

EMERGING ISSUES IN SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION**Dr. Vikramendra Kumar**Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Delhi School of Economics, University of
Delhi, New DelhiBardhan.vikramendra@gmail.com**Abstract**

The notion of educational sociology, which is described as the application of broad sociological ideas and results to the administration and operations of educational institutions and programs, is distinct from the premise of the sociology of education subfield. This distinction is important since educational sociology goes beyond the scope of the sociology of education. In this approach, an attempt is made to see schools as a distinct social entity that is worthy of being analysed using sociological theory. The area of educational sociology is believed to be able to address issues that come up in the realm of education. Therefore, the literature on the sociology of education included a wide range of subjects, including but not limited to: society, accommodations, assimilation, cultural lag, subcultures, status, and other related notions. In addition to these factors, sociologists examine the following: the role of the government and the economy in education; social forces and determinants that impact educational and cultural change; social institutions like the family, school, and church that play a role in education; the formal organisation of the school, including topics like authority, selection, learning organisation, and streaming; the relationship between social class, language, and culture; the relationship between education and occupation; and concerns about democratisation and elitism. When carrying out the aforementioned responsibilities, sociologists often use analytical approaches that are functionalist or historical correlation. It is the unique viewpoint that is used in the investigation of a certain topic that makes the presentation of these things easier to accomplish. Within the discipline of sociology, the study of issues that arise as a result of the interaction between society and education is the focus of the area known as educational sociology. As this field of study progressed, it became more effective in preparing educators for the obstacles that they would encounter in the years to come. For the purpose of designing educational activities and developing efficient methods to put these plans into action, it makes use of the findings of sociological research investigations. Educational sociology has the primary objective of shedding light on human interaction as one of its primary purposes. Francis Brown was of the opinion that the fundamental driving force behind the implementation of any educational program should be to increase the social consciousness of race among each and every student. He defines educational sociology as the study of how to combine the broad principles and results of sociology into the classroom. This is his definition of educational sociology by definition. Researchers in the field of sociology who approach the study of education from a sociological perspective refer to their field as educational sociology. In doing so, it is assumed that education is understood to be a social occurrence, a social process, and a social institution, all of which are influenced by society and contribute to the formation of society. The word "implementation" refers to the actions that are made to solve issues that are present in an educational system via the use of sociological theories and practices.

Keywords: discipline, function, system, education, social, curriculum, development.

Introduction

The importance of a person's contacts with many elements of society has been better understood via the study of educational sociology. It promoted education as the means by which society might advance and hailed it as the key to a better future. The public saw educational institutions as the epitome of society's ills. The goal of educational sociology as a field is to determine the best approach to teaching and learning. What is the best way to approach education? At what age do criminal interests often emerge in young people? This allowed us to have a deeper appreciation for the major groupings and crucial social links that shaped the educational system. The program encouraged participants to become more social via educational interactions that supported their personal growth. It appeared like nobody knew which parts of educational sociology were most important, despite the fact that it highlighted the social side of education, offered guidelines for educational planning, and drew on theoretical knowledge from the work of sociologists and educational sociologists. There were a lot of strong feelings when it was time to classify the several branches of educational sociology. This led to the idea that educational sociology ought to stand on its own as a field of study. A new historical phenomena emerged with the advent of educational sociology. A rebranding to the Journal of Sociology of Education occurred after the Journal of Educational Sociology's 1963 launch. The field known as "sociology of education" seeks to understand educational systems by analysing them scientifically and looking for societal patterns and processes within them.

Education and Development

While education has many practical applications, one crucial question to consider is how it may aid in a nation's economic development. It is critical for developing nations to weigh the high cost of educational institutions against other potential development initiatives when they are establishing developmental goals. This is why it's so important to provide a compelling argument for how education contributes to growth. This link has been rethought no less than four times by development theory and economics specialists during the last 20 years. If you want to know what changed in Third World development policy during the last 20 years, especially when it comes to educational priority, you have to know what changed. Know that there was a period when people typically assumed that economic growth was the only measure of progress. This assertion is supported by the fact that the following were the most popular indicators of "development" throughout the decades before and including the 1960s:

1. Growth of Gross National Product,
2. Technological advance and rate of industrialization,
3. Improved living standards.

In contrast, the idea of development as just an economic simplification is less often acknowledged in contemporary philosophical discourse. Development now encompasses more than simply increasing revenues; it has broadened its reach over time. Despite the increase in definition, it becomes far more difficult to describe a dynamic link when a crucial

term in the relationship is changing meaning.

The countries that would later be referred to as the Third World often neglected education when it came to post-war economic expansion. Despite education's perennial popularity and widespread acknowledgement as a path to a better society, it was formerly seen as a luxury for countries struggling to provide enough food for their citizens. For these countries, the real requirement was to boost output, which included updating their production methods (factories, resource utilisation, etc.). The major tactic for achieving this goal was to amass sufficient national wealth to fund industrialisation and infrastructural development. For the economy to grow, either enough money was saved at home or enough money could be borrowed from outside. The Stages of Economic Growth by Rostow is the most famous of many studies that ostensibly proved a correlation between capital creation and economic growth in Western industrialised nations. It was believed that this also held true for less industrialised, more traditional countries throughout the globe.

In the early 1960s, there was a major change in the way development theory was approached. Levels of capital investment might only explain a fraction of the phenomena of economic progress, according to more thorough research. It would seem that other factors were as important for development. At the time, most studies conducted by economists looked at the correlation between higher levels of education and GDP growth. According to some, elementary education significantly affects GDP, others think that college is the most important component, while still others think that basic reading is the most important. Assuming a causal relationship between educational attainment and GDP growth, economists often saw "investment in human resources" as an essential condition for economic prosperity. Rather than industrial enterprises, this meant that developing countries would largely receive funds for healthcare and education.

The following is an explanation of development inversion: in order for a society to undergo economic development, its citizens must get training in the basic skills required for a transitional society and embrace ideals that promote modernisation and progress. A break in the "crust of custom" was necessary for transformation to occur. The people's material desires had to be satisfied before they could successfully reject the conventional beliefs that were holding them back from progress. Because of this, they would eventually start managing their resources and producing goods like the West. A different school of thought held that recognising the value of human capital was education's primary function in development. A quotation from Gunnar Myrdal's *Asian Drama* encapsulates the dominant worldview of the time: "Countries are underdeveloped because most of their people are underdeveloped, having had no opportunity of expanding their potential capital in the service of society." The area of economic development theory has recently seen a shift in thinking, with the newfound belief that economic growth is driven by a "capacity to create wealth rather than the creation of wealth itself." So, it was thought that every high school graduate in a developing nation was a priceless resource that could significantly affect the GDP development of the country. Ultimately, the country would gain a lot by funding his schooling.

It was clear by the late 1960s that healthcare and education investments, like capital

accumulation, could not ensure advancement in and of themselves. Education, long overlooked in development efforts, is now a focal point of aid programs for developing countries. Neither tactic worked very well. Some have argued that development efforts that place an excessive focus on education fail to take into account the myriad of other elements that shape a society. They cautioned that education, tractors, and herbicides weren't enough to boost agricultural productivity. Other forms of institutional reform, like land reform programs, were also seen as crucial to development. There are many other, more important, prerequisites for economic growth than education, even if it were one of them.

Many who disagree with the "Investment in Man" theory of development worry that education will slow down rather than speed up economic growth. A state in India, Kerala, demonstrated how, in certain contexts, more access to education may lead to social unrest, political unrest, and a halt in economic development. The long-held view that "there can never be too much of a good thing." with regards to the acceleration of education in impoverished countries was coming under increasing scrutiny. As a substitute, "controlled education" was advocated for developing countries. Educational expansion plans should take the country's capital's projected growth into account. The production shouldn't outpace the economy's ability to absorb it. This led to yet another investigation. Given that education, when left to its own devices, may stifle economic growth, then surely it can do the same for social advancement in certain circumstances? Striking a balance between education and the development of other institutions was crucial in the Third World. If this isn't fixed, education can end up hurting development as a whole. Education lost its status as an ideal good because of this.

Education as Barrier to Development

Formal education was a major barrier to development for Third World nations, according to a small but rising group of social critics who openly voiced their opinions around the turn of the century. A new definition of "development" emerged among the movement's early proponents, including Ivan Illich and Paulo Freire. Productivity and income growth were no longer indicators of success. The freedom to decide one's own destiny and act accordingly is more important than material prosperity, both national and personal. The nation must be somewhat successful in order to attain this power, but only up to a certain limit; beyond which the affluent cannot rise to global dominion. In addition to rescuing the country from its vulnerabilities, progress frees all social groupings inside the country. According to this theory, reducing economic disparity is the primary goal of development efforts. The Western model of education has just taken a major hit. Because it uses its own standards to categorise individuals (Ph.D. holders, ABs, high school grads, dropouts), this system contributes to social stratification and inequality. Opponents of publicly financed schools argue that the same pupils whose lives they are attempting to improve end up feeling dependent on and powerless in the face of the system. When it comes to acquiring meaningful knowledge outside the confines of a school, many students begin to doubt their capacities. Since the Western school is just as indicative of an industrialised culture as the skyscraper and the rapid express train, Illich argues that it is unsuitable for many emerging nations. He has an issue with education in general, not with formal education specifically, since it unfairly utilises

national resources for the benefit of a few elite. The idea that education primarily has academic monetary benefits is held by a small number of individuals. Even if it may not be the cheapest item that educated people learn to obtain, the consumption of education ultimately surpasses its production. In the end, people will live in a society where education is valued highly. Lastly, a formal education system modelled after the West will not help emerging nations.

The theoretical landscape has seen a dramatic shift throughout the previous two decades. Once despised as a growth engine, education is now seen as essential to achieving economic success. Despite the delay in its explanation, it was still entrusted with a significant role in the nation's growth. Some see education—and notably the formal education that the vast majority of us have received—as a significant roadblock to progress in general, particularly when optimism over the expansion's successes in the 1960s wanes. Looking back at past events helps us to look beyond the ideologies of our day and find out what matters most in the grand scheme of things. If we want to zero down on education's role in general development, this is vital. Even though our schools in Micronesia were founded on stronger theoretical grounds in the early 1960s, they are now under danger from even more innocent assumptions that are still being used today. As a matter of intrinsic relevance, the crucial subject of how education relates to overall progress should not be ignored by educators. We can get a clearer picture if a sufficient number of individuals participate in this survey.

Marxian Perspective on Education

Philosophers, educators, and sociologists have all stressed the importance of a child's community in developing their moral character. Since the upbringing of children is a reflection of society's and its numerous institutions' commitment, educational institutions should devote themselves to this essential goal of society. But educational institutions in society exacerbate preexisting disparities and conflicts via their "hidden agendas," biased information dissemination, and exclusion of "other" cultural perspectives. Emile Durkheim and other functionalists and educational theorists neglected to investigate how society's inconsistencies and difficulties are mirrored in educational institutions and curriculum. Because it does nothing to bring people together in understanding, the educational system distorts society by making divisions more pronounced. Because this is societal reality, it cannot be refuted. Marxism places special emphasis on the dynamics between social classes and how these dynamics legitimise and perpetuate the capitalist system even in non-economic spheres like educational institutions, demonstrating the interconnectedness of society and the economy. Capitalism, according to Karl Marx, can't function unless it allows for the exploitation of the working class and the downtrodden. The system's unhappiness and alienation of workers might affect the economy's efficiency and the riches of capitalists. The Marxist view of education's function in Western industrialised nations was shaped by two primary concerns. What effects has the system of economic institutions had on school curricula, first and foremost? How does this educational system generate the kind of employees that capitalists require? This is the second question. Investigating the relationship between ideology, power, education, and production within the framework of capitalism can help us uncover the answers to these questions. The majority of Marxist thinkers believe that

schools are repressive because they mould children into submissive, obedient adults while suppressing their unique identities and emotional development. By learning to accept things without question as true, children develop a skill that will serve them well throughout their lives. As a result, this Marxist perspective looked at how schools spread the ruling class's ideology in an effort to debunk the concept that schools are neutral.

Karl Marx dealt with production and reproduction under capitalism. Conversely, Louis Althusser focused his research on the role of social institutions in social reproduction and the importance of these institutions in society. French philosopher Louis Althusser used a Marxist perspective to analyse the educational system. Instead of being an unbiased and neutral institution that encourages the transmission of social customs and values, education acts as a "ideological state apparatus" by disregarding the "repressive state apparatus," according to Althusser. Consequently, the interest of the state depends on education. Schools in this culture are able to inculcate the ideology of the ruling class because they educate students not to share a common consciousness but to understand their own role in society. As a social institution, school serves to inculcate the values held by the governing elite. Also, the 'state apparatus' isn't about repressive education; it's about ideological education that uses manipulation, coercion, and indoctrination to govern various instructional activities. This is a tool of the ruling class to control curriculum and instruction. As a part of the larger infrastructure, the educational system is shaped by the former. This means that the ruling capitalist class will reap the rewards. 'Labour force reproduction is vital' for the ruling class's prosperity and survival. Profit creation via the education of future generations of workers is crucial to the survival of capitalism. Althusser posits that in order to reproduce labour power, two processes are required. Making ensuring everyone on staff has the same amount of knowledge is the first step in creating a productive workforce. The ideology of the ruling class is also heavily influenced by the workers' socialisation. One of the most important roles of education in the capitalist sector is worker reproduction. According to Althusser, a ruling class cannot attain hegemony only by the application of repressive (force) apparatus. In contrast, education is ideological equipment and plays a crucial function in contemporary capitalist society. Education not only perpetuates the mindsets and actions that big groups need for the division of labour, but it also legitimises and justifies capitalism via the teaching of ruling class ideology. In order to prepare young people for careers in the economy, it puts forth certain standards that they should adhere to. As a result, aspiring wage workers understand the need of modesty, submission, and acceptance. It teaches aspiring capitalists and corporate executives to be narcissistic, cynical, arrogant, clever, disrespectful, and sugarcoated. He contends that the working class, in addition to lacking in abilities, must also submit to the ruling class's ideology in order for labor-power reproduction to take place. This style of worker is shaped by the school climate, which encourages some behaviours while discouraging others. But he believed that education had replaced religion in a capitalist society; before capitalism, he thought of the church as the intellectual apparatus of the ruling class. It is possible to draw the conclusion from Althusser's work that direct suppression is not always necessary. Symbols may be used to represent oppression. An important link between the development of the idea of symbolic repression and Pierre Bourdieu's work on "symbolic power" At this stage, studying Bourdieu is essential for completely understanding

symbolic repression.

Among Pierre Bourdieu's many contributions to the discipline of education sociology is his status as a leading Marxist sociologist. "Habitus," "Field," and "Capital" are three of his most famous notions. According to him, habitus is something that grows out of one's early existence, especially their interactions with socialisation within their families. Furthermore, the external environment is always changing as a result of human interactions with it. He claims that there is a subset of opinions with common values that make up "fields" in the social realm. He distinguished between four types of capital: monetary, cultural, social, and symbolic.

1. Economic capital — It can be quickly, directly, and readily transformed into currency that can be formalised into ownership rights.

2. Bourdieu places cultural capital in a prominent role in his study. It may take on several shapes in his view:

a. The Embodied State – Characteristics, both mental and physical, that remain across time. No one can change its format or give it to someone else. People who are born with a big vocabulary or excellent communication skills may have an inherent advantage in social situations because of these qualities, which manifest as physical attributes. So, depending on the conditions, the embodied cultural capital of an individual or an organism might be more or less durable.

b. The objectified state—It traces the emergence and decline of different objects by describing their relevance in a certain social setting. Owning a valuable old classical painting from the fourteenth century is one example of something that may fetch an incredible sum of money. Anyone may change their hands with anyone else.

c. The established state of affairs—credentialed a person's academic achievement. Here, the linked institution formalises the passing on of cultural wealth from one generation to the next. Some societies place a great value on degrees from elite universities; one such institution is the London School of Economics (LSE). No one can change its format or give it to someone else.

3. Social Capital—The connections, responsibilities, and involvement in powerful social groups and networks are what make up social capital. Under certain conditions, it may be converted into monetary capital. One other option is to include it into a noble title.

4. the resources that an individual has amassed via their honour, fame, and reputation make up their symbolic capital. Concentration of power is closely related to it. For instance, when a monarch takes the "sceptre," he or she has the power to speak for the whole society and make official speeches.

The relationship between habitus, field, and cultural capital gives rise to the "logic of practice," according to Bourdieu. To further explain this link, he offered the following

equation: Capital plus field plus habitus equals practice. His theory of practice seeks to shed light on human conduct by clarifying the mutually beneficial relationship between human activity and the objective environment. Two important concepts in Bourdieu's theory, field and habitus, demonstrate this.

Schools were Bourdieu's primary emphasis since, according to him, they help to maintain class privilege and social inequality. Education, he argues, serves to legitimise and articulate authority, and he demonstrates how schools contribute to social reproduction. He theorised that people and groups may be defined in relation to their relative positions in the social world, which can be best seen as a "social space" that offers a "space of positions" with several structural levels. In this case, agents' intrinsic and relational characteristics allow for the definition and differentiation of classes based on the positional knowledge that inhabits spaces. In Bourdieu's opinion, class is not only a "theoretical existence," but also the "space of relationships" where efforts, labour, and time are truly rewarded for. Inside the 'space of connections' and its underlying dynamics lies the notion of actual or real class, which is based on Bourdieu's theory of capital. Furthermore, the many forms that Bourdieu's capital undergoes modification and re-formation. According to him, French society is characterised by class segregation and formal education. Inculcating the 'primary habitus' is a family affair in these societies; families engage with the state-run institution, the school, which is not beholden to families. The ruling class benefits from cultural capital as the 'cultivated habitus' grows here. Students from this socioeconomic standing are even more favoured by school because of the prideful way it certifies their knowledge. Given Bourdieu's analysis of "class" as a crucial category, it follows that the majority of educational elements in fact mirror the cultural practices of the powerful. The "multiplier effect" is a tool that schools use to increase the cultural capital of the ruling class, according to him. Schools use this to hide or ignore the reality of social inequality. Cultural advantages are more riskier than economic ones as they are harder to notice. Bourdieu laid forth the difference and connection between cultural and economic capital in two tables.

According to him, "With the exception of the liberal professions, who occupy, in this field too, a high position, the structure of the distribution of economic capital is symmetric and opposite to the structure of the distribution of cultural capital – that is to say, in order, heads of industry and of commerce, professionals, managers, engineers and, lastly, civil servants and teachers" (Bourdieu, 1977, pages 499-500).

Bourdieu set out to comprehend the systemic ways in which cultural behaviours, familial beliefs, and educational procedures all contribute to the maintenance of inequality among pupils. Secondly, he aimed to illuminate the interplay between the many conflicts and interests that shape social, cultural, and educational formations and how these factors impact one another. Finally, Bourdieu's method is based on the idea that symbolic forms are key to maintaining inequality.

Cultural reproduction, which he calls "the central role of the educational system," highlights how schools link the first and last stages of social stratification. While it does include emulating "dominant class culture," it does not mean that the whole society's culture is being passed down. These groups have the power to force their own meaning on others and also to

teach it. He attributes the culture of the ruling class to "cultural capital" because of the potential to transform it into wealth and power via education. 'Cultural capital' does not show a uniform distribution across classes as it mainly shows differences in educational attainment across them. In industrialised countries, he argues, it is hard to get beyond one's social class due to the fact that educational institutions legitimise class inequality and that academic achievement is linked to cultural capital and an upper-class habitus. Here, habitus is highly structured and taught via an unconscious internalisation process; it's a subconscious persuasive force that makes us act in a certain way. Our habitus also sheds light on who we are and what we do for a living. Thus, habitus is both a framework and an agent. Because they lack these qualities, most children from lower-class families will fail. Schools use their pedagogical practices to impose ruling-class cultural values on working-class children. This is how "symbolic violence" is kept alive. He went on to discuss symbolic power as well. Symbols, in his opinion, are vital for the maintenance of social norms because they facilitate the exchange of information and the development of common perceptions of the social world. A crucial component of the symbolic power's effectiveness is acknowledging its authenticity. Consequently, it is not coincidental. The role of schools in perpetuating the perception that working-class students' culture is inferior and that studying the culture of the ruling class is more important is significant. A person's "cultural capital," or familiarity with and respect for the arts and other types of high culture, is something that he believed the offspring of the ruling class acquire. Educational credentials, in his view, only serve to amplify preexisting socioeconomic gaps by creating the false impression that students from more privileged families are more deserving of the roles they play in society. A system of education that uses an implicit pedagogic action—requiring an initial acquaintance with the prevailing culture—is necessary for the effective transmission and inculcation of a culture. Furthermore, this system provides instruction and knowledge that can only be received and learnt by persons endowed with this system of predispositions, and it occurs by unnoticeable familiarisation. Instead of giving students what they need, the educational system makes sure they have what they need by making sure they don't have what it explicitly asks. Both the ability to speak the target language fluently and an understanding of the culture at large are aspects of this, and both may be influenced by how one's family practices culture (Bourdieu, *Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction*, 1977, p. 494).

This is how knowledge is inefficiently conveyed and the educational system allows for the ownership of cultural capital, which is something that very few students really achieve. It is common knowledge that educational chances are severely limited for children from low-income families. Everything is fair game, however, in the competition for certificates and degrees, and the winners are the children of the ruling class who perform very well in school. It raises questions about the overall objectivity of the educational system in terms of instruction and student achievement. According to Bourdieu, the privileged pupils in this class have the credentials that allow them to rationalise social inequalities. "It is probably cultural inertia which still makes us see education in terms of the ideology of the school as a liberating force and as a means of increasing social mobility, even when the indications tend to be that it is in fact one of the most effective means of perpetuating the existing social pattern, as it both provides an apparent justification for social inequalities and gives

recognition to the cultural heritage, that is, to a social gift treated as a natural one" (Bourdieu, The School as a Conservative Institution: Learning and Differences in Culture, 1974, page 32)

Bourdieu's worries on social reproduction in schools must be addressed. Nowadays, social mobility has taken a nosedive with the proliferation of higher education in many countries. Bourdieu devoted his life's effort to developing or refining concepts like habitus, capital, and field that would help us escape the unconscious repetition of social order. Thinking about Bourdieu makes it more clear how education legitimises and maintains the status quo of the ruling class. It became critical to link what pupils learn in school with the broader socioeconomic context because of the educational system's pivotal role in upholding the status quo.

The American philosopher Michael W. Apple has made significant contributions to several fields, including the sociology of education. He argues in his book "Ideology and Curriculum" that students lose their sense of self because schools quietly promote a set of institutional values, such as following the rules instead of thinking for themselves. The school does this without giving any background information since no one in authority or in the classroom is paying attention. "The curriculum field, more particularly than other educational areas, has been dominated by a perspective that might best be called 'technological'" says Apple (1979, p. 44) as he discusses curriculum. There is a spectrum of importance when it comes to curriculum knowledge, in his opinion. Legitimate, high-status technical knowledge excludes disadvantaged groups and minorities in the workforce from future job projections and economic stratification. Schools are vital in the distribution of cultural capital in modern industrial society because they legitimise different forms of knowledge. He describes educational knowledge as "a study in ideology, the investigation of what is considered legitimate knowledge by specific social groups and classes, in specific institutions, at specific historical moments" (Apple M. W., 1979, p. 45). What he considers to be the "real" academic data In a nutshell, the concepts of selection, arrangement, and evaluation of information that are prevalent in educational settings are value-governed decisions made from a large pool of possible information and selection criteria. Hence, instead of accepting things as they are, we should strive to make them problematic or frame them so that we may analyse the institutionally constructed meanings and underlying social and economic ideologies. The arrangement that supports a viewpoint's commonsense acceptance and its hidden meaning are two of its most important aspects. "And if we are solely focused on improvement, we will almost never uncover these hidden institutional meanings and relations." (Apple, 1979, p. 45) is where we got this data.

It can only be understood by familiarising oneself with the prevailing social and economic theories. Because it is useful for companies, technical knowledge is given a lot of "high status" in schools, same as in the US. The way American schools prioritise technical knowledge that leads to "high status," as Michael Apple puts it, is a mechanism by which the ruling class maintains their control and the current state of affairs. Schools foster a conformist or technical worldview in pupils by discouraging critical thinking and painting institutional standards as "pre-given, neutral and basically unchanging because they all continue to exist

by consensus" (Apple, 1979, p. 83). "The curriculum in schools responds to and represents ideological and cultural resources that come from somewhere," said the professor. Of course, not every group's goals and dreams come to fruition. It appears on page 46 and was written by Apple in 1979. And Michael Apple's 1982 book was "Education and Power" too. The power dynamics inside a school are explored in the book. The author argues that influential groups utilise their control over schools to promote a corporate-centric curriculum that furthers their own economic, cultural, and political agendas. His goal in writing this was to reveal how influential groups manipulate schools. According to him, schools play a significant role in cultural creation. Within these institutions, the lower classes debate and battle over various kinds of cultural reproduction that are offered to the future-oriented bourgeoisie. He reasoned that workers are now mindlessly following orders, but that things might improve if everyone did their part. His second book, "Teachers and Texts" (1987), explores the educational system's political economics. He explores the subject further, looking at how gender and class dynamics are shaped by power dynamics both inside and outside of schools. More specifically, he investigates how texts and instructors facilitate reproduction in educational institutions. He claims that the abundance of curricula and textbook bundles on the market is overwhelming instructors, who are disproportionately female since women make up the majority of teachers.

For this reason, Michael Apple focused on how educational philosophy contributes to the maintenance of power imbalances. In his perspective, schools have a dual purpose: they mould students into productive members of society and they preserve and disseminate the "legitimate" knowledge that society believes everyone should have. Even in educational institutions, the knowledge of some groups is institutionalised. Success in passing off the group's knowledge as "everyone's" depends on the group's clout in the larger political and economic arena. Hence, we should not see culture and power as static concepts, but rather as features of society's preexisting economic links. Power and control in the cultural and economic spheres are interdependent and dialectical.

The formal education of workers in a capitalist society is described by two eminent Marxist philosophers, Herbert Gintis and Samuel Bowles, as indoctrinating them into a life of exploitation. Those who held the view that education ought to be based on merit, such as functionalists Talcott Parsons, were opposed to this. In their view, class distinctions are reinforced by the educational system. The apparent hierarchies in both the business and schools led them to draw comparisons between the two. One of civilization's primary objectives is to preserve power for the ruling class. The interests of the ruling class are served by most social institutions. The institution of education is vital for the consolidation, maintenance, and management of persons. A 1976 book by Gintis and Bowles titled "Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradiction of Economic Life" explores the structure and function of the American educational system within the system of capitalism. The book also explores the ways in which the expanding US industrial capitalism economy dealt with the changing demands for workers.

The manufacturing process under capitalism, according to Gintis and Bowles, is not just technical but also has strong roots in social dynamics. Employees in the manufacturing sector

are not objects but rather people who labour to fulfil material and interpersonal demands, both their own and those of others (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 10). Education, argue Gintis and Bowles, should not just prepare people to carry out technical tasks in the service of capitalist production, but also to integrate them into social networks. The primary objective of education, in their view, is socialisation. In addition to helping individuals feel more at ease in their social responsibilities, education doesn't always improve such positions. After considerable deliberation, they reached the conclusion that "U.S. education is highly unequal, the chances of attaining much or little schooling being substantially dependent on one's race and parents' economic level" (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 35). And they went on to state that "intellectual ability developed or certified in school makes little causal contribution to getting ahead economically" (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 110). American workers must also display all the essential characteristics of alienated, hierarchical, and fragmented capitalist production. on an apparently meritocratic manner, schools promote actual inequality by promoting and rewarding students and allocating them to various positions on the professional ladder. They aid students in making the "right" connection to their position in the industrial process's hierarchical power structure by constructing and sustaining standards of social class, race, and sexual orientation. Bowles and Gintis (1976, p. 11) argue that schools foster particular types of personal development that are compatible with economic hierarchies, and they also provide sufficiently skilled workers to make the ability to recruit and dismiss a powerful instrument for labour discipline. Particular personal traits and attributes that are heavily emphasised include conformity, discipline, obedience, unquestioning acceptance of routine and authority, etc. This chart was used by Gintis and Bowles to demonstrate which characteristics were valued and which were not at one particular New York high school:

As far as character traits and conduct go, schools are more concerned with process and form than substance. Consequently, one's educational system determined their level of development. At the outset of each student's educational journey, the expectation that they would be a "good disciplined boy or girl and listen to teachers carefully without questioning" is established and maintained throughout their time in school. The educational system serves the demands of capitalism's production system by equipping the next generation of workers with vital skills. Besides social skills, schools also include job-related subjects like "working on the skills of the workers" that are vital to the workforce. According to Gintis and Bowles, the reproduction of labour power under capitalism is disseminated via education. The link between the two was also emphasised in Gintis and Bowles' 1976 book, *Schooling in Capitalist America*. The "structural correspondence between its social relations and those of production" was allegedly a factor in attracting young people to the workforce. The social connections framework in schools does more than just prepare students for the discipline of the job; it also creates the qualities, attitudes, and self-perceptions that are crucial to thriving in the corporate world. The social interactions inside the educational system resemble the conventional industrial organisational structure, including those between administrators and educators, between educators and students, and among students themselves. Administrators, teachers, and students all form vertical authority lines, which Bowles and Gintis (1976, p. 131) interpret as a sign of hierarchical relationships. The availability of educational

opportunities, in their opinion, substantially raises the probability that employees would embrace the exploitative worldview, attitude, and character quirks that characterise their workplace. Hierarchical control and authority, in their view, hindered capitalism's efficient flowering. School for working-class students is quite hierarchical, with distinct lines of authority and duty, much like a factory. Students learn to be subservient, to remember knowledge, and to obey teachers at these schools. Because of this, workers must adapt to an authoritarian management style in which upper-level executives have little to no input into crucial policy choices. Based on their analysis, Gintis and Bowles came to the conclusion that the existence and prosperity of capitalism depend on a workforce that is both submissive and compliant.

Gintis and Bowles argue that the educational practices of elite institutions adequately educate their students for leadership roles in society. They build deep relationships with their instructors, which helps them learn to learn on their own. The meritocratic ideology, which supports this stratified system, is legitimised by economic inequality. "Our historical interpretation, however, goes considerably beyond our earlier more statistical and structural analysis," they said, and their stance was that changes in industrial processes were the direct source of meritocracy ideology and varied forms of schooling. This is due to the fact that we have demonstrated not only a current correlation between social relations at the production level and those at the education level, but also that changes in the organisational framework of the educational system have historically paralleled changes in the social organisation at the production level. Economic structure has been argued to be a significant predictor of educational structure, as changes in the structure of production have happened before equivalent shifts in schooling (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 224).

Taking this perspective, Gintis and Bowles concluded that the primary goal of the American educational system is to foster values and habits that are conducive to active engagement in the job market. They studied the nature of work and interpersonal interactions inside the system and found similarities to the economic system. According to the concepts of command and hierarchy, the educational system functions when teachers give orders and pupils obey them. Since they aren't engaged in developing the curriculum, students are compelled to study subjects that don't really interest them. Students get zero satisfaction from their work because they are uninterested in their work. We may ask why, in this setting, schools stress the need of being subservient, mild, and obedient. What gives them the willies when it comes to creativity and intuition? Despite the organization's long history of vital function in youth development, domination and repression exist within it (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 42). It is obvious that schools limit kids' creativity in some ways. It is also thought that "the educational system operates in this manner not so much through the conscious intentions of teachers and administrators in their day-to-day activities, but through a close correspondence between the social relationships which govern personal interaction in the work place and the social relationships of educational system" (Bowles as well as Gintis, 1976).

Universities, according to Bowles and Gintis (1976, p. 131), "replicate the hierarchical division of labour in the work place" via student interactions. If students aren't given enough

freedom to make decisions in class, they'll hate their future jobs, they say. The school's external rewarding system mimics the industrial incentive system, whereby influential individuals motivate and inspire their staff by doling out power, status, and compensation. Capitalism can only work if its disparities are seen as justifiable and acceptable. According to Gintis and Bowles, the educational system was a major factor in the perpetuation of inequality in capitalist society. Schools legitimise and excuse inequality by insisting that they provide equal opportunity and host an open competition to assess, develop, and certify talents and abilities. In terms of employment opportunities, those with more qualifications usually end up with better ones. Consequently, educational institutions justify economic disparity. Economic and educational rewards need not to be based on talent, the book said. The competing normative positions of Gintis and Bowles set their work apart from that of functionalist philosophers. As a functionalist, Talcott Parsons concurs with the current educational system's emphasis on indoctrination on the inherent and necessary nature of social and occupational stratification in order to facilitate the effective functioning of society. However, Gintis and Bowles contend that the many forms of education that exacerbate economic and social division serve as reproductive processes in and of themselves. They were calling for educational, social, and economic changes grounded on Marxist theory. They state that in a perfect society, a decent educational system should aim to achieve the following: Personal development programs should first aim to inculcate useful knowledge and intellectual qualities. When individuals have these down pat, they'll be far more equipped to steer their own lives, build the respect and dignity they need, and eventually push for the resources they want. Secondly, it need to strive for parity rather than sustaining inequity. Third, it has to demonstrate that it can serve as a stabilising force by instilling in children a rejection of the dominant culture. There is a fundamental contradiction between both aims in capitalist schools, which legitimise social injustice while ignoring pupils' holistic personal development. They refer to the need for a complete socialist movement as "the ultimate dismantling of the capitalist system and its replacement by a more progressive social order coupled with revolutionary education" (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 269). They argued that a person's educational and occupational success is more dependent on their family history than on their own abilities. Thus, children of the wealthy may get into well-paying jobs and have great educations regardless of their natural abilities. The educational system continuously hides this fact using the ideology of meritocracy. As a result, schools operate in a way that legitimately exposes economic inequality.

As capitalism developed, so did the demands placed on the educational system. There is a rising need for well-behaved workers in mills and factories, so many young people would be considered for these jobs, say Gintis and Bowles. "The structure of employment was changing drastically: between 1820 and 1840, the percentage of the workforce engaged in agriculture fell from 58 to 40 percent; by 1850, the percentage would fall to 15 percent," according to the authors. Bowles and Gintis (1976, p. 165) also noted an increase in manufacturing employment. Factory employees' familiarity with management's aims and values is crucial to the smooth operation of the capitalist production system. Schools are the only means of inculcating these values in the next generation of workers. Thanks to widespread education, a large number of individuals were ready to work as mill and

industrial labourers. Subordination and dominance were socially acceptable within the capitalist system, and subsequent generations of workers internalised these values as well. The existing quo is greatly reinforced by "educational credentials" as well. "Employers choose to place hierarchical authority in the hands of workers who have completed more formal education. This is due to several reasons, including the fact that employees with more education tend to be better at their jobs and have a more authoritative demeanour. Additionally, educational achievement, represented by various types of sheepskins, legitimises authority according to prevailing social values" (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 82). They contend that if America wants to see a real and enduring change in its economy, it should not concentrate on changes in the workplace or schools but rather go through a radical change in its social class structure. The abolition of socially required employment for everyone, income equality, worker engagement and control over production, democratic ownership, and the removal of economic hierarchy were their suggested solutions. The obvious definition of socialism is "the broad economic expansion of political democracy" (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 14), therefore here we have socialism in action. Also stressed was the requirement of having a consciousness that is either revolutionary or working class. "The overriding strategic goal of a socialist movement is the creation of working class consciousness"—this group is mentioned by Bowles and Gintis (1976, p. 285). The authors also stressed that every teacher has a moral obligation to work for societal improvement. "Even within the individual classroom, the dissident teacher can become an effective subversive through teaching the truth about society; through inspiring a sense of collective power and mutual respect; through fighting racist, sexist, and other ideologies of privilege through criticising and providing alternatives to this culture" (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 274). They propose that there are alternatives to capitalism.

Although kids may benefit from learning to think critically in a classroom setting, schools should not be considered in isolation. We all continue to learn throughout our lives. The work of Gintis and Bowles sheds light on the capitalist education system's limiting nature, demonstrating the need of learning outside of it for the purpose of implementing revolutionary changes in social and educational contexts.

According to Ivan Illich, there are two main types of curriculum that are implemented worldwide. What is meant by the phrases "declared curriculum" and "hidden curriculum²" is same. The specified curriculum includes predetermined subjects. On the other hand, a disguised curriculum is a method of teaching wherein planned goals are achieved, such as making pupils submissive and mindlessly following the teacher's lead, controlling them via testing, moulding them into compliant learners, etc. Accordingly, an education hidden agenda exists when the state seeks to impact student learning for its own ends. Furthermore, these clandestine aims were refined inside the declared curriculum so as to steer the development and future careers of youngsters in the right direction.

Schools have a history of making low-income children feel even worse about themselves by making empty promises of salvation and equality, even if the government claims it is currently working to make schools more inclusive. The state has already authorised a curriculum that plans to meet the demands of the labour market. In this context, teachers have

the duty to educate their students so that they may get credentials. "Actual learning" is nonexistent in this educational paradigm. At this point, it's reasonable to assume that students develop skills and knowledge that set them up for success in their post-secondary jobs and pay grades. Consequently, if you want to work when you graduate, you need a certificate from a recognised school.

A significant issue in Ivan Illich's works was the institutionalisation of schools. By arguing that the "Schooled Mind" may be reimagined via the establishment of ad hoc "web of learning" in his 1971 book "Deschooling Society," he effectively debunks the concept of formal education. These days, we tend to see schools through a more materialistic lens, as places that push us towards privatising our real lives and treating them like standardised commodities. Technical experts design the containers, and classroom teachers serve as distributors, delivering the goods to the pupils who ultimately purchase them. Children learn to be submissive and open-minded. One manifestation of modern colonialism is the rise of new materialist elites. As a consequence, students were even more estranged from their education, a danger that Marx would rank higher than worker alienation. When it comes to learning and opportunities that are relevant to students' future careers, schools often stand in the way. In the long run, it generates John Dewey was among the first scholars to use the term "Hidden Curriculum" to characterise the underlying beliefs and routines that students bring to their studies. Everything a student learns on their own time outside of class might also be included.

Everything has a deeper significance, and the school educates its pupils that their teachers hold the key to discovering that significance so that they may lead meaningful lives. Here, "the educated mind" takes hold because students blindly follow their teachers' lead in class. Students stop questioning after they fully absorb the concept that the teacher knows all that needs to be taught in class. If this line of thinking is correct, then schools are "repressive institutions" because they suppress student speech, promote adult conformity and obedience, and mould students' perspectives to reflect those of the ruling elite. This is what he had to say: "One is 'schooled' to confuse teaching within learning, grade advancement with education, a diploma with competence and fluency with the ability to say something new" (Illich, 1984, number nine). He warned that the "Hidden Curriculum" is harmful since it leads to societal discord, economic stagnation, mental illness, and physical illness. As a child goes through school, they absorb many myths. Here are some of the various types of myths that Ivan Illich classified:

The illusion of institutionalised value emerged throughout the modern age as a result of our faith in the mechanisms of modern industrialism. All results ultimately originate from an institution. Dedicated institutions produce or manufacture things with a specific objective in mind. Let us pretend, for the sake of argument, that the church produces redemption, the industry produces consumer goods or commodities, the military ensures national security, and educational institutions impart knowledge. Now that we've grown up with the concept of a national army or police force, we can't imagine a world without them. Like information and instruction, a school is an organised institution that is necessary for both.

2. We were taught that everything can be measured in school, which is a measuring fallacy.

We are all extremely used to the idea of a mark system or grade sheet as everything can be measured. So, the gap between a score of 33 and 99 on a maths test is considered an indicator of how well a student has grasped the material. Consider this scenario: Rabindranath Tagore wants to become a professor at a university that teaches Bengali, but he doesn't have the requisite credentials, such a Master of Arts, a Doctorate, or a National Examination in English (NET). Simply said, Tagore did not fulfil the minimal standards for admission to the college as a professor.

3. The fallacy of packaging – We are living in the packaging era now, when a lot of our emotions, including happiness and joy, are packaged. These days, people speak about "smart cities" that have 24/7 internet and retail centres built around this packaging idea. Rather than talking about inclusive or equitable city plans. Therefore, we got the concept of packing the principles from our school consciousness.

This is why the aforementioned three fallacies continue to influence our beliefs and behaviour. "Rose is a rose" and "lotus is a lotus" are two instances where our unique identities are eroded by the school system. But the problem with the learning machine or school system is that it tries to transform a lotus into a rose, and this is when the bloodshed begins. For example, due to the educational system's determination on classifying all kids into one academic category, some children's innate talents in music or dance have been severely stifled. The best way to learn some of life's most important lessons is not via books, exams, or other types of formal innovation found in schools, but by experiencing and observing the world around us. Contrary to common assumption, school is not a church; rather, it is a modern institution where no one can be taught or learn anything new, as Ivan Illich was arguing here. The "learning web" was Illich's replacement model that he suggested after studying these problems. In essence, the 'learning web' is a system of mutual aid in which people help one other out by drawing on and passing on each other's expertise. Its stated purpose is to pave the way for a new kind of schooling that is less regimented and more open to student-driven ideas and action, with the hope that they will one day work together to create a better world. According to him, a great school should accomplish two things: first, ensure that all students have access to the necessary resources at all time; and second, foster an environment where students and teachers are constantly exchanging knowledge. Last but not least, it must guarantee that everyone who wishes to express themselves openly has an opportunity to do so. The objective of this kind of school, in his view, would be to level the playing field by removing the present pyramid. Informally, we pick up the vast majority of life's lessons. Despite the fact that a person's formative years are vital for establishing a "foundation," the objective of this purpose is hindered by the institutionalisation of schooling. This is where he tries to bring down schools by making the case that traditional education teaches students to confuse process with substance. They are "taught" to mistakenly believe that having a certification indicates competency rather than real learning, topic mastery for real fluency, and academic achievement for real learning. A de-institutionalization movement would dispel the myth that schooling is necessary for acquiring knowledge.

Learning about the "Deschooling revolutionary potential" is, therefore, an important and commendable objective. Actually, there are a lot of useful life skills that can be picked up

outside of the typical classroom setting. Although kids do pick up a few tidbits from their instructors, they usually end up learning most of what they know from personal experience. It is worth noting that several famous people throughout history did not finish high school. According to Illich's "Deschooling," pupils should not have total autonomy over their education at "free schools" where they are not required to follow any particular curriculum. On the contrary, he strongly supports what he calls "meaningful schooling," which opens the door for education to begin in the family. Because of this, when Illich mentioned the Deschooling society, he meant a new approach to education.

"The Pedagogy of the Oppressed," Paulo Freire's 1972 book, discussed methods of education that break the "cultural silence" that has rendered many people mute and despondent. He brought up the question of how oppressed people end "cultural silence" and transform the world in the process of liberation from oppression and domination. At this stage, his main focus was on the pedagogical problem. He compared the educational system to a money system and argued that teachers force their pupils to be silent about cultural issues. In order to maintain order and silence in the classroom, the teachers pretend to be utilising this banking tactic. Educators, in this "banking system," are like depositors; they replenish pupils' depleted educational funds. To sum up, teachers provide their pupils with a treasure trove of knowledge by filling their minds with ideas, facts, and data. Thus, this financial concept or approach to instruction just helps to reassure the pupil even more. The instructor hated school because, from his point of view, it was a regimented environment that restricted his students' freedom of choice. He believed that there was no way to automate the process of teaching into a set of fixed procedures. We don't always mean a certain amount or kind of information when we speak about passing it on to the next generation. If classrooms are just seen as places to pass on knowledge to students, they will either become intellectual nirvanas or they will die out. Here, children learn to rely on adults, laying the groundwork for a life of submissive obedience to authority figures. That is something they never question since it is assumed. For these students, the most important part of school is following teachers' directions and learning the meaning of various concepts. "Knowledge is gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon whom they consider to know nothing" (Freire, 1972, page 56). A hierarchical view would hold that it upholds injustice and inequality in this particular context. This prompted Freire to suggest what he termed "dialogic education" as a solution. He combines his approach to teaching with his goal of encouraging critical thinking. He believes that educators should strive to encourage critical thinking among their students rather than just transmit information.

Paulo Freire argues that this banking paradigm should be replaced with a humanitarian or problem-based education system where students and teachers work together to solve problems and gain knowledge. They start to build a rapport via conversation in this way. In opposition to the banking concept or method of instruction, this problem-imposing or humanitarian education emphasises the need of critical thinking, dialogue, introspection, and debate. Consequently, dialogic education offers an opportunity for oppressed and oppressors to form liberated connections. It drove home the point that in this cosmos, you are both a thing and a parent. From his perspective, when students participate in class "dialogue," it separates them from being just observers of the material. At the same time as it questions the

students' presumption of intellectualism, it lessens their dependence on authority figures because they look to the instructor for guidance and explanations. It casts doubt on students' ability to follow directions, their level of background knowledge, and their level of quiet. To rephrase, it seeks to discredit all pedagogical practices used in traditional schools. The 'dialogic education' also has the unintended effect of making teachers less aware of how they dominate their students. They gain confidence in initiating discussions and see challenges as chances for development. He made it quite clear that a freed education is well-organised and follows strict guidelines at all times. Fundamental to dialogic education is the idea of two-way communication between the teacher and the pupils. Critical thinking is an essential component of education, because neither conversation nor critical thinking can exist in a vacuum.

Educators should read extensively and critically. In addition, teachers have a responsibility to lead their pupils via classroom democracy. The new paradigm of teacher-student with students-teachers is formed out of the reversal of traditional roles brought about by two-way communication. Teaching is a two-way street; not only does the teacher pass on information to the students, but the students also teach the teacher new things via conversation. Consequently, everyone is equally responsible for the change that occurs. This method disproves arguments based on authority since authority can only function when it is in harmony with freedom and not against it. In this place, no one ever learns anything, not even from their peers.

The teacher has the objects of knowledge in financial education, and men impart knowledge to one another via the medium of the world (Freire, 1972, p. 53). Paulo Freire addresses this issue in his famous work "Pedagogy of the Oppressed," which offers oppressed people a way out of their current predicament and towards redemption and freedom. To paraphrase Freire (1972, p. 65), "there can be no true education"; he claims that discourse is the foundation of education.

Paulo Freire was concerned that schools were becoming too bureaucratic and that students were losing their vocational spirit in favour of impersonal mechanical norms. Because the bureaucratic worldview despises charisma, it devalued teachers and made them into insignificant parts of the educational system. Teachers do not have any input over the selection of topics, assessments, or course outline since everything is decided by a centralised authority. We told the instructors a long time ago what they should and should not tell their students. Educators are therefore reduced to the position of a clerk, whose duties include taking instructions from higher-ups and compiling or keeping records. Critical thinking is almost nonexistent in such kind of environment. Within this context, Freire hoped that dialogic education would become an essential part of revolutionary praxis, giving people the tools to question and analyse events instead of blindly accepting them.

Culture and education were crucial to the work of another prominent Marxist philosopher, Antonio Gramsci. Contrarily, the idea of capital is where the working class's crises and class antagonism begin, as Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels laid out in great socioeconomic detail. Gramsci investigated not only the organic and dialectical connection between politics and

economic and social circumstances, but also broadened their views outside the domain of politics.

The extraordinary intellectual and creative abilities are on display in Antonio Gramsci's work, which develops from an anti-capitalist and alternative formation. His revolutionary approach was based on the conviction that the upbringing of the oppressed class's children was vital to the development of oppositional culture. The working class, he argues, is the best place to encourage creative thinking. The working class, in his opinion, can liberate themselves from the governing elite and lead their own revolution if they learn to think critically and autonomously. Plus, they might end themselves in a position of power.

Education, according to Gramsci, is the only path for members of the working class to acquire the critical thinking abilities necessary to separate themselves from the modern upper class's intellectual dependence. He claims that the educational system is an integral aspect of the prevailing ideology that educates individuals to maintain the status quo, and that schools have a major impact on this trait. Though he did call for a more "inclusive" or "comprehensive" school system in his famous book "Prison Notebooks," he seldom ever discussed education or schools in general. Seeking a change, he spoke out against the increasing tendency of specialisation in Italian schools. In its pursuit of "modernisation," Italy set up many technical colleges. Instead of just spreading social disparity, the advocates of this new, more democratic system want to crystallise it. In describing the social character of the traditional school, he went on to say that every social group had its own kind of school that had a certain traditional role, whether it was subordinate or ruling. The proposed solution to the issue of "modernising education" suggested "to create a single type of formative school (primary-secondary) which would take the child up to the threshold of his choice of job, forming him during this time as a person capable of thinking, studying and ruling - or controlling those who rule" (Gramsci, 1971, p. 40), rather than establishing a vast network of vocational schools.

The radical Italian thinker Luigi Gramsci argued that "already everyone is cultured" in some primitive way, and that education is the path to liberation via greater self-awareness and control. The learner, in his view, should not be "a passive and mechanical recipient" (Gramsci, 1971, p. 41), but rather should take an active role. The link between instructional methods and students' psyches need to be fluid and adaptable, just as a worker's relationship with his equipment is. He thought that education in modern Italy was a tool to control the people. The essential change could only be achieved by completely rethinking the educational system. He was well aware of the massive obstacle he would face in his quest to change education. "We have unprecedented difficulties to overcome if our aim is to produce a new stratum of intellectuals... from a social group which has not traditionally developed the appropriate attitudes" (Gramsci, pp. 42-43, 1971). He thinks the intellectual role is necessary for establishing a counter-hegemonic atmosphere. He saw that the only way to get from a capitalist to a socialist society was for the people to become involved. Additionally, it can't be ruled out that socialist revolutionaries were members of elite groups that advocated for the working class and their subordinates. The intellectual's contribution was critical, and public

understanding and participation were crucial, for this to happen. Keep in mind that Gramsci did not restrict himself to writers for academic journals when he talked about intellectuals. However, his ideas were more expansive, and he had far-reaching beliefs.

"All people are intellectuals, but not everyone acts like an intellectual in society," according to him. The implication here is that societal categorisations mean that although everyone is intelligent, not everyone is an intellectual. As he puts it, "At some point in life all of us may fried eggs or sew any tear in a cloth," but it's not fair to argue that everyone is a tailor or a chef. What gives every social group its identity, cohesion, and capacity to go about its everyday business is the diversity of thought that exists inside it. They may take the form of teachers, academics, administrators, lawyers, scientists, technicians, doctors, or members of the church. They are now a valuable asset to the ruling class because they have always been part of it. Gramsci argued that intellectuals had to be seen as a separate social category from class. More pragmatically, he expressed his thoughts on power and how it is formed in the information and idea sphere by agreement rather than force, and he called for a variety of open strategies to challenge the prevailing legitimacy norms.

Issues in Sociology of education

Sociology of education research is varied, disorganised, ever-changing, imprecise, and often contentious. The optimal way for sociologists to identify themselves is in plural form, according to Lather (1988). This includes feminisms, phenomenologies, Marxisms, and postmodernisms. Sociologists with backgrounds in education research and practice represent a wide range of cultural and linguistic backgrounds, allowing them to provide fresh perspectives to the field. Despite this diversity, different approaches, viewpoints, and ideas are coming together as a result of globalisation. Concepts and theories may readily move from one academic institution to another because of the "communications heavy, travel-based, market dependent" nature of higher education (Marginson and Considine, 2000: 48). Multinational publishing firms have a global reach, and academic cooperation is on the rise, which is different from other areas. The field of sociology of education is nonetheless characterised by theoretical disagreements, splits, and sometimes violent paradigm fights. "What actually counts as the sociology of education is a construction," one of us said in a study of American sociology of education (Apple, 1996b: 125). Ideological and highly pragmatic disputes gave birth to that system, which is characterised by power and resource disparities. There is no getting around the fact that this anthology is a building project—a "carving up and carving out" (Edwards, 1996)—that defines limits and sets forth competing perspectives. Although it is not a "policing action" (Apple 1996b), the term is nevertheless not innocent. We will not say that we set out to create a dogmatic or definitive definition of the field; rather, we hope that the announcements of inclusion and exclusion in the collection accomplish that goal (which we will address later on). In order to better understand sociological activities, it could be helpful to use sociological techniques. According to Bernstein, sociology's "horizontal knowledge structure" consists of "specialised languages with specialised modes of interrogation and criteria for the construction and circulation of texts" (Bernstein, 1999: 162). These designs do not adhere to any rules of integration. Idiolects of these niche languages are "not translatable" (p. 163) according to him, and he

contends that speakers of these languages are exclusive and have serial connections. So, according to him, the sociology profession's academic and social capital is centred on the "defence of and the challenge of other languages" (p. 163). A new language that "offers the possibility of fresh perspective, a new set of questions, a new set of connections, and an apparently new problematic, and most importantly, a new set of speakers" (p. 163) is essential to the advancement of this "horizontal discourse," as he called it, rather than further integration, generalisation, or abstraction. His central argument is that there are significant barriers to integration caused by the distinctiveness of these languages and the envy felt by their devoted speakers. The propagation of new languages, he argues, is the driving force behind this discursive regime. He continues by stating that disciplines such as educational sociology have horizontal knowledge systems that include what he terms "weak grammars" or implicit "conceptual syntax," making it difficult for students to tell whether they are "actually speaking or writing sociology" (p. 164). The right "gaze," or "a particular mode of recognising and realising what counts as a "genuine" sociological reality" (p. 165), is necessary for tactic learning. As knowledge systems that rely on past events, "segmental competences" and "segmental literacies" emerge from this "obsession with language," but they are also "characterised by inherent obsolescence" (p. 167). If you're looking to assist spread sociology literacy, this collection of definitions of "really speaking or writing sociology." might be a good place to start. Bernstein claims that sociology's segmenting methods destroy "any feeling of an underlying unity" (page 170). Because of this, the sociology of education area has seen a proliferation of new subfields and even whole disciplines as a consequence of idiolects, or debates over theory and methodology, within the last 30 years. Disagreements arise when several "discourse communities" "create knowledge and set the parameters for who speaks and who gets heard" (Brantlinger, 2000). Numerous "interests" are at play here. There are three types of interests that people have: "personal," which are closely tied to power, patronage, and reputation; "vested," which are more conventional, and include things like the financial benefits of a successful career, a prominent position, or a publication; and "ideological," or philosophical, which are more abstract and include things like questions of value, personal philosophy, or political activism. These issues are fundamental to the day-to-day operations of educational institutions. That is, in the choices, suggestions, and outcomes that influence the benefits and sociology of education. Women, people of colour, LGBTQIA+ people, and people with disabilities have made great gains in the sociology of education profession, applying for positions, publishing, and even starting new journals. Additionally, these scholars have revolutionised the field's analytical methodologies and theoretical foundations. Disputes over interests may be played out in both high-level intellectual venues like journals and conferences and lower-level political settings like editors' offices, department meetings, and appointment committees. Two distinct ways in which such differences manifest themselves are in "the hidden curriculum in graduate sociology departments" (Margolis and Romero, 2000). As part of the process of professionalisation that certifies certain technique, subjects, interests, and attitudes as "good sociology," a "weak" version seeks to define and regulate what it means "to be a sociologist." When describing this, Bourdieu uses the phrase "corporeal hexis," which means "the visceral form of recognition of everything which constitutes the existence of the group, its identity, its truth, and which the group must reproduce in order to reproduce itself" (1988: 56). According

to Bagilhole (1993), white men academics' dominance and control are examples of how the 'strong' form perpetuates racial social structures. So, educational sociology is distinct from other branches of the discipline; it has its own "collective scientific unconscious," to paraphrase Bourdieu, and its own unique conditions of production, which have historically limited thought in various ways through particular theories, issues, and groups. The barriers separating sociology from fields such as philosophy, geography, political science, and social psychology have blurred and grown less clear in recent decades. Consequently, identifying sociologists who work in the field of education and providing a definition for it may prove challenging tasks. It is exemplified by postmodernism, which "has spread like a virus through the disciplines of the social sciences and the humanities eating away at the boundaries between them" (MacLure, 2003: 4). It is worth noting that modernist social research, especially in the area of sociology of education, may benefit and suffer by using postmodern or linguistic methods. The field of social sciences has seen both "the end" and "the beginning" of eras. As Bloom somberly states, it is "the last, predictable stage in the suppression of reason and the denial of the possibility of truth in the name of philosophy" (1987: 379). Postmodern philosophy poses serious challenges to certain long-held beliefs in sociology. Here we have an example of research and practice that relies on overarching "grand narratives" assuming certain things. Postmodernism, as Lyotard rightly puts it, is a "incredulity towards meta-narratives" that questions and, in the end, rejects systematic, overarching "explanations" of "the social." Poststructuralists, according to Lather (1988: 7), do not accept authoritative narratives as, instead of strengthening claims to meaning, they undermine meaning itself. Because of this, "postmodernism" has grown into a politically and philosophically problematic term in the last 20 years (Harvey, 1989: 39). The book uses epic tales and a healthy dose of scepticism to explore a range of epistemological positions within this dialogue. Many sociologists regard postmodernism as nihilistic, politically apolitical, egotistical, and sarcastic because they see it as a lack of seriousness. Actually, some feminists consider postmodernism to be "a problem" or even "boys games," especially since it challenges the "oppressions" inherent in the humanist heritage that "women's liberation" seeks to overcome. Some see post-modernism as nothing more than the inevitable progression of critique and controversy. According to Kenway (1997: 132), feminist postmodernism is "The New Way" to approach feminist studies, education, and politics. This new approach, meanwhile, isn't without its challenges, hazards, and misconceptions, he cautions. Sociology has been influenced by both modernist theory and practice and the postmodern (or poststructuralist) movement, according to this book. We hope that by presenting these traditions in a parallel fashion, we can better understand the intricate relationships between education and society. This is because we are approaching the sociology of education from several angles, each with its own critical impulses. Bernstein asserts that educational sociology is founded on "languages of dedication" rather than "a problem and its vicissitudes" (1999: 170). Although this is somewhat accurate, one may argue that Bernstein paints an excessively negative and biased image of the current state of sociology of education when considering the relative importance of commitment and analytical rigour in the field. On the other hand, social obligations and commitments in many forms are used as a therapeutic activity in the field of sociology of education. Global social transformations are reflected and addressed by both sociology and sociology of education,

notwithstanding their internal conflicts. Academic interests and leanings are not, however, always linked up with political and social settings. However, social scientists still have an indirect impact on society via reusing the "human sciences" in government initiatives and professional training, which is different from previous times. Politics drives the collection of "human science" data, which is intrinsically related to the everyday management of social and political issues. A heavy and harmful misconception is the idea that the humanities, including sociology, are free from political agendas pertaining to population control or that they maintain an impartial position characterised by an independent, progressive logic. Despite the apparent objectivity of "scientific" or theoretical terminology towards the people studied, it casts a "gaze" that draws attention to the "landscape of the social" and leads or participates in discussions that establish certain "subject positions." Governments are trying to affect the harvest by issuing bids and sponsoring more concentrated research efforts; nevertheless, they are no longer satisfied to sit back and let academics enjoy the advantages of their research ideas. The government is increasingly pressuring private companies, not universities, to do sensitive and vital "government" research.

The emphasis on the 'authority and apparent objectivity of disciplines such as accountancy, economics and management' is a result of the regulations imposed on university research by academic capitalism and the operationalisation of ideas like 'quality' and 'policy-relevance' (MacKinnon, 2000: 297). As Young (1971) noted, the 'making' and 'taking' challenges in social research are being played out in a new way by the politics of research and university financing. The authors of this Handbook have chosen their sources with care because they are deeply concerned with the "making" and "taking" of social issues. A large portion of the chapters are "engaged," and one of the three portions primarily focusses on this. Several of the authors agree with Michael Burawoy's definition of "organic public sociology." According to him, and to a lesser degree Gramsci, the critical sociologist is an organic thinker who: works closely with a visible, thick, active, local, and often counter-public. She or he works for a human rights organisation, a religious community, a labour movement, a neighbourhood association, or an immigrant rights group. The general population and the public sociologist engage in a two-way flow of knowledge and insight. By seeking to legitimise these organic interactions as an essential part of our sociological life, [organic] public sociologies like these seek to make the private public and shed light on the invisible. The road to become a critical scholar or activist is a meandering one; it's a never-ending process. This is why our earlier remarks on the role of critical research in the classroom should be expanded upon. These are just initial points and in no way constitute whole arguments. However, they are meant to initiate conversations around the actions that "we" should do. Generally speaking, there are seven steps that must be followed while teaching critical thinking in the classroom (Apple, 2006b). 1 It must be "bear witness" to negativity. Put another way, its main purpose is to shed light on how social struggles against injustice and oppression are interwoven with educational institutions, laws, and actions. Dominance and exploitation are terms used at a more technical level. According to Nancy Fraser (1997), these elements point to what she terms "a politics of redistribution" and "a politics of recognition" as institutions and processes. If at all possible, this kind of critical analysis should also reveal gaps in coverage and other avenues for improvement. Consequently, it

aims to examine the current situation through a political and theoretical prism that identifies both possible and existent locations for counter hegemonic actions. 3 Because of this, expanding the concept of "research" is sometimes necessary. When we talk about "critical secretaries," we're referring to the people and groups who are now working for what some have called "non-reformist reforms" or more equal power relations. Democratic schools' (Apple and Beane, 2007) in-depth investigation of democratic school practices and Gandin's (2006) supporting but critical portrayals of revolutionary changes in Porto Alegre, Brazil, such as the Citizen School and participatory budgeting, both tackle this issue head-on. 4 The organic intellectual ideal is central to the quickly developing sociology of curriculum area within critical curriculum studies and the sociology of education. Gramsci (1971) argued that counter-hegemonic education should improve "elite knowledge" rather than purify it in order to suit progressive societal goals (Gutstein, 2006; Apple, 1996a). This suggests that "organic intellectuals" might play a part in this reform. Thus, we must not conspire to commit intellectual suicide. It takes a lot of intellectual (and pedagogical) strength to tackle the debates and histories of the political, epistemological, and pedagogical obstacles in defining what knowledge is significant. These complicated and serious issues need highly developed intellectual and political capacities. If you fail to make use of them, however, they can shrink. We may pay it forward by making use of these skills to encourage communities to think about and learn more about this problem, and to have the sort of conversations that teach each other that result in decisions that address the needs of oppressed people both now and in the future. Maintaining the heritage of radical labour is entrusted to crucial work as part of this process. Considering the coordinated attempts to erase "collective memories" of difference and struggle, which have been instrumental in questioning dominant narratives and relations, it is crucial to maintain, revitalise, and critically examine these traditions for any gaps or shortcomings in theory, research, history, or politics. We must avoid reductionism and essentialism and return to the topics we have already covered. Finally, Gramsci (1971) argues that critical sociologists of education must take a stand against the practices and assumptions they study or join progressive social groups whose causes they support in their work. One definition of an organic intellectual is someone who actively participates in and contributes knowledge to political movements seeking redistribution and recognition. Learning from past social revolutions is also an important part of this. Neither the "unattached intelligentsia" (Mannheim, 1936) nor someone who "lives on the balcony" (Bakhtin, 1968) would be suitable for this situation. Though important, our intellectual pursuits "cannot stand aside, neutral and indifferent, from the struggles in which the future of the world is at stake," as Bourdieu notes (2003: 11). Throughout the several chapters that comprise this book, you could come across authors exhibiting at least one of these behaviours. It is impossible for one person to adequately do all seven of these demanding tasks simultaneously. There are several intellectual, emotional, and political obstacles associated with this perspective, and all we can do is keep attempting to overcome them. Furthermore, there is a noticeable lack of dedication to the original "fathers" of both sociology and the sociology of education. That type of technique is well covered in current textbooks. You may receive a collection of "classic" papers from other, more practical sources. On the contrary, this is a compilation of "state of the art" essays written by leading experts in the field but never published previously. Critically important coverage, work of global significance, and theoretical foundations usable

elsewhere are the focal points. Because of their extensive conceptual grounding and high level of generalisability, the papers are suitable for a wide variety of national contexts and are therefore widely available. While they do not do so simplistically, they take into account literatures from a variety of national settings to contemplate the overwhelming and inevitable fact of globalisation in all its forms. The commodity status of education is growing in today's international marketplaces for educational services and globalised employment markets. Thus, the sociology of absences creates the conditions for a wider variety of credible experiences. Despite the fact that various locations and national systems are impacted by globalisation processes in different ways, there is a clear convergence and homogenisation of educational forms and modalities driven by what Santos (2003) terms "mono-cultural logics." This trend is seen both within and across settings. These reasonings are very obvious in today's educational methods that prioritise independence, competition, performance assessment, individual responsibility, and risk-taking. All three of us editors are cognisant of the fact that such culturally restricted logics should not be allowed. When we set out to produce this an international collection, we did so with full awareness of the weight of certain claims made in works of post-colonialism and literature on globalisation. What really gets under our skin is the idea that post-colonial experiences (the plural is important) and the theories of globalisation that have been connected to them offer solid foundations for analysing the global and local politics, economics, and culture of empires. Postcolonial thinkers, globalisers, and education sociologists concerned with neoliberal attacks have long held this view. When people talk about "turning the world upside down," they're referring to the intentional change in perspective (Young, 2003: 2). Alluding to power dynamics as an oppressive web and the many identities, movements, and cultures that seek to unravel it, they suggest that we see the world via a relational lens. And for those who have been geographically, economically, politically, or culturally cut off from the "West's" dominant voices or who are inside the West but not really a part of it, "post-colonialism offers you a way of seeing things differently, a language and a politics in which your interests come first, not last"—in other words, as they put it. Second page. Several influential publications in educational sociology agree with Robert Young's larger claim that post-colonialism and the worldwide awareness it brings about are signs of a "philosophy of activism" that aims to combat these injustices. Continuing the long-standing anti-colonial struggles, it promotes measures that question 'Western' perspectives (p. 4). Two passages from Young (2003) provide the clearest explanation of this point: The ultimate goal of postcolonial thought is to influence power structures, whether they are based in the West or elsewhere, by imposing its alternative knowledges. Its stated goal is to influence individuals to think and behave in a more equitable way so that all people on Earth may live in harmony with one another.

Conclusion

The role of education in promoting social mobility is a central subject in contemporary political and sociological debate. These days, a person's social standing and the professions into which they are born are heavily influenced by their degree of schooling. Consequently, some scholars have foretold the emergence of meritocratic, liberal societies, and the evidence supports this forecast. In many countries, people from wealthier families still have a leg up when it comes to beginning a long educational career and getting higher level certifications

than those from poorer families. Those who enter the job with master's degrees are at a significant advantage. One important aspect to consider is the impact of education on social mobility and inequality. It is worth mentioning that education plays a major part in linking one's social origin to their class destination. It is possible that educational institutions' admissions, selection, and certification processes significantly affect the maintenance or reduction of social disparities.

References

1. Alam, Arshad. 2013. Controlling Minds, Discipling Bodies: Life inside a Madrasa. In Geetha Nambissan and Srinivas Rao. (ed.) Sociology of Education. Delhi, OUP.
2. Apple, M. (1982). Education and Power. Routledge & Kegan Paul.
3. Apple, M. (1987). Teachers and Texts: A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education. Routledge.
4. Apple, M. W. (1979). Ideology and Curriculum. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
5. Aurobindo, S. (1950). The Human Cycle. New York: The Sri Aurobindo Library.
6. Apple, Michael. 1982. Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education. Essays on Class, ideology and the state. London, RKP. (Chapter 1 and 9).
7. Aurobindo, S. (1992). A New Education for a New Consciousness. Pondicherry: Sri Aurobindo Ashram.
8. Batra, Poonam. 2014. Probalematizing Teacher Education Practices in India. Developing a Research Agenda. Education As change. Vol. 18, No. S1: S5-S18
9. Bernstein, B. (1999) 'Vertical and horizontal discourse: an essay', British Journal of Sociology of Education 20: 157–173.
10. Bernstein, Basil. 1996. Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity, London, Tylor and Francis. (Chapter 1)
11. Bourdieu, Pierre. 2018. A Sketch for Self-Analysis. Cambridge, Polity Press
12. Bourdieu, P. (1974). The School as a Conservative Force: Scholastic and Cultural Inequalities. In J. (. Eggleston, Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education (pp. 32-46). London: Methuen.
13. Bourdieu, P. (1977). Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction. In J. a. Karabel, Power and Ideology in Education. Oxford University Press.
14. Bourdieu, Pierre and J. C. Passeron. 1978. Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture. London, Sage (Book 1).
15. Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. The Forms of the Capital. In Richardson (ed.) Handbook of Research in the Sociology of Education, New York, Greenwood.
16. Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational reforms and the contradictions of economic life. New York: Basic Books.
17. Dewey, J. (1915). School and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
18. Dewey, John. 1916. Democracy and Education. New York, Free Press.
19. Durkheim, E. (1961). Moral Education: A Study in the Theory and Application of the Sociology of Education. New York: The Free Press.
20. Durkheim, Emile. 1961. Moral Education. New York, The Free Press.

20. Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. (T. f. Sheridan, Trans.) New York: Vintage Books.
21. Freire, P. (1972). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Penguin Books.
22. Friere, Paulo. 1970. Pedagogy of the oppressed. New york, Continuum.
23. Gandhi, M. (1953). Towards new Education. Ahmadabad: Navjivan Publishing House.
24. Gramsci, A. (1971). Selections from the Prison Notebooks. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
25. Illich, I. (1984). Deschooling Society. Penguin Books.
25. Gupta, Latika. 2015. Formation of Religious Identity in Early Childhood. In Thapan, Meenakshi. (ed.) Education and Society. Themes, Perspectives, Practices. Oxford University Press.
26. Henry A Giroux (2011) On critical pedagogy, Continuum International Publishing Group, UK
27. Illich Ivan (2013). Deschooling Society KKIEN Publ. Int.
28. Jeffrey, Craig. 2010. Timepass. Youth, Class and time in India. CA, Stanford University Press.
29. Krishna Kumar, 2002. Prejudice and Pride. New Delhi, Viking.
30. Krishna kumar. 2004. What is Worth Teaching? Delhi, Orient Blackswan.
31. Krishna Kumar. 2015. Texts and Values. In Thapan, Meenakshi. 2015 (ed.) Education and Society. Themes, Perspectives, Practices. Oxford University Press
32. Krishnamurti, J. (n.d.). Krishnamurti on Education.
33. Lather, P. (1988) 'Ideology and methodological attitude', in American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New Orleans.
34. Manjrekar, Nandini. 2013. Gender, Childhood, and Work in the Nation: Voices and Encounters in Indian School. In Geetha Nambissan and Sriniva Rao. (ed.) Sociology of Education. Delhi, OUP
35. Mannheim, K., & Stewart, W. (1962). An Introduction to the Sociology of Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
36. Michael W. Apple, Stephen J. Ball and Luis Armando Gandin (2010) The Routledge International Handbook of the Sociology of Education
37. Muller, Thomas, Ulrike Lichtinger, Ralf Girg. 2015. The MultiGrade MultiLevel-Methodology and its Global Significance Immenhausen near Kassel / Germany. Prolog-Verlag.
38. Nambissan, Geetha. 2003. Social Exclusion, Children's Work and Education: A View from the margins, in NailaKabeer, Geetha B. Nambissan and Ramya Subramaniam (eds.) Child Labour and the Right to Education in South Asia. Delhi, Sage: 109-141.
39. Parsons, T. (1968). The School class as a system: Some of its functions in American society. In R. R. Bell, & R. H. Stub, The Sociology of Education: A Sourcebook. Homewood: The Dorsey Press.
40. Peter McLaren (1995) Critical pedagogy and predatory culture : Oppositional politics in apostmodern era., Routledge, London

41. Pinar, William F. 1975. The Method of "Currere". Address to the American Research Association. April 1975.
42. Pinar, William F. 2015. (ed.) Curriculum Studies in India. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
43. Tagore, R. (1961). A Poet's School. In Rabindranath Tagore Pioneer in Education: Essays and Exchanges between Rabindranath Tagore and L.K. Elmhirst (pp. 44-65). London: Visva Bharati.
44. Tagore, R. (1961). The Art of Movement in Education. In Rabindranath Tagore Pioneer in Education: Essays and Exchanges between Rabindranath Tagore and L.K. Elmhirst (pp. 101-111). London: Visva Bharati.
45. Tagore, R. (1961). The Parrot's Training. In Rabindranath Tagore Pioneer in Education: Essays and Exchanges between Rabindranath Tagore and L.K. Elmhirst (pp. 96-100). London: Visva Bharti.
46. Thapan, M. (2006). The Life at School: An Ethnographic Study. Oxford University Press.
47. Thapan, M. (2014). School Experience: An Autobiographical Approach. In M. Thapan, Ethnographies of Schooling in Contemporary India (pp. 333-355). Sage.
48. Thapan, M. (2015). Introduction: Understanding Education - Ideas, Practice, and Outcomes. In M. (. Thapan, *Education and Society: Themes, Perspectives, Practices* (pp. 1-56). Oxford University Press.
49. Thapan, Meenakshi. 1991 (2006, 2nd edition). Life at School. An Ethnographic Study. Delhi, Oxford University Press.
50. Thapan, Meenakshi. 2014. (ed.) Ethnographies of Schooling in Contemporary India Sage.(1-7).
51. Thapan, Meenakshi. 2014. Chapter 8. School experience. An Autobiographical Approach. In M. Thapan(ed.) Ethnographies of Schooling in Contemporary India. Sage
52. Thapan, Meenakshi. 2015. (ed.) Education and Society. Themes, Perspectives, Practices. Oxford University Press. (Chapters 4 and 10)
53. Timothy Scrase, Image, Ideology and Equality. Cultural Domination, Hegemony and Schooling in India. New Delhi, Sage. Chapters 3-7.
54. Willis, Paul. 1977. Learning to labour. How Working Class Kids get Working Class Jobs Surrey, Saxon House.
55. www.ddceutkal.ac.in
56. Young, R. (2003) Postcolonialism, New York: Oxford University Press.