Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The current research in Sociology of Education has largely focused upon the relationship between society, culture and schooling practices. Interestingly, there has been sharp focus on researching the processes of schooling, face to face interaction and the nature of oppositional culture of the pupils in Sociology of education as a whole (Reynolds and Sullivan, 2014). In India, Scholars in Sociology of Education has put emphasis on researching the relationship between education, stratification and change in past decades while fair amount of research attention is paid into the state of Schooling and experiences of Scheduled Castes (SCs) and Scheduled Tribes (STs) in relation to policy thrust for equality of educational opportunities and affirmative action. In addition, the study of gender identity and its implication for education are the added dimension in sociological research in India. However, institutional structure and practices in the contexts of exclusion and inclusion particularly in case of girls, SCs, STs and minority groups are yet to be systematically studied. The school and classroom processes as research areas are also rarely studied. (Nambissan and Rao, 2013). In sociological literature, studies explore, for example, how school processes and practices both influence and are influenced by social and cultural phenomena and how these practices aid to reproduce social structure. Halsey et al., (1997 argue that schools act as agencies of cultural reproduction through which patterns of power and inequality are maintained. (Halsey et al., 1997). Levinson and Holland (1996) describe schools as sites for formation of subjectivities through the production and consumption of cultural forms. Critical scholars argue that schools actually serve to exacerbate or perpetuate social inequalities (Levinson and Holland, 1996). I begin this chapter discussing the relationship between schooling, community and social structure and thereafter, discussions on literature related to school participation and drop-outs.

2.1. Schooling, Capital and Social Structure

Recent advances in sociological literature place ‘Capital’ broader than the monetary notion of capital in economic literature. Capital is defined as the generalised resource that includes monetary and non-monetary as well as tangible and non-tangible resources. Bourdieu (1986, p.243) discusses three different kinds of capital and explains how they stand different to each other. While economic capital implies monetary income as well as financial resources and assets, social capital means the sum
of actual and potential resources which can be mobilised through membership in social networks. On the other hand, cultural capital, core to the Bourdieusian approach, refers to knowledge, disposition, skills and cultural goods that are unique to specific social classes, which can be passed on from one generation to the other (Bourdieu, 1986).

Research has shown that most parents invest different kinds of resources including time and money for the education of the children, but the way these resources are used determine the educational advantage of the children (Bourdieu, 1986 and Coleman, 1988). Individuals adjust their investments to their probability of success. Closely related to the concept of cultural capital is habitus, which means a set of values and attitudes; and the dominant habitus means a set of values and attitudes held by dominant groups (Bourdieu, 1986, Sulivan, 2002). Further, the development of learners’ habitus is influenced by the culture of the parents and everyday experiences within the family, peer group and also relation to the school norms that powerfully mediate children's learning. No doubt, habitus is the creation early childhood experience, and particularly, influenced by socialisation within the family. Habitus is shaped and reshaped by individual’s encounter with the outside world. (Di Maggio,1979; Reay,1995). Habitus reflects the social position and social structure in which it was constructed and can be transformed through a process that either raises or lowers an individual’s expectation(Reay,1995). Thus, habitus is an interplay between past and present, which influences individual’s decision.

Emphasising upon the reproductive and transformative potential of the habitus in the context of schooling, Mills (2008) argued that in particular social structure, on some occasions students having realised the constraint of social conditions and conditioning and perceive their future that fits them, while on others they may realise that they have the capacity for improvisation and act upon to generate opportunities for action in the social field. Mills (2008), taking the Bourdieu’s (1977) argument, points out that many marginalised students, having realised the constraints of their circumstances, take the things for granted, tend to perceive the world as natural and confine themselves to the possibilities which they find fit to their social groups.

In describing social identity as an integral part of this research, I will consider Turner’s social identity theory. The Social identity theory by Turner and Tajfel (1979) explains the minimal conditions that would influence members of one group to discriminate in favour of the in-group to which they belong to and against another out-
group. This theory states that people have a collection of such discrete category memberships that vary in relative overall importance in the self-concept. The membership belonging to a group represented in the individual’s mind as a social identity that defines one’s attributes as member of that group. The interaction between two or more individuals (or group of individuals) are fully determined by various social groups or categories and not affected by inter-individual personal relationships between people. Thus, when specific social identities become the prominent source for self-regulation in a particular context, self-perception become the in-group stereotypical and normative perception of relevant out-group members attain competitive and discriminatory properties to a varying degree depending on the nature of relations between groups” (Hogg, Terry, White,1995).

Central to the theory of Social identity theory are the concept of Categorisation and Self-enhancement. Categorisations sharpen the group boundaries by producing group-distinctive stereotypical and normative perception and actions and assigns into relevant category. Subjects perceive themselves as similar to or different from others as individuals but they are the members of discrete and discontinuous categories-that is “groups”. Self-enhancement can be achieved in groups by making comparisons between the in-group and relevant out-groups in ways that favour the in-group. Mostly, the in-group norms and stereotypes largely favour the in-group.

Jodhka (1998) pointed out that notion of community, in Indian social science, had been discussed in two distinct approaches: substantive approach and constructive approach. In the substantive approach, culturally defined categories such as ethnic groups, religious groups and castes are seen as the authentic units that constitute the society. The second was the constructivist approach, which saw the most of the present day ‘communities’ and the identities on which they are based are creation of colonial policies and discourses. Further, Jodhka (1998) argued that communities are constituted of symbolic processes in order to claim space for themselves, in order to protect their privileges, structure of prestige or to prevent their own annihilations. Communities have two distinct faces: one as it appeared to members from inside and other as it looked from outside to others.

Levinson (1996) defines social identity as the self-understandings, acquired from social understandings, social discourses and often symbolically charged through emotional attachment, which an individual has of himself/herself. He further adds
saying that schooling, in addition to providing specific knowledge and skills, also contribute to a new social identity. Schooling is one of the important means of maintaining or advancing status prerogatives through acquisition of more knowledge and culture. He points out that the cultural production of schooled identity took place largely in and through the realm of student culture, that is, in the informal domains of student organised activities, in and out of school. Apart from the school effects, politics of schooled identity also extends to the areas of social affinity and even sexual attraction outside immediate purview of the school. According to Levinson, “The construction of schooled identity involves an understanding of social self as educated person, as occupying social position distinct from unschooled.

Pollard and Filler (2007) discusses pupils are seen as negotiating their learner identities at the intersection of school, home and cultural influences and peer group relationships. Families, teachers and friends, in relationship with an individual with each other, act to mediate and interpret wider cultural and political discourses, shaping individual pupils' experience and perceptions. The relationship between each pupil and their parents, sibling peers and teachers influence their behaviours. The social contexts in which each pupil interacts and learns are represented by the broader social contexts and historical specific locations, the cultural environment influencing peers and the school cultures and imperatives that influence the work of their teachers or superiors.

Paul Willis (1997) in his book on "Learning to Labour: How Working class Kids Get Working Class Jobs" argues that working class children are drawn to grunt work on the basis of their self-evaluation that they are less capable. Willis finds that these children are not less talented, but they do develop resentment towards the "work hard move forward" mentality of modern education, and develop what Willis terms as "counter school culture". These children distance themselves from the school culture and school requirements, and develop their own counterculture. Willis points out that these lads have the realisation that the formal knowledge and skills offered by the school will not serve the purpose of their life fully but the less rewarding jobs in the labour market, which demands more of them. Therefore, they display resistance to school by manifestation of chauvinistic masculinity, challenging obedience and rejection of schooling.
2.2. Drop-outs and School Participation

The literature on school participation, drop-outs and low achievement in India is numerous and has been examined from wider perspective in elementary education. But the number of such studies on secondary education is very less. It has been widely acknowledged that the reasons of discontinuing school and low achievement can be broadly classified into three groups. These can be categorised as academic, socio-economic and cultural (Rumberger, 2001). These are: family related reasons (socio-economic status of the parents, parent-child relation, parental expectations, cultural resources in the family etc.); community related reasons (parental networks, ethnic status in the village, peer networks, social norms and values etc.) and school-related reasons (school timing, school culture etc.)

Previous research indicates that social and academic support at school as one of the reasons of students’ decision to continue or leave secondary schools before graduation (Deschenes, Tank and Fines, 2001). Studies cite that many drop-outs have fewer positive social interaction and less access to assistance from teachers; on the other hand, children with positive social relationships have better chances to complete secondary schooling even when school work is difficult and classroom expectations are troublesome (Lecompte & Dworkin, 1991, Wehlage, Rutter, Smith, Lesko and Fernandez, 1989). On the other hand, Deschenes, Cuban and Tyack (2001) cite that children often fail academically because the culture of the school is so different from cultural background of the communities they serve.

There are some theorists who advocate that decisions to complete or withdraw schooling are based on the process of engagement with academic and social aspects of schooling (Newmann et al., 1992, Wehlage et al., 1989, Finn, 1989). While academic disengagement is reflected in their frequent absenteeism in school, lower achievement and student discipline problems (Bachman et. al, 1971, Carbonaro, 1998, Rumberger, 1995), Social engagement are reflected in features like disengagement with peers etc. They are of the opinion that students ‘disengagement or withdrawal from school is not a sudden event; rather it is a long-term process influenced by student’s early school experiences. They found that early academic achievement, late retention and behaviour in the school all indicate students’ completion or drop-out problems in the school (Alexander et al., 1997, Roderick, 1993).
Ensminger and Slusacick (1992) pointed out that early performance level along with family background determine drop-out pattern in secondary education. Children who perform well in the school initially receive greater rewards and recognition in the school and family and thus successfully complete schooling. On the other hand, they found out that probability of drop-out is found to be more among the children, whose early school performance isn’t well, where parental expectation is very low, influenced by early school performance and who are from relatively poor socio-economic background.

Along with personal characteristics, many studies point out that family background may indicate success or failure in secondary education. Research has found that socio-economic status most commonly measured by parental education and income is the predictor of student’s achievement and drop-out behaviour. Advocates of human capital theorists conclude that parents make choices about how much time and other resources have to invest in their children’s education, which in turn, influence the children’s success in education. Coleman argued that human capital (parental education) and financial capital (parental income) were insufficient to explain the connection between family background and school success (Rumberger, 2001). Rather social capital, which is manifested in the relationship of parents with their children, other families and the school influence school achievement independent of the effects of human and financial capital (Coleman, 1988). McNeal (1999) also found that familial social capital is effective in keeping children from dropping-out from high school in combination with high socio-economic status—that is when parents have high income, education and/or occupational prestige.

Research demonstrates that students whose parents monitor and regulate their activities, provide emotional support, encourage independent decision-making and are more generally involved in their decision-making and involve them in their schooling are less likely to drop-out from school (Astone & McLahen, 1991, Rumberger et al., 1990, Rumberger, 1995). In a similar argument, Carveantes (1966) indicates that the drop-outs found to experience academic difficulty when they are terminated from education. Though they are not significantly involved but they are slightly involved in any school related activities throughout academic career. In a comparison among family dynamics of both drop-out and graduates, he states the families of drop-outs have less intra-family connection and fewer social networks than that of high-school graduates. The dropouts have less encouragement for academic activity than that of
family of graduates. Ekstrom et al. (1986) also found that drop-outs have less educational support than that of students, who remain in the school. The groups differed significantly in terms of number of available study materials, opportunity for non-school related learning, parents’ educational aspiration, interest and amount of attention to their children’s school activities.

Blake (1991) and Hanushek (1992) argued that the number of siblings in the family determine the participation of children in education. Children from small number of families gain more advantages than that of families with more children because the parent’s attention and material resources are focussed than diluted among children.

Some theorists advocate that the curricula, syllabi and modes of assessments adopted in most of the educational institutions are heavily biased towards students with linguistically and logic-mathematical capabilities, with priority given to one or the other varying cross-culturally (Gardner, 1983,1989,1999). Linguistic capital often differed by social groups because it is differed by culture, life-style and workplace. Oral and written linguistic capabilities aren’t equally valued in school. Even within the school, oral capabilities of children form upper class backgrounds are largely valued than the children form lower socio-economic bracket of the society (Bernstein, 1971). These characteristics, Bernstein points out; largely determine the success and failure of one working class over others.

While there are limited studies on secondary drop-outs in India, a study on secondary education in India by Sujatha and Geetha Rani (2006) indicate that poor quality of teaching-learning mechanism in the school demotivate the children to continue their schooling. While some academically weak students prefer to discontinue education due to fear of failure in the terminal examination, children from poor socio-economic bracket due to multiple of factors like irregular attendance, familial burden and engagement with non-academic activities drop-out from the system. Along with, both cite that customary practices like early-age marriage and over-age are also among the factors that affect the decision to drop-out from school.

Aikara (1997) in a study on “Educating out-of-school children in India’ found that extent of wastage and stagnation was rampant among economic backward classes. Moreover, the illiteracy of parents, poverty and lack of study atmosphere at school are causes behind wastage and stagnation in school education in Kamrup district of Assam.
2.3. Schooling in Tribal Areas

While there are number of researches done in the past to show the slow progress of education among the tribal children in India, the current review will attempt to see some pertinent studies that look at socio-cultural context than other factors and especially the education of tribal children in the mixed setting. Studies on the extent and utilisation of facilities found that educational facilities are unevenly distributed in tribal areas and the relatively developed tribal areas have better access to education compared to the backward and interior tribal areas. In terms of utilisation of facilities, the disparity at inter and intra-tribal levels are found significantly higher compared to disparities between tribal and non-tribal population (Nuna, 1993, Sujatha, 1987 and 1990).

Ambasht found non-suitability of school programmes are also allude to as the reason of drop-out among tribal communities (Ambasht, 1970). Tribal-non-tribal prejudices, social distance among teachers and taught, poor delivery system that do not fit to the demands of tribal societies are some of the factors that cause drop-out in the tribal system of education. Mujumdar (1950) in his study on “HO village Schools’, found that that HO students could successfully compete with non-tribal counterpart and can even excel them but these schools were mostly ill-equipped and don’t function according to the requirement of the tribe.

Most of the studies found the lack of interest among the teachers and more particularly among the non-tribal teachers in the tribal settings are as the major reasons for disadvantaged position of tribal children in school (Ambasht, 1978, Sachidananda, 1971, Mishra, 2008, Panda, 1983, Sujatha, 1987, 1994, Panda, Bijoy, 1995). Coupled with faulty selection and appointment of the teacher, lack of experience and interest to teach the tribal children are found as some of the reasons for lower participation of tribal students. In the mixed tribal setting, the condition of tribal children is more appalling where their socio-cultural resources (language, culture) become burden for them. The teacher instead taking a neutral stand point, takes the standpoint of the children of the dominant group, uses the language and discourse from dominant setting. The teachers mostly perceive the tribal students as backward and they don’t have adequate competencies to learn and acquire the skills. This kind of
prejudices and discriminatory attitude among teachers has largely affected the tribal education system. Pati and Panda (2010) also found that with a very poor infrastructure and absence of the requisite number of teachers, students in the backward districts/regions have frustrating experience in schools. Most of the students, as they come from socio-economically disadvantaged communities like the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, are scared of the teachers and do not find anything interesting to hold them on to the schools and gradually they start withdrawing from the schools.

Sinha (2005) in a study on education of the tribal girls in Odisha emphasizing on attitude and language of Instruction argues that in tribal communities, parents give minimal importance to girl’s education due to economic and social limitations. Since parents perceive economic returns of sending the boys than girls are high, they prefer to send boys to school. Most frequently, girls, apart from taking part in agricultural activities and collection of forest products are also engaged in sibling care.

Rath (2006) mentions that the reasons of drop-out in the Kandhamal district of Odisha mainly attribute to prevailing economic backwardness among the tribes. Majority of the people in the district are poor, who spend most of their times in doing small jobs and marginal farming. Even children are engaged in these occupations. In addition to this, ignorance and superstitions and prevailing cultural process and life style also affect the education of tribal children. Lack of proper school schedule, health problem and lack of communication problem are also cited as reasons of drop-out.

Madan (2004) points out that the teacher’s cultural background and traditional upbringing and mind-set inhibit the role of teacher that she/he is supposed to perform. The social and cultural attitudes that teacher brings into classroom about the children often lead to biased attitudes among children and perpetuate pervading inequalities. Thus, the children from socially underprivileged groups suffer and less benefit from the teaching learning process in the school. In her study, she argues that teachers believe that some children can’t perform because they belong to particular community.

Krishna Kumar (2009) in his book “Social character of learning” discussed that curriculum and text, having non-description of the matter from the tribal world view and the major interaction of majority world, forced to identify to the symbols of dominant groups. Thus, tribal children perceive themselves as backward since they don’t find their worldview in the contents.
Apart from the teacher characteristics, it was also found that the incompatibility between home and school culture also found as the factor affecting the lower participation among the tribal children. Sujatha (2001) points out that conflict between norms of the school and socialisation of children at home results in resistance and unwillingness to attend school. Along with, the dress, language and authoritarian behaviour of teachers being perceived as alien to outsiders to tribal location are also cited as the major factor that resist the children in going to school. In the same line but in different version, Nambissan (1994) cite cultural discontinuity between home and school as one of the factors that affects the performance of the tribal children in the school. Included the factors are the exclusion of the child’s language from the school and denial and denigration of tribal cultures, she cites, as the factors that negatively affect their sense of identity and self-confidence and thereby results in poor response to education.

Nambissan (1994) argues that languages spoken in the home environment if used in the school can play a significant role in facilitating education of tribal children. But such practices are rarely found except some schools. The languages of tribal children are still seen as underdeveloped and inappropriate for schooling process. These stereotypes underlie recommendations in education policy as well as in the attitudes and expectations of teachers which are communicated to children as part of the hidden curriculum of schooling.

Sundar (2010) argues that how the promise of formal education comes at the cost of cultural identity and local knowledge for Adivasis, even while recognizing that in all cases, “educational processes are… fundamentally cultural processes. She further cites that language gap between students and teachers who do not speak any of the local languages and further, blatant discrimination or at the very least unequal treatment by teachers towards Adivasis(tribes) as compared to non-adivasis(non-tribes) or upper-caste students, makes the educational experience alienating for tribal children.

Ramachandran and Jandhyala (2007) asserts that good quality education remains a challenge in the tribal areas due to the fact that dialects and languages involved in the pedagogic process are totally different from the languages of the tribes. The tribal areas are not well connected and people speak their own language – posing a huge problem for young children forced to learn in the region’s majority language.
Mishra (2009) also points out that the failure of tribal children in school education partly results from unfamiliarity of the tribal learners with the language used in the school. Since the language of the school used by the teacher and language of the textbooks differ considerably from their first language, most of the tribal children fail to comprehend the school subjects up to primary level. Along with children’s learning problems arise out of the non-contextual content of the curriculum and instructional processes used in school setting, which is far from the children’s need.

Peer influence has also been found as the factor affecting the education of tribal children. Sharma (1988) making quote of several studies in ICSSR, note that pronounced differences exist between tribal students and other students because of deprivation, they suffer in relation to higher status groups and receive differential treatment from the power elites, who came from general category and from among themselves. Their differential background, social networks, status and power determine their level of education considerably in a different manner than their fellow members. Even the study notes the differences in schooling exist between different groups of children in terms of quality, performance and extra-curricular activities due to these reasons.

Roy-Burman (1969) in a discussion on classroom practices in inter-ethnic situations also points out that tribal and non-tribal children have group prejudices and stereo-types relating to one another and this affects the sitting arrangement in classrooms, composition of play-grounds, of friendship ties and so on. In many areas, the inhibitions due to group prejudices and stereotypes also affect the enrolment of students.

Studies have shown that the child’s community and local environment form the primary context in which learning takes place and acquire its significance; it is interaction with the environment around him that child constructs knowledge and derives its meaning. Unfortunately, these theoretical stands are hardly taken in conceptualisation of textbooks and pedagogic practices (Sujatha, 2001) prevalent in tribal education. They are transacted with the curriculum that is conceptualised for common children. A serious lacuna in our system is that our text book writers no doubt, eminent in their own discipline but they have little experience with the phenomenon existing in the tribal setting and less likely the teachers from the tribal setting were consulted in the consultation meet for framing up the curriculum for these pupils.
(Rampal, 2001). Even the teachers are given representation, their viewpoint aren’t taken into consideration and the pupil-relevant content related to his own culture get a diminutive place in the curriculum. The studies show that these factors cause downbeat and depressing attitudes among the learner towards his own culture.

An important point raised by Sujatha, speaks of how the uniform policies for the common people constrain the education of tribal children. The school calendar is a case in point where vacations and holidays cater to the needs of the formal school set-up in a non-tribal context, with little consideration for local contexts and tribal festivals. These result in higher absenteeism among the tribal children than the non-tribal children.

In the mixed tribal setting, the condition of tribal children is more appalling. The teacher instead taking a neutral stand point, takes the standpoint of the children of the dominant group, uses the language and discourse from dominant setting. The teacher mostly perceives the tribal students as backward and they don’t have adequate competencies to learn and acquire the skills. These kinds of prejudices and discriminatory attitude among teachers have largely affected the tribal education system (Sujatha, 1987).

In addition, some of the studies note that the unfamiliarity of the teacher with the tribal languages in the locality as the reason of lower participation of tribes in the educational setting. Jha and Jhingran (2002) illustrate a case of school in the Mohana block of Gajapati district in Odisha with all Kondha speaking children and a teacher can only speak Odia. In the school, the tribal children (whose first language differed substantially from mother tongues) only read with a lot of effort, mostly word by word, even in Class V which is expected from Class I students only.

The problem is more acute in the multi-lingual environment where tribal live with their non-tribal counterpart and somewhere with more than one community of tribe. Being a multi-lingual environment, it is expected that the students will be treated with the medium of instruction that will include multi-lingual treatment. But the teacher uses only the local language, the language of the dominant communities and even the teachers don’t try to use the language of the other communities. No doubt, the tribal children through the interaction with other children will be exposed to other languages other than their mother tongue, but it is under doubt that how will they earn the competency from the school curriculum. In one schools of Assam, due to extensive
use of local dialect the children weren’t able to acquire any proficiency in the standard language even in Class V and continued to use words and expressions from local dialects. Even they aren’t able to express their thought freely and coherently, in their mother tongue. Academic and higher order language skills in the first language don’t develop since the language isn’t used at all in the school.

Along with, the home environment also attribute as major factor in the non-acquisition of requisite skills among students although they participate in the teaching learning activity in the school. The main reason is that the languages that are used in the classroom situations contradict with the day-to-day interactions in the home and community (Pattanayak, 1981). Apart from these, parents not being acquainted with the classroom languages aren’t even able to support the children in learning the things. Being unaccustomed to the text book, teaching contents and teacher’s pedagogic methods, the child slowly and slowly lose interest in the classroom and withdraw himself/herself from the classroom situations that cause the children to be out of the educational system. Xaxa (2011) discusses that modern education provided in the tribal society has been an alien phenomenon. Not only medium of instruction but also culture and content of education and the teachers themselves tend to be alien to the tribal children, which leads to high dropout rates at school level. He argues that there is strong absence of culture in education imparted in tribal areas.

The review of relevant literature make a point that the characteristics of children who drop-out and graduate from high school is associated with either familial constraints or schooling experiences or strong coupling of all these factors. While majority of theorist’s advocate that the educational marginalisation of one group from other is economically generated, others account that those who lack cultural capital that schooling demands and who lack resources and social capital to acquire it will experience relative educational failure than upper class background. But hardly there are any studies that vividly discuss the process of dropping out or successful completion in secondary education in India. While the number of studies in secondary education seems to be rare phenomenon in India, especially in the tribal settings, it is worthwhile recommended to study the process of drop-out and characteristics of secondary graduates in similar setting in school education in India.
2.4. Theoretical Framework

According to Bourdieu, “Schools are the institutions where the preferences, attitudes and behaviours of the “dominant class” are mostly valued than that of lower and middle class. Bourdieu (1984) and DiMaggio and Useem (1978) have pointed out that children who have more cultural capital (having been exposed to it from birth in their upper middle and upper class families) feel more comfortable in the school, communicate easily with teachers and are therefore able to gain from schooling. Thus, different measures of cultural capital such as academic qualifications of the parents, educational experiences (e.g., types of institution attended) (institutionalised cultural capital); cultural dispositions inherited and learned during childhood, a person’s demeanour speech and manners, speech, attitudes, behaviour, knowledge, and other interactions(embodied cultural capital) and book, artefacts, knowledge of paintings, the kind of dress and lifestyles used by different groups (objectified capital) will be considered while studying the participation of children in school education.

Bourdieu (1984) argues that habitus plays a major role in academic success and it develops in relation to how much cultural capital one has. Therefore, lower class students and their parents being aware of the fact that they have less cultural capital, they opt to withdraw themselves from the process of school on the basis of their views what is possible and what is not possible. While McClelland (1990) and Dumais (2002) used occupational expectation as a variable against habitus, particularly whether they aspired for white collar jobs or not, the same variable will also be used here to show success and failure in education system. Sedwal and Kamat (2008) cites that SC and ST parents are reluctant to send their children because they find the disconnection between school education and further their prospects in the economy. Manjrekar (2013) also points out that schooling has an organic relationship with imagined prospects of employment that is embedded in the consciousness of students. Therefore, social expectations associated with formal education and employment outcomes was taken as a measure of habitus (Jeffrey, Jeffrey and Jeffrey, 2004).

On the other hand, Coleman’s social capital theory of school effects posits that inter-generational closure among parents and friendship networks among peer groups largely determine the success or failure in school education. So, it may happen that parents and students in socially closed networks may have norms that are unrelated to academics and hostile to school norms and practices. On the other hand, other group of
people might have norms and practices similar to school practices. Similarly, Bourdieu (1986) argues that if the relations between actors in the social group are themselves dyadic, communal resources that facilitate the interchange of other kinds of more tangible resources such as information and money can be used by a way of group membership. Even students whose parents maintain contact with school personnel demonstrate better school performance and participate effectively in the teaching learning process. Therefore, social networks and norms will be taken into consideration in analysing the relationship between parent-to-other parents, parent teacher relationship, student-student relationship and student-parent relationship as measure against social capital to determine as factor explaining drop-out and completion rate among both tribal and non-tribal population.

Rumberger (1983) discussed that drop-out is a process that takes places over time rather than a status at one point of time. Underlying these considerations, an in-depth understanding of the events and interaction operating in the life trajectories of the child that drive the child to drop-out or complete school education will be done in the study. No doubt, the individual variables such as performance score, repetition, attendance pattern, participation in the teaching learning activities will be studied. Besides, the current study will also attempt at understanding factors operate in the family, school, and community settings, cultural influences and peer group relationships which shape learner identities and how it influences their decision to complete or discontinue education.