable

for the purposes of political control. Liberalism, rather than being the discovery of freedom as a natural condition, is thus a perception for rule, which becomes both the ethos and techne of government. For Foucault (1991a), liberalism represented a constructed political space or a political reconstruction of the spaces in terms of which market exchanges could take place and in terms of which a domain of individual freedom could be secure. As such a constructed space, liberalism, says Foucault, enabled the domain of ‘society’ to emerge in that it stood opposed to the polizeiwissenschaft of the ancien regime which constituted a formula of rule that sought total control. In this sense liberalism is a form of permanent critique of state reason, a form of rationality.

On this model, education is represented as an input-output system which can be reduced to an economic production function. The core dimensions of new public management are: flexibility (in relation to organizations through the use of contracts); clearly defined objectives (both organizational and personal), and a results orientation (measurement of and managerial responsibility for achievement of). In addition, new public management in applying quasi market or private sector micro techniques to the management of public sector organizations has replaced the ‘public service ethic’ whereby organizations were governed according to norms and values derived from assumptions about the ‘common good’ or ‘public interest’ with a new set of contractualist norms and rules. Hence notions of ‘professional’, ‘trustee’ or ‘fiduciary’ are conceived as ‘principal/agent relationship’. When organizations are ruled by new governance arrangements and models, under relations of managerialized accountability, what happens to the presumption of trust that public servants will act in the public good?

There is also a complex and subtle shift in relation to political philosophy. Under liberal governmentality, the ‘professions’ constituted a mode of institutional organization characterized by a principle of autonomy which characterized a form of power based on ‘delegation’ (i.e., delegated authority) and underpinned by relations of trust. Under neoliberal governmentality, principle-agent line management chains replace delegated power with hierarchical forms of authoritatively structured relations, which erode, and seek to prohibit, an autonomous space from emerging. This shift in regulative modality constitutes a structural shift which is likely to transform the academic’s role.
While Susan Halford and Peter Leonard claim that we are open to the contention that new ‘emergent’ possibilities exist, in our view neo liberalism constitutes a ‘structural selectivity’, in Offe’s (1984) sense, that alters the nature of the professional role. Targets and performance criteria are increasingly applied from outside the academic role that diminishes the sense in which the academic- their teaching and research- are autonomous. The rising importance on ‘managed research, and the pressures to obtain ‘funded research’ constitute further evidence that academic freedom, at least in terms of the academics’ determination over research are concerned, are increasingly ‘compromised’, or at least ‘under pressure’. The extent to which the ideal expressed by Kant and Newman, of the education as an institutionally autonomous and politically insulated realm, where there are traditional commitments to a liberal conception of professional autonomy, in keeping with a public service ethic, has any relevance in a global economic order, is increasingly seen as an irrelevant concern.

One of the major objectives of the reforms in higher education has been to install relations of competition as a way of increasing productivity, accountability and control. Increased competition represents improved quality within neoliberalism. As Marginson says,

“Increased competition is meant to increase responsiveness, flexibility and rates of innovation….increase diversity of what is produced and can be chosen….as well as strengthen accountability to students, employers and government.”

More indirect advantages are ‘internationalization….fiscal reduction…and educational business links’. There is, he says ‘an integrated line of causation from competition to consumer sovereignty to better efficiency and quality at is the virtuous ideal glowing at the core of micro-economic reform in education.

What such a competitive ordering results in is a new type of approach to academia which, with the addition of a particular funding model, conflicts with and interferes with traditional notions of professional academic autonomy and freedom. In this process the values of disinterested inquiry and respect for the integrity of the subject matter compete with a new set of pressures to ‘dumb’ courses down, as well as to demonstrate their relevance to labour market conditions and prospects.

In that competitive neutrality is a state engineered ‘market driven’ programme, it must be considered as a series of supply-side levels introduced to increase responsiveness of the educational institutions to the market order and to market interests of their customers. A further consequence of marketization has been the increased emphasis on performance and accountability assessment, with the accompanying use of performance indicators and personal appraisal systems. Under the neoliberal period there has been a shift from ‘bureaucratic- professional’ forms of accountability models. Under consumer-managerial forms of accountability, academics must demonstrate their utility to society by placing themselves in an open market and accordingly competing for students who provide the bulk of core funding through tuition fees. If academic research has value, it can stand up to the rigors of competition for limited funds.

In some disciplinary areas, such as education, neo liberalism has seen a move towards a concentration on professional work-based (as opposed to academic) practice, such as has occurred in relation to teacher education. This has encouraged not only the growth of professional doctorates but a new theoretical literature, linked to the professional capabilities. In addition, concepts such as ‘situated learning’ and ‘communities of practice’ link with concept of the ‘reflective practitioner’, and also with those of ‘experiential learning’, ‘critical learning’ and ‘critical reflection’ to constitute a transformed theoretical infrastructure to the new understanding of academic theory as preparation for the world of professional work.

The most significant material change that underpins neoliberalism in the twenty first century is the rise in the importance of knowledge as capital. This change, more than any, propels ‘the neoliberal project of globalization’- an outcome of the Washington consensus and modeled by world policy agencies such as the IMF and World Bank-
which has predominated in universalizes policies and obscures country and regional
differences. It also denies the capacity of local traditions, institutions and cultural values
to mediate, negotiate, reinterpret and transmute the dominant model of globalization and
the emergent from of knowledge capitalism on which it is based. Yet the voices of
criticism, even from mainstream economists have been raised against this monolithic and
homogenizing model of globalization.

With the continuous spread of neoliberalism, along with the knowledge economy
a class/new groups of people emerged—middle class/middle class groups, this was
notably interested in employment, so the expansion of public services could be observed.
With neoliberalism, attitudes to education in all classes changed as more people realized
the importance of educational qualifications to obtain and retain any job. By the 1990s
the expanding middle and aspirant classes were anxious that their children should obtain
the credentials for the good jobs, but aware that by then policies were rationing good
education. The major political parties sought to convey concern for the insecurity and
anxiety that the middle classes displayed while attempting to persuade individuals that
their class bound society was classless, and that individual effort and merit would bring
social and occupational mobility.

The higher achievements of those from the higher social groups were persistently
rationalized by the myth of meritocracy— the notion that superiors are deserved rewards
because they reflect superior achievements. The notion of meritocracy had been boosted
by the heavy reliance on mental testing throughout the twentieth century which
encouraged the idea that selection for elite forms of education was meritocratic and that
privileges were just and fair rewards for achievements. The idea was satirized in 1958 by
Michael Young, who pointed out that a meritocracy could mean downward mobility for
some and sarcastically envisaged the upper middle classes admitting that they could
produce dull children, who would then happily live in council housing, doing domestic
service without resentment because ‘the inferiors knew their superior had a greater part
to play in the world’.27 However, this sad situation was never a reality; Goldthorpe (1997)
and his colleagues demonstrated that to provide legitimation for structures of inequality

in modern societies do not work. Through painstaking social mobility studies, they showed that merit plays a limited role in class mobility and that children of lower socio-economic origins have to demonstrate much more ‘merit’ entering desirable class positions.

During the 1990s the realities of social class and education were obscured by governments in many countries such as in Britain, government seized on school effectiveness research was superficially supported the political message that ‘poverty is no excuse’ for schools in deprived areas obtaining low examination results, and enabled a blame and shame culture to flourish. While school effectiveness debates were becoming increasingly acrimonious, numbers of pupil population between 1993 and 1997. During the 1990s, the world was forced to believe that school could be manipulated as technical system to make a difference to performance, with individuals being responsible for their own levels of performance, and schools, whatever their history or clientele, being held responsible for failure to meet targets. School effectiveness research played down the impact of social and economic disadvantage on learning, and social class became an element to be ‘controlled out’ of research. The failure of technical solutions applied to so-called failing schools began to be apparent almost as soon as they were implemented.

[II]

SOCIOLOGY OF NEOLIBERALISM; GROWTH OF URBAN MIDDLE CLASS

Despite the political focus on social exclusion and inclusion- terms popularized was- ‘equality of opportunity’. The idea that there would be equal access to good credentials and jobs had a strong appeal for the middle classes, who either already possessed, or quickly developed strategies to ensure, that their children had advantages in any supposedly equal competitive examination. The move towards comprehensive education in the 1990s was supported by many middle class parents who realized that, despite cultural advantages, their children might be displaced in selective schools by ‘able’ working class children. But just as their children had dominated grammar schools in the selective system, the middle classes using state education became adept at seeking
out the best comprehensive (particularly those retaining grammar streams), accessing resources and avoiding schools attended by the poor and by ethnic minorities.

Despite the heterogeneous nature of the middle and aspirant groups- middle class including highly paid managers, administrators, and professionals, lower paid semi-professionals, white collar employees, skilled workers, and the well-pensioned retired- a common characteristics had become a commitment to a social and political system that had provided them with advantages and a ‘good life’, for many a better life than their parents, and a fierce determination to see their children reproduced into similar spheres. Middle class group realized, long before the advent of new technologies, the increasing importance of access to knowledge and credentials. By the 1990s there was an important section of the middle class, educated in private or good state schools and good universities, dominating the communications and information and propaganda industries, and the political arena, who were easily able to resist egalitarian and social democratic school organization. These and other knowledgeable groups were determined that their children would have similar access to privileged education. This entailed not only using traditional social networks and contacts with private schools that would equip their children with the credentials to move on to the most prestigious universities. It also entailed equipping their children with what Philip Brown called the ‘value-added curriculum viate’, a CV which demonstrated the right personal and social skills and cultural experiences.

‘Within them middle classes, the development of the charismatic qualities of their children is becoming as important as arming them with the necessary credentials, contacts and networks’. 28

Another remarkable observation has brought out by Reay (1998); the importance of mothers in the reproduction and maintenance of class inequalities was cogently demonstrated by her. In a study of the strategies adopted by middle and working class mothers to assist their children’s educational achievements, she showed how the confidence and knowledge of the middle class in their dealings with the school paid off.

In addition, (through the emerging trend she explained), their children engaged in a ‘social whirl’ of contacts and extracurricular activities, and dinner parties were devoted to discussing education. In ‘acting in their own children’s best interest’ middle class mothers were inevitably acting against the best interest of less privileged mothers.

The educational needs of the middle classes, which by the 1990s incorporated the need to move away from meritocratic and egalitarian beliefs and exclude the disadvantaged and troublesome from interfering with their children’s education, could be understood as a reaction to heightened insecurities, as global economic conditions, insecure employment, and a de-layering in public bureaucracies and private business affected middle class groups in ways they could not have envisaged up to the 1980s. The middle classes had largely become the anxious classes, certainly as far as their children’s education was concerned. Particular ways in which their educational needs were satisfied were by the use of private education, by the advantages that choice policies delivered, by the avoidance of a vocational curriculum, and by avoidance of the poor and socially excluded.

Clearly, private education continued to be important for those who could afford to buy competitive advantage for their children; the upper classes and old middle classes effortlessly reproduced most of their children into good social and economic positions, and new and aspirant groups were eager to grasp the advantages of both excellent resources and old boy networks, with the additional legitimacy of meritocracy. The top private schools, especially girls’ schools, regularly featured at the top of school league tables from 1992, which, together with policies such as the assisted places scheme, encouraged aspirant parents to regard private schools as first rate and state schools as second rate. Philip Brown pointed out that an expanding section of both the old and new middle classes were undermining the principle of equality of opportunity by returning to the idea that educational outcomes should be determined by parental wealth and preference, rather than the ability and effort of pupils. ‘This form of social closure is the
outcome of an evaluation by them middle classes that educational success is too important to be left to the chances of a formally open competition’.  

Giddens (1998b) put this in a slightly different way, rejecting the American scholar John Galbraith’s (1992) thesis that there was a ‘culture of contentment’ among the middle classes. The middle classes, according to Giddens, were well aware of the hazards and risks of modern life, and opt out of public provision because they have a more active orientation to risk management. State education constitutes a risk; private education, if affordable, poses less risk. During the 1990s, politicians became worried that the private-public divide in education did pose considerable risk to social cohesion.

A major need of the middle classes had always been to avoid the relegation of their children to vocational education and practical training. The academic-vocational continued during the later twentieth century to be synonymous with a class divide, with policy makers, politicians and professionals continuing to find reasons to legitimize the separation of some young people into high status education and others into lower status courses. The era of neoliberalization brought the market competition and the result of market competition did indeed work to the benefit of middle class and aspirant groups, and despite rhetoric of inclusion, continued to perpetuate a divided and divisive system. Though, education had started associating with the market and education market, contrary to its claim of equal development did not encourage social balance in schools, equalize opportunities or help the socially excluded, and social segregation in education worked against the possibility of preparing good citizens who care about each other. On the global level in both developed and developing countries, increased numbers of highly educated professional and managerial elites, successful in private public school competition and privately schooled, were by 1990s contributing as the politics of secession. This meant ‘undoing the ties that bind them to their undesired compatriots’ and creating new global structure of inequality.

This mushrooming of middle class was not only limited to the international sphere but it also entered into Indian boundaries. Like the whole world, Indian middle class too

---

was consider as an outcome of liberal or global economical changes. Historically, the emergence of this larger populated group of India can be seen in the colonial India where it’s various public discourses of identities and practices were the debatable topic for the years. While tracing Indian middle class’s historical roots, Leela Fernandes in her remarkable work on ‘Indian Middle Class’ also agrees with this point that this group is closely linked with colonization before economic liberalization and she properly traced three major points in favor of this argument, which is quoted in this following long paragraph:

“An analysis of the historical roots of the new middle class demonstrates the continuities between earlier periods and trends in the post-independence period, and allows us to specify the particular characteristics of the new middle class that are associated with the contemporary politics of economic liberalization. Three central characteristics stand out with regard to the rise of the new middle class in the colonial period. First, the distinctiveness of this social group is marked by specific kinds of socioeconomic resources such as access to English education and modern forms of professional employment. These resources came to distinguish this social group from traditional elites, and led to specific forms of connection with and dependence on the colonial state. Second, the newness of this middle class rested on an emerging set of political claims of public representatives that this group made within the realm of democratic civic life. The political assertiveness of the new middle class rested on its claim to represent the general interests of the public, often against colonial state power. Finally, this claim of representation was continually accompanied by a project of self-identification that was marked by a politics of distinction from both the colonial state and more marginalized social groups. This distinction, along with the internal forms of differentiation with the new middle class, accentuated a sense of uncertainty and contradiction within this
group. The management of these contradictions has historically constituted the politics of the new middle class.”

Those political processes in the formation of Indian middle class group placed an important role altogether in the whole socioeconomic structure of Indian society, where it reflected the relationship between the middle class group and the state. This formation again reshaped in the period of post-independence, this time it was mainly in the context policies of economic liberalization. Therefore, the concept of the rise of new Indian middle class in terms of two dominant approaches defines it differently. One focuses on consumption-based\textsuperscript{31} definition of the new middle class and the other is defined through occupational-based\textsuperscript{32} definition corresponding to white collar, professional-managerial workers. Both the definitions are important and reveal its other critical side also as middle class’s association together can be observed in both the definitions.

Thus, based on the above mentioned definitional criteria created a hierarchical positioning of groups within the middle class stature, such as upper middle class, middle class, lower middle class. This specific positioning within the larger group of middle class clearly exposes power of consumption of a group which is depending upon income structure and status of that group which is also associated with the level of salaried income. This created structure or sub-structures indicates few variables as their designing characteristics- culture of a group; specifically consumer culture, a strategy of upward mobility and setting a standard of living as defining feature of their group. Many academicians and thinkers see upward mobility as a basic foundation stone of new middle class group in India, particularly in the period of neo liberalization. Because, beyond existence of structural inequalities of Indian society for example; caste inequality, it avails a major scope to access provided opportunities of the society up to its maximum usage. In this forum, education becomes the main reliable source in making easy accessibility of professional opportunities in 19th and 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries. For instance,

\textsuperscript{30} Fernandes, L. (2006), India’s New Middle Class; Democratic Politics in an Era of Economic Reform, New Delhi: OUP: 2.
\textsuperscript{31} Beng-Huat (2000), quoted in Fernandes, L. (2006), India’s New Middle Class; Democratic Politics in an Era of Economic Reform, New Delhi: OUP:xxiv.
\textsuperscript{32} Embong (2002) and Pinches (1999), quoted in Fernandes, L. (2006), India’s New Middle Class; Democratic Politics in an Era of Economic Reform, New Delhi: OUP: xxiv.
degrees of MBA (Masters in Business Administration) and MCA (Masters in Computer Application) becomes a milestone for high salaried and high profiled jobs in multinational companies. This attraction clearly effects school education as well when children start preferring those subjects which will be helpful in MBA and MCA courses in future. Therefore, this desire of upward mobility with high packaging jobs, offered by liberalization, globalization and now neo liberalization is not totally negative in its nature, as it proposes wider scope to individuals to design or to create their identities and to produce their status-achieved status. This formation of achieved status in Indian society reinforce class based society, is an example of equal opportunities. Definitely, growth of this new salary base group contributes into the economical development of the society which shapes the lives of the people also. On the other hand, this created demarcation or difference of class based society eventually produces class inequalities and with speedy accumulation strengthens it further.

The correlation of wide opportunity and high salary is very direct and positive in nature, for example high designation in a profession directly converts it into high packaging of salaries. Further, it demands for a distinctive lifestyle and consumption practices are the major part of it that determines shifts of income level or individuals’ responses to advertising images. This interactive composition of consumption and income level now days have become purely subjective and indicate symbolic processes of middle class. Therefore, strong influence of these symbolic processes force structure of middle class and the formation of new middle class occurs. As Leela Fernandes in her work, focuses on the significant conversion of capitals into classificatory practices in the formation of middle class. In her words,

“Structure is not a deterministic, prediscursive realm but it is produced both diachronically through historical processes and synchronically (she explains it in below table form) as various forms of capital are converted into classificatory practices.”

While drawing the concepts of middle class John Harriss also argued that the middle class is very diverse in its composition. In essence the term refers to people who, in the jargon of social scientists, ‘occupy a contradictory class location’. They are neither capitalists nor just labour power (though they are employed); they are more than just their labour power. Notably people who can be described as ‘middle class’ command professional, technical or managerial skills that set them apart from regular workers and frequently give them authority over others. Similarly he reveals that in the year of 2007, so many of the working poor of Banglore city responded to researchers that they considered themselves to be ‘middle-class’, they were perhaps above all laying claim to increased levels and new standards of consumption. This procedural reality favors emergence of new identity of this group which reflects various socio-cultural trends and symbols of this group. Thus, structure of middle class in recreation of capital proclaims heavy dependency upon it specifically on cultural capital in terms of good command of English language and cosmopolitan manners. In this regard, the social and political changes of the 1980s and 1990s, in which the middle classes were such significant actors, were associated, too, with a shift in their values. It was Pavan Varma’s lament that ideals of service gave way to ruthless individualism, that austere ways of life came to be replaced by consumerism, and that the values of the middle class, ironically, came to resemble those reflected in the self-seeking actions of the politicians they so much despised.
Since liberalization, the linkage between middle class and consumerism has been the central theme to analyze the structuring or restructuring of middle class. Even now, consumerism can be observed as a central pivotal part of this group. Here one can be curious about the reasons behind this scenario, as not only economical aspect of neo liberalization and its political consequences reinforcing wide socio-cultural changes in the society but it’s the consumptionist culture, the whole changing structure of media agency, changing modes of basic life styles and level of luxury, high influence of information technology, discovering new parameters of amusement and out of these rebuilding bases of global aspirations for the youth are setting new criteria of development and progress for society as well as individual. In support of this argument here are some examples which are providing insightful reflection of prevailing changes of Indian society:

In the 1960s and 70’s this whole bit of accumulation of wealth was still suffering from a Gandhian hangover. Even though there were a whole set of families who were wealthy all over India in the North and South if you noticed all their lifestyles were very low key. They were not exhibitionist or they were not into the whole consumer culture. Now I see that changed completely…. You want to spend on your lifestyle. You want your cell phone. You want your second holiday home, which earlier as I said people would feel that sense of guilt- that in a nation like this a kind of vulgar exhibition of wealth is contradictory to Indian values. I think now consumerism has become an Indian value. – Editor, lifestyle magazine

That rapid change of Indian society is still continued; in fact it’s faster than before. Following table is showcasing some important variables of it:

---

34 Interview with author, September 17, 1998, Quoted in Fernandes, L. (2006), India’s New Middle Class; Democratic Politics in an Era of Economic Reform, New Delhi: OUP: 29.
Demand for Consumer Durables (figures in ‘000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1995-96</th>
<th>2001-02</th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cars</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>3466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorcycles</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>2599</td>
<td>4665</td>
<td>8369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTV regulars</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>4580</td>
<td>6295</td>
<td>9957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refrigerators</td>
<td>18500</td>
<td>3006</td>
<td>4335</td>
<td>6774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White goods</td>
<td>3437</td>
<td>6024</td>
<td>8727</td>
<td>13149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Great Indian Market: Results from NCAER’s Market Information Survey of Households, 2005

Currently India has 31.4 million middle class households (160 million individuals). A report by National Council for Applied Economic Research’s (NCAER) Center for Macro Consumer Research (CMCR) said by 2015-16, India will be a country of 53.3 million middle class households translating into 267 million people falling in the category. Interestingly, as per NCAER findings, the middle class that represents only 13.1 percent of India’s population currently owns 49 percent of total number of cars in India, 21 percent of TVs, 53.2 percent of computers, 52.9 percent of Air Conditioners, 37.8 percent of microwaves and 45.7 percent of credit cards. The report said a typical Indian Middle Class households spends about 50 percent of the total income on daily expenses with the remaining goes into savings which means a middle class family has strong purchasing power to spend on durables and other items.\(^{35}\)

These increasing consumption levels among Indian middle class is not merely highlighting statistical side of research studies but it is raising many vital questions about these prevalent changing scenarios and their implications over Indian society. Firstly, one can argue that if every sphere of development of Indian society is revealing some positive numbers/data than the question of real progress arises or we can say that the need of

---

\(^{35}\) Zeenews.com, Saturday, June 30, 2012, NCEAR’s Center for Macro Consumer Research’s director Rajesh Shukla told a news agency.
redefining the real progress or real development arises. Secondly, if Indian society is ready to compromise with certain old economical, social, political and cultural trends and practices than the society needs to reexamine that where are we actually heading. Thirdly, Indian society has to relocate the positioning of this new emerging middle class which is becoming more and more influencing factor for the larger Indian population. These three queries are of course correlating with each other but providing three different perspectives to analyze the structuring of new middle class and showing their concerns for young aspirants.

Similarly, in this neo liberal era this whole connotation of new middle class emphasizes upon positivity related to material wealth, importance of comfort and luxury zones, and recreation of the concept of good life. These are of course basic elements of the economical betterment for the society and individual upliftment but at the same time one cannot negate the excessive domination of consumption, high propensity of unlimited desires, increasing exploitative tendency towards all kinds of resources, and material gain as the new index of progress. And if Indian society sticks to it than tragically the society is actually confining itself into the web of artificial, illusionary development and producing a narrow, conservative definition of progress. This highly speeding involvement with neo liberalization reflects irrational and ill logical set up of Indian development where according to economical data people are labeled as labour power, educational institutes are converted into sectors and they are producing working force for the future, and consumption targets are determining happiness and well being of the people. In this whole scenario Indian society is consciously compromising with its ethics and values. The modern value crisis is mainly due to the excessive overplaying of the importance of material values of life, and consequent down playing of other life values like the moral, aesthetic and spiritual. Pavan Varma in his brilliant book, *The Great Indian Middle Class*, touches the heart of the matter with his remark:

“For all the achievements of the Indian state in the last fifty years, there is, for its middle and elite classes, a crippling ideological barrenness which threatens to convert India into
vastly unethical and insensitive aggregation of wants.”

Therefore, this whole process lead emergence of individuation where an individual seeks to know what is there for him in the society. For him the ends should be prioritized and every other individual and institution should be taken just as an important means towards the end. Hence, the main aim revolves around to economical security and success defines in terms of securing a place in the society. This competitive environment is the outcome of increasing material desires and greed for comfortable life of powerful middle and elite classes where their aspirations become central theme for their socialization patterns and practices. Their upbringing and enculturation have tuned them for single minded pursuit of career growth and economic success. All other life values which give meaning, worth and fullness to human existence are seen as roadblocks and unnecessary diversions from the high road to material success. Ultimately, new changes occur, new experiences have experienced and new definitions arrive for success and failure among school children.

[III]

EMERGENCE OF THE CONCEPTS: SUCCESS AND FAILURE IN NEO LIBERAL SOCIETY

However, powerful relationship of market and education opens many layers of this rampant ideology which compels academicians and thinkers to engross in this unavoidable thinking quest. Those who advocate this relationship, Blake, Smeyers, Smith and Standish in their edited work claims, they admire freedom of choice, individuality, self reliance, and enterprise (let’s call these the neoliberal virtues) and see conditions of competitiveness as conducive to their development, then at least some of their critical adversaries extol the virtues of community, fraternity (or sorority, though this does not have the same political/historical resonance), and equality and see conditions of

---

collaboration in a public service as conducive to their development (let’s call these social democratic virtues). In other words we can observe in this debate a conflict not just about which means are best conducive to a particular set of outcomes (judged perhaps by reference to the aggregate of children’s achievements on some measure of their learning of school subjects) but about the social values that are expressed in and through the means of providing the education that results in these outcomes, including in this the value-laden behavior and beliefs that are properly to be counted among those outcomes (2003). Thus Noddings also argues:

*We do not ask how we must treat children in order to get them learn arithmetic but rather, what effect each instructional move we consider has on the development of good persons. Our guiding principles for teaching arithmetic, or any other subject, are derived from our primary concern for the persons whom we teach, and methods of teaching are chosen in consonance with these derived principles. An ethic of caring guides us to ask: What effect will this have on the person I teach? What effect will it have on the caring community we are trying to build?*

Above explanation shows the concern for the larger purposes; transmitting ethical and moral values to younger generation through educational system for the society’s overall development. As Mahatma Gandhi also continuously emphasizes on the prime motive of education i.e. character building as an essentially important part of education for nation making. He sees education in well correlated relation with vocation as an important part to realize one’s own faculties. In his views, good education should be understood in terms of ‘self-sufficiency with collectivity’. He continuously opines for the altogether development of the individual, the body, the mind, and the spirit through craft work. The emergence of Gandhi as a perpetual seeker of truth, an activist and an intellectual cannot be understood without his association with morality, spirituality, and religiosity and of course, politics. Therefore, that continuous thought process enabled him

---

to evolve a critical and rational vision, which provided a new sight to his countrymen for the nation making. Indeed, Gandhian idealism came into its own as a mode of thought discourse and most importantly, action and that appealed the whole nation and every section of the society.

But later with Pandit Nehru’s romanticism with modernity and modern thoughts the whole nation got aspired to engage with the scientific and technocratic world. Yet, Gandhi also understood the significance of modernity and modern thought but he actually warned his nation to the exploitative and alienated character of modern education. With the major ignorance of Gandhian philosophy of education, India as a nation state was with great hope to bring change started believing and practicing in Nehruvian perspectives of education. Consequently, with time and space the meaning of knowledge and true education was recreated and largely affected Indian mind sets. Therefore, contemporarily Indian society’s reaction to the ongoing changes of economy and educational system is not actually a big shock for its citizens, moreover it just merely a continuation of some insulated philosophies of the system at the larger pace.

Hence, today Indian society’s increasing faith in educational system in terms of ‘marketing strategies’, ‘mission statements’, and ‘business plans’, ‘performance measures’, ‘parents as customers or clients’, ‘heads of departments as senior management teams’, bringing drastic changes in the society and schools are expected to deliver ‘products’ in the most ‘cost effective’ ways they could invent (ibid, 2003). In this vicious circle of expectations children are getting confused about their positioning in the highly competitive and insecure environment where achievements are actually against the targets; targets of getting admission in private Kindergarten- private high profile Higher Secondary School- Senior Secondary School, Famous Colleges of Central Universities than in cashing that whole education into high packaged salary.

This whole construction of success and failure lies in the definition of ‘good life’, which demands a certain standard of life and naturally primary socialization and secondary socialization abide for that new definition of ‘good life’. This mythological description of good life has many variations with different time and space and influences students to achieve numerous targets in the process of achieving ultimate goal. Indeed,
media (both print and electronic) in this creation of myth of good life has been always supported in the name of awareness for products and their wisely purposes. For instance; in the beginning of 80s media projected the need of television for awareness, connectivity with the world and then entertainment purpose but gradually dependency over television created the need for ‘eye-care’ televisions or big screen televisions, therefore conversion from need to necessity and then social status automatically happened. Now, students are aspiring to have such electronic items as necessity in their future life. Hence, to avail such comforts one needs to be in a profession which can provide huge salary packages. So, this one dimensional success is monopolizing entire society and clearly stated that if a child is participating in a music reality show then he/she should be a dramatic winner who can not only raise his popularity in the field but also raises popularity chart of the show. This process of winning situations is highly supported by mushrooming of coaching classes that claim guaranteed victory and surprisingly highly populated coaching classrooms are clearly indicating society’s inclination towards achieving successful life. Following collage of the advertisements of coaching classes is representing the emerging significance of parallel education in the making of achievers.

Here, we can see the great shift of knowledge into knowledge economy where benefits of knowledge inspired the youth to build their aspirations. They attach utility purpose with education, for instance if a particular form of disciplinary knowledge is not able to attract utility of accessing great salary packages with occupational opportunities, in comparison to the other disciplines than that discipline is not really relevant to study presently or its obvious if that has been not taken so seriously. However, the purpose of this study is to record the beliefs/views of all those individuals who are directly or indirectly such as educators, teachers, students, family members and school employees contribute to the process of schooling, on the social dimension of school failure and success. The facts of this research are part of a wider research concerning student’s social adequacy having used narratives as a research method and the viability of the educational system. Along with the analysis of education policies and the views of educators, students and younger teacher attribute school failure more to lack of knowledge on their part and to parents’ excessive demands and less to the relationship between educator and the parents’ low socio-economic status.
In a wider sense, learning is a permanent change of behavior and formal education aims at transmitting cultural and social values of the dominant ideology to students. Students are evaluated through standardized methods, which include cognitive, emotional and social measurements. According to Bourdieu (1994), the degree of conformity to those predetermined criteria segregate students between high and low achievers.

School performance is of complex and multi dimensional significance defines school performance as a cluster of maneuvers attempting to integrate the student to the schooling system and the student’s efficiency towards lessons. School on the other, bilateral difference is obvious. The school success or failure refers to what degree the student has fulfilled (fully or partially) teaching goals. Success is believed to be the lack of problems and the student’s achievement of high standards, while failure is characterized by difficulties and an inability to reach the desired goals. It is also accompanied by a variety of other problems (behavioral etc.) which often associated with school failure.

It is believed that success and failure depend on the evaluation system applied by an educator, and the criteria are thus subjective. If the criteria were shifted, success and failure would also differ, as it would not go against children of a low socio-economic status, since it would not depend on “cultural inadequacy” but a “cultural differences”. The definition of school failure can be ambiguous, since it not only entails the student’s failure, but also that of the educational system as it has not successfully met the student needs.

The problem of school failure is of great importance, as it affects mostly poor students and becomes an obstacle to a large part of this segment vulnerable population from making full use of their educational opportunities to improve their social status. As a result, human resources are not adequately used, a fact that has a negative impact on the economic mobility of society. School failure sometimes leads to alienation and social exclusion thus putting social cohesion at risk. The consequences of school failure are economic, social, professional, educational and cultural. People who have difficulties at school find it hard to join and be competitive in the labor market and end up doing mental jobs with no specific specialization.
Educational difficulties, failure and drop outs are connected to adverse reaction on the part of young. It has been proven that children with learning difficulties, who cannot follow teaching techniques, get together with similar peers who have the same learning abilities and behavior and make groups’ gangs. This increases the risks of marginalization and anti social behavior. What is more important is that the wrong use of educational techniques forms a particular way of thought, characterized by lack of perspective, withdrawal and school indifference. Fighting against school failure demands not just the application of “therapeutic” methods at schools, but rather the participation of society as a whole.

There are several theoretical explanations for the concepts of success and failure based on theories of intelligence, cultural deprivation, material deprivation, culture and interaction. The supporters of this theory concluded that intelligence is something that can be inherited. However, this theory was heavily criticized by sociologists, who believe that genetics and environmental influences interrelate (as in poverty and education, etc). Furthermore, IQ tests (supported by theorists of intelligence theory) been criticized as culturally biased.

The theory of cultural deprivation relates school success to the ability to communicate. According to this theory, middle class children learn to make use of communication skills at a younger age than those of the labor class. As a result, middle class children have a more elaborated verbal code and more familiarized with the way of thought prevailing at schools (which is made out for the middle class), a fact which is of vital importance of school success. The connection between socio-economic factors and linguistic performance of a child is based on Bernstein’s theories. The linguistic weakness of the lower class is the phenomenon which Bernstein calls “a limited verbal code of communication”, something which has adverse effect on both the way a child expresses himself/herself and on his/her education.

Wedge and Prosser (1973), supporters of the materialistic deprivation theory, have connected poverty to school performance. They emphasize that children from poor backgrounds are more prone to illnesses; they have more accidents and present learning and speaking problems more often than children from other classes. Poverty creates a
very difficult environment for the family, which also entails lack of learning opportunities for the children. Other researchers believe that a low social background and poverty do not always lead to school failure. They stress that what is most important in school performance are parents’ cultural values and their family lifestyle as well as the importance attributed to education by them.

Pierre Bourdieu (1994) believes that the educational system underestimates knowledge, skills, experience and, subsequently, the culture of the labour class children. This might not necessarily be done on purpose, as it is a result of the way education is organized. Bourdieu believes that education enforces a certain type of culture, that of the predominant class, creating a sort of “symbolic violence”. He also supports that middle class children join the educational system at a more advantageous position and succeed because their background is similar to that of the predominant class, i.e. their mentality coincides with that of their educators. Bourdieu considers this to be “a cultural investment”. Labor class children to be of lower standard and cannot fit within school in general.

In the theory of interaction, Keddie (1973) supports that educational failure is vastly due to facts attributed to the abilities and intellect an educator has. The beliefs and evaluation criteria of an educator are not objective; they are rather based entirely on his cultural background. These beliefs are standardized by educators when it comes to teaching behavior, a stereotype connected with social class and race. It has been observed that schools have a clear cut opinion of how children should talk, react and appear, and there are instances where these attributes are even considered more important than learning. An ideal student’s attributes coincide with those of the middle class children, placing labor class children at the most unfavorable position.

In modern times the complex environment of school demands a certain way of reacting, feeling, thinking and socializing. Competency is achieved when the framework has realistic goals, is concise and provides feedback. Autonomy is gained when the framework is accepted, if it offers the opportunity to the children to choose and to move about independently. Consistency develops through co-operation and interest in
communication. Social framework can hinder all the above if it becomes inconsistent, chaotic, stressful or indifferent.

Peers can also have a positive impact on school work, since they are the strongest influence children receive on a daily basis at school. Students perform much better with teachers who control them than with supportive and encouraging teachers. The first type of teacher provides them with motivation, creativity, motivation towards mastery, better comprehension of concepts, positive feelings and fewer possibilities of dropping out. Certain conditions, such as too much home work, unrealistic demands of success on behalf of society and a highly competitive educational system leads to a diversity of results. In his book “schools without failure”, the American Psychologist Glasser (1975) points out certain weaknesses in educational system, which he considers to be responsible for the failure of students. He supports that the average school has been “designed for failure”, due to its traditional educating ideas, which block out active participation of children when it comes to learning and thinking.

The main priority seems to be high marks, while education is of minor importance, as is also the case of personal development and satisfaction derived from teaching and learning. This creates a climate of tough competition and students in the classroom are classified in terms of their good or poor performance. The classification reflects children’s ability not only at school but in society as well; as school does not prepare them for the role and responsibilities they will have to take on later in their life. This type of education does not help student with learning difficulties. It is not flexible and does not provide equal opportunities in learning, so that groups are formed with children of the same abilities.

[IV]

SCHOOLS, METROPOLITAN MIDDLE CLASS AND MODES OF SOCIALIZATION

Schools, as repeatedly said, are essential part of modern society. Ideally, with the complexities of modern society they have emerged as significant way to transmit
knowledge from one generation to another in the first form. Secondly, schools as educational institutions have become the authentic and legitimate places to communicate and transfer real meaning of knowledge to pupil. Thirdly, they produce legitimate form of knowledge which provides enough spaces to shape students’ knowledge into vocational forms. Fourthly, they transfer individuals into responsible adulthood for the society. Lastly, by giving equal set of opportunities and structures, schools favor equality and claim to reproduce it again with the great vision of individual’s overall development as well as society’s. These are the basic elementary features of school education irrespective of time, space and place. This universalistic character of schooling is closely integrated with the learning process. School education conveys its basic element of relatedness to students; a relatedness of textual understanding with existential realities of the world, a relatedness of inner quest with the outer world and a relatedness of theory and practice. Through their universal and abstract form school education compel a pupil learn to realize itself and provide best possible ways to convert those inner abilities into concrete shape. A child through the impersonal journey of schooling learns to relate his/her own experiences with human and social world and develop his/her knowledge through interactive relationships of peer groups, teachers and whole environment of school. By studying many disciplines students build their own knowledge along with critical, imaginative, and rational site that leads their actions and attitudes towards life course. This means that integral school education succeeds in realizing the ‘four primary components of human life- knowledge, love, self-realization and vocation’.

Ideally, Indian schooling system is closely linked to the cultivation of values; social and cultural values. Therefore, in Gandhian views it’s a process of ‘man-making’. Similarly, Swami Vivekananda conceived of an “education by which character is formed, strength of mind is increased and expanded, by which one can stand on one’s own feet.”

Schooling process and knowledge often overlap with each other. This overlapping basically arouses a society’s expectations to recreate/ to reproduce actual knowledge through schooling process. Thus, existence of knowledge is ever present in the world


therefore it has been experienced, defined and produced differently with time and space. For instance it was the existence of knowledge which reinforced the whole world towards enlightenment era. This cycling process of understanding knowledge and making availability of it is necessary for the continuation of the societal world. As Karl Mannheim describes, knowledge was socio-culturally and existentially bound, determined and validated conditioning of thought. To him all knowledge and ideas, although to different degrees, were “bound to location” within the social structures and the historical process. At a particular time, a particular group can have fuller access to the understanding of a social phenomenon than other groups, but no group can have complete access to it. Knowledge takes different shapes and different meanings in the understandings of thinkers. For Durkheim, knowledge is an intellectual category which is originally derivative of group activity whereas for Kant it’s a love of truth. In a sense it’s a power which dominates the world with its own meanings and connotations in respect of time and space.

Traditionally, in the stature of Indian society knowledge is correlated with moral, spiritual and divine character of it and Indian society always believe in imparting it through the value system. For example Krishnamurti emphasized knowledge through the self-knowing factor in two way philosophy-going inward and understand himself. The other is, going outward into society and engaging with processes in society. Similarly in the views of many Indian thinkers and philosophers knowledge can be defined in terms of critical quest, inner awakening, rational engagement, experiential venture and creative pursuit. With the acceptance of the larger meaning of knowledge, modern world believe in the mode of continuity and progressive element. In result, the need/ requirement of school felt where knowledge has started link with organizing and specializing factors.

Today, with modern complexities and web of relationships modern schools are carrying great responsibility. They are overloaded or overburden with high expectations of society. They are supposed to maintain the balance between ideological/ philosophical element of education and increasing modern demands and desires. At this juncture,

---

schools have to face main issue of whose/which form of knowledge should be the part of curriculum and pedagogy, and history reveals that it has been always a debatable topic for the world. But it seems according to the requirements of the society knowledge with dominating societal forces takes it shapes automatically. Unlike the philosophical aspect of knowledge i.e. divine character, modern education is much related with scientific and technological aspect. With continuous emphasis on rationality, specificity and progressive element modern education believes that for the effective functioning of the society all sorts of knowledge should be communicated with students through the process of schooling. Therefore, knowledge has been started equalizing with informative character and students are supposedly catering all kinds of disciplinary knowledge in schools that is playing an important role in a child’s overall development also where a pupil learns to relate their different forms of disciplinary knowledge with his/her experiences. But over emphasis on collecting information actually kills a learning spirit of a child and the main motive of school education i.e. realizing one’s self are sacrificing in the domain of school education.

Noticeably, one can observe contemporary India’s obsession with modernity, information knowledge, technological development, and rapid progressive element. In result, techno-economic structure is becoming more prevalent and it requires development of certain kinds of skills to reproduce itself. Consequently educational institutions (from schools to universities) are supporting the new emerging ideology of the society and believing in the execution of it in its best possible ways. Therefore, in the making of skilled labourers for the techno-economic structure of Indian society and its development, schools with strong conception of hierarchization of disciplinary knowledge are reproducing inequalities such as some disciplines which are more suitable for the development of neo liberal India naturally receive special attention of the entire educational system in comparison to others. In this regard, schools are converted into the legitimate places to produce high skilled performers for the economy or aiming for the advanced sci-fi society. For modern Indian families, naturally schools are not merely a form of secondary socialization but more than that those are the reliable, legitimate, authentic places which produce desired outcomes. In this process schools are becoming factories and educational knowledge can be scaled down according to the demand-supply
ratio of neo liberal Indian society. For example: with the huge effect of colonization after industrialization, high expectancy of benefits lead increasing interests of English language and its domination could be seen not only on social-cultural aspect of Indian society but it also affected Indian educational system equally. Society demanded English educators from the behavioural perspective to occupational reality, so schools especially urban schools adopted English language from their curriculum to the pedagogy, classroom culture to the teacher- taught relationship, textual knowledge to real life experiences. Then, on the bases of urban middle class demands, the whole Indian Educational Structure got fragmented between rural-urban schools, English-vernacular schools and private- public schools. That whole politics of Indian educational system penetrates demarcation into the system and maintain the establishment of unequal structure of learning process.

Besides, uninterrupted domination of English language, with economic liberalization, globalization and then neo-liberalization, structure of Indian educational system started responding to the economic desires of the society where knowledge as above mentioned altered into the knowledge economy. For example, after Independence, for steady growth and stable development India required engineers, scientists, doctors, so Indian leaders, thinkers and educational policies (like; Kothari commission 1964) all were communicating in the language of science and technology, consequently, hierarchy of disciplines had established in the favor of science streams. This eye-opening transformation opens the doors for the real understanding of education and economy and need to redefine its vitality in contemporary society. The relationship of economy with education is necessary for the continuity and progress. It helps us to build a proper understanding of resources and their rational usage in the welfare of society. Any kind of imbalance of this relationship can create the disturbance in the society and appears as major hindrance for the societal development. Such as, despite covering the targets of economical growth in India, the country is not able to claim real development, and despite increasing numbers of schools and colleges India is still starving for the hundred percent literacy-rates. And those who are successfully attaining their education, their craving for happiness are increasing day by day. In a nutshell, India as a country is suffering from the value crisis of the educational domain.
Meanwhile, Neo liberal economy of India exposes diversifying occupational realities and their implications in the structure of middle class. We have already discussed above about the emergence of middle class, in this respect one cannot negate the accumulation of middle class through the economical changes but even in the structure of Indian middle class on the bases of their location in the economic structure and consumption set up some broad categorization among middle classes can be seen like; urban middle class, rural middle class and metropolitan middle class. In their deeply rooted structure every category is slightly different from the other in terms of their approach towards life, in their socialization patterns, and in their hopes and agonies. As we know metropolitan cities offer a new kind of environment to its people. From its infrastructure to occupational realities, dimensions of socio-cultural, economic-political and gender, every aspect differs from the other two categories of middle classes.

The era of economic liberalization did not only bring changes into the society but it brought the major shift in the political-social culture of the nation. A major shift in consumption level took the main position in transferring identities of middle classes especially urban middle class. Overall economic structure was revolving around this transformation. Media; both print and electronic media were witnessing that change and their regular representation of it contributed in varying ways to a perception that India is being fundamentally changed by rapidly expanding consuming class. Further with the expansion of consumption level those perceptions with strong conviction became hardcore reality of metropolitan middle class.

Historically, metropolitan middle class is the result of emergence of opportunities; educational opportunities as well as occupational opportunities at the time of economic liberalization which gave birth to new kinds of hopes towards upward mobility factor amongst the individuals of metropolitan middle class. People of that group developed a faith in those economical changes; they saw them as better alternatives to personalized success. In the beginning, high packaged occupational opportunities attracted the attention of that group to enhance their income structure but gradually it connected with high consumption level, having the heightened sense of high standard of living. As Leela Fernandes also claims in her work;
“While emerging opportunities for the consumption of newly available commodities represent the public face of the benefits of economic liberalization, the central figure in such representations of consumption is the urban middle class. The urban middle class, in effect, represents a hegemonic socio-cultural embodiment of India’s transition to a committed liberalizing nation. She continues, in public discourses, practices of consumption and the depictions of associated life style changes distinguish the new Indian middle class from the older traditional middle class that was held back by the cultural structures on consumption inherent in Nehruvian state socialism and Gandhian austerity. This heightened visibility has transformed the new middle class into an object for the projection of political, cultural and ideological assumptions from a range of actors.”

Presently, the perception of consumption is not only limited to the consumption of material goods it’s far beyond the objectification of consuming structure. It’s about the consumption based identity, representation of hegemonic process, cultural variations, and economical shifts. This whole process of recreation of identities of metropolitan middle class embodies with symbolic shifts in the overall structure of the society. Its about the consumption of public goods and private goods. Largely, its effective affect can be observed through two way parameters- first, the structure of institution of family and second, the socialization patterns in the pivotal institution of family and schools as another important element of socialization. From the structural perspective to sociocultural perspectives Indian metropolitan families are experiencing the vast changes, now the concept of nuclear family is not a shockingly surprising response of this group. As many times Indian advertising agencies are depicting the changing definition of a metropolitan family where they show in a car advertisement- a husband, a wife and one or two children with a pet animal. This advertisement wisely highlights the comfortability and reasonability of the car company which accommodating family’s desires with a great care of their status symbol. Another advertisement of a Food Joint- Pizza Hut also

41 Ibid: 2006; 30.
showcasing the rampant understanding of the structure of metropolitan families where they advertise that ‘Order for a family meal (sized for four persons) and save up to 100 rupees in the next order’\(^{42}\). This prevailing assumption of family structure, which is constituted with the size of four individuals indicate the changing scenarios of families in terms of economical affordability and social expectations. Along with this structural reality of metropolitan middle class families recent development of some satellite cities such as Noida, Greater Noida and Gurgaon and some other mushrooming of developed places like Dwarka in Delhi and areas like Vasundhara, Indrauram, Koshambi in Ghaziabad of Uttar Pradesh are illustrating middle class aspirations and achievements. Besides the inflationary factor of the country, complicated situations for basic facilities of water and electricity (as government to warn people advertises its figures for electricity situation in these areas are as following):

**POWERLESS IN NATIONAL CAPITAL REGIONs (NCR):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>Shortfall</th>
<th>Power cuts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>5,454 MW</td>
<td>5,454 MW</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2-3 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurgaon</td>
<td>860 MW</td>
<td>640 MW</td>
<td>220 MW</td>
<td>12-14 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noida</td>
<td>800 MW</td>
<td>750 MW</td>
<td>50 MW</td>
<td>8 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghaziabad</td>
<td>800 MW</td>
<td>600 MW</td>
<td>200 MW</td>
<td>12-14 hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hindustan Times: Tuesday, July 03, 2012.

and total negligence of aesthetic beauty, middle class people are entirely neglecting these factual situations and highly aspire to be a part of these cities or areas. A suitable example of an advertisement of apartment Construction Company supports this argument strongly. This is as follows;

**“JAYPEE GREENS INTRODUCES KRISTAL COURT: Luxury apartments with breathtaking views of the 18 hole golf course; Be one of the select few to own a breathtaking view of the golf course in Wish Town, Noida. LUXURY 2BHK APARTMENTS STARTING 1.49 CR. RUPPES ONWARDS.**

\(^{42}\) Example has taken from the pamphlet of Pizza Hut, distributed around Christmas festival, dated 24 December 2012.
Wish Town Highlights: 1162 acres of gated community living. Jaypee Institute of Information Technology and Jaypee Public School are operational. 18+9 hole golf course ready. 500 bed super speciality Jaypee Medical Centre to be operational in 2013. 24x7 water and power supply. Centrally monitored 3-tier security and much more."

Above explanations are not merely exemplifying collective information of print media but it clearly visualizing new emerging definition of Indian Middle classes. Despite various formative struggles of big developed places one can be curious about this emerging interest of middle classes towards metropolitan cities. In answer, metropolitan middle class favoring progress, upward mobility in all spheres of life, matching with the high trends set by the neo liberal era, and popular conception of achievement in terms of ‘owning a house in these particular cities, a big branded car, accessibility of privatized education and newly available commodities so on’ and this whole process of upgrading class status, one can visualize the domination of symbolic cultural reproduction in Indian society.

On the other hand this creation or recreation of symbolic culture and cultural reproduction is cultivating through school education and family socialization. With the birth, a child attains ascribed status of the family but with new trends and set ups family tries to upgrade his/her status and support him towards achieved status through education and occupations, then introduce him to certain parameters of high status such as mannerism and behaviourism in relation to westernization, language of English now with some more foreign languages should be the mode of expression, familiarity with mall culture and foreign products and relaxation in terms of particular labeled resources of entertainment etc. For example; recently kindergarten schools are mushrooming in India and for parents their children’s admissions in those schools are reflections of their social status and attach to the need of their children. Narration of Mrs. Rana (who is working as a software engineer in a Multinational Company) reveals the importance of few selected Kindergarten like- Mother’s Pride, Shemrock pre-nursery schools means something for her family. She says,

---

43 Hindustan Times, Saturday, June 30, 2012.
“It’s a starting point to familiarize your child with the pattern of schooling and he/she develops some habits in that school environment. Those habitual traits are playing an important role in making of their peer groups etc, so one should be cautious while making an appropriate choice for their children. As ultimately you, as a parent, are targeting a big branded school such as Delhi Public School, Modern International School, Ryan International School etc. in the long run for the bright future of your child.”

With the regular exposure of such kind of socialization at schools and family, a child naturally develops a habit, a tendency towards such kind of life and when it lacks they feel anxious, on the contrary when they achieve it they feel relaxed and pleased. In support of this argument following pictorial reflection (in a collage form) is symbolizing consummative, aspiring Indian middle class in neo liberal economy.

In result, their thinking/ mode of thought becomes conservative and orthodox despite experiencing modern education in its full fledged form, with its loud positive elements like science, technology, growth, liberty, and reasoning. This in-build natural process of commodification and consumer culture forces a child to generate maximum best possibilities of comfort and luxury out of his/her talent, energy, ideas and thoughts. Therefore, a pupil/ a child tend to choose a path which is suitably connecting towards his/her ultimate dreams i.e. highly designated position in a most suitable profession. So, in the making of inspirational attitudes, structure of contemporary economy is dominating the domain of education.

Therefore, after sketching the sociology of neo-liberalization in the form of historical and theoretical revelation of classical liberalization to neo liberalization, along with the emergence of Indian middle class and situation of schools and school children in it, my collective effort is to situate a debate about conditioning of concepts like success and failure in this research project. Thus, through the subsequent chapters of this research, the argument will be articulated that how schools play a decisive role, since they transform social and economic differences into inadequacy of ability. The evaluation system applied to school legitimizes segregation, becoming thus part of a wider social
segregation and exclusion. Education does not only reflect social relationships but also an output in production. Students are equipped with knowledge, which can be used later on the workplace. Due to the fact, though, that the middle class has a great influence on the educational system (school curriculum, school texts, teaching methods) and the children of that level are more favored than the others. Unnecessary knowledge and skills do not become part of the teaching curriculum. Furthermore, educators cannot bridge the gap between education and social inequality, which is a major part of the system.

Education, as a social determinism should be considered as part of the macro and micro sociological area. An individual should be an interactive part of his/her own society. Therefore, school should be “a place which systematically teaches all its students the abilities are obtains from this privileged environment”. It should take into consideration the different socioeconomic background of student and try to even out differences among them. In India, intellectuals and leaders of this country considered education as a significant element in the development of nation. Before, taking some rigorous steps towards development of nation, Indian leaders and intellectuals wanted to awake Indian population to overcome from the dark slumbers of society. In the sparkling light of modernity, from Raja Rammohun Roy, Bankim Chandra Chatterjee to Vidyasagar, Dadabhai Naoroji and Nehru spread a “light of reason” in the society to fight with the societal deformities. Up to some level, they succeeded in their actions and we as Indian citizens started imbibing new mode of thought i.e. rational and scientific in nature which helped us to fight with our own superstitions and established prejudices. Consequently, classification of knowledge has begun where science got highest status in educational system at the rate of deprivation of other disciplinary knowledge. At this juncture, with Gandhian philosophy of education, the meaning of education has slightly molded. Gandhi’s emphasis on vocational aspect of education gave a different shape to Indian education system. But in the race of science as an essential element of progress and technology as a requirement of nation’s development, whole system of knowledge has been categorized and politicized.

Though, at the time of liberalization, new ventures of knowledge have been open for Indian middle class along with changing dimensions of economy. It directly hit the
established hierarchy of disciplinary knowledge and created a new hierarchy in school education. Wherein commerce as a separate discipline and within arts economics came into high demand among school students but still science achieved the highest priority in prevailing educational system. For this matter various reasons are responsible such as Indian government’s budget allocation along with its special emphasis upon subjects related to science and technology, market driven society of India and Indian societies’ established prejudices of science and social sciences which create such notions of school education- success and failure. This theoretical understanding behind these notions clearly shows the prevailing unequal structure of Indian education system.

In this biased environment of school curriculum, this is necessary to know about the significance of school education in terms of its hierarchical representation, unequal knowledge system, and the pedagogic and curriculum structure. Similarly, for more authenticity of my work I took narrations of students as well as school teachers which are the main theme of my preceding chapters. In the reflection of those narratives I was trying to visualize the importance of these concepts and their reconstruction in the domain of education. Subsequently, through narratives as a methodology of my work, I tried to analyze the real situation of such notions in school curriculum. I interacted with students and teachers where in the light of their own experiences and their engagement in the processing of schooling, I highlighted the reflection of present situation of students. Experiences of students and teachers in terms of anxiety, disillusionment, hopes and future projects, provided me a scope to build up a sociological understanding of these notions in the context of established prejudices of society. In result, all three following chapters are trying to reveal present scenario of school education.

**********
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