

Nita Mathur

EDUCATION AMONG URBAN POOR: ISSUES OF DEPRIVATION, EXPECTATION AND CHOICE

This article locates urban poor's discourse on education in the larger framework of school choice and expectations from education. It employs the framework of struggle for recognition framework to develop an understanding of their sense of deprivation, expectation from education and choice of school. This is not to diminish the significance of the other ideas around expectation, deprivation, and school choice. Rather, it is accepted that the framework of struggle for recognition juxtaposes with ideas centered around notions of identity, livelihood security, aspirations, and capabilities and in doing so offer a basis for making sense of their experience, expressions, and decisions that otherwise seem ambiguous. This article begins with an introductory note on the origins and basic idea of the struggle for recognition followed with a discussion on the notion of poor and the importance of education among them. Subsequently, it explores how education informs their struggle for recognition with emphasis on market-driven forces and intersubjectivity.

Beginnings of philosophical interest in the subject of recognition can be located in the writings of Montaigne (1958), Rousseau (1762), Fichte (2000) and others who noted that far from remaining contented with the lives that we have, our concern lies with constantly re-fashioning ourselves with the intent of casting an enviable impression on others often at the cost of masking the real self. At least two trends in the understanding of recognition emerge. The first one rests on an atomistic conception of human beings. Represented by Rousseau, it maintains that human beings lead isolated and individuated life bereft of dependence on social relationships and social situations. The second rests on relational conception of human beings. Represented by Fichte, later developed by Hegel, it prioritizes recognition in the development of self-consciousness, agency and freedom. More specifically, the latter presents, as McQueen (2015:10) writes, “an inter-subjective or dialogic conception of the subject: we can only understand ourselves through our interactions with others. It is not just that others help me make sense of myself, but rather that others are in the same way *constitutive* of the self. The other, as it were, is contained within and is an essential condition of, the subject.” It is the intersubjectivity and relational nature of human beings which makes for a more realistic

NITA MATHUR, Professor, Faculty of Sociology, School of Social Sciences, Indira Gandhi National Open University, New Delhi

understanding of the idea of recognition and its play in everyday life of people. Majority of them follow the idea that one of the most significant ways of gaining recognition in society is education.

The present article draws from interviews with 50 informants (both men and women in equal numbers) and insights obtained with discussions with teachers who deal with poor students as also academics who engage with the theme closely. The strategy to identify poor households was at first to restrict the scope to those covered under the Economically Weaker Sections (EWS) category (i.e. have annual income of less than Rs 8,00,000/-, and are not covered under the category that brings protective discrimination with it). Expectedly, such people would have EWS certificate. However, it was noticed that there were many households with annual income much less than Rs. 8,00,000/- who do not have an EWS certificate for the reason that they belong to the Scheduled Caste category, therefore, exclusion of those belonging to the Scheduled Caste or any other reserved category cannot be treated as a sufficient criterion for identification of the poor. The most appropriate way out of the maze was to limit the criteria of identification of the poor as those with annual income of less than Rs 8,00,000/- notwithstanding their social category or eligibility for gains from protective discrimination.

Unpacking the 'Poor'

Multiple approaches and strategies have been proposed to reach a common measure of poverty (see Grusky and Kanbur 2006). The most common and perhaps one of the earliest markers of poverty is economic hardship assessed in terms of income levels (Townsend 1979, Sen 1983, Smeeding 2016). Criteria defining poverty have been reviewed and revised many times in the few decades. The emphasis on income level for assessment of poverty has been hugely favoured by international and domestic agencies. Rowntree's use of income or living standards to measure poverty in Anglo-Saxon countries way back in 1901 has been used in more than 100 countries and for Europe as a whole (see Smeeding 2016). Booth's idea of the poverty line for London (1903) has become an internationally acclaimed concept for estimation of poverty. In fact, "the World Bank" has revised the international poverty line in September 2022 from \$ 1.90 to \$ 2.15 per person per day using 2017 prices. While income level macro-economic indicators reigned poverty studies in 1970's, 80's and 90's, a fairly large number of studies challenged it squarely. Satterthwaite (2004) reminds us, "It might be assumed that poverty lines establish how many people have inadequate incomes to afford basic needs. But most poverty lines do not do so because they are not based on any study or data of the income level that individuals or households require to afford non-food essentials (including safe, secure housing, basic services including water and sanitation, health care, keeping children at school...)". He makes a case for widening the scope of poverty definitions to incorporate asset bases, housing conditions and

tenure, access to services, the laws and respect for civil and political rights. These aspects, other than income or consumption, are expected to present new possibilities for poverty reduction and simultaneously call for more intense engagement of local governments, community organizations, and local NGOs. The widening of poverty definitions also marks a shift in 'the official perception of 'poor people' as 'objects' of government policy to 'poor people' as citizens with rights and legitimate demands who have resources and capabilities that can contribute much to more effective poverty reduction' (p.4). Further, far from defining poverty in terms of lack of income, skeptics have argued for inclusion of access to health, education and other social services in assessment of poverty (see Haveman 2009, Boltvinik 2000).

Indicators of poverty play a crucial role in identifying the poor not just for statistics that sleep in reports and documents but as feed to policies and programmes for their welfare. Most welfare states in the present day treat lack of economic resources as a crucial indicator of poverty. Studies on poverty, however, abound in indicators, definitions and approaches to developing a comprehensive indicator that can measure its level and changes therein. Mood and Jonsson (2016) sieve out three approaches that predominate scholarly literature on poverty. The first one, well-summed up as absolute income poverty, defends income 'deemed necessary for living a life at par with others, or that makes possible an "acceptable" living standard' defined as the goods and services judged necessary, often on the basis of consumer or household budget studies'. The second is relative poverty which identifies poor as those whose income lie below the median income of the country. The third one embarks on lack of consumer products and services necessary for acceptable living standard. Taking the capability approach as point of departure Sen (2009) argues for dismissal of income-centric approach to poverty in favour of what people can do and be rather than on what they have, or how they feel. Placing Sen's capability approach in the context of empirical applications Hick and Burchardt (2016:89) conclude, 'However, if the income-centric perspective fails to identify those individuals who experience capability deprivation; if it fails to capture the richness and breadth of the deprivations that people face; and if it fails to point toward the relevant policy solutions to remedy deprivations in what people can do and be, then this complexity can, it is argued, be justified, and the capability approach can be used in order to understand the problem of poverty'.

Notwithstanding the multiplicity of views and subjectivity in defining poverty, an overall consensus on their living conditions characterized by vulnerability, despair and disempowerment, social injustice as also livelihood insecurity, unfair access to healthcare and education has emerged (see Narayan 2000). Poverty has remained a key concern for policy makers and analysts alike as also academic researchers worldwide because of both its scope and social consequences including social exclusion, sense of vulnerability, social

exclusion, and multiple disadvantages (see Hills et al. 2002). A substantially large number of measures have been adopted to estimate the size and magnitude of the poor across the world. In India, poverty line was the most popular and reliable measure of poverty even as estimation of poverty gap occupied the imagination of the state for several decades. In assessment of poverty in India, “United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI)” considered various deprivations experienced by people across health, education, and standard of living, developed the “Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI)” and estimated that the incidence of poverty fell from 55.1 per cent in 2005/06 to 16.4 per cent in 2019/21 (UNDP 2022). There is no denying that education has a significant role to play in promoting economic mobility and consequently reducing poverty. Further, the poor may not be able to make the most of reforms-led growth unless they are equipped with skills and education to do so (see Document of “the World Bank,” Report no. 22323-IN, 2002).

Approaches to Understanding Importance of Education among Poor

Several studies on education, especially those that treat education as an investment in society’s human capital, have accorded a prominent place to the poor. The idea that government spending on education lowers poverty, accelerates growth, and improves people’s sense of general well-being has gained currency (Becker 1964, Goldin and Katz 2008, Woessmann 2015, Tilak 2005). Three perspectives framing the concern for importance of education among the poor come to light: the first sees education as a human right, the second sees education as a means of enhancing people’s capabilities, and the third sees education as a means of advancing people’s capabilities.

The goal of the rights-based approach is to guarantee everyone right to education (RTE). According to McCowan (2010), however, in providing valuable guarantees, the RTE falls short in terms of its detail. More specifically, at least two deficiencies are prominent. First, it ignores multiple forms that education can take (as in the configuration of learning in informal and non-formal contexts) in favour of excessive emphasis on school as the sole site of learning. Second, it does not factor in disparity of prestige in educational institutions that are likely to deepen socio-economic inequalities in the long-run. These are confounded by problems of quality of education, teacher absenteeism, and overall learning environment in schools. Apart from the necessity of prioritizing meaningful learning, the right to education must also take into account positional factors like certification and the demonstration of prestige among various educational establishments. The right to education has not been fully realized if children belonging to underprivileged communities are restricted to institutions that do not offer opportunities for advanced study or preparedness for well-paying jobs. A common result of poor school infrastructure, inadequate resources, and teacher absenteeism is a general

lack of motivation to continue with education. This is often exacerbated by unfavorable home study environments, parents' lack of formal education, and family obligations.

Amartya Sen's human capabilities approach intricately links development, education, and quality of life. It places human development within the context of each person's capabilities, or what they are able and unable to do. Education is thought to be a way to increase a child's potential and variety of options. A fundamental ability that influences the growth and development of other abilities is education. Human freedoms are expanded by the availability of educational opportunities and the development of educational capabilities (e.g., the ability to read and write). The ability to make thoughtful and reflective decisions is fundamental to human agency, which is also at the core of the capability approach. The presumption is that education performs a crucial role in human development. Human capital approach, however, falls short of gauging the full scope and potential of university curriculum. Alternatively, an approach to curriculum with emphasis on human development and capabilities formation is the need of the day (Walker 2005, 2012, 2020).

It is important to consider the substantive freedom of people to make decisions in life and the ability to live the kind of life they value in order to fully realize and comprehend the relevance of the capabilities approach to education. Education must foster the qualities that will enable children to think critically, creatively, and with the acumen to make wise decisions. The line between freedom and choice represents the learning objectives of education.

In the words of Crespo (2007: 60-61):

"In order to situate education within the capability approach, it is necessary to recognize the simple but important fact that the educational process normally occurs within institutions, that knowledge is achieved through written and visual material, that pupils are guided by teachers, and that generally students are educated by having an intense social interaction with others. The school environment, therefore, entails diverse factors that may condition the acquisition of knowledge, the development of reason and, therefore, our present and future human freedoms. Education can certainly contribute to the expansion of capabilities, but, under certain conditions, it can also function with the opposite result."

It is commonly acknowledged that engagement in civic life and the development of human capital both lead to better economic conditions and better participation in society. Nonetheless, the disadvantageous state of poverty endures despite everyone having a legal right to an education. The belief held by poor families that there is a negative correlation between education and employment prospects is one of the causes.

Households' Struggle for Social Recognition

Persons belonging to poor households have jostled for acceptance of their integrity in society since long. They ground beliefs about their own integrity and respect in day-to-day interactions. Their fight for recognition is two-pronged. It involves both, assertion of demand for social fairness and equitable access to economic and political resources and a tussle with social relations, processes of identity construction, and a sense of self. The jostle for acceptance in defining social identities and positive social interactions can be linked to Hegel's theory (1977) that a person becomes self-conscious when other people acknowledge them as independent entities. The relationship between mutual recognition and social relationships is where the struggle for recognition is played out.

The issue of the struggle for recognition can well be placed within the general framework of social interactions and reciprocal recognition. Social groups that have experienced disdain for their accomplishments tend to assert claim to resources and economic transfers that would benefit them. Education is often treated as a means to both effect and make use of resources and economic transfers for betterment of poor's life. In fact, education is presented as a panacea for hardships that come with poverty. A fairly large number of informants held the view that education would equip them with the capability of understanding the nature and scope of their deprivation and suitable strategies to leap over it. This may be appreciated in light of the fact that many of them tend to confine their aspiration from life to securing a livelihood; and remain unaware of the possibilities of alleviating their condition afforded by the state and/or civil society. While keeping the significance of education outside the purview of discussion, critical issues here are those of context, quality and the efficacy of education in making a positive impact on poor people's life.

With the 86th Amendment of the Indian Constitution, children aged 6 to 14 are now recognized as having a fundamental right to education on the one hand while on the other the state is vested with leadership role to ensure that children receive fair, free, and required education. The pressure to conform, among others, has compelled the government to accord greater emphasis on policy approach centered on statistics rather than goals of equal educational opportunity and a uniformly high-quality public education system. One of the fall-outs of such an arrangement is enviable statistical data pertaining to enrolment of children in schools which does not match adequately with their performance and human capital of the country. The gap between statistics pertaining to education and employment is wide. The issue is worsened by teachers' disregard for the struggles that the poor face and the long history of socioeconomic inequality, as well as their conviction that children from poor families are incapable of learning and will therefore perform poorly in school. Policy frameworks continue to ignore disparities in experience, quality, and

educational processes(Sarangpani2018, Sharma 2021).

The poor have the ability to create a new narrative of equal recognition through consumerist lifestyle choices or by participating in educational programs that train them for well-paying jobs. They shared the belief that spending money on children's education was more crucial than on ostentatious consumption. The decision between education and conspicuous consumption is meaningless for those at the bottom, who are barely able to make ends meet. For them, securing a meal remains a primary concern. Many of those who could think beyond securing meals, stated that they would rather pay for their children's education than satisfy their own needs for clothes, cell phones etc. Apart from health crises, holidays and other events requiring financial and social commitments are the biggest barriers to spending money on children's education. Several informants claimed that while these events may yield short-term benefits, they ultimately have no lasting value.

Following case studies exemplify these ideas:

Case 1: Sanket, an informant who makes a living as office clerk on daily-wage basis, explained that education raises awareness of matters that are significant to them, such as government programs, job security, and employability. He stated that an educated person is able to, for example, understand and make use of programmes and guarantees that are extended by the government. It gives one the wisdom to navigate life enabling them to be a part of mainstream society.

Case 2: Harish, a research scholar from a poor background. His parents don't read or write. His father sells vegetables, and his mother stays at home. Harish had a very impoverished upbringing. He has been helping his father pursue his vocation. Alongside, he continued going to school with a firm belief that education would provide a way out of poverty and abject living conditions. He received the best grades in every subject he took in school. At the time of writing this article, he is working towards a doctorate while also teaching at a University of Delhi college.

Case 3: Mother of twelve year old girl, Muskan, said that when her daughter grows up, she would want her to be free from constraints that come with lack of enough resources to meet one's aspirations and expectations from life. She did not want Muskan to reflect on the past which is filled with financial constraints and denial of simple wants. She believed that education would ease her daughter's life which is why she nudged her to focus attention on studies. She aspired to be recognized as mother of an educated child.

Case 4: Rahul, whose mother is a tailor and father an electrician, is a floor polisher. He recalled that his parents had put in a lot of effort to provide him with the means to support himself. He argued that the only way the poor could escape poverty was through education. An educated poor person has a

better chance of acquiring a decent job and being respected by others than an uneducated one. The prevailing sentiment was, 'Parents want to see their children make enough money to live the kind of life where basic needs are met and there's extra money to spend on fun things.' They would be able to establish themselves in society as a result.

Recognition in the community is reserved for those who possess exceptional skills that are indispensable to the success of the group. Lack of recognition leads to low self-esteem, which is typified by insecurity and doubt about one's ability to face life's challenges. As long as they are deprived of equal access to the institutional order, their self-deprecation grows stronger. Lack of education is used as a justification for poor people's exclusion from institutional order. They view education as a means of achieving their subjective goal of becoming accepted members of society with an equal right to take part in institutional order. Higher education is thought to give daughters a sense of individuality and independence that will likely give them the courage to face their affines, which could lead to arguments and a troubled marriage. Paradoxically, a number of parents agreed that their daughters should receive an education but opposed having educated daughters-in-law within the family.

Education and Market Forces: Issue of Choice and Constraints

The education sector has been subject to market forces. The challenge that market forces pose to state-run machinery is the matter of concern (Kumar 2016, Nambissan and Ball 2010, Raina 2020). As education becomes more commercialized, market forces that prioritize capital accumulation and profit maximization supplant values, ethics, and the sense of personal development and refinement. The ways that poor families respond vary: some choose to send their children to work instead of attending school, while others choose to pay for private education instead of the free education provided by state-run institutions. The idea that limited financial resources serve as a barrier to education was corroborated by informant narratives. In a family of four, Sunder Yadav, a security guard, is the only source of income. He described struggles brought on by early family obligations and a lack of funds for his own educational pursuits. Even though he values education, his meager income belies all his efforts to give his children an education. Sunder is an example of many informants who recognize the value of education but are limited by their financial situation. Many people give up on schooling because they feel pressurised to start earning money fairly quickly. Interestingly, approximately 90 per cent of informants expressed (i) a strong desire to send the children to school for which they curtail family expenditure; and (ii) optimism about the benefits of education. They believe that the degree and type of employment is the primary determinant of an individual's educational success. The most favored type of work is still in the public sector, which is followed by skill-based or self-owned businesses. Its underlying theory is that education promotes

the development of human capital, which raises labor returns and raises household income. A consistent rise in income causes consumption expenses to rise, which raises the household's standard of living. In order to achieve this growth trajectory, a household must set aside a sufficient portion of its income for educational expenses. However, providing enough funds for education can be challenging for poor families that are struggling to make ends meet.

Low representation of children from lower socioeconomic backgrounds in higher education, keeps them away from high-paying jobs. Several studies highlight the enduring impact of class, gender, and parental educational background on opportunities to gain access to education and prepare ground for the formation of human capital (Haveman and Smeeding 2006, Apple 2007, Assari 2018). It would be worthwhile to develop policies and plans that enable children from poor households to jump over the fence of obstacles and join (Lynch 1995, 1999, Slaughter and Rhoades 2004, Davies and Hentschke 2005, Ball 2009).

A dismal fallout of the interface between education and market forces is the emergence of stratification in schooling system in the country. There is noticeable rise in private schools that cater to the poor. More specifically, these are imagined as public schools for those who cannot afford the fees of better-established public schools that children of middle class and upper class families attend. Newly established 'low fee private school' (LFPS) in India are projected as responding to the growing demand of poor families for good-quality private English medium education. They are envisaged to bridge the wide gap between depressing state-run schools and upscale private schools (Nambissan 2012). According to Jain and Dholakia (2009), there is a claim that these schools outperform their state-run equivalents and fulfill the desire of poor households for competitive education. Tooley (2007, 2009) argues that children belonging to poor households were prepared to pay for their education in low fee private schools since they were less expensive yet offering better quality education than state-run institutions. Kingdon (2000) draws the conclusion that there is a significant increase in the number of students enrolling in private schools based on data from the National Sample Survey (NSS). The counterargument posits that these educational institutions encourage inequality and deal a systematic blow to India's public education system (Jain and Saxena, 2010). According to Nambissan (2012, 2021), advocacy groups' portrayal of LFPSs as an affordable and practical way to help the poor realize their dreams is actually a plea in favour of market-oriented policies and the neo-liberal rhetoric. This argument gives discrimination against poor families a safe haven. Further, large number of the corporate players in the low-cost school market are concurrently providing the middle class and upper class segments of Indian society with a qualitatively distinct educational package.

Some parents want to send their children to private schools, completely

unaware of the well-reasoned unfair treatment they receive. My examination of the interview data revealed two factors that contributed to the decision to attend a private school: the expectation of receiving a high-quality education and the expectation that success in life can be attained through English language proficiency. When private schools are too expensive, they contentedly make do with LFPSs. Manju is a 48–50 year old attendant who works in a government office for a daily wage. She is a widow who struggles to support her two daughters. She took on debt in order to pay for her daughters' LFPSs. Significantly, she manages moneylenders, skips meals, and expresses no regret about sending her daughters to private schools. According to her, her daughters would be able to compete with their middle-class counterparts if they were to acquire 'quality education,' be well-groomed, and be able to read, write, and converse in English. She wants the daughters to have a 'good life' meaning they should not be constrained by their financial situation, in exchange.

A majority of informants desired to send their children to private schools because they expected their teachers to be more accountable. Projecting LFPSs as a fair educational space for the poor is a morally justifiable way to divert the greatest resources into the hands of the wealthiest. It's interesting to note that one informant justified optimism about government schools by stating that graduates had a higher chance of finding employment in the public sector. This may be explained by the improved knowledge base that results from competitive educational processes in schools and the institutional tendency in the public sector to accept applicants from their own schools.

Conclusion

There are a large number of initiatives undertaken by international agencies as also the state to incorporate an increasing number of children across the country within the fold of education. On the one hand and enhance the quality of education on the other. The World Bank Group partners with India in employing an exhaustive and inclusive life cycle approach for education to prepare youth for future jobs. A key focus is strengthening teacher performance and improving governance and quality assurance systems in schools and colleges'. (worldbank.org/en/epf/india/what_we_work/human-capital/education)

Schultz (1961) treated education as an investment and returns from it as a type of capital. Despite the fact that since education becomes an integral part of the person who receives it and that cannot be sold or bought or treated as property, Schultz referred to it as human capital for the reason that it renders productive service of value to the economy. In essence, the human capital theory education can contribute to productive capacity of human beings. As Figueroa (2015:11) explains, "on the one hand, human capital is as important as machines and technology in the production process; on the other hand, higher human capital implies higher labor productivity and higher incomes

for workers; higher human capital also requires higher schooling years, which give workers the basic capacity to learn skills.”

The focus at the current juncture, so far as social discourse on education is concerned, has veered around formulation, implementation and evaluation of policies and performance on the macro aspects of education. It is unfair to segregate the macro or societal aspect of education from the micro or individual engagement with education. What is imperative is to develop a discourse which sets education free from market forces and in doing so disables its commoditization. Additionally, it is imperative to move beyond the human capital approach in favour of watering moral and ethical concerns in education discourse. Bell and Stevenson (2006) suggest that schools and colleges, should arrive at a consensus on basic values that inform both the educative process and the leadership of it in such a way that ethical dimension acquires a place of prominence with emphasis on cultivation of humaneness, compassion, and responsiveness to new ideas. As Apple (2013:12) argues, ‘Thus, the answer to the question of whether education can change society is “yes” if and only if it overtly challenges class and capitalism. Other challenges, hence, either become less significant or are only valued for their “ancillary” role of directly acting on capitalist relations and structures....understanding class relations and economic dynamics and structures is fundamental to dealing with the ways in which our societies operate.’ For this reason, the social function of education policy is of critical concern. At the level of the individual, investment in education and training is made with the objective of enhancing earning potential (Mincer 1974, Fevre et.al 1999).

The Indian government’s pledge to implement the social justice and equality enshrined in the nation’s Constitution has undergone several policy changes. Education was declared a Fundamental Right by the 86th Constitutional Amendment of 2002. The simultaneous expectation of egalitarianism and welfare state However, opportunities are limited and viewed differently due to a variety of factors, including neoliberal ideology. According to Raina (2020) the Act was designed to increase the state’s obligation to educate children in India, but rather than doing so through a public, universal elementary education system, it opted to outsource the expansion to the private sector. This intention was belied by the act’s focus on quantitative expansion rather than qualitative improvement in a “universal” government school system. Every child was enrolled in the system, norms were established, and a token space was created for children from economically disadvantaged social groups (EWS) who chose to co-opt private schools within the framework of a market society based on private education.

Within this framework, education is viewed as an independent public good subject to the whims of policymakers. In addition to making education vulnerable, it also makes democratic social order impossible to maintain. If this were the case, highly educated nations would be devoid of inequality and a model of well-intentioned democracy. It is imperative to recognize that

educational goals and expectations, enrollment in and success within educational institutions, and the outcomes of education are inextricably linked to societal processes. This includes the contemporary imperative to situate education within a relational framework. Well-rounded understanding would be made possible by examining the relationship between education and socioeconomic factors that influence daily life. Undoubtedly, education is intricately linked to the entirety of our comprehension of society. The social struggle for recognition is sparked by the marginalization of the poor. Their rights and integrity are being compromised, which feeds their sense of impending injustice and outrage. The fight for the recognition of the poor must be viewed in the context of real and perceived deprivation, disrespect, and contempt that govern their normative conception of who they are and what they are capable of. Interviewees consistently stated that there is a complex intersubjectivity relationship between social recognition and education. Intersubjective recognition served as the primary motivator for parents to educate their children, in actuality. The parents I spoke with associated education more with a sense of recognition and being valued as a contributing member of society than with privilege or prestige. More precisely, an examination of the narratives provided by informants revealed that education fosters both self-respect and the courage and ability to engage in debates and opinion-sharing pertaining to public issues as an equal participant. Strengthening moral responsibility and perseverance in the face of oppression are natural outcomes.

It would be worthwhile to incorporate people's perspective and agency in conversation about education and democratic order, failing which the understanding would be far removed from people's lived experiences and remain barren in nature and scope. By examining the micro-perspective, this paper strengthens the stability of development, economic returns, and policy in the field of education. It argues in favor of examining people's goals and expectations for education as well as their struggles and resistance to it. It is critical that projections of agendas and policies regarding education, as well as evaluations of the role of the state and its contribution to education, take into account people's intersubjectivity in decision-making.

Some questions that arise are: Whether and in what way does education inculcate a sense of appreciation for criticism and alternative thought? How and in what way does education generate preparedness to accommodate diversity? Does education prepare an individual to generate economic capital or engage with equitable access to resources? These questions address key concerns of democratic social order. It is envisaged that, issues of hierarchies that have plagued the arena of education would calm down when the ultimate objective of raising individuals for responsible citizenship is upheld.

Acknowledgement:

This article is an outcome of major research project, "Education and

Human Capital Formation: The Case of Low-Income Households in Select Indian States” funded by the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR). The responsibility for the facts stated, opinions expressed and the conclusions drawn, however, are entirely of the author.

References

- Apple, M. W.
2007. “Social movements and political practice in education”, *Theory and Research in Education*, Vol. 5, No.2, pp.161-171.
- . 2013. *Can education change society?* New York and London: Routledge.
- Assari, S.
2018. “Parental education better helps white than black families escape poverty: National survey of children’s health”, *Economies*, Vol. 6, No. 30, available at: <https://doi.org/10.3390/economies6020030>.
- Ball, S. J.
2009. “Privatising education, privatizing education policy, privatizing educational research: Network governance and the competition state”, *Journal of Educational Policy*, Vol.), No. 42, pp. 83-99.
- Becker, G. S.
1964. *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bell, Les and Howard Stevenson.
2006. *Education Policy: Process, Themes and Impact*. New York: Routledge.
- Boltvinik, J.
2000. “Poverty Measurements and Trends, United Nations Development Programme”, SEPED Series on Poverty Reduction. United Nations, NY, available at: www.undp.org/poverty/publications/pov_red.
- Booth, Charles.
1903. *Life and Labour of the People of London*. New York: Macmillan and Co., Ltd.
- Crespo, Flores-Pedro.
2007. “Situating Education in Human Capabilities Approach”. In M. Walker et. Al (Eds.), *Amartya Sen’s Capability Approach and Social Justice in Education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Davies, B. and G. Hentschke.
2005. “Public/private partnerships in education: Grounds for optimism?”, *Management in Education*, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 6-7.

Fevre, R., G. Rees., and S. Gorard.

1999. "Some sociological alternatives to human capital theory and their implications for research on post-compulsory education and training", *Journal of Education and Work*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 117-40.

Fichte, J. G.

- 2000 [1795-1796]. *Foundations in Natural Right: According to the Principles of Wissenschaftslehre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Figueroa A.

2015. *Growth, Employment, Inequality, and the Environment*. Palgrave Macmillan: New York.

Goldin Claudia and Lawrence F. Katz.

2008. *The Race between Education and Technology*. Harvard University Press.

Grusky, David B. and Ravi Kanbur.

2006. "Introduction: The Conceptual Foundations of Poverty and Inequality Measurement." In David B. Grusky and Ravi Kanbur (eds.), *Poverty and Inequality*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Haveman, R.

2009. "What does it mean to be Poor in a Rich Society?", *Focus* Vol. 26, No.2, pp. 86.

Haveman, R. and T. Smeeding.

2006. "The role of higher education in social mobility". *The Future of Children*, Vol. 16. No. 2), pp. 125-150.

Hegel, G. W. F.

- 1977 [orig. 1807]. (A. V. Miller trans.) *Phenomenology of the Spirit*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hick, R. and T. Burchardt.

2016. "Capability Deprivation", In Brady, D. and L.M. Burton, L.M. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Social Science of Poverty*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hills, J., Grand, J. Le, and D. Piachaud.

2002. *Understanding Social Exclusion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Honneth, A.

1992. "Integrity and Disrespect: principles of a Conception of Morality based on the Theory of Recognition." *Political Theory*, Vol 20, No. (2), pp. 187-201.

Honneth, Axel.

1995. *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral grammar of Social Conflicts*.

Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hopkins, Lucy and A. Sriprakash.

2016. "Unsettling the Global Child: Rethinking Child Subjectivity in Education and International Development", In Lucy Hopkins and ASriprakash(eds.), *The 'Poor Child': The Cultural Politics of Education, Development and Childhood*. New York: Routledge.

Jain, M. and Saxena, S.

2010. "Politics of low cost schooling and low teacher salary". *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 45, No. 18, pp.79-80.

Jain, P. and R. Dholakia.

2009. "Feasibility of implementation of Right to Education Act". *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 44, No.25, pp. 38-43.

Kingdon, Geeta Gandhi.

2000. "The Private Schooling Phenomenon in India: A Review". *The Journal of Development Studies*, Vol. 56(10), 1795-1817.

Kumar, R.

2016. "Introduction",. In Ravi Kumar (ed.), *Neoliberalism, critical pedagogy and education*. London and New York: Routledge.

Lynch, K.

1995. "Equality and resistance in higher education", *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, Vol. 5, No. 1pp., 93-111.

1999. "Equality studies, the academy and the role of research in emancipatory social change", *The Economic and Social Review*, Vol. 30, No. 1pp., 41-69.

McCowan, T.

2010. "Reframing the Universal right to education", *Comparative Education*, Vol. 46, No.(4), pp. 509-525.

McQueen, Paddy.

2015. *Subjectivity, Gender and the Struggle for Recognition*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mincer, Jacob.

1974. *Schooling, Experience and Earnings*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Montaigne, Michel de.

1958. *The Complete Essays of Montaigne*, trans. D.M. Frame Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Mood, Carina and Jan O Jonsson,.

2016. "The Social Consequences of Poverty: An Empirical Test on

- Longitudinal data". *Social Indicators Research*, Vol.127, pp. 633-652.
- Nambissan, G. B.
2012. "Private Schools for the Poor: Business as Usual?", *Economic & Political Weekly*, Vol. 47, No. 41, pp. 51-58.
-
2021. "The Changing Urban and Education in Delhi: Privilege and Exclusion in a Megacity", Working Paper Series 2021/9, Max Weber Stiftung available at https://perspectivia.net/receive/pnet_mods_00003983 (accessed on January 05, 2023).
- Nambissan, G. B. and S. J. Ball.
2010. "Advocacy networks, choice and private schooling of the poor in India", *Global Networks*, Vol.10, No. 3, pp. 324-343.
- Narayan, Deepa.
2000. *Voices of the poor: Can Anyone Hear Us?* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Raina, Jyoti.
2020. "Introduction", In Jyoti Raina, (ed.) *Elementary Education in India: Policy Shifts, Issues and Challenges*. New York: Routledge.
- Rousseau, J.
2002. [1762]. *The Social Contract; and the First and Second Discourses*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sarangpani, P.
2009. Quality, feasibility and desirability of low cost private schooling. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 44(43), 67-69.
-
2010. "Quality Concerns", *Contemporary Education Dialogue*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 41-57.
-
2018. "Hyderabad's education market", In Manish Jain, Archana Mehendale, Rahul Mukhopadhyay, Padma Sarangpani, and Christopher Winch (eds.), *School education in India: Market state and quality*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Satterthwaite, D.
2004. "The Under-estimation of Urban Poverty in Low and Middle-Income Nations", Working paper on Poverty Reduction in Urban Areas 14 available at: file:///E:/Poverty%20and%20the%20Poor/reading%20material/The_Under-estimation_of_Urban_Poverty_in_Low_and_M.pdf (accessed on November 23, 2022).
- Schultz, T. W.
1961. "Investment in Human Capital", *The American Economic Review*,

Vol.51, No. 1, pp. 1-17.

Sen, A.

1983. "Poor, relatively speaking", *Oxford Economic Papers*, Vol. 35, pp.153-169

2009. *The Idea of Justice*. Harvard University Press.

Sharma, G.

2021. *Schooling and Aspirations in the Urban Margins: Ethnography of Education in the Indian Context*. London and New York: Routledge.

Slaughter, S. and G. Rhoades.

2004. *Academic Capitalism in the New Economy*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Smeeding, T. M.

2006. "Poor people in Rich Nations: The United States in Comparative Perspective", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 69-90.

2016. "Multiple Barriers to Economic Opportunity for the "Truly" Disadvantaged and Vulnerable", *The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 2 No. 2. pp.98-122.

The World Bank.

2002. *Poverty in India; The Challenge of Uttar Pradesh*, available at <http://www.ibe.unesco.org/en/glossary-curriculum-terminology/e/education-all-efa> (accessed on December 08, 2022)

Tilak, J. B. G.

2003. "Higher Education and Development in Asia", *Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, Vol.XVII, No. 2, pp. 151- 173.

Tooley, J.

2007. "Educating amaretech: Private schools for the poor and the new frontier for investors", *Economic Affairs*, Vol.27, No. 2, pp. 37-43.

2009. *The Beautiful Tree: A personal journey into how the world's poorest people are educating themselves*. New Delhi: Penguin.

Townsend, P.

1979. *Poverty in the United Kingdom*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

United Nations Development Programme.

2022. *Unpacking Deprivation Bundles to reduce multidimensional poverty: Global Multidimensional Poverty Index*, available at <file:///C:/Users/signou/Downloads/2022mpireportenpdf.pdf> (accessed on January 05, 2023)

Walker, Melanie.

2005. "Amartya Sen's Capability Approach and Education. Educational Action Research", Vol. 13, No. 1, pp.103-110.

2020. "On Education and Capabilities Expansion", In Enrica Chiappero-Martinetti, Siddiqur Osmani and Mozaffar Qizilbash (eds.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woessmann, L.

2015. "The Economic Case for Education", *Education Economics*, available at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09645292.2015.1059801?journalCode=cede20> (accessed on January 05, 2023)

RECEIVED: 16TH FEB 2024

REVISED: 03RD AUG 2024

ACCEPTED: 10TH AUG 2024



This document was created with the Win2PDF "print to PDF" printer available at <http://www.win2pdf.com>

This version of Win2PDF 10 is for evaluation and non-commercial use only.

This page will not be added after purchasing Win2PDF.

<http://www.win2pdf.com/purchase/>