

---

# Elementary Education in India

---

This book examines the policy shifts over the past three decades in the Indian education system. It explores how these shifts have unequivocally established the domination of neoliberal capital in the context of elementary education in India.

The chapters in the volume:

- Discuss a range of elementary education policies and programmes in India with a focus on the policy development in recent decades of neoliberalism.
- Analyse policy from diverse perspectives and varied vantage points by scholars, activists and practitioners, illustrated with contemporary statistics.
- Introduce the key curriculum, assessment and learning debates from contemporary educational discourse.
- Integrate the tools and methods of education policy analysis with basic concepts in education, like equality, quantity, equity, quality and inclusion.

A definitive inter-disciplinary work on a key sector in India, this volume will be essential for scholars and researchers of education, public policy, sociology, politics and South Asian studies.

**Jyoti Raina** is Associate Professor, Department of Elementary Education, Gargi College, University of Delhi, New Delhi, India. Her main teaching focus is educational studies, learning theory and science education. She also looks after the work of equal opportunity, Gandhi studies and anti-discrimination at the college.

*'Elementary Education in India: Policy Shifts, Issues and Challenges* constitutes an urgent challenge not only to India's educational system but to the underpinnings of the crisis in which it is perilously enmeshed – the roots and branches of capitalist overproduction and consequent immiseration. Jyoti Raina has assembled a distinguished group of Indian and international educational scholars whose critiques of neoliberalism and education sound the death-knell of efforts to repurpose education to accommodate a capitalist system reeling on its transnationalist heels. Equally important, the book provides readers with new vantage points from which a new system can be built. This stunning work will be of interest to critical educators worldwide.'

– Peter McLaren, *Distinguished Professor in Critical Studies,  
The Attallah College of Educational Studies, Chapman University;  
and Chair Professor, Northeast Normal University, China*

'The period 1990 to the present has seen a major neoliberal turn in public policy in India in all sectors of education. The policy shifts in elementary education have been of the greatest impact because these touch the very base of India's highly stratified society. There has been a dearth of competent documentations and analyses that set out the causes, trajectories and consequences of these major shifts. The present collection of essays attempts to fill this vacuum by bringing together the perspectives of several Indian and international scholars and practitioners on the contemporary realities of policy and practice in elementary education. This book promises to serve as an important resource world-wide for students and educators as well as for those who work in policy spaces.'

– Shyam B. Menon, *Professor of Education, Central Institute  
of Education, University of Delhi, Delhi; Founder  
Vice-Chancellor, Ambedkar University, Delhi, India*

'This is an important book that brings together a rich collection of essays on a range of issues that are critical to the present and future of education in India. The larger context is the neoliberal restructuring of education and its fallout as reflected in the changes we are witnessing in schooling especially in the last two decades. The themes dealt with relate to policy shifts in education, privatisation, transformations in curriculum and pedagogical practices, exclusion and discrimination in schooling and so on. There is also an engagement with education as a public good and the challenge of public education, social justice and democratic citizenship, concerns that are increasingly marginalized today. This makes the book a timely contribution as well.'

– Geetha B. Nambissan, *Professor of Education, Zakir Husain  
Centre for Educational Studies, School of Social Sciences,  
Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India*

‘At a time when discourse on the public education system is dominated by activist foundations and the practical urge [for] “fixing things” the collection of essays in this book bring back the focus on the underlying national and transnational force field within which the Indian constitutional promise of the Right to Education is playing out. The collection of essays presents fresh historical and political analysis and commentary on education in society.’

– *Padma M. Sarangpani, Professor of Education, Tata Institute of Social Science, Mumbai, India*

‘This volume edited by Jyoti Raina is a direct and critical engagement with the ideas and practices of neoliberalism as they restructure education with devastating consequences for the institutions of public education. Even more, Raina advances the theory that neoliberalism and the global ideas of the Washington Consensus find their partner in the Indian state. This state has abandoned its role of redistribution in favour of the poor, and advancing the conditions for growth of private capital in education. The contributions in the volume highlight myriad themes of these arguments. A must read for scholars and researchers of Indian education.’

– *Manisha Priyam, Associate Professor, National Institute for Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi*



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

---

# Elementary Education in India

---

Policy Shifts, Issues and Challenges

Edited by Jyoti Raina

First published 2020

by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge

52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2020 selection and editorial matter, Jyoti Raina; individual chapters, the contributors

The right of Jyoti Raina to be identified as the author of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*Trademark notice:* Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

*British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data*

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-1-138-32231-8 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-429-32879-4 (ebk)

Typeset in Sabon

by Apex CoVantage, LLC

---

# Contents

---

<i>List of figures</i>	x
<i>List of tables</i>	xi
<i>List of contributors</i>	xii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xvi
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	xvii

<b>Introduction: mapping the exacerbated crisis in elementary education: issues and challenges</b>	<b>1</b>
JYOTI RAINA	

<b>PART I</b>	
<b>Neoliberal restructuring of education</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>1 Neoliberal policy shifts in elementary education in India</b>	<b>25</b>
JYOTI RAINA AND PARUL	
<b>2 Extending the neoliberal agenda to forbidden territory: public-private partnership in school education in India</b>	<b>43</b>
SUMAN LATA	
<b>3 Public education: can it be fixed?</b>	<b>55</b>
ATISHI	
<b>4 Equitable elementary education as a public good: what is left of it?</b>	<b>66</b>
JYOTI RAINA	

**PART II****Understanding knowledge and curriculum 89**

- 5 Draft NEP 2016: education for 'citizenship' or 'resource development for a pliable workforce'? 91

ROHIT DHANKAR

- 6 Bin bhay hoye na preet: resilience of the fear-based examination-detention policy in the Indian education system 108

DISHA NAWANI

- 7 Indian modernity as the problem of Indian education 122

NITA KUMAR

**PART III****Schooling, social justice and critical pedagogy 135**

- 8 *Sanskara*: the notion of hereditary educability and changing behaviour of the teachers 137

SANJAY KUMAR

- 9 Consensualised reproduction and the fascised rule of capital: the responsibility of critical pedagogy 154

RAVI KUMAR

- 10 A strategy for exclusion: how equality and social justice have been derailed in Indian elementary education 177

MADHU PRASAD

**PART IV****Transnational perspective on neoliberalism and education 201**

- 11 The reactionary right and its carnival of reaction: global neoliberalism, reactionary neoconservatism: Marxist critique, education analysis and policy 203

DAVE HILL

- 12 The agonies of neoliberal education: what hope progress? 220

TOM G. GRIFFITHS



<b>13</b>	<b>Analysing educational change: towards an understanding of patterns of historical and cultural refraction</b>	<b>235</b>
	IVOR GOODSON	
<b>14</b>	<b>Combating educational inequality: competing frameworks</b>	<b>249</b>
	VIKAS GUPTA	
	<i>Index</i>	<b>285</b>

---

# Figures

---

4.1	Social backgrounds of children attending different types of schools in primary grades, academic year 2014–15	69
4.2	Social backgrounds of children attending different types of schools in primary grades, academic year 2011–12	70
8.1	Vicious circle of exclusion of children from marginalised communities	139
8.2	Parameters of action research	141
13.1	Juxtaposing system narratives and work–life narratives	240

---

# Tables

---

4.1	Increase in number of private schools providing elementary education from 1979 to 2009	78
4.2	Increase in number of new private schools versus state schools from 2010 to 2016	79
4.3	Children attending private unaided schools in India by age and region for the academic year 2014–15	79
8.1	Percentage of children by social category and education of father	143
8.2	Percentage of children by social category and education of mother	144
8.3	Percentage of children by social category and household landownership	145
8.4	Percentage of children by social category and occupation of father	146
13.1	Periodisation in national contexts	237
13.2	Main features of public service restructuring in the case studies	238

---

## Contributors

---

**Atishi** is a political leader belonging to the Aam Aadmi Party. She has been an advisor to the deputy chief minister of Delhi, primarily on education. She has a master's degree in education curriculum from Oxford University and has worked in the field of alternative education and curriculum. She spent some time teaching at Rishi Valley School in Andhra Pradesh before moving to a small village near Bhopal in Madhya Pradesh, India. There she was involved with developing organic farming and progressive education systems. She has worked with several non-profit organisations on public policy issues.

**Rohit Dhankar** is Professor of Philosophy of Education at Azim Premji University, Bengaluru, India. He has been a member of several NCERT initiatives to develop material and curriculum for school education. He trained as a teacher under David Horsburgh in the Neelbagh School, and taught in elementary schools for 15 years. He is the founder secretary of Digantar, a voluntary organisation in Jaipur, India, that is engaged in providing alternative education to rural/urban slum children.

**Ivor Goodson** has worked in universities in England, Canada and the United States, and is currently Professor of Learning Theory at the Education Research Centre, the University of Brighton, UK. He has authored more than 50 books and 600 articles, including *Negotiating Neoliberalism: Developing Alternative Educational Visions* (2018); *Routledge International Handbook on Narrative and Life History* (2017); *The Limits of Neoliberal Education. Refraction, Reinterpretation and Reimagination* (2017); *Critical Narrative as Pedagogy* (2014); *Developing Narrative Theory: Life Histories and Personal Representations* (2012); *The Life History of a School* (2011); *Through the Schoolhouse Door* (2010); and *Professional Knowledge, Professional Lives: Studies in Education and Change* (2003). Among the key ideas that he has contributed to the study of education include notions of Historical Periodisation, Refraction, Narrative Capital, Narrative Learning, Narrative Pedagogy and Curriculum Form. He has received the Michael Huberman Award at the American

Educational Research Association for his work on teachers' lives and was made a laureate of the Phi Delta Kappan Society in the United States.

**Tom G. Griffiths** is Associate Professor of comparative and international education at the University of Newcastle, Australia. His recent books include a co-authored volume, *Mass Education, Global Capital, and the World: The Theoretical Lenses of István Mészáros and Immanuel Wallerstein*, and the co-edited *Logics of Socialist Education: Engaging with Crisis, Insecurity and Uncertainty*. His research is focused on the relationship between education and projects to construct a more democratic, equal, peaceful and just world-system.

**Vikas Gupta** teaches in the Department of History at the University of Delhi, India. His broad area of academic engagement includes historical and contemporary aspects of education in modern India, with a special focus on curriculum knowledge, social inequalities, state policies and school practices. He is a member of the All-India Forum for Right to Education and Associate Editor of its quarterly newsletter, *Reconstructing Education for Emancipation*. He is currently also engaged in building up a nation-wide public campaign in support of the Common School System and spearheads this work through the All-India Forum for Right to Education.

**Dave Hill** is a socialist political activist, trade union leader and twice a Labour parliamentary candidate in England. His academic work focuses on issues of neoliberalism, capitalism, class, socialist education, critical pedagogy and resistance. He is Research Professor (Emeritus) of Education at Anglia Ruskin University, Chelmsford, England; Visiting Professor at the Kapodistrian and National University of Athens, Greece; and in the Social Policy Research Centre at Middlesex University, London, UK. He is series editor for the *Routledge Studies in Education, Neoliberalism and Marxism* series, which has published 18 books. He founded and is editor-in-chief for the *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, which has had more than a million downloads in the last 10 years. He is co-organiser of the annual International Conference on Critical Education (founded in 2010). His recent works include *Marxism and Education: International Perspectives on Theory and Action* (2018); *Class, Race and Education Under Neoliberal Capitalism* (2017); *Eleştirel Eğitim ve Marksizm (Critical Education and Marxism)* (2016); *Marxist Essays on Education: Class and 'Race', Neoliberalism and Capitalism* (2013); and *Immiseration Capitalism and Education: Austerity, Resistance and Revolt* (2013), among many others.

**Nita Kumar** is Professor of South Asian History at the Department of History, Claremont McKenna College, United States. She also runs a school and an organisation, NIRMAN, in Banaras, India, which is a postcolonial

education research centre devoted to sponsoring intellectual and change-oriented activity on the subjects of children, education, women and civic and environmental values. She has written several books on history, education and gender studies, including *Educating the Child in India: The Family and the School*; *Lessons from Schools: A History of Education in Banaras*; *Exploring Indian Precolonial and Colonial Intellectual History*; and *The Politics of Gender, Community and Modernity: Essays on Education*. She has produced and scripted a forthcoming film, *Shankar's Fairies*.

**Ravi Kumar** teaches at the Department of Sociology, South Asian University, New Delhi, India. His recent works include *Neoliberalism, Critical Pedagogy and Education* (2016); *Education, State and Market: Anatomy of Neoliberal Impact* (2014); and *Education and the Reproduction of Capital: Neoliberal Knowledge and Counterstrategies* (2012). He co-edits the book series on *Social Movements, Dissent and Transformative Action* (2014), *Conversations on/for South Asia* and *Sociology/Anthropology Across Borders*. His area of research includes political economy of identity politics, social movements, neoliberal impact on education and processes of knowledge production. He is also an associate editor of *Society and Culture in South Asia* and a member of the editorial board of *Journal of Critical Education Policy Studies*.

**Sanjay Kumar** is a scholar, practitioner and founder of the Deshkal Society, Delhi, India. He has been working in the area of social diversity, inequality and education for more than one and half decades, both in practice and scholarship. His articles, monographs and occasional papers have been published in journals and magazines. He is a co-editor of various books: *Interrogating Development: Insights from the Margins*, *School Education Marginality and Pluralism Comparative Perspectives* and *Dynamics of Inclusive Classroom: Social Diversity, Inequality and School Education in India*.

**Suman Lata** teaches at the Department of Elementary Education, Gargi College, New Delhi, while also a doctoral candidate at the Jamia Milia Islamia, New Delhi, India. Her areas of interest include curriculum studies and school educational policies and practices. She is a member of the Parents Forum for Meaningful Education, India, an organisation that works for child rights and progressive practices in the elementary school system all over the country.

**Disha Nawani** is Dean, School of Education, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai, India. Her research interests include curriculum, teacher education, educational policy and resources for school education. She has been a member of various teacher education review committees set up by Ministry of Human Resource Development and the National Council of

Teacher Education. She has been writing on the contemporary discourse of educational policy and assessment. She has also edited the volume *Teaching-Learning Resources for School Education* (2016).

**Parul** is a doctoral candidate at the Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai, India, in the area of Teachers Professionalism in the context of policy changes. Her research interests include Teachers Professional Development, Gender and Education, Policy Studies and Curriculum Studies.

**Madhu Prasad** has been actively involved with issues of education policy for more than two decades. She has analysed the impact of early 19th-century colonial education policy from archival material on Delhi's Madrasa Ghaziuddin/Delhi College, contributed chapters to volumes on the Education Commission (1964–66) and on India's neoliberal policy in education, and writes on education for academic journals and the print media. She is a member of the editorial board of the journal *Social Scientist* and is Executive Editor of *Reconstructing Education for Emancipation*, a quarterly newsletter of the All-India Forum for the Right to Education.

**Jyoti Raina** is Associate Professor, Department of Elementary Education, Gargi College, University of Delhi, New Delhi, India. Her main teaching focus is educational studies while her research interests include learning theory, cognitive education and initial teacher education. She also looks after the work of equal opportunity, Gandhi studies and anti-discrimination at the college.

---

# Acknowledgements

---

I am grateful to all the chapter authors for their contributions, which made this volume possible at the current juncture of unprecedented crisis in elementary education in India. The friendships formed in bringing the chapters together has provided me several insights on the role elementary education can potentially play in building an inclusive society.

I thank all the contributing authors for letting me experience this thread of interconnectedness that has enriched me personally. I thank anonymous reviewers of the manuscript for pointing out some missing aspects of policy analysis, as well as for ideas on addressing them. I want to express my gratitude to Dave Hill, Ravi Kumar, Suman Lata and Parul for their encouragement, support and optimism that provides me with strength to carry on my teaching, writing and action. I thank Manju Rajput for inviting me to various meetings, activities and programmes at Raghubir Singh Junior Modern School, New Delhi – each visit illuminated me with valuable insights on school education policies and practices.

My colleagues at Gargi College have been a constant source of fellowship. I particularly thank Anjana Neira Dev for her constant advice that enabled me to sharpen the manuscript and members at the Department of Elementary Education for always being available to discuss my ideas. My students at the department continue to challenge me with their questions, teach me new things and expect me to generate readings for them, which compelled me to bring out this volume. They are too many to be named, but I need to make special mention of the B.El.Ed. fourth-year students of the 2018–19 session.

I am grateful to Aakash Chakrabarty and Brinda Sen of Routledge for helping at each step of turning the draft manuscript into this edited volume. They have not only been patient and cooperative but have also made useful suggestions. Their de-bureaucratic approach combined seriousness with a lightness that made the work of this volume a pleasurable experience.

Finally, I owe a debt of gratitude to my teacher, Professor Bharati Baveja, for initiating me into educational studies and teaching me the willingness to learn.



---

# Abbreviations

---

AAP	Aam Aadmi Party
ABVP	Akhil Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad
AHC	Allahabad High Court
AIE	Alternative and Innovative Education
AIFRTE	All-India Forum for Right to Education
AISF	All India Students Federation
AKP	Adalet ve Kalkinma Partisi, Justice and Development Party
ASER	Annual Status of Education Reports
BDO	block development officer
B.Ed.	Bachelor of Education
B.El.Ed	Bachelor of Elementary Education
BJP	Bhartiya Janata Party
BO	beat officer
BPS	budget primary/private schools
BRC	block resource centre
BRP	block resource person
CBSE	Central Board of Secondary Education
CCS Rules	Central Civil Services (Conduct) Rules
CCE	continuous and comprehensive evaluation
CCS	Centre for Civil Society
CPI	Communist Party of India
CRC	cluster resource centre
CRP	cluster resource person
CSR	corporate social responsibility
CSSNS	common school system based on the concept of neighbourhood schools
CUG	Central University of Gujarat
DBT	Direct Benefit Transfers
DIET	District Institute of Education and Training
DISE	District Information System for Education
DoE	Directorate of Education

DPEP	District Primary Education Programme
EFA	Education for All
EGS	Education Guarantee Scheme
EIC	East India Company
EWS	economically weaker section
GATS	General Agreement for Trade in Services
GDP	gross domestic product
GER	gross enrolment ratio
GoI	Government of India
HM	headmaster/headmistress
HRD	human resource development
ICT	information and communication technology
IEC	Indian Education Commission
IIT	Indian Institute of Technology
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IMF	International Monetary Fund
INC	Indian National Congress
ISA	ideological state apparatus
JNU	Jawaharlal Nehru University
KBES	knowledge-based economy and society
LFPS	low-fee private schooling
LGBT	lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender
LLO	learning level outcome
LO	learning outcome
MBC	most backward class
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MDM	mid-day meal
MHRD	Ministry of Human Resource Development
MLL	Minimum Levels of Learning
NAR	net attendance ratio
NAS	National Achievement Survey
NCERT	National Council of Educational Research and Training
NCF	National Curriculum Framework
NCFR	National Curriculum Framework Review
NDP	no-detention policy
NEET	national eligibility cum entrance test
NEP	National Education Policy
NER	net enrolment ratio
NFE	non-formal education
NGO	non-governmental organisation
NISA	National Independent School Alliance
NITI Aayog	National Institution for Transforming India
NPE	National Policy on Education
NPM	new public management

---

NSP	non-state providers
NSSO	National Sample Survey Organisation
NUEPA	National University of Educational Planning and Administration
OBC	other backward class
OBE	outcome-based education
OoSC	out-of-school children
PISA	Programme for International Student Assessment
POA	Programme of Action
PPP	public-private partnership
PROBE	Public Report on Basic Education in India
PSU	public sector undertaking
PTM	parent-teacher meeting
RMSA	Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan
RPA	repressive state apparatuses
RSS	Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh
RTE Act	Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act
SAP	structural adjustment programme
SC	scheduled caste
SCNC	School Choice National Conference
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SEQI	School Education Quality Index
SMC	school management committee
SSA	Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan
TaRL	Teaching at the Right Level
TDC	Teacher Development Coordinator
UEE	Universalisation of Elementary Education
UIS	UNESCO Institute for Statistics
UKIP	United Kingdom Independence Party
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNO	United Nations Organization
UP	Uttar Pradesh
WB	World Bank
WHO	World Health Organisation
WTO	World Trade Organisation



Taylor & Francis

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

---

# Introduction

## Mapping the exacerbated crisis in elementary education: issues and challenges

*Jyoti Raina*

---

The Indian constitution envisioned elementary education as a public good that contributes to the building of an egalitarian, just and democratic social order by providing free schooling of equitable quality to all the children of our country up to 14 years of age. This was viewed as the means to secure equality of opportunity for all citizens while upholding constitutional principles of social justice, diversity and inclusion. The educational policies of the post-independence years did not reflect the social justice intent towards securing this, by detailing an operational framework, to actualise elementary education into a public good. Moreover, subsequent educational policy shift(s) have cumulatively moved further from this constitutional commitment, following the twin trends of increased abdication of constitutional obligation and steady dilution of policy thrust on ensuring the public good of a free elementary education (Sadgopal, 2006: 93). The priorities of India's constitutional commitment to public elementary education have been wholly restructured in the past three decades as a result of the economic policy decisions for the liberalisation of the Indian economy under the influence of World Bank (WB)–World Trade Organization (WTO) mandates following the Washington Consensus in 1989. The consensus consists of a list of ten policies and reforms that include reordering public expenditure priorities, trade liberalisation, liberalisation of inward foreign direct investment, privatisation and deregulation (Williamson, 2009: 10). These international policy prescriptions and reforms were primarily economic but had wide-ranging implications for political economy as well for the social infrastructure domains, including education. They emanated from the ideology of neoliberalism that continues its dominance in shaping political and economic practices mediating a common sense that believes:

[W]e are best served by maximum market freedom and minimum intervention by the state. The role of government should be confined to creating and defending markets, protecting private property and defending the realm. All other functions are better discharged by private enterprise,

which will be prompted by the profit motive to supply essential services. By this means, enterprise is liberated, rational decisions are made and citizens are freed from the dehumanising hand of the state.

(Monbiot, 2007)

Following the announcement of the New Economic Policy, since 1991 the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the WB dictated a structural adjustment programme (SAP) and downsized welfare sectors, with a consequent reduction in the public financing of elementary education. This was reflected in the planning, organisation and pedagogy of WB-sponsored state programmes like the District Primary Education Programme (DPEP), beginning in 1994, but later covering 18 states and more than half of the districts in the country; it was characterised by replacing regular teachers with inadequately prepared contractual para-teachers, single-teacher schools with multi-grade teaching and the beginning of an outcome orientation (Ayyar, 2017: 26) with a curriculum consisting mainly of mere foundational skills, such as numeracy and literacy, as well as wreaking major havoc upon the elementary education system. The serious shifts in educational policy had already begun with the National Policy on Education (NPE) in 1986, which in itself heralded the policy wisdom in favour of privatisation (or non-state stake holding), reducing the role of the state and its commitment to public education. It continued to speak, as did previous policies, about equalising educational opportunities through the strengthening of the common school system, but without delineating how the state proposed to actualise this vision. More importantly, it continued to ignore an analysis of why the egalitarian idea of a common school system had continued to remain mere policy rhetoric on paper. The process of policy implementation into practice was simply passed over. The NPE in 1986 also introduced the category of ‘pace-setting schools’ on the premise that,

It is universally accepted that children with special talent or aptitude should be provided opportunities to proceed at a faster pace, by making good quality education available to them, irrespective of their capacity to pay for it.

(MHRD, 1986: 13)

This brought further structural distortion to the already multi-layered school system, as if the state was responsible for provisioning ‘good quality education’ only for some children with the necessary aptitude in a separate layer of government schooling that was above the common school in an ascending hierarchy of school education. The children who belong to this category would typically be from the relatively advantaged sections of rural/semi-urban society. This represents a selective kind of thinking, a tapered inclusion (Gupta, 2016) of a symbolic few, which awards policy legitimacy

to the point of exacerbating already deep hierarchies in terms of access in the Indian multi-layered, graded, non-egalitarian schooling system. The policy also proposed, and in fact popularised, a multi-track, parallel, discriminatory, non-formal education system of elementary education while adversely affecting public institutional teaching and learning, leading to a deterioration of the state education system. The underlying assumption was that formal schooling is not necessary for every child. The subsequent ambitious state flagship educational reforms, like Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA), in 2000 continued to offer inferior norms and standards, further increasing the stratification among government schooling systems, while popularising the non-formal system in the trajectory of educational policy and practice, particularly for children who were not yet in the fold of school education. Ravi Kumar highlights how incremental policy changes and reforms (I wonder why they are called reforms!) moving further from the constitutional vision of equitable elementary education continue to reflect the segregation of an already differentiated typology of school systems, because the

transition from a promise of universal free and compulsory education (read equality in access and access to quality education) by leaders of the freedom movement to the current division into formal and non-formal schools, with trained and well-paid teachers on one hand, and partially trained and ill-equipped, underpaid teachers on the other, has come about.

(Ravi Kumar, 2006b: 14)

The outcome orientation embedded in the policy shifts aligned with a techno-managerial model for educational planning and management in which the notion of quality education was quantified to the achievement of measurable learning outcomes (LOs). The prevailing status of education in any district of the country was assumed to be indicated by the assessment of the LOs in the school academic domains of reading and arithmetic (ASER, various years). These kinds of large-scale assessments resulted in the development of a binary between public and private school performances, which instead of taking a school as the unit of analysis, has tended to show public schools as failures. This further aggravates the multi-faceted attack on the public education system, which is now not only turned into but is even known as the colony of the 'underprivileged' section of our society. This has continued to draw attention away from systemic constraints and other structural bottlenecks associated with the functioning of government schools, circuitously further supporting the political economy of privatisation. Empirical research has demonstrated that the systemic deterioration of the public education system in the name of educational reforms, following SAP, led to the proliferation of a burgeoning economy of private schools euphemistically termed low-fee private schooling (LFPS) by the end of the 1990s (Valaskar,

2017), adding further layers in the existing graded hierarchy of access to schooling. Another precarious outcome of this alleged deterioration of government schools was the diversion of public finances to private players in a hidden agenda of privatisation in the name of public–private partnership (PPP). The WTO–General Agreement for Trade in Services (GATS) regime had already come to India in 1995, following the Washington Consensus, turning education into a legally ‘tradeable commodity’ and distorting the role an equitable system of schooling could play in building a democratic society. The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education, or RTE Act (2009), in pursuit of a rights-based approach to elementary education as an entitlement that every child deserves, continued with the existing hierarchies of schooling which were established as legitimised by earlier policies, cumulative shifts and reforms. Although the act was created with the intention of expanding the state’s responsibility for providing education to the children of India, it preferred to outsource expansion in the non-public sector instead of achieving it via a public and universal system of elementary education. This intent belied the impact, as the act did not focus on qualitative improvement in a ‘universal’ government school system, but on quantitative expansion, enrolling each child in the system, establishing norms and creating a token space for children belonging to economically weaker sections (EWS) of society and choosing to co-opt private schools in the policy framework of a private schools–based market society. The exploratory studies examining the status of implementation of this provision of including EWS children in private unaided schools in cities have identified gaps in administrative processes in terms of their complexity, whereby inclusion is ensured only at the level of granting admission to the school and does not provide inclusive education beyond the mere physical presence of the child in the school (Mehendale et al., 2015). Anil Sadgopal, has pointed out how the act succumbed to the neoliberal trap by providing an escape route for the state and indirectly supported the withdrawal of the state governments in ensuring public education for all, as well as diffused the struggle for a common school system (Sadgopal, 2016a: 34). The entrenchment of a multi-layered school system from the mid-1980s for each separate section of our stratified society has contributed to the sharp divisions in school education, as well as the decline of the state system, which is being attended, in recent years, mostly by children from the marginalised social segments (Sadgopal, 2016b: 18).

Thus, the trajectory of the constitutional vision of equitable elementary education has continued to remain mere rhetoric or sloganeering for more than seven decades. This parallels the worrying trend in post-colonial schooling systems in several other parts of the world, where schooling is increasingly class based, with children of the elites and well-to-do attending schools with better physical infrastructure and other resources, and those of the peasantry and working class lacking access to such schools (Bloch, 2009).



The social differences based on economic class and school education are not cross-cutting but overlap in Indian society, leading to profound social divisions while perpetuating graded social hierarchies, regional disparity and educational inequality. This merits importance, as social scientists in India have emphasised caste–class, rural–urban and gender-based distinctions but have not paid sufficient attention to the sharp divisions produced in society by the multi-layered, graded structures that distort our school education system (Kumar, 2009). The outcome of the neoliberal policy changes since the liberalisation of the economy has been the operationalisation of the process of developing and entrenching further hierarchies of schooling systems which not only reproduce the existing social inequalities but also exacerbate another set of graded inequalities in our stratified social structure with its overlapping social differences. School education has become a class-based process. This has debilitating consequences for our society, as there are disturbing resemblances between the densely, multi-layered graded hierarchies of schooling and the exacerbating structural social hierarchies of the neoliberal economy, which is irreparably shaping the lives, aspirations and aims of our young learners. The lack of thrust on public education with each policy ‘reform’ has accentuated social divisions by unequivocally establishing the domination of private capital (with increasing privatisation) in the context of elementary education policy and practice in India. The state, irrespective of political dispensation, has continued to be a facilitator of this shift (in the name of reform), leading to a convergence of economic and educational discursive regimes aimed at adjusting education to fit the prevailing neoliberal socio-economic order since the two and a half decades following liberalisation. The wilful lack of policy thrust on public education, accentuation of existing hierarchies of access, contractualisation of teaching, increasing non-state stake holding, involvement of private players, proliferation of private capital and a shift of value by the state from public to private have precipitated an educational crisis since education came under neoliberalisation.

However, at the current historical juncture, the state of crisis in elementary education has exacerbated to an unprecedented urgency since a new political-ideological context is becoming more sharply defined. The post-colonial capitalism complemented welfare policies (in education as in other social domains) for the seven decades following independence, but the state gradually eschewed this welfarism in favour of the market as the socio-political determinant shaping public policy – so much so that at the current juncture there are hardly any incremental aspects left that provide continuity to the ‘policy history’ (Rizvi and Lingard, 2009: 9) of previous policy concerns of egalitarianism, social justice and commitment to a public good. The nature of the state has shifted with the diminishing operative distinction between state and market. The direction of policy shifts culminates into a new paradigm of unprecedented privatisation/quasi-privatisation of schooling, driven by both the market and the neoliberal state. The agenda

of marketisation/privatisation and abdication of direct state responsibility for elementary education is not even hidden anymore, but rather working towards increased accommodation of the demands of private capital in/from school education. With the increasing commodification, marketisation, privatisation and commercialisation of society and education, whatever remains of public schooling in this country is endangered and is on the cusp of being turned into a privatised service in a free-market model of elementary education, accompanied by the broader social, cultural, economic and political changes supporting it.

This new policy context is sorely appropriate to the workings of neo-liberal capital underwritten within contemporary reform practices. The country has not had a national policy on education for more than three decades. The trends reflected in executive pronouncements and policymaking projections are based on the underlying assumptions of a 'market-based economy' in 'a regulatory framework that maximises the efficiency of markets' (NITI Aayog, 2017: 123). This calls for an education that '[orients] the system towards outcomes' (NITI Aayog, 2017: 131), 'will amalgamate globalization with localization' (MHRD, 2016a: 1), giving 'new impetus to skill development through vocational education in the context of the emergence of new technologies in a rapidly expanding economy in a globalised environment' and 'encouraging ways of enhancing private investment and funding' (MHRD, 2016a: 2), involving strategies of privatisation, marketisation and centralisation coupled with minimum state power and oversight (Ramamurthy and Pandiyan, 2017). The worrying effects include an outcome-based curriculum which provides opportunities to aspire for 'excellence in learning outcomes' which can be 'comparable to student learning outcomes in high-performing international education systems', designing a common national curriculum for the subjects: Science, Mathematics and English; and introduction of information and communication technology (ICT) as another subject in grade 6 (MHRD 2016b: 21). There is an affirmation of the neoliberal common sense, as the structural inequality prevailing in school education and what it means in terms of a redistributive elementary education policy – a fundamental concern – has been side-stepped. The earlier genre of policies at least paid symbolic lip service to the social aims of education and reconstruction of Indian society on egalitarian premises. There was no shying away from at least expressing disquiet at the class basis of school education and its role in reproducing the societal class divide (NCERT, 1970: 449). The topic of education for equality and, more importantly, a common school system (which is an instrument in the quest for equality) to which full chapters were dedicated in earlier policies cease to receive space in the current policy text, or rather the policy regime, as no formal education policy has been pronounced for three decades now. The urgent crisis in elementary education has been cumulatively building up but has peaked at the current juncture, as policymaking is looking like

an official participant of the global neoliberal project, a new version of the class phenomenon, re-posing faith in a stratified society with concomitant sharp divisions in the school education system. It is insightful to contextualise what we want to make of our society as these policy changes threaten to further divide Indian society in which social differences are not cross-cutting but typically overlap in graded hierarchies.

Educators in the Indian tradition have held the aim of education to be nothing short of the highest aim of life itself, to discover the higher and wider significance to life, to seek an intelligent understanding of the world (Krishnamurti, 1992: 11) and to experience the unity of life. To critical educators, the goal of education is to invite students to think about varied disciplinary domains, their society and learning how to learn so that education becomes the place where the individual and society are co-constructed. This co-construction is based on a social pedagogy, a mutually created dialogue developed by teachers posing problems to students that may be derived from their own personal and social lives and the disciplinary academic domains. Such a critical education ‘challenges teachers and students to empower themselves for social change, to advance democracy and equality as they advance their literacy and knowledge’ (Shor, 1993: 25). In contrast the neoliberal policy framework of a market society with techno-managerial competency-based knowledge systems undermine knowledge in its true meaning by merely functioning to prepare students to take their place in the existing consensuses of the corporate hierarchy and serve as submissive human capital, tolling the bells for a globalising polity that envisages to build ‘obedient productive units in so called knowledge based economy, and society consisting of an uncritical citizenry (Dhankar, 2016). The neoliberal educational policies and reforms have attempted to understand learning, knowledge and curriculum in mere utilitarian terms of measurable standards and targets – so much so that learning outcome performances are centre stage in most of the mainstream education debates, blurring the distinction between classroom learning experiences and LOs and in alignment with the changing aims of education that restrict it merely to uncritical skill building in the national and international context.

The policy shifts, issues and challenges that the study of elementary education during the last three decades in India brings to the fore contour the four section divisions of this book. These consist of theory, policy analysis, empirical research, ethnographic data, field experiences and critical explorations, which are presented in the 14 chapters that have been brought together in this anthology plumbing diverse disciplinary viewpoints while engaging with structures of elementary education across policy contexts, dividing the range of section-division deliberations as follows:

- Policies, programmes and practices have played a devastating role by a **neoliberal restructuring of education**, beginning with the SAP unleashed

by the Washington Consensus, which imposed a reform regime in the developing context of India. This has resulted in policy-led dilutions, detractions and distortions in the nationalist vision of educational progress underlying constitutional ideals. An overview of the history of the neoliberal shifts, an explanation of what neoliberalism means in policy parlance, its assault on democratic polity and commitment to public good (including elementary education) are basic to undertaking an analysis of the restructuring of elementary education, while raising questions related to policy emphasis, strengths and shifts. A direct engagement with various policy texts on specific matters is useful in fleshing out the exact terms of policy discourse, putting it in a societal context and outlining worrying trends and policy outcomes.

- Transactions of **knowledge and curriculum** in the classroom and its assessment are trivialised to literacy, numeracy and mechanical skill development and shorn of criticality. The aim of education is to prepare a docile workforce for a graded labour market, so knowledge, too, depends on whether the market wants or does not want the specific skills to exist. There is *fragmentation* of knowledge into marketable competencies, its *alienation* from its social and material base, exacerbated by the fetish for information and communication technology (ICT) in school education and *increasingly* shaping the character of knowledge by global market trends (Kumar, 2017: 10). The economic rationale underlying ‘input’ considerations within curricular practice and accompanying assumptions of knowledge ‘output’ frequently remain unexamined in policy and practice. The examination system, based on a conception of education as the acquisition of a given body of knowledge, continues the spectacle of reproducing social asymmetries legitimised by school systems that make differential resources available to children from different sections of our hierarchical society who attend different types of schools.
- Critical education engenders possibilities to mitigate the structures of oppression, dominance and inequality inherent in the existing society, with special reference to **schooling, social justice and critical pedagogy**. The emphasis on critical pedagogy makes for a counter-hegemonic examination of the exclusion inherent in neoliberal policies for the masses, with an eye for a wider transformative egalitarian vision that educators can catalyse. The National Curriculum Framework Review (NCFR) 2005 proposes a new vision of pre-service teacher education ‘to create reflective practitioners who would have the promise of bringing about radical changes in the process of schooling for hundreds of millions of our children’ (NCFR, 2005: 101). Such reflective practitioners cannot remain apolitical by framing pre-defined questions from existing textbooks dissuading schools to teach young children from raising their own questions (Sleeter et al., 2004). Critical pedagogy thus positions

elementary school teachers as transformative educators in an explicit emancipatory role (Hill and Boxley, 2007: 54), offering possibilities that can potentially lead to fissures in the neoliberal common sense.

- There is agreement that private capital, with its overriding aim of maximising profit under neoliberal capitalism, accumulates globally. Its consequences for elementary education, though global, vary for various countries, depending upon uneven levels of resistance based on each country's own balances of class forces (Hill and Kumar, 2009) and class interests. Marxist educational analysis and world-systems analysis (Wallerstein, 1994) provide as one of its many theoretical arguments a lens to look at **transnational trends on neoliberalism and education**, recognising both the power of resistance and the need for more fundamental economic, political and social change. The ubiquitous prevalence of human capital theory as the basis for educational planning and policy-making further supports the neoliberal logic, with its recognition of education as an instrument of future economic return. Research has revealed the robust evidence of fissures in the neoliberal common sense with the finding that neoliberal restructuring has not necessarily improved even 'educational standards', its avowed goal (Goodson and Lindblad, 2011).

## **Neoliberal restructuring of education**

In Chapter 1 Jyoti Raina and Parul present an overview of the educational policy changes that have taken place in the last three decades since neoliberalisation of school education. The chapter examines the dominant wave of policy reform, quality, an idea which has been reduced to completing targets in the name of achieving LOs, and proxy indicators that 'show off' learning have become centre stage. It concludes by highlighting the emergence of a new political-ideological policy context framed around the concepts of quality and accountability in contemporary times that seeks to legitimise the neoliberal common sense in spite of the devastating role it has played in restructuring educational policy and practice in India.

The Bombay Plan (1945) advocated a capitalist model of development, using the resources of the public sector for its own advancement, a phenomenon that Suman Lata examines in Chapter 2 while looking at the extension of the neoliberal agenda by governments across the world in involving private players in big public projects in the name of utilising the managerial expertise and capital from the private market for efficient delivery of public services, supposedly, in the larger interest of people. The term public-private partnership (PPP) is a euphemism for this scourge and is one of the depredations associated with liberalisation of the economy in the arena of social infrastructure. Her multi-pronged analysis of the origin, rise and models of the concept in the Indian context concludes with the argument for not only its undesirability but also possible fallout in school education.

Atishi, who is a leader from a political party that is currently in office in the capital's state government, speaks in a voice that is unusual for a politician. In Chapter 3 she does not hesitate to make several against-the-grain admissions which merit special attention for two reasons. The first is their unambiguous candour and the second is the fact that they are made by a politician at the helm of affairs in a state. She states that the 'deep politician-private school nexus means that [the] executive has little or no incentive to fix public education', the 'political establishment that profits from [the] increasing enrolment of children in private schools has a vested interest to keep government schools dysfunctional' and 'public education is closely linked to the class divide prevailing in the country'. She looks at the steady decline in the quality of public education as a 'national crisis' of the government's own making (without hesitating to term it nothing short of a *national crisis*), which further coincides with the widening inequality India has witnessed over the last three decades. She makes a call that research on land allocations to private schools during different political regimes would provide an interesting insight into why there is a breakdown of the public education system. Who would undertake such a research? The doctoral students fishing for scarce employment opportunities in the private sectors of education (the state is hardly recruiting anymore) or civil society/research organisations that depend on state largesse in the name of funding.

She speaks of possibilities to a better public schooling system, simply through honest governance and political will. The Aam Aadmi Party (AAP) made school education an election issue, and since coming to power in February 2015 accorded highest priority to it. The immediate huge hike in allocation to education (in 2015–16, the government allocated Rs 9,836 crore to education) was a whopping 106% over the previous government's allocation. Over the next two years, the allocation to education has been maintained at around a quarter of the total budget of the Delhi government. Atishi presents a poignant account of some of these efforts to 'fix' public education through a four-pronged approach involving modernising infrastructure, building capacity for schoolteachers and principals, making the school administration accountable and improving LOs. The hurried policies and programmes of the AAP government, particularly ability grouping, opposition to continuous and comprehensive evaluation (CCE), equating quality with better LOs and looking up at private schools in the name of standards, have attracted censure from progressive educators, but her chapter reflects an uncompromising political commitment to saving public education, particularly at the school level. Ironically, the policies have provided a fillip to non-state actors in the name of outsourcing several school services, deflecting the increased budgetary allocation to private players, while recruitment of teachers to vacant posts has not been undertaken for eight years now. Yet the intent in school improvement processes by taking up the underlying challenges and opportunities is undeniable.

The central argument of Chapter 4 by Jyoti Raina is that both the stance of the state and the neoliberal assault on education are in conflict with the constitution's vision of elementary education. The cumulative policy shifts in the direction of non-state stake holding are explicated through a direct engagement with policy text(s) revealing how a lack of thrust on elementary education as a public good, increasing privatisation of school education and indifference to increasing hierarchies of schooling in policy parlance is serving to exacerbate the class divisions underlying Indian education. The chapter undertakes a policy analysis examining the worrying outcomes of contemporary trends in India's national trajectory and what we intend to make of our society with them as school education emerges as an overlapping social difference providing another category of social division.

## **Understanding knowledge and curriculum**

In some of the recent policy deliberations, there was talk of the need to educate the youth as per the industry demand while lamenting the gap between industry requirements and the goals of education. It was argued that institutions should be prepared according to a list of industry requirements (ASSOCHAM, 2017) evidently reflecting the policy impact of the market on the content of education. These changing aims of education ignore the entrenched inequalities, oppressive power structure and neoliberal depredation of our society. The function of education should be to develop critical citizens who sustain a society through their economic and cultural contribution and have a responsibility to offer constructive criticism to counter its ills. Rohit Dhankar, Chapter 5, argues that historically education policy documents in India emphasise both these functions. However, the current policy shifts seem to be heavily tilting towards the 'citizen as a resource', reducing the idea of a 'democratic citizen' to a 'subject of the state'. One strategy to achieve this tilt that is being used in the recent state initiatives is a surreptitious 're-definition of knowledge'. The chapter focuses on this tilt in the conception of knowledge in a supposedly knowledge-based economy and society (KBES) and its implications for social justice in a democracy.

If the purpose of knowledge in forming a formal curriculum and its assessment is understood as grading and ranking of learners in a culture of competition, enterprise, employability and managerialism, a Marxist analysis would see this process as natural to a class society (Rustin, 2016: 148). The understanding of assessment, which is a key aspect of the examination-centred Indian school education system, follows from the behavioural paradigm, which is in alignment with the neoliberal approach. Assessment is aimed at evaluation of LOs on scholastic parameters and criteria by using paper-and-pencil methods rather than building a learning culture where assessment is a continuous process of and for learning (Shepard, 2000).

Such an approach to learning and assessment have been declining in educational theory for several decades, and its underlying assumptions about the nature of the learner and the learning process are unacceptable to most progressive educators. The examination system with a sole focus on LO performances assumes a narrow, behavioural view of learning as an external observable product, ignoring the holistic processes of learning and knowledge construction during classroom and out-of-classroom experiences. In Chapter 6, Disha Nawani contests the narrow product-oriented viewpoint which implies that learning can be ensured by holding learners back and testing them in standardised, time-tested, reliable ways via a centralised examination system where students had to per force learn (read and memorise), pass the exam and get promoted to a higher grade. Part of the chapter carries an interview with eminent educationist Krishna Kumar explaining how the examination system tries to provide a legitimate veneer of fairness to the participation of children from different social backgrounds in a supposedly objective certification process under common conditions, irrespective of the social or educational background they come from. The interview speaks of this supposed fairness as something that can be read as silence to the deep inequalities that prevail in the broader structure of our school education system. The performance in the examination ignores the supply-side asymmetries within schooling systems, including academic resources, physical plant and infrastructural resources, among others. The chapter highlights that socially, the examination system, just like the other social systems, is working for a society which is divided hierarchically, legitimising the prevailing social hierarchies of our society, a process that is exacerbated by education under neoliberalisation. The struggle for improvement in the examination system needs to be situated in the wider background of other unjust aspects of our educational systems in our society, where social differences of economic class, caste and gender do not cross-cut, but overlap, leading to sharp social divisions that are reflected in school education.

In Chapter 7 Nita Kumar argues that we must understand longer political trends since independence and the relationship of the school to the family to be able to deal with neoliberal shift towards privatisation in schooling. She presents ethnographic data from a large research study conducted in one of the schools in a representative small town, Varanasi, in Uttar Pradesh, to describe that the present failure of egalitarianism and democracy in education at several levels in living up to the constitutional policy of equality is due to our very understanding and practices of modernity. If we understand the longer trends, if we break up schools and technical practices, if we focus on the relationship between the school and community and, most of all, if we look, apart from numerical data, at thick ethnographic data, we will come closer to understanding the shift towards privatisation as a problem and find a solution.



## Schooling, social justice and critical pedagogy

In Chapter 8 Sanjay Kumar interrogates and interrupts caste-based exclusionary processes in select rural Bihar schools, situating the questions of social justice and structural discrimination with an eye for anthropological detail, in a critical framework emphasising first-hand inclusive teaching and learning methodology. He presents some revelatory truths about the deep-rooted caste-based prejudices in schools by a rigorous engagement with some of the structures of belief that condition classroom practice, especially teaching activity, and end up making elementary education double up for a renewed performance of caste-, class- and community-based discrimination. The chapter is based on an action research study focused on the key question of how teachers can be made aware of the problems around the notion of heredity-based educability, reflected through *Sanskara*, and the ways in which teachers can be enabled to reflect on their own beliefs and assumptions about the key concepts of education, learning and the notion of caste. The methodology consisted of small-group workshops, classroom demonstrations and training modules engaging some 1,000 primary and upper primary school teachers from the Wazirganj block of the Gaya district of Bihar. The findings of the action research study inform policies and practices in making classrooms inclusive for all children in particular, and the professional development of the teachers in general, in order to attain the larger goal of social justice and equality in a teacher education programme. Prior to deployment of the intervention programme of inclusive teaching and learning methodology, the teachers lacked an understanding of the doctrine of inherent educability of children, which is central to the history of ideas in educational theory. It is further disturbing to note that the key findings of the study based on the micro-context correspond to the macro-level understanding and perception prevalent in the public knowledge domain. A similar study in a village in Bihar more than a decade ago also concluded that ‘unequal structural realities of village life play a very important role in producing and reproducing educational inequality in the village’ (Kumar, 2006a: 319). This seriously implicates teacher education for absence of a critical pedagogy that interrogates the deficit assumptions of educability among socially disadvantaged children. The social realism underlying the chapter is a grim reminder of the dehumanisation that is implicit in caste hierarchy, social exclusion and the consequent discriminatory practices. The flush of educational reforms in the uncritical framework of the techno-managerial model does not provoke teachers to interrogate such structures and practices of the deep social inequalities, but rather to potentially reinforce, promote and validate the deficit assumptions about educability that often stem from discriminatory attitudes which underlie the class, caste and gender hierarchies in wider society.

In a Marxist educational analysis, the possibilities for social justice exist only by doing away with an unjust, exploitative and oppressive capitalist social order. This has greater relevance at the current historical juncture in which the sharper avatar of capitalism-neoliberalism dominates the social, economic and political life, coupled with the dismantling of the social justice agenda in official policy trends. Dave Hill (in this volume) argues that because neoliberalism is simply the current stage of capitalism, its critique is essentially a critique of capitalism itself. Slavoj Zizek (2018) reiterates the same when he writes that

not only is Marx's critique of political economy and capitalist dynamics still fully relevant, but rather it is only today, with global capitalism, that it is fully relevant.

Ravi Kumar's critical essay in Chapter 9 resonates these words with a hammer while presenting an incisive critique of the shifting aims of education. The aims have moved beyond the idea of knowledge that even capitalist welfare regimes conceived to mere skilling; which in turn is about training an individual to be unconcerned about the oppression prevailing around her or him. This is a tacit consensualisation for the existing order of things in times of what he calls a 'fascisation of society' – so much so that he even considers the question, are we living in a fascist state, worthy of asking. Critical pedagogy can be an instrument to counter these processes of consensualisation, which is something that mobilisation aimed to counter. Ravi argues that critical pedagogy, while locating itself within the labour-capital dialectic, must also move towards exploring the possibilities of how its teachings can lead to a situation of counter-mobilisation. In the education battlefield, therefore, possibilities of being neutral, quiet and non-partisan do not exist (Ravi Kumar, 2016: 2). The chapter states that unequivocally *we need to decide which side we are on*, which can be very simply read as either standing for the status quo or challenging it. In a penetrative analysis, the chapter shows that educational discourses are inherently political, in which the mainstream schooling systems are dedicated towards a consensus-building exercise based upon the status quo, consisting of existing social formations. The possibilities to challenge the status quo are compromised if, for example, one is dependent on the state for survival (economic wages for work) or in precarious contractual work buffered by a wide pool of unemployment, as is increasingly the case in both the arenas of school education and higher education. The adjustment with neoliberal policies starts with this fear, which in turn helps the capitalist status quo to thrive (Marcuse, 1969). Also in India supposedly under cover by Central Civil Services (Conduct) CCS Rules, academics, although not owing direct allegiance to any political party, understandably seek personal and academic protection against discrimination that being a critic of government policy might bring. Where

then is the direct possibility for entering a pedagogical war to counter, subvert and resist the processes of consensualisation by a practice of freedom from the logic of the present system? Nine teachers of the Central University of Gujarat (CUG) were issued show cause notice under Rule 5 of CCS Rule number 5, which prohibits government employees from associating with any political party or campaigning for elections. The clarification offered by the teachers in this matter was finally accepted by the university administration, and the matter has been since closed (IE, 2018). The CCS Rules have been in force since 1964 with unwritten ambiguity about whether teachers are covered under these rules or not. Rule 5 states

No Government servant shall be a member of, or be otherwise associated with, any political party or any organisation which takes part in politics nor shall he take part in, subscribe in aid of, or assist in any other manner, any political movement or activity.

Rule 9, in fact, prohibits criticism of the government. Critical educational policy analysis is political in nature, as the making of public policy is a political activity and can be looked at as a violation of CCS rules. Coupled with this, even if teachers as transformative intellectuals and critical citizens were to realize that education is the battlefield on which possibilities of being neutral are non-existent, educational issues have been rendered invisible in the party manifestos by competitive electioneering over other popular political issues in the public imagination. Even if academics review party manifestos, policies and programmes, in various fora like academic books and journals, raising concerns about the core issues related to schooling, social justice and equality, their voice, inputs and scholarship more often than not fall on deaf ears in political policymaking arena. This is evident as the plethora of writings and research on how neoliberal restructuring has devastated educational systems and practices, with the loss of equity, democracy and critical thought, and has not received any political recognition in state policymaking, which continues to shift in the opposite direction. This is notwithstanding the social imaginary underlying the aim of public policy for inclusive development through equitable elementary education.

Exclusions based on caste and status have existed in Indian society, and Madhu Prasad, in Chapter 10, provides a synoptic account of pre-colonial exclusions, colonial subjugation, radical goals of our freedom movement and their subversion in the politics of an independent citizenry. In a democratic society, all sections of the population, including children, have legitimate rights to equality and claims on the state not merely to 'protect' those rights but also to ensure that they are realised in ways that comply with the principles of equality and social justice. She argues that India's attempt to leap-frog over this democratising phase of capitalist development, with its concomitant increased employment and mass provisioning of essential

social services such as education, health, public utilities, etc., and adopt the contemporary phase of neoliberal ‘jobless growth’ and privatisation/corporatisation of all essential services with user-pays principles of efficiency, has resulted in a massive ‘exclusion’ of those who simply cannot afford to pay. This contemporary sense of ‘exclusion’ in the Indian context de-legitimises existing sites of debate against oppression, threatens the autonomy and self-governing capacity of the people and ultimately endangers the democratic unity of society itself.

### **Transnational trends on neoliberalism and education**

The final section opens up the debate for a comparative understanding through an analysis of some of the recent policy trends in some parts of the world as an index for measuring neoliberal ‘common sense’ and its relative degree of failure. This section is also aimed at deepening the response to emerging challenges in India through a wider international and comparative lens.

Locating contemporary developments more theoretically within the Marxist fold continues to highlight the enduring relevance of Marxist educational analysis to the current neoliberal era. Class analysis as an intellectual tool with abiding significance central to a social understanding of education can also contrastingly explain reflective departures that emphasise two-way relations between ideas and material realities or conditions. The recognition of the latter relationship is increasingly contrasted with a view of Marx’s theory as one which defines ideas being determined by economic conditions (Sen, 2018). Marxian analysis remains pervasive in education discipline because it continues to inspire extraordinary contributions from other radical left, non-Marxist educators ranging from Anton Gramsci, to Henry Giroux, to Michael Apple and enable anyone with egalitarian beliefs, including the non-Marxist reader, to draw insights from Marxist theory. It also inspires the reader to move beyond ‘deconstruction’ to ‘reconstruction’ by offering a doctrine for action, while recognising both the power of resistance and the need for more fundamental economic, political and social change in the hope of building a new world. It is against this background that Dave Hill, in Chapter 11, critically examines neoliberal and neoconservative policy globally and how it differs in different national contexts. The chapter concludes by suggesting a socialist policy for education, delineating facets of its ownership and control, funding, organisation of students, the curriculum, the hidden curriculum, secular education and relationship with communities. This suggestion of a socialist policy for education is important because a central theme in educational studies, particularly programmes of teacher education, is student-teachers building their own personal theory of education. This theoretical chapter provides valuable conceptual tools,

techniques and perspectives on educational policy analysis for education workers across political affiliations.

Engagement with ideologies across political dispensations in the public sphere is part of a democratic citizenship. The conservatives in India have been running schools through non-profit religious and cultural trusts, but have recently become increasingly articulate about their economic world-view as well, which includes a general opposition to privatisation. The chief of Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh (RSS) was invited to speak on the Indian economy at the Bombay Stock Exchange, Mumbai, on 16 April 2018, where he highlighted that enslavement to a theory or an ideology like socialism or capitalism was unwise, as each country must pick policies suited to its own unique circumstances. He spoke of 'leading' the world economy through India's own model of development; reflecting how neoconservatism is sometimes in conflict with neoliberalism, which Dave Hill points out in his chapter.

Tom Griffiths's theoretical analysis in Chapter 12 further argues that neo-liberal policy for education gains legitimacy from, and in turn reinforces, aspects of human capital theory, through its construction of education not as a public and social service, nor as a universal human right, but as a private, individual responsibility to be purchased by individuals for their personal social and economic benefit. The chapter concludes by noting how advocacy for increased public expenditures on education often cites economic returns, which risks supporting the neoliberal logic and policy that we seek to replace. Instead, it calls for critical educators and activists to emphasise and build support for alternative primary purposes of mass education that more firmly support high-quality, public, universal systems with the potential to contribute to wider anti-systemic movements.

Even though neoliberal restructuring, resembling a world movement emanating from the global financial institutions (Meyer, 2000), started in most of the countries of the world in the 1990s, it has varied historical foundations. The historic trajectory of each nation-state has therefore 'refracted', translated and diffused the neoliberal reform agenda in different ways. The post-liberalisation neoliberal regimes have thus increasingly sought the technocratic weight of evidence in favour of restructuring. Ivor Goodson, in Chapter 13, based on seminal research, presents evidence that is otherwise. The chapter aims to understand patterns of historical and cultural 'refraction' by reporting some of the findings from four-year qualitative national case studies of educational reforms in seven European countries. The empirical findings from this seminal qualitative research can be read as an index for the measurement of this neoliberal common sense, as well its assault and paradoxically also a relative failure at 'implementation' policies. The global neoliberal frameworks get re-worked, re-enacted and re-formulated by international and national actors alike, and particularly professionals like teachers, often ending up getting fissured in unintended directions, like the refracted rays of light through an optical medium.

The comparative understanding of transnational trends of neoliberalism and its consequences for education is useful in re-visiting the current elementary education policy context in India through the lens of competing frameworks for combating educational inequality in the concluding chapter. The judgment dated 18 August 2015 by Justice Sudhir Agarwal of the Allahabad High Court (AHC) directing the Uttar Pradesh (UP) government to ensure that government servants and all such persons who receive any perk, benefit, salary, etc., from state exchequer or public fund to send their children to primary schools run by the UP Board of Basic Education can be read as an attempt by the Indian judiciary to mitigate sharp educational inequality. In Chapter 14 Vikas Gupta examines this audaciously radical legal development. He develops his line of argument using the context provided by the AHC judgment and further validated through a very brief survey of the chequered transnational historical trajectories of the Western world to combat educational inequalities through state intervention. The chapter draws attention to the radicalness of the judgment, which was ahead of its time in comparison to the RTE 2009, which is often facetiously hailed in Indian educational debates as a progressive piece of legislation. This is against the backdrop that ‘neoliberalism poses a more serious threat not only to the diversity of knowledges and languages, but to the entire society by augmenting existing inequalities’ (Gupta, in this volume) by ignoring the wider structural concerns.

The pending issues and contemporary challenge that the judgment poses resonate in many of the chapters in this volume that highlight the indifference and now increasing complicity of the state in the policy-led deterioration of state schooling systems. The vision of an egalitarian, democratic and inclusive society, of development of the country through an equitable system of elementary education, cannot be realised without an uncompromising thrust on public education, an ideal that neoliberalisation in education works against. If hope is the thing that features our burdens, then the fact that the judgment has to date continued to remain only a non-mandatory declaration on paper, without implementation, begs the question: Is there hope for a greater thrust on public education in India at the current juncture of neoliberal depredation? But what is left of life without hope? ‘So the sailor sails on, though he knows he will never touch the stars that guide him’ (Galeano, 2011). It is hoped that the chapters gathered in this volume will contribute to the timely debates on elementary education policy and practice at the present juncture of an unprecedented crisis. The volume aspires not just to analyse the policy shifts in recent years but also to offer possibilities and egalitarian alternatives to the educational crisis generated by the neoliberalisation of education. More importantly, it hopes to re-kindle a constitutional renaissance by re-vitalising the diffused struggle for a common school system among teachers, academicians, researchers, activists, policymakers, students and other education workers, which alone holds the

promise to create an equitable elementary education policy and practice that can serve as the foundation of an inclusive society.

## Notes

- 1 [www.pppindia.gov.in](http://www.pppindia.gov.in)
- 2 [www.narendramodi.in/people-public-private-partnership-3163](http://www.narendramodi.in/people-public-private-partnership-3163)
- 3 Article 21 of the constitution is a fundamental right pertaining to right to life and liberty. In various judgments the Supreme Court expanded the right to life to mean the right to live beyond mere physical existence and to be able to live with dignity. Eventually, the right to education was declared a fundamental right by associating it with the right to life. Now the right to free and compulsory education from six to fourteen years of age has been added as Article 21-A. See *Mohini Jain v. State of Karnatka* (1992) 3 SCC 666 and *Unnikrishnan J.P. v. State of Andhra Pradesh* (1993) 1 SCC 594, 603, 605, 645.
- 4 During drafting of the constitution, a sub-committee on justiciable fundamental rights recommended inclusion of the right to free and compulsory education in the list, but the advisory committee later put the right in the directive principles of state policy, which are guiding principles for the state to follow. ([righttoeducation.in/how-was-original-article-45-constitution-arrived](http://righttoeducation.in/how-was-original-article-45-constitution-arrived)).
- 5 The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009, Chapter iv, section 12(2).
- 6 As per the Companies Act of 2013, every private or public limited company with a net worth of Rs. 500 crore or a turnover of Rs. 1000 crore or a net profit of Rs. 5 crore has to mandatorily spend at least 2% of its net profit on CSR activities. The activities have been specified in the act. An analysis of 300 big companies for the financial year 2016–17 shows that the maximum spending (32%) has been on education. See [www.mca.gov.in/SearchableActs/Section135.htm](http://www.mca.gov.in/SearchableActs/Section135.htm) and India CSR Outlook Report 2017 at [ngobox.org](http://ngobox.org).
- 7 [www.azimpremjifoundation.org](http://www.azimpremjifoundation.org)
- 8 [www.Akshaypatra.org](http://www.Akshaypatra.org)
- 9 <https://teach4india.wordpress.com>
- 10 The state of Rajasthan is a front-runner when it comes to PPP in schools. But of late, the government's move to hand over even those government schools that are doing well to private operators has led to lot of resentment among teachers and parents. See the news reports 'In Rajasthan, villagers protest as government plans private management for schools it did not build' at <https://scroll.in/article/863718> and 'Protests forced govt to shelve PPP model in state' at [www.dnaindia.com/jaipur/report](http://www.dnaindia.com/jaipur/report)
- 1 One wonders what those 'universal values' are and whether 'peace', 'tolerance', 'secularism', etc., are seen as non-universal. But we will ignore this point.
- 2 One can (should) equally respect all human beings, who may be believers in different religions. But respecting 'equally' all religions in terms of their ideology and theology is tantamount to abandoning one's critical outlook. Actually, the ideologies and theologies of religions can be more or less justified and, therefore, more or less respectable. But that is not the issue in this chapter.
- 3 I am not commenting on this term here, which gives a feeling of saddling a beast of burden.
- 1 I interviewed Krishna Kumar in 1995–96, when I was a young research scholar at Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. The interview covered a range of questions based on his scholarship in both Hindi and English. Some of the questions

pertaining to his understanding of the significance and resilience of the public examination system in India are being presented here because they help us situate our prevailing resistance to the assessment-related provisions in RTE 2009.

- 1 In the context of karma theory, *sanskara* are dispositions, character or behavioral traits, that exist as default from birth or prepared and perfected by a person over one's lifetime, that exist as imprints on the subconscious according to various schools of Hindu philosophies such as the Yoga school. These perfected or default imprints of karma within a person, influences that person's nature, response and states of mind. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sanskara\\_\(rite\\_of\\_passage\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sanskara_(rite_of_passage)). In common parlance, *sanskara* is popularly referred as attributes of hereditary, hierarchy and status in the context of caste which determines that lower castes have absence of the *sanskara* and higher castes are endowed with the *sanskara*.
- 2 The origin of Musahars, which are known by different names in Bihar and its adjoining states, has still remained debatable. In colonial ethnographic works they have been related to different tribes both within and outside the region. While Nesfield (1888) linked their origin to the Kol and Cheru tribes of Chotanagpur based on legendary myths of 'Deosi,' Risley's (1891) hypothesis based on the etymological explanation of the word Musahar (rat-eater or 'rat-catcher') traces their origin to the equally Dravidian Bhuiyas of southern Chotanagpur. Indian ethnologist S.C. Roy (1935a, 1935b) links their origin to the independent section of the old 'Desh Bhuiyas' or 'Pauri Bhuiyas' in the tributary state of Orissa. For a detailed discussion on this see Prakash (1990).
- 3 For details about the basic principles of the dialogue, refer to <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dialogue>
- 1 I am thankful to Dave Hill and Jyoti Raina for their comments. It has helped me to reflect on certain aspects, which were completely left out. This chapter is an expanded version of an article titled 'Consensualised Reproduction and the Fascination of Society: Critical Pedagogy in Times of Despair' that appeared in the *Journal of Critical Education Policy Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 3.
- 2 The labour laws can be changed at both levels. In the federal structure, different federal governments have the right to change the labour laws within their own territories and for the industrial units that come under their purview, whereas the central/national government has to change the laws for the units that come under its purview.
- 3 For related information see: <http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/tech/ites/it-to-layoff-up-to-2-lakh-engineers-annually-for-next-3-years-head-hunters-india/articleshow/58670563.cms>; <https://thewire.in/157093/1-5-million-jobs-lost-2017-demo-netisation/>; [www.livemint.com/Industry/4CXsLIIZXf8uVQLs6uFQvK/Top-7-IT-firms-including-Infosys-Wipro-to-lay-off-at-least.html](http://www.livemint.com/Industry/4CXsLIIZXf8uVQLs6uFQvK/Top-7-IT-firms-including-Infosys-Wipro-to-lay-off-at-least.html)
- 4 [www.bloombergquint.com/business/2017/06/27/india-may-see-more-job-losses-over-next-decade-low-skill-jobs-skill-development](http://www.bloombergquint.com/business/2017/06/27/india-may-see-more-job-losses-over-next-decade-low-skill-jobs-skill-development)
- 5 Aadhar is a national identification number allotted to each individual to which there are massive oppositions, but the government is forcing it upon people. Some of these views can be found at <https://scroll.in/article/832595/privacy-security-and-egality-are-not-the-only-serious-problems-with-aadhaar-here-are-four-more>; <https://thewire.in/119323/real-problem-aadhaar-lies-biometrics/>; <https://thewire.in/136102/coercion-aadhaar-project-ushar/>
- 1 Altaf Hussain Hali (1837–1914). Hali wrote one of the earliest works of literary criticism in Urdu, *Muqaddamah-i Shay'r-o-Sha'iri*. Its critical preface, 'the Muqaddima-i-Sher-o-Shairi', led the way to literary criticism in Urdu literature.
- 2 A uniform definition of literacy for British India was adopted beginning with the 1911 census – an individual was recorded as literate if he or she could read



and write a short letter to a friend. Although officials point to certain problems with the post-1911 enumeration, such as enumerators on occasion adopting school standards, they do indicate that 'the simple criterion laid down was easily understood and sensibly interpreted' (Census of India 1921, Volume I – Report, Chapter VIII).

- 3 Notes on Indian Affairs: (1837: Vol. 2. No. XXXVII: 28).
- 4 Greatly influenced by social reformer Jyotiba Phule, Shahuji Maharaj was associated with many progressive and path-breaking activities during his rule (1894–1922). Primary education to all, regardless of caste and creed, was one of his most significant priorities.
- 5 Gokhale pointed out while introducing a bill on compulsory primary education on March 16, 1911, which was defeated in the Imperial Legislative Council, that 'His Highness began his first experiment in the matter of introducing compulsory and free education into his State eighteen years ago in ten villages at the Amreli Taluka. After watching the experiment for eight years, it was extended to the whole taluka in 1901, and finally, in 1906, primary education was made compulsory and free throughout the State for boys between the ages of 6 and 12, and for girls between the ages of 6 and 10' Natesan, G. A. (1916). *Speeches of Gopal Krishna Gokhale* (2nd ed.). Madras, India: (p. 725–26).
- 6 A great reformer in the tradition of her mother and grandmother, Sultan Jahan founded several important educational institutions in Bhopal, establishing free and compulsory primary education in 1918. During her reign, she had a particular focus on public instruction, especially female education. She built many technical institutes and schools and increased the number of qualified teachers.
- 7 In contrast, the School Choice National Conference (SCNC), hosted annually in New Delhi since 2009 by the Centre for Civil Society (CCS), wants government to fund 'children' not 'schools' through Direct Benefit Transfers (DBT), including voucher schemes, and transfer state funds to aided and unaided private elite and low-budget school managements alike to 'develop an education market where students can avail education of their choice'. CCS's latest initiative, National Independent Schools Alliance (NISA), advocates expansion of parental school choice and systematic competition between private and government schools, at state expense, to improve quality and outcomes for all schools. The NISA support base comprises largely budget-based private schools that face closure for failing to meet RTE (2009) input norms for recognition.
- 8 Whereas the 1993 judgment directed that the entire Article 45 of the Directive Principles be converted into 'an enforceable right' applicable to all children 'up to 14 years of age', the 86th Amendment introduced Article 21A in the Fundamental Rights section, providing for compulsory and free education for all children, except for those attending private unaided or minority schools, from age six to fourteen years only. The original Article 45 was retained as a directive principle but was amended with the state promising 'to endeavor to provide early childhood care and education for all children until they reach the age of 6 years'.
- 9 The influence of international agencies like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) was felt as the GOI negotiated the largest-ever IMF loan given to a developing country in 1980–81. Although the GOI withdrew from the loan and from implementing the IMF reform programme in 1984, the reforms process had in fact begun.
- 10 Outcome-based education (OBE) is an educational theory that bases each part of an educational system around specified outcomes and pedagogical methods and tools focusing on what knowledge and skills are required to reach the outcome.

Planners of the course work backwards from the outcome. Students understand what is expected of them, and the faculty functions as an instructor, trainer, facilitator, and/or mentor. Potential employers can look at records of potential employees to determine if the outcomes they have achieved are necessary for the job. A holistic approach to learning is lost. Learning can find itself reduced to something that is specific, measurable and observable. As a result, OBE is not widely recognized as a valid way of conceptualizing what learning is about.

- 11 A 2015 report of the International Labour Organization (ILO) puts the number of child workers in India aged between five and seventeen at 5.7 million, out of 168 million globally. More than half of India's child workers labour in agriculture and over a quarter in manufacturing – embroidering clothes, weaving carpets or making matchsticks. Children also work in restaurants and hotels and as domestic workers. With child labour rates highest among tribal and lower-caste communities, at almost 7% and 4%, respectively, the amendments to the 1986 law will disadvantage and have an adverse impact on these especially marginalised and impoverished communities.
- 12 Government expenditure on education as a percentage of GDP was 3.8% for India in 2012. The figure is 6.3% for Vietnam, 4.3% for Mali, 4.7% for Nepal and 5% for Rwanda, all of them poor countries. Direct tax concessions to rich individuals and companies was pegged at Rs. 128,639 crore in 2015–16. Yet school education got only Rs. 42,187 crore.
- 13 Top of the World: USA. Access to literacy not a constitutional right in America. *The Indian Express*. July 7, 2018.
- 14 An overwhelming 78%, i.e. 836 million people in India, were found to be living on a per capita consumption of less than Rs 20 a day, according to the Arjun Sengupta report on the Conditions of Work and Promotion of Livelihood in the Unorganised Sector, based on government data for the period between 1993–94 and 2004–05. The per capita consumption of the extreme poor was at Rs 12 per day. The justification for economic reforms was supposed to be the trickle-down effect but ten years of economic reforms seems to have made little difference.
- 15 Government discusses military training plan for disciplined 10 lakh 'force of youth'. *The Indian Express*. July 17, 2018.
- 1 Care is needed to acknowledge significant points of difference, such as the systemic application of the 'work-study' principle, illustrated most emphatically in the *Escuelas en el campo* (Schools in the Countryside), which were full boarding schools for students located in areas of agricultural production and with part of the school day dedicated to students' productive work, which in turn was envisaged to help finance the expansion of these secondary schools across the country. This phenomenon has also received quite a bit of attention from academic researchers, including work tracking and comparing its application in countries like Tanzania and Zimbabwe.
- 1 I thankfully acknowledge generous grants received for the research utilized in this paper from Indian Council of Historical Research, TRG on Education and Poverty in India (Max Weber Foundation, Germany), University of Delhi and Charles Wallace Trust for India.
- 2 The term 'officialization of knowledge' has been derived from Michael W. Apple (2000).

## References

- ASER. (various years). *Annual status of education report*. New Delhi: ASER Centre, Pratham.
- Associated Chambers of Commerce and Industry of India (ASSOCHAM). (2017). *Keynote address at education summit by Shri Manish Sisodia, Minister of Education*, Government of National Capital Region of Delhi (Accessed on 25 October 2017).
- Ayyar, R. and Vaidyanatha, V. (2017). Inclusive elementary education in India: The journey. In: M. Tiwary, K. Sanjay Kumar and A. K. Misra, eds., *Dynamics of inclusive classroom: Social diversity, inequality and school education in India*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.
- Bloch, G. (2009). *The toxic mix: What's wrong with South Africa's schools and how to fix it*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Dhankar, R. (2016). Dumbing Down a Pliable Workforce. *The Hindu*. Available at: [www.thehindu.com/opinion/lead/Dumbing-down-a-pliable-workforce/article14562308.ece](http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/lead/Dumbing-down-a-pliable-workforce/article14562308.ece) (Accessed on 10 August 2016).
- Galeano, E. (2011). *Mirrors: Stories of almost everyone*. London: Portobello Books.
- Goodson, I. F. and Lindblad, S. (2011). Conclusions: Developing a conceptual framework for understanding professional knowledge. In: I. F. Goodson and S. Lindblad, eds., *Professional knowledge and educational restructuring in Europe*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Government of India. (2009). *The right of children to free and compulsory education act*. New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice, Legislative Department.
- Gupta, V. (2016). Politics of the guarded agenda of national education policy 2015–16. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 51(42), 15 October 2016, pp. 59–69.
- Hill, D. and Boxley, S. (2007). Critical teacher education for economic, environmental and social justice: An ecosocialist manifesto. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 5(2).
- Hill, D. and Ravi, K. (2009). *Global neoliberalism and education and its consequences*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Kumar, K. (2009). Bring Everyone On Board: India's School System Must Be More Egalitarian. *The Times of India*. New Delhi (Accessed on 19 June 2009).
- Kumar, R. (2006a). Educational deprivation of the marginalised: A village study of the Mushar community in Bihar. In: R. Kumar, ed., *The crisis of elementary education in India*. New Delhi: Sage.
- . (2016). Introduction. In: R. Kumar, ed., *Neoliberal, critical pedagogy and education*. New Delhi: Routledge.
- . (2017). Introduction. In: D. Hill, ed., *Class, race and education under neo-liberal capitalism*. New Delhi: Aakar.
- Krishnamurti, J. (1992). *Education and the significance of life*. Chennai: Krishnamurti Foundation India.
- Marcuse, H. (1969). *An essay on liberation*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Mehendale, A. R., Mukhopadhyaya, R. and Namala, A. (2015). Right to education and inclusion in private unaided schools: An exploratory study in Bengaluru and Delhi. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 50(7), pp. 43–51.

- Meyer, J. (2000). The world institutionalisation of education. In: J. Schriewer, ed., *Discourse formation in comparative education*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, pp. 112–132.
- MHRD. (1986). *National policy of education 1986*. New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
- . (2016a). *National policy on education, 2016: Report of the committee for evolution of the new education policy*, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, New Delhi.
- . (2016b). *Some Inputs for Draft National Policy on Education (Draft NPE)*, ministry of human resource development, Government of India, New Delhi, [http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload\\_files/mhrd/files/Inputs\\_Draft\\_NEP\\_2016.pdf](http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/Inputs_Draft_NEP_2016.pdf) (Accessed on 12 June 2017).
- Monbiot, G. (2007). How the Neoliberal Stitched up the Wealth of Nations for Themselves. *The Guardian*, 28 August 2007. Available at: [www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2007/aug/.comment.buisnesscomment](http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2007/aug/.comment.buisnesscomment) (Accessed on 20 March 2017).
- NCERT. (1970). *Education and national development: Report of the education commission 1964–1966* (Kothari Commission). New Delhi: NCERT.
- NCFR. (2005). National Curriculum Framework Review (NCFR). National Focus Group Position Papers Systemic Reform Vol. II *Draft, teacher education for curriculum renewal*. New Delhi: NCERT (National Council for Educational Research and Training), 89–116.
- NITI Aayog. (2017). *Three Year Action Agenda 2017–18 to 2019–20*. New Delhi: Government of India.
- Ramamurthy, S. and Pandiyan, K. (2017). National policy on education 2016: A comparative critique with NPE 1986. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 52(16), 22 April 2017.
- Rizvi, F. and Lingard, B. (2009). *Globalizing education policy*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Rustin, M. (2016). The neoliberal university and its alternatives. *Soundings: A Journal of Politics and Culture*, 63(3), pp. 147–176.
- Sadgopal, A. (2006). Dilution, distortion and diversion: A post – Jomtien reflection on the education policy. In: R. Kumar, ed., *The crisis of elementary education in India*. New Delhi: Sage.
- . (2016a). Skill India’ or deskilling India: An agenda of exclusion. *Economic and Political Weekly*, LI(35), pp. 33–37.
- . (2016b). Common classrooms, common playgrounds. In: M. Prasad, ed., *Newsletter*. New Delhi: All India Forum for Right to Education.
- Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, 29(7), pp. 4–14.
- Shor, I. (1993). Education is politics: Paulo Freire’s critical pedagogy. In: P. McLaren and P. Leonard, eds., *Paulo Freire: A critical encounter*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Sen, A. (2018). Karl Marx 2.00. *The Indian Express*. New Delhi, 5 May 2018.
- Sleeter, C., Torres, M. and Laughlin, P. (2004). Scaffolding conscientization through inquiry. *Teacher Education*, 31(1), pp. 81–96.

- The Indian Express (IE). (2018). Showcause to 9 teachers closed: Gujarat varsity. *The Indian Express*, 10 May 2018.
- Velaskar, P. (2017). Neo-liberal policy and the crisis of state schooling. In: Avinash Kumar Singh ed., *Education and empowerment in India: Policies and practices*. New Delhi: Routledge, pp. 251–267.
- Wallerstein, I. (1994). The agonies of liberalism: What hope Progress?. *New Left Review*, (204), pp. 3–17.
- Williamson, J. (2009). A short history of the Washington consensus. *Law and Business Review of Americas*, 15. Available at: <http://scholar.smu.edu/lbra/vol15/iss1/3> (Accessed on 18 July 2017).
- Zizek, S. (2018). *Voices*. [www.independent.co.uk/voices/karl-marx-200-years-uk-politics-elections-working-class-slavoj-zizek-a8335931.html](http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/karl-marx-200-years-uk-politics-elections-working-class-slavoj-zizek-a8335931.html) (Accessed on 4 May 2018).
- Ahmed, P. R. (2017). Neoliberal education and critical social movements: Implications for democracy. In: R. Kumar, ed., *Neoliberalism, critical pedagogy and education*. London: Routledge India.
- Alexander, R. J. (2015). Teaching and learning for all? The quality imperative revisited. *International Journal of Educational Development*. Elsevier, 40(C), pp. 250–258.
- ASER. (various years). *Annual status of education report*. New Delhi: ASER Centre, Pratham.
- . (2017). *Annual status of education report (Rural) 2016*. New Delhi ASER Centre (Accessed on 18 January 2017).
- Ayyar, R. and Vaidyanatha, V. (2017). Inclusive elementary education in India: The journey. In: M. Tiwary, K. Sanjay Kumar and A. K. Misra, eds., *Dynamics of inclusive classroom: Social diversity, inequality and school education in India*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.
- Ball, S. J. and Deborah, Y. (2007). *Hidden Privatisation in Public Education*, Preliminary Report, prepared by Institute of Education, University of London presented at Education International, 5th World Congress, July 2007.
- Batra, P. (2015). *Quality of Education and the Poor: Constraints on Learning*. TRG Poverty and Education Working Paper Series 4: Max Weber Stiftung Foundation.
- Chattopadhyay, S. (2016). Neoliberal approach to governance reform. In: R. Kumar, ed., *Neoliberalism, critical pedagogy and education*. London: Routledge India.
- GoI. (1968). *National Policy of Education (NPE)*, Department of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
- . (1986). *National Policy of Education*, Department of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
- . (1992). *National Policy on Education 1986 Programme of Action 1992*, Department of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
- . (1995). *DPEP guidelines*. New Delhi: MHRD, Government of India.
- . (2004). Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, a programme for universal elementary education, a manual for planning and appraisal. New Delhi: MHRD, Department of Elementary Education and Literacy.
- . (2009). *Rashtriya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan, framework for implementation*. New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD).

- . (2016a). *National policy on education, 2016: Report of the committee for evolution of the new education policy*. New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
- . (2016b). *Some Inputs for Draft National Policy on Education, 2016*. New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, [http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload\\_files/mhrd/files/Inputs\\_Draft\\_NEP\\_2016.pdf](http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/Inputs_Draft_NEP_2016.pdf) (Accessed on 28 June 2017).
- Govinda, R. and Sedwal, M. (2017). *India education report: Progress of basic education*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Green, J. (2011). *Education, professionalism and quest for accountability: Hitting the target but missing the point*. London: Routledge.
- Hall, S. (2011). The neo-liberal revolution. *Cultural Studies*, 75(6), pp. 705–728.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hayek, F. A. and Caldwell, B. (2007). *The road to serfdom: Text and documents—The definitive edition* (The collected works of F.A. Hayek). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hill, D. (2003). Global Neo-liberalism, the deformation of education and resistance. *Journal of Critical Education Policy Studies*, 1(1).
- . (2009). Foreword. In: D. Hill and E. Rosskam eds., *The developing world and state education: Neoliberal depredation and egalitarian alternatives*. London: Routledge.
- Jeffery, P. (2005). Introduction: Hearts, minds and pockets. In: R. Chopra and P. Jeffery eds., *Educational regimes in contemporary India*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Kremer, M., Nazmul, C., Halsey, R., Karthik, M. and Jeffery, H. (2005). Teacher absence in India: A snapshot. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 3(2–3).
- Kumar, K. and Padma, M. S. (2004). History of the quality debate. *Contemporary Education Dialogue*, 2(1), Monsoon.
- Kumar, R. (2016). Introduction. In: R. Kumar, ed., *Neoliberalism, critical pedagogy and education*. London: Routledge India.
- Kundu, P. (2018). NITI Aayog Three Year Action Agenda: What is there for education?. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 53(18), 5 May 2018.
- McMurtry, J. (1991). Education and the market model. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 25(2), pp. 209–217.
- Mukhopadhyaya, R. and Sriprakash, A. (2010). Global frameworks, local contingencies: Policy translations and education development in India. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 41(3), pp. 311–326.
- Naik, J. P. (1975). *Equality, quality and quantity: The elusive triangle of Indian education*. Bombay: Allied Publishers.
- Nayyar, D. (2017). 25 years of economic liberalisation. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 52(2), 14 January 2017.
- NITI Aayog. (2017). ‘Three Year Action Agenda 2017–18 to 2019–20, April, Government of India, New Delhi.
- Olssen, M., Codd, J. and O’Neill, Anne-Marie. (2004). *Education policy, globalization, citizenship and democracy*. London: Sage Publications.
- Pratham. (2016). *ASER: Annual status of education report*. Delhi: Pratham.

- Sadgopal, A. (2016). Skill India' or deskilling India an agenda of exclusion. *Economic and Political Weekly*, LI(35).
- . (2010). Right to education Vs Right to education act. *Social Scientist*, 38(9–12), pp. 17–50.
- Sarangapani, P. (2010). Quality concerns: National and extra national dimensions. *Contemporary Education Dialogue*, 7(1).
- Sriprakash, A. (2011). Being a teacher in contexts of change: Classroom reforms and the repositioning of teachers' work in India. *Contemporary Educational Dialogue*, 8(1), pp. 5–31.
- Subramaniam, T. S. R. (2016). Education in disarray: Need for quality upgradation and inclusivity. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 51(35), 27 August 2016.
- Tooley, J. (2000). *Reclaiming education*. London: Cassell.
- . (2001). *The global education industry*, 2nd ed. London: Institute for Economic Affairs.
- Velaskar, P. (2010). Quality and inequality in Indian education: Some critical policy concerns. *Contemporary Education Dialogue*, 7(1).
- . (2017). Neo-liberal policy and the crisis of state schooling. In: A. K. Singh, ed., *Education and empowerment in India: Policies and practices*. New Delhi: Routledge, pp. 251–267.
- Winch, C. (1996). Manufacturing educational quality. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 30(1), pp. 1–24.
- World Education Forum. (2000). *The Dakar Framework for action: Education for all: meeting our collective commitments*. Dakar, Senegal: World Education Forum.
- World Trade Organisation (WTO). (1998). *Education services: Background note by the Secretariat*. 23 September 1998. Available at: [www.wto.org/english/tratop\\_e/serve\\_e/w49.doc](http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serve_e/w49.doc) (Accessed on 15 June 2017).
- Apple, W. M. (2006). *Educating the 'right' way: Markets, standards, god, and inequality*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
- . (2013). *Can education change society?* New York: Routledge.
- Chaudhary, S. and Uboweja, A. (2014). *Public-private partnerships in school education: Learnings and insights for India*. Central Square Foundation, Working Paper. Available at: [www.centralsquarefoundation.org](http://www.centralsquarefoundation.org) (Accessed on 12 March 2017).
- Dreze, J. and Sen, A. (2013). *An uncertain glory: India and its contradictions*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.
- Fennell, S. (2007). *Tilting at windmills: Public-private partnership in Indian education today*. Research Consortium on Educational Outcomes and Poverty, RECOUP WP07/05
- Harma, J. (2009). Can choice promote education for all? Evidence from growth in primary schooling in India. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 39(2), pp. 151–165. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03057920902750400>
- Kaushal, S. (2009). *A study of the best practices in the implementation of mid-day-meal programme in Rajasthan*. New Delhi: National University of Educational Planning and Administration.
- Kumar, K. (2008). Partners in education? *Economic and Political Weekly*, 43(3), pp. 8–11.
- Rai, A. (2015, 18 July). Misguided education policy in Rajasthan: A critique of the public private partnership in school education. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 50(29).

- Sadgopal, A. (2013). Inclusion vs. Equality in right to education. *Restructuring Education*, 2(2), April-June.
- . (2011). Neoliberal Act. *Frontline*, 28(14), July, pp. 2–15.
- Sarangapani, P. (2009). Quality, feasibility and desirability of low cost private schooling. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 44(43), pp. 67–69.
- Shah, P. J. (2010). Where private and public co-exist: The opportunity in the right to education act, *Pragati*. March 2010. Available at: [www.schoolchoice.in/media room/articles by supporters/201003-pragati-parth.php](http://www.schoolchoice.in/media room/articles by supporters/201003-pragati-parth.php) (Accessed on 22 December 2016).
- Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD). (2010). *Scheme for augmenting school education through public private partnership: Report of the sub-group of the round table on school education*. MHRD, May 25, 2010. Accessible at [Planningcommission.gov.in/sectors/ppp\\_report\\_guidelines](http://Planningcommission.gov.in/sectors/ppp_report_guidelines).
- State of Victoria (Department of Education and Training). (2016). *Project Summary: New Schools Public Private Partnership (PPP) Project*.
- Tilak, J. B. G. (2010). Public Private Partnership in Education. *The Hindu*, 24 May 2010.
- . Tooley, J. (2004). Private education and education for all. *Economic Affairs*, 24, pp. 4–7. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0270.2004.00506.x
- Tooley, J. and Dixon, P. (2005). *Private education is good for the poor: A study of private schools serving the poor in low-income countries*. Cato Institute. <https://object.cato.org/pubs/wtpapers/tooley.pdf> (Accessed on 20 August 2017).
- UNICEF Report. (2011). *Non-state partners and public-private partnerships in education for the poor*. ADB UNICEF, Available at: [www.unicef.org/eapro](http://www.unicef.org/eapro) (Accessed on 24 March 2017).
- Venu, N. (2010). The private and the public in school education. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 45(6).
- Whitty, G., Power, S. and Halpin, D. (1998). *Devolution and choice in education: The school, the state and the market*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Winch, C. (1996). Quality and education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 30(1)
- World Bank Institute. (2012). *Public-private partnerships reference guide version 2*. Washington, DC: World Bank Publications.
- Aiyar, Y., Banerji, R., Chavan, M., Bhattacharjea, S. and Wadhwa, W. (2018). *Annual status of education report 2016 – National findings*. New Delhi: ASER Centre, January 2018.
- Banerjee, A., Banerji, R., Berry, J., Duflo, E., Kannan, H. and Mukerji, S. et al. (2016). *Mainstreaming an effective intervention: Evidence from randomized evaluations of 'teaching at the right level' in India*. Cambridge: Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab, August.
- Directorate of Information and Publicity, Govt of NCT of Delhi. (2016). *Press release*. Available at: <http://delhi.gov.in> on (Accessed on 9 August 2016).
- Government of India. (1966). *Report of the education commission: Education and national development*. New Delhi: Ministry of Education.
- . (1986). *National policy of education*. New Delhi: Ministry of HRD.
- . (10 March 2016). *Education in India*. New Delhi: National Sample Survey Organisation.
- Hunt, E. (1961). *Intelligence and experience*. New York: Ronald Press.
- Piaget, J. (1974). *Understanding causality*. New York: Norton.



- Acharya, P. (1994). Universal elementary education: Receding goal. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 29(1), pp. 27.
- Ansari, H. (2016). *Inaugural speech in the conference on Factors of poor learning: Challenges, opportunities, and practices for learning improvement in socially diverse schools of India* in. New Delhi, organized by Deshkal Society, New Delhi on 2 September, 2016.
- Ayyar, R. and Vaidyanatha, V. (2017). Inclusive elementary education in India: The journey. In: M. Tiwary, K. Sanjay Kumar, and A. K. Misra eds., *Dynamics of inclusive classroom: Social diversity, inequality and school education in India*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.
- Bandyopadhyay, M. (2012). Social Disparity in Elementary Education. *Seminar*, October, pp. 21–25.
- Bandyopadhyay, M. (2017). Social and regional inequality in elementary education in India: Retrospect and prospect. In: M. Tiwary, K. Sanjay Kumar, and A. K. Misra eds., *Dynamics of inclusive classroom: Social diversity, inequality and school education in India*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.
- Bhatty, K. (2014). Review of elementary education policy in India: Has it upheld the constitutional objective of equality? *Economic and Political Weekly*, 49(43–44), 01 Nov, 2014.
- Chagla, M. C. (1964). *Presidential address*. Bangalore: Thirty-first, meeting of the Central Advisory Board of Education, 11 and 12 October 1964.
- Chancel, L. and Piketty, T. (2017). *Indian Income Inequality, 1922–2014: From British Raj to Billionaire Raj?* CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP12409. Available at: SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3066021> (Accessed on 11 March 2018).
- Choudhary, S. (2014). Right to education act 2009: Letting disadvantaged children down? *International Research Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(8), pp. 1–7.
- Das, G. (2018). *License Permit Raj, renewed: Industry was liberated in 1991, but education's Shackles are growing heavier*. New Delhi: The Times of India, 17 April 2018.
- Deshkal Society. (2012). *Findings of household survey and baseline learning assessment of children in government primary and primary with upper primary schools in Bihar* (Mimeo.). Delhi: Deshkal Society.
- Government of Bihar. (2007). *Report of the Bihar common school system commission*. Patna: Common School System Commission, Govt. of Bihar.
- GoI. (1966). *Report of the education commission: Education and national development*. New Delhi: Ministry of Education.
- . (1986). *National policy of education*. New Delhi: Department of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
- . (1992). *National policy on education 1986 PROGRAMME OF ACTION 1992*. New Delhi: Department of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
- . (1997). *Report of the committee of state education ministers on implications of the proposal to make elementary education a fundamental right*. New Delhi, Chairman: Muhi Ram Saikia, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Department of Education.
- . (1999). *Expert group report on financial requirements for making elementary education a fundamental right* (also known as Tapas Majumdar

- Committee Report of 1999). New Delhi: Department of Education Ministry of Human Resource Development, GoI.
- . (2002). *Report of the national commission to review the working of the constitution*. New Delhi: Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, Department of Legal Affairs, GoI.
- . (2016a). *National policy on education, 2016: Report of the committee for evolution of the new education policy*. New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
- . (2016b). *Some inputs for draft national policy on education, 2016*. New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India. [http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload\\_files/mhrd/files/Inputs\\_Draft\\_NEP\\_2016.pdf](http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/Inputs_Draft_NEP_2016.pdf) (Accessed on 10 April 2017).
- Govinda, R. and Sedwal, M. (2017). Introduction. In: R. Govinda and M. Sedwal eds., *India education report*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Gupta, V. (2016). Politics of the guarded agenda of national education policy 2015–16. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 51(42), 15 October 2016.
- Hill, D. (2016). Transformative education, critical education, Marxist education: Possibilities and alternatives to the restructuring of education in global neoliberal/neoconservative times In: K. Ravi, ed., *Neoliberal, critical pedagogy and education*. India: Routledge.
- Jha, P. and Parvati, P. (2017). The challenges of public finance. In: R. Govinda and M. Sedwal eds., *India education report*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Kingdon, G. (2011). Private Versus Public Schooling in India. *Seminar* # 626.
- Kumar, K. (2011). Teaching and the neoliberal state. *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVI(21), 21 May 2011.
- Kumar, R. (2006). Introduction: Equality, quality and quantity-mapping the challenges before elementary education in India. In: R. Kumar, eds., *The crisis of elementary education in India*. New Delhi: Sage.
- . (2017). Introduction. In: H. Dave ed., *Class, Race, and education under neoliberal capitalism*. New Delhi: Aakar.
- State Report Cards 2013–14 (2015). *Elementary education in India where do we stand?* Vols. I and II. New Delhi: NUEPA.
- State Report Cards 2015–16 (2017). *Elementary education in India where do we stand?* Vols. I and II. New Delhi: NUEPA.
- Mehendale, A. and Hridaykant, D. (2015). Towards a new education policy: Directions and considerations. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 50(48).
- Nag, S. (2018). The skew in education. *The Indian Express*. New Delhi. 28 June 2018.
- Naik, J. P. (1975). *Equality, quality and quantity: The elusive triangle of Indian education*. Bombay: Allied Publishers.
- Nallur, V. and Alex, M. T. (2018). Urgency of inclusive education. *The Book Review*, LII, 5 May 2018.
- NSSO (2016) *National sample survey, 71st round, 2014–15*. New Delhi: National Sample Survey Organisation, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation.
- NITI Aayog. (2017). *Three Year Action Agenda 2017–18 to 2019–20, April*. New Delhi: Government of India.

- Oxfam. (2017). *One percent of Indians own 58% of country's wealth: Oxfam inequality report*. Available at: [www.oxfamindia.org/newsclipping/1781](http://www.oxfamindia.org/newsclipping/1781) (Accessed on 24 March 2018).
- Priyam, M. (2017). Policy Reform and Educational Development: Reflections on the uneven process of change in Bihar. In: A. Kumar Singh ed., *Education and empowerment in India: Policies and practices*. London: Routledge New Delhi South Asia, pp. 160–178.
- Sadgopal, A. (2003). Education for too few. *Frontline*, 20(24), 22 November–5 December.
- . (2010). The world bank in India: Undermining sovereignty, distorting development. In: K. Michele and D. D'Souza, eds., *Dependent people's tribunal on the world bank in India*. Hyderabad: Orient Blackswan, pp. 296–324.
- . (2016a). *Common classrooms, common playgrounds*. In: M. Prasad, ed., April 2016: New Delhi: All India Forum for Right to Education.
- . (2016b). Skill India' or deskilling India: An agenda of exclusion. *Economic and Political Weekly*, LI(35), pp. 33–37.
- Save the Children. (2017). *Report on school closures and mergers: A multi-state study of policy and its impact on public education system*. Telangana, Odisha, Rajasthan, New Delhi: Save the Children.
- Seetharamu, A. S. (2002). Fundamental right status for education: Opportunity or eyewash? *Deccan Herald*. 9 February 2009. Available at: [www.deccanherald.com/](http://www.deccanherald.com/) (Accessed on 2 March 2018).
- Singh, P. D. and Kumar, S. (2010). *Social hierarchy and notion of educability: Experiences of teachers and children from marginalised and non marginalised communities*. Dalit Studies-3. New Delhi: Deshkal Society.
- Subramaniam, T. S. R. (2016). Education in disarray: Need for quality upgradation and inclusivity. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 51(35), 27 Aug 2016.
- Tilak, J. B. G. (2010). RTE Act 2009 – Illusory promises. Available at: <http://educationworldonline.net/index.php/page-article-choicemore-id-2288>. (Accessed on 6 July 2010).
- Tiwary, M. K., Sanjay, K. and Misra, A. K. (2017). Introduction. In: M. K. Tiwary, K. Sanjay and A. K. Misra, eds., *Dynamics of inclusive classroom: Social diversity, inequality and school education in India*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.
- Velaskar, P. (2010). Quality and inequality in Indian education: Some critical policy concerns. *Contemporary Education Dialogue*, 7(1).
- . (2017). Neo-Liberal Policy and the crisis of state schooling. In: A. K. Singh, ed., *Education and empowerment in India: Policies and practices*. London: Routledge New Delhi South Asia, pp. 251–267.
- Weiner, M. (1991). *The child and the state in India; Child labour and education policy in comparative perspective*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- World Commission on Social Dimensions of Globalisation. (2004). *A fair globalisation: Creating opportunities for all*. Geneva: International Labour Organisation.
- Dearden, R. F. (2012). *The philosophy of primary education*, (First published in 1968). Milton Park, Abingdon and Oxon, OX: Routledge.
- Dewey, J. (1983). Report and Recommendation upon Turkish Education. The Collected Works of John Dewey, 1882–1953, The Middle Works of John Dewey,

- 1899–1924, vol. 15(1923–1924). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, p. 273.
- . (2004). *Democracy and education*. New Delhi: Aakar Books.
- GoI. (1953). *Report of the secondary education commission*, Ministry of Education, Government of India. First Published September 1953.
- . (1962). *Report of the university education commission*. New Delhi: Ministry of Education Government of India 1950. Reprint 1962.
- Gomery, D. (2008). *Public policy, entry in international encyclopedia of social sciences*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- MHRD. (1986). *National policy of education 1986*. New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
- . (1998). *National Policy on Education 1986 (as modified in 1992) with National Policy on Education, 1968*. Government of India, Department of Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, New Delhi. Available at: [http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload\\_files/mhrd/files/document-reports/NPE86-mod92.pdf](http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/document-reports/NPE86-mod92.pdf) (Accessed on 12 June 2017).
- . (2016a). *National policy on education, 2016: Report of the committee for evolution of the new education policy*. New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
- . (2016b). *Some Inputs for Draft National Policy on Education (Draft NPE)*, New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India, [http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload\\_files/mhrd/files/Inputs\\_Draft\\_NEP\\_2016.pdf](http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/Inputs_Draft_NEP_2016.pdf) (Accessed on 18 June 2017).
- Winch, C. (1996). Quality of education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 30(1), p. 33.
- A S E R (Rural). (2012). *Annual status of education report*. New Delhi: Pratham Resource Centre.
- Dore, R. (1976). *The diploma disease*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- GoI. (1986). *National policy on education, 1986*. New Delhi: MHRD, Department of Education, Government of India.
- . (1992). *Report of the committee for review of NPE: Towards an enlightened and humane society*. New Delhi: MHRD, Department of Education.
- . (2009). *The right of children to free and compulsory education act*. New Delhi: Ministry of Law and Justice, Legislative Department, Government of India, Available at: [http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload\\_files/mhrd/files/rte.pdf](http://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/rte.pdf) (Accessed on 24 June 2017).
- Kumar, K. (1991). *Political agenda of education: A study of colonialist and nationalist ideas*, 2nd ed. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Madan, T. N. (2010). Between the braying pestles and the examination blues: The childhood years. In: M. Karlekar and R. Mukherjee eds., *Remembered childhood: Essays in honour of Andre Beteille*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- MHRD. (1993). *Learning without burden- Report of the national advisory committee appointed by. MHRD*: New Delhi.
- . (2014). *Report of CABE Sub-committee on assessment and implementation of CCE and NDP (under the RtE Act, 2009)*. New Delhi: MHRD.
- Ministry of Education. (1966). *Education and national development, report of education commission (1964–66)*. New Delhi: Government of India.

- National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT). (2005). *National Curriculum Framework 2005*. New Delhi: NCERT.
- Nawani, D. (2017). Examination for elimination: Celebrating fear and penalizing failure. In: *Handbook of Education in India: Debates, Policies and Practices*. London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- NCERT. (1971). Report of the committee on examinations, CABE, ministry of education and social welfare, India, New Delhi: NCERT.
- . (2006). *Position paper: National focus group on examination reforms*. New Delhi: NCERT.
- Report of Indian Education Commission, 1882–83. (1884). Calcutta: Government Printing Press.
- Singh, A. (1997). *Remodelling of school education boards: Report of the task force on the role and status of boards of secondary education*. New Delhi: MHRD.
- Stories from Premchand. (1986). *Madhuban educational books*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Private Ltd.
- Aries, P. (1962). *Centuries of childhood: A social history of family life* (Translated by Robert Baldick). New York: Vintage Books.
- ASER. (various years). *Annual status of education report*. New Delhi: ASER Centre, Pratham.
- Bayly, S. (1999). *Caste, society and politics in India from the eighteenth century to the modern age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Conlon, F. (1977). *A caste in a changing world: The Saraswat Brahmins*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Guha, R. (2010). *Makers of modern India*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.
- Kaul, M., Sukhdev, S. and Gill, S. S. (1996). Facets of primary education in rural Punjab. *Journal of Indian Education*, XXII(3), Nov. 1996, pp. 1–14.
- Kumar, N. (1988). *The artisans of Banaras: Popular culture and identity, 1880–1986*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . (2012). India's Trials with Citizenship, Modernisation and Nationhood. In: L. Brockliss and N. Sheldon eds., *Mass education and the limits of state building, 1870–1930*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- PROBE Team and Centre for Development Economics. (1999). *Public report on basic education in India*. New Delhi: CDE.
- Sen, A. (2000). *Development as freedom*. New York: Anchor, Reprint Edition.
- Biswas, M. M. (2015). *Surviving in my world growing up Dalit in Bengal*. Kolkata: Stree.
- Byapari, M. (2018). *Interrogating my Chandal life: An autobiography of a Dalit*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Bechain, S. S. (2017). *My childhood on my shoulders*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- BRC. (2013). *Annual enrolment register of school children in block Wazirgaj, 2013–14*. Gaya: BRC.
- Census of India. (2011). *Primary census abstracts*. New Delhi: Census of India.
- Deshkal Society. (2011). *Toolkitforteachers\_Hindi\_DFID*. Available at: [www.deshkalindia.com/img/reports/1.%20Toolkit%20for%20teachers\\_Hindi\\_%20DFID-%2026-8-2011.pdf](http://www.deshkalindia.com/img/reports/1.%20Toolkit%20for%20teachers_Hindi_%20DFID-%2026-8-2011.pdf) (Accessed on 12 June 2018).

- . (2013a). *Baseline survey report on out of school children in block Wazirganj (Gaya)*. Delhi: Deshkal Society.
- . (2013b). *Survey on social diversity and learning achievement. The status of primary education in rural Bihar*. Delhi: Deshkal Society.
- Govinda, R. ed. (2002). *India education report*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Krishna, M. M. (2012). Pedagogic practice and the violence against Dalits in schooling. In: C. Sleeter, et al. eds., *School education, pluralism and marginality: Comparative perspectives*. New Delhi: Orient BlackSwan.
- Nambissan, Geetha B. (2001). Social diversity and regional disparities in schooling: A Study of Rural Rajasthan. In: A. Vidyathan and P. R. Gopinathan Nair eds., *Elementary education in rural India: A grassroots view*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Naorem, T. and Ramachandran, V. (2013). A synthesis of a six-state qualitative study: What it means to be a Dalit or tribal child in our schools. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 48(44), 02 Nov., 2013.
- Nesfield, J. C. (1888). The Musheras of central and upper India. *The Calcutta Review*, 171.
- NUEPA and MHRD. (2014). *State Report Cards 2013–14*, New Delhi: NUEPA and MHRD, Department of School Education and Literacy, p. 13.
- Ojha, L. B. ed. (2003). *Dalit, adivasi and school*. Bhopal: Samavesh.
- Palshaugen, O. (2006). Dilemmas of action research-an introduction. *International Journal of Action Research*, 2(2), pp. 149–162.
- Prakash, G. (1990). *Bonded histories: Genealogies of labour servitude in colonial India*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- PROBE Report. (1999). *Public report on basic education in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Risley, H. H. (1891). *Tribes and castes of Bengal*, 2 vols. Calcutta: Bengal Secretariat Press.
- Roy, S. C. (1935a). *Hill Bhuiyas of Orissa*. Ranchi: Man in India Office.
- . (1935b). Report of anthropological work in 1930–31: Chotanagpur, the Chutias and Bhuiyas. *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Society*, 18.
- SCERT. (2008). *Prakhand Sansaadhan Kendra evam Sankul Sansadhan Kendra Samanyavak: Margdarshika*. Patna: SCERT.
- Singh, P. D. and Kumar, S. (2010). *Social hierarchy and notion of educability*. Delhi: Deshkal Publication, pp. 36–37.
- SRRI. (2014). Social and Rural Research Institute, *National Sample Survey of Estimation of Out-of-School Children in the Age 6–13 in India*, Available at: [https://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload\\_files/mhrd/files/upload\\_document/National-Survey-Estimation-School-Children-Draft-Report.pdf](https://mhrd.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/upload_document/National-Survey-Estimation-School-Children-Draft-Report.pdf) (Accessed on 20 June 2018).
- Tiwary, M., Kumar, S. and Mishra, A. K. (2017). *Dynamics of inclusive classroom social diversity, inequality and school education in India*. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan.
- Valmiki, O. P. (2003). *Joothan*. Delhi: Rajkamal Prakashan, p. 53.
- Velaskar, P. (2005). Education, caste, Gender'. Dalit girls. Access to schooling. *Maharashtra. Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*, 19(4), pp. 459–482.
- Abraham, D. and Rao, O. (16 July 2017). 86% killed in cow-related violence since 2010 are Muslim, 97% attacks after Modi govt came to power. *Hindustan Times*, Available at: [www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/86-killed-in-cow-related-vio](http://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/86-killed-in-cow-related-vio)

- lence-since-2010-are-muslims-97-attacks-after-modi-govt-came-to-power/story-w9CYOksvgk9joGSSaXgpLO.html (Accessed on 13 September 2017).
- Allman, P., McLaren, P. and Glenn, R. (undated). *After the box people: The labour-capital relation as class constitution – and its consequences for Marxist educational theory and human resistance*. Available at: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download;jsessionid=BFDEFE6FFB000D946CB816F6B4B0BC0A?doi=10.1.1.202.59&rep=rep1&type=pdf> (Accessed on 12 May 2017).
- Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. New York and London: Monthly Review Press.
- Banaji, J. (12 September 2016). Stalin's Ghost Won't Save Us from the Spectre of Fascism: A Response to Prakash Karat. *Sabrang*. Available at: [www.sabrangindia.in/article/stalin-s-ghost-won-t-save-us-spectre-fascism-response-prakash-karat](http://www.sabrangindia.in/article/stalin-s-ghost-won-t-save-us-spectre-fascism-response-prakash-karat) (Accessed on 15 September 2016).
- Bloch, Ernst. (1996). *The Principle of Hope* (Translated by Neville Plaice, Stephen Plaice and Paul Knight) Vol. I. Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Ghosh, P. (23 February 2016). Fascism or Dictatorship of Neoliberal Capital? The Need for a Correct Line. *Radical Notes*, Available at: <https://radicalnotes.org/2016/02/23/fascism-or-dictatorship-of-neoliberal-capital-the-need-for-a-correct-line/> (Accessed on 10 May 2017).
- Government of India. (2016). *All India survey on higher education (2015–16)*. New Delhi: Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
- Gramsci, A. (1924). *Neither fascism nor liberalism: Sovietism!*. Available at: [www.marxists.org/archive/gramsci/1924/10/fascism-liberalism.htm](http://www.marxists.org/archive/gramsci/1924/10/fascism-liberalism.htm) (Accessed on 16 June 2016).
- Hill, D. (2006). Class, Capital and Education in this Neoliberal/Neoconservative Period. *Information for Social Change*, 23. Available at: <http://libr.org/isc/issues/ISC23/B1%20Dave%20Hill.pdf> (Accessed on 15 May 2017).
- . (5 January 2017). The Role of Marxist Educators Against and Within Neoliberal Capitalism, *Insurgent Scripts*, Available at: <http://insurgentscripts.org/the-role-of-marxist-educators-against-and-within-neoliberal-capitalism/> (Accessed on 20 March 2017).
- . (2018). Marxist education against capitalism in neoliberal/neoconservative times. In: L. Rasinski, D. Hill and K. Skordoulis eds., *Marxism and education: International perspectives on theory and action*. New York and London: Routledge.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York and London: Routledge.
- International Labour Organisation. (2011). *World of work report 2011: Making markets work for jobs*. Geneva: International Labour Organisation.
- Jha, S. (9 November 2014). President okays Rajasthan labour reforms: Firms with 300 workers need no govt nod to sack (State expects more investment as industry cheers move). *Business Standard*. Available at: [www.business-standard.com/article/economy-policy/president-okays-rajasthan-labour-reforms-firms-with-300-workers-need-no-govt-nod-to-sack-114110801356\\_1.html](http://www.business-standard.com/article/economy-policy/president-okays-rajasthan-labour-reforms-firms-with-300-workers-need-no-govt-nod-to-sack-114110801356_1.html) (Accessed on 10 May 2017).
- Karat, P. (6 September 2016). Fight against BJP cannot be conducted in alliance with the other major party of the ruling classes. *Indian Express*. Available at: <http://>

- indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/india-nda-government-narendra-modi-bjp-right-wing-hindutva-3015383/ (Accessed on 8 September 2016).
- Kingdon, G. G. (March 2017). *The private schooling phenomenon in India: A review*. Discussion Paper Series, IZA-Institute of Labor Economics: Bonn.
- Kumar, A. (3 August 2017). Bihar government to compulsorily retire non-performing teachers, officials above age of 50 years. *The Hindustan Times*, Available at: [www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/bihar-govt-to-compulsorily-retire-non-performing-teachers-officials-above-age-of-50-years/story-uDSKFNw2lZuc2cnHN0jT1J.html](http://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/bihar-govt-to-compulsorily-retire-non-performing-teachers-officials-above-age-of-50-years/story-uDSKFNw2lZuc2cnHN0jT1J.html) (Accessed on 4 August 2017).
- Kumar, R. (10 September 2017). Victory of Left Reflects JNU's Resistance to BJP's Campaign to Alter the DNA of Indian Varsities. *The Wire*. Available at: <https://thewire.in/175931/victory-left-reflects-jnus-resistance-bjps-campaign-alter-dna-indian-varsities/> (Accessed on 10 September 2017).
- Marcuse, H. (1998). Some implications of modern technology. In: K. Douglas, ed., *Technology, war and fascism (collected papers of Herbert Marcuse)*. New York: Routledge.
- Marx, K. (1887). *Capital: A critique of political economy*, Vol I. Available at: [www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch16.htm](http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch16.htm) (Accessed on 12 June 2017).
- McLaren, P. (1999). Traumatizing capital: Oppositional pedagogies in the age of consent. In: P. McLaren, ed., *Critical education in the new information age*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 1–37.
- McLaren, P. and Farahmandpur, R. (2005). *Teaching against global capitalism and the new imperialism: A critical pedagogy*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Mehta, A. C. (2016). *Analytical tables 2015–16: Progress towards UEE*. New Delhi: NUEPA.
- Montgomery, M. and Iyengar, R. (22 August 2017). Closed until further notice: Most McDonald's restaurants in India's capital. *CNN Money*. Available at: <http://money.cnn.com/2017/06/29/news/india/mcdonalds-india-delhi-stores-closed/index.html> (Accessed on 22 August 2017).
- Nanda, Prashant K. (12 September 2017). NDA plans new push for labour reforms. *Live Mint*, Available at: [www.livemint.com/Home-Page/nnOHLRpsWxkGk80J2sHW2L/NDA-plans-new-push-for-labour-reforms.html](http://www.livemint.com/Home-Page/nnOHLRpsWxkGk80J2sHW2L/NDA-plans-new-push-for-labour-reforms.html) (Accessed on 12 June 2017).
- NSSO. (2016). *Education in India, NSSO, 71st Round (January–June 2014)*. New Delhi: Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation.
- Rawal, Urvashi Dev. (Sep 08, 2017). Rajasthan government's move to privatise school education draws flak. *The Hindustan Times*, Available at: [www.hindustantimes.com/education/rajasthan-govt-s-move-to-privatise-school-education-draws-flak/story-Xgn0kcAElbfH9eefJ8U8IK.html](http://www.hindustantimes.com/education/rajasthan-govt-s-move-to-privatise-school-education-draws-flak/story-Xgn0kcAElbfH9eefJ8U8IK.html) (Accessed on 8 September 2017).
- Reich, W. (1946). *The mass psychology of fascism* (English translation by Theodore P. Wolfe). New York: Orgone Institute Press, Inc.
- Renton, D. (1999). *Fascism: Theory and practice*. London: Pluto Press.
- Riley, D. (19/08/2016). Fascism and Democracy. *Jacobin*, Available at: [www.jacobinmag.com/2016/08/trump-clinton-fascism-authoritarian-democracy/](http://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/08/trump-clinton-fascism-authoritarian-democracy/) (Accessed on 12 February 2017).



- Shaull, R. (2005). Preface. In: P. Freire, eds., *Pedagogy of the oppressed*, 30th ed. New York: Continuum.
- University Grants Commission. (2016). *Annual Report 2015–2016*. Delhi: University Grants Commission.
- Acharya, P. (1997). Educational ideals of Tagore and Gandhi: A comparative study. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 32(12).
- Allahabad High Court. (2015). *Judgment pronounced on 18/08/2015 on a bunch of petitions, first amongst them being the WRIT No. 57476 of 2013*. Shiv Kumar Pathak and 11 Others Versus State of UP And Three Others.
- Annual Status of Education Report (ASER). (2012). *Annual Status of Education Report*. New Delhi, India: ASER Centre/ Pratham.
- Arnold, W. D. (1922). First Report. 1857. In: J. A. Richey, ed., *Selections from educational records*, Part II. Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing.
- Biswas, A. and Aggarwal, S. P. (1994). *Development of education in India: A historical survey of educational documents before and after independence*. Delhi: Concept Publishing.
- Chaudhary, S. I. (2002). *1882 Middle class and the social revolution in Bengal: An incomplete agenda*. Dhaka: The University Press Limited.
- Cole, M. (2018). *Marxism and educational theory: Origins and issues*. New York: Routledge.
- Davis, L. E. and Huttenback, R. A. (1986). *Mammon and the pursuit of empire: The political economy of British imperialism, 1860–1912*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Engels, F. (1845/1975). *Speeches in Elberfeld. 8 February 1845*. Marx – Engels Collected Works, Vol. 4. Moscow: Progress Publishers, pp. 1844–1845.
- Government of India. (1966). *Education and national development: Report of the education commission*. New Delhi: Ministry of Education.
- . (1967). *The Report of the Committee of Members of Parliament on Education*, New Delhi: Ministry of Education.
- . (1944). *Post-War Plan of Educational Development in India*. Central Advisory Board Of Education (CABE). New Delhi: Manager of Publications.
- . (1995) *DPEP Guidelines*. New Delhi: MHRD.
- . (2016). *National policy on education (NPE) 2016: Report of the committee for evolution of the new education policy*. New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
- Gupta, N. (1981). *Delhi between two empires (1803–1931): Society, government, & urban growth*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heintz, J. and Folbre, N. (2000). *The ultimate field guide to the U.S. economy: A compact and irreverent guide to economic life in America*. New York: New Press.
- Howell, A. (1872). *Education in British India: Prior to 1854 and in 1870–71*. Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, pp. 20–21.
- Lee, J. W. and Lee, H. (2016). Human capital in the long run. *Journal of Development Economics*, 122, pp. 147–169.
- Marriot, S. (November 1846). *Commissioner of Revenue in the Deccan, and later Member of Council, Government of Bombay, in a letter to Sir R. Grant*.

- India: The Duty and Interest of England to inquire into its State (Accessed on 16 January 1836).
- Martin, M. (1834). *The history of British colonies*, Vol. 1: *Possessions in Asia*. London: James Cochrane and Co.
- McLaren, P. and Farahmandpur, R. (2001). Educational policy and the socialist imagination: Revolutionary citizenship as a pedagogy of resistance. *Educational Policy*, 15(3), pp. 343–378.
- Naik, J. P. (1975). *Equality, quality and quantity: The elusive triangle in Indian education*. Bombay: Allied Publishers.
- Report of Indian Education Commission. (1882). *Calcutta: Manager of publications*. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/ReportOfTheIndianEducationCommission/page/n325> (Accessed on 12 January 2018).
- . (1884). *Bombay*, Vol II. Calcutta. (1884: 140).
- Weiner, M. (1991). *The child and the state in India: Child labor and education policy in comparative perspective*, 4th ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- . (1994). India's case against compulsory education. *Seminar*, 413, January, pp. 83–86.
- World Development Movement. (2001). *The tricks of the trade: How trade rules are loaded against the poor*. London: WDM.
- Anyon, J. (2011). *Marx and education*. London: Routledge.
- Apple, M. (2006). *Educating the right way: Markets, standards, god, and inequality*. London: Routledge.
- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and State apparatus. In: L. Althusser, ed., *Lenin and philosophy and other essays*. London: New Left Books.
- Banfield, G. (2016). *Critical realism for Marxist sociology of education*. London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (1977). Class and pedagogies: Visible and invisible. In: B. Bernstein, eds., *Class, codes and control*, Vol. 3. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *In other words: Towards a reflexive sociology*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, R. (1997). The forms of capital. In: A. Halsey and H. Lauder, et al. eds., *Education: Culture, economy, society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, R. and Passeron, J. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bukharin, N. and Preobrazhensky, Y. (1920/1969). *The ABC of communism*. London: Penguin Books. Available at: [www.marxists.org/archive/bukharin/works/1920/abc](http://www.marxists.org/archive/bukharin/works/1920/abc) (Accessed on 19 December 2017).
- Duffield, J. (1998). Learning experiences, effective schools and social context. *Support for Learning*, 13(1), pp. 3–8.
- Freire, P. (1993). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Gamble, A. (1988). *The free society and the strong state*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Gezgin, U. B., İnal, K. and Hill, D. eds. (2014). *The Gezi revolt: People's revolutionary resistance against neoliberal capitalism in Turkey*. Brighton: Institute for Education Policy Studies.

- Giroux, H. (1983). Theories of reproduction and resistance in the new sociology of education: A critical analysis. *Harvard Education Review*, 53(3), pp. 257–293.
- . (2004). *The terror of neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and the eclipse of democracy*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Gramsci, Antonio. (1971). *Selections from the Prison notebooks*. New York: International Publishers Co.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hill, D. (2003). Global neoliberalism, the deformation of education and resistance. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 1(1). Available at: [www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=7](http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=7) (Accessed on 12 April 2018).
- . (2006a). Education services liberalization. In: E. Rosskam, ed., *Winners or losers? Liberalizing public services*. Geneva: ILO, pp. 3–54. Available at: [www.ieps.org.uk/PDFs/DaveHill-2006-EUCATIONSERVICESLIBERALIZATION.pdf](http://www.ieps.org.uk/PDFs/DaveHill-2006-EUCATIONSERVICESLIBERALIZATION.pdf) (Accessed on 23 December 2017).
- . (2006b). Class, the crisis of neoliberal global capital, and the role of education and knowledge workers. *Firgoa Universidade Publica*. Available at: <http://firgoa.usc.es/drupal/node/47262> (Accessed on 20 November 2017).
- . (2010). *A socialist manifesto for education*. Available at: [www.ieps.org.uk/PDFs/socialistmanifestofore.pdf](http://www.ieps.org.uk/PDFs/socialistmanifestofore.pdf) (Accessed on 23 December 2017).
- . (2012a). Immiseration capitalism, activism and education: Resistance, revolt and revenge. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 10(2). Available at: [www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=259](http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=259) (Accessed on 23 December 2017).
- . (2012b). Fighting Neoliberalism with education and activism. *Philosophers for Change*. 1 March. Available at: <https://philosophersforchange.org/2012/02/29/fighting-neoliberalism-with-education-and-activism/> (Accessed on 19 December 2017).
- . ed. (2013). *Immiseration capitalism and education: Austerity, resistance and revolt*. Brighton: Institute for Education Policy Studies.
- . ed. (2017a). *Class, race and education under Neoliberal capitalism*. New Delhi: Aakar Books.
- . (2017b). The Role of Marxist Educators Against and Within Neoliberal Capitalism. *Insurgent Scripts*, January. New Delhi: Insurgent Scripts. Available at: <http://insurgentscripts.org/the-role-of-marxist-educators-against-and-within-neoliberal-capitalism/> (Accessed on 26 January 2018).
- Hill, D. and Kumar, R. eds. (2009). *Global neoliberalism and education and its consequences*. New York: Routledge.
- Hill, D. and Rosskam, E. eds. (2009). *The developing world and state education: Neoliberal depredation and egalitarian alternatives*. New York: Routledge.
- Inal, K. and Akkaymak, G. eds. (2012). *Neoliberal Te of the AKP. Transformation of education in turkey: Political and ideological analysis of educational reforms in the ag*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Malott, C., Hill, D. and Banfield, G. (2013). Neoliberalism, immiseration capitalism and the historical urgency of a socialist education. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 11(4). Available at: [www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=311](http://www.jceps.com/index.php?pageID=article&articleID=311) (Accessed on 3 November 2017).

- Marx, K. (1845). *Theses on Feuerbach*. Available at: [www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/](http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1845/theses/) (Accessed on 19 December 2017).
- . (1847). *The poverty of philosophy*. Available at: [www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1847/poverty-philosophy/](http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1847/poverty-philosophy/) (Accessed on 10 January 2017).
- Marx, K. and Engels, K. (1848). *The communist manifesto*. Available at: [www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf](http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf) (Accessed on 28 December 2017).
- Oxfam (2018). *Press release: Even it up*. Available at: [www.oxfam.org/en/pressroom/pressreleases/2018-01-22/richest-1-percent-bagged-82-percent-wealth-created-last-year](http://www.oxfam.org/en/pressroom/pressreleases/2018-01-22/richest-1-percent-bagged-82-percent-wealth-created-last-year) (Accessed on 19 December 2017).
- Picketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the twenty-first century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rikowski, G. (2001). *After the manuscript broke off: Thoughts on Marx, social class and education*. A paper prepared for the British Sociological Association Education Study Group Meeting, King's College London, June 23. Available at: [www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001931.htm](http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001931.htm) (Accessed on 19 January 2017).
- . (2002). Fuel for the living fire: Labour-power! In: A. Dinerstein and M. Neary eds., *The labour debate: An investigation into the theory and reality of capitalist work*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- . (2008). The compression of critical space in education today. *The flow of ideas*. Available at: [www.flowideas.co.uk/?page=articles&sub=Critical%20Space%20in%20Education](http://www.flowideas.co.uk/?page=articles&sub=Critical%20Space%20in%20Education) (Accessed on 20 February 2018).
- Wilkinson, R. and Pickett, K. (2009). *The spirit level: Why more equal societies almost always do better*. London: Allen Lane.
- Apple, M. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bach, Q. V. S. (2003). *Soviet aid to the third world: The facts & figures*. East Sussex: The Book Guild.
- Blacker, D. J. (2013). *The falling rate of learning and the Neoliberal Endgame*. Winchester: Zero Books.
- Bloodworth, J. (2016). *The myth of meritocracy: Why working-class kids get working-class jobs*. London: Biteback Publishing.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Collins, R. (2013). The end of middle-class work: No more escapes. In: I. Wallerstein, R. Collins, M. Mann, G. Derlugian, and C. Calhoun eds., *Does capitalism have a future?* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 37–69.
- Council of Australian Governments. (2009). *Investing in the Early Years – A National Early Childhood Development Strategy* Available at: [www.startingblocks.gov.au/media/1104/national\\_ecd\\_strategy.pdf](http://www.startingblocks.gov.au/media/1104/national_ecd_strategy.pdf) (Accessed on 26 September 2017).
- de Sousa Santos, B. (2008). Depolarised pluralities. A left with a future. In: P. Barrett, D. Chavez, and C. Rodríguez-Garavito eds., *The new Latin American left: Utopia Reborn*. Amsterdam: Pluto Press, pp. 255–272.
- Down, B. (2006). A critical pedagogy of vocational education and training in schools and communities struggling with shifts in the global economy. *Learning Communities: International Journal of Learning in Social Contexts*, 3(1), pp. 94–120.

- Fleming, P. (2017). *What is human capital?* Available at: <https://aeon.co/essays/how-the-cold-war-led-the-cia-to-promote-human-capital-theory> (Accessed on 28 December 2017).
- Frank, A. G. (1966). The development of underdevelopment. *Monthly Review*, 18(7), pp. 17–31.
- Griffiths, T. G. (2005). Learning ‘to be somebody’. Cuban youth in the special period. *International Journal of Learning*, 11, pp. 1267–1274.
- . (2009). 50 Years of socialist education in revolutionary Cuba: A world-systems perspective. *Journal of Iberian and Latin American Research*, 15(2), 45–64.
- . (2010a). Las reformas curriculares y la educación Bolivariana: Una perspectiva del análisis sistema-mundo [Curricular reform and Venezuela’s Bolivarian education: A world-systems perspective]. *Ensayo y Error*, XIX(38), pp. 117–139.
- . (2010b). Schooling for twenty-first-century socialism: Venezuela’s Bolivarian project. *Compare*, 40(5), pp. 607–622. doi:10.1080/03057920903434897
- . (2013). Wallerstein’s world-systems analysis. In: T. G. Griffiths and R. Imre eds., *Mass education, global capital, and the world: The Theoretical lenses of István Mészáros and Immanuel Wallerstein*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 67–98.
- . (2015). Critical education for systemic change: A world-systems analysis perspective. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 13(3), pp. 163–177.
- Griffiths, T. G., and Arnove, R. F. (2015). World culture in the capitalist world-system in transition. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 13(1), pp. 88–108. doi:10.1080/14767724.2014.967488.
- Griffiths, T. G. and Charon Cardona, E. T. (2015). Education for social transformation: Soviet university education aid in the cold war capitalist world-system. *European Education*, 47(3), pp. 226–241. doi:10.1080/10564934.2015.1065390
- Harvey, D. (2014). *Seventeen contradictions and the end of capitalism*. London: Profile Books.
- Heckman, J. (2018). Invest in early childhood development: Reduce deficits, strengthen the economy. *Heckman: The economics of human potential*. Available at: <https://heckmanequation.org/resource/invest-in-early-childhood-development-reduce-deficits-strengthen-the-economy/> (Accessed on 15 June 2018).
- Hill, D. (2005). Globalisation and its Educational discontents: Neoliberalisation and its impacts on education workers’ rights, pay and conditions. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 15(3), pp. 257–288.
- . ed. (2013). *Immiseration capitalism and education: Austerity, resistance and revolt*. Brighton: Institute for Education and Policy Studies.
- Liu, Y. (2016). The truth about meritocracy: It doesn’t make society fairer. *The Conversation*. Available at: <https://theconversation.com/the-truth-about-meritocracy-it-doesnt-make-society-fairer-65260> (Accessed on 22 December 2017).
- Mason, P. (2015). *Postcapitalism: A guide to our future*. London: Allen Lane.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2012). Education for profit, education for democracy. In M. C. Nussbaum, ed., *Not for profit: Why democracy needs the humanities*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, pp. 13–26.
- Rostow, W. W. (1959). The stages of economic growth. *The Economic History Review*, 12(1), pp. 1–16.
- Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in human capital. *The American Economic Review*, 51(1), pp. 1–17.

- Smith, K., Tesar, M. and Myers, C. Y. (2016). Edu-capitalism and the governing of early childhood education and care in Australia, New Zealand and the United States. *Global Studies of Childhood*, 16(1), pp. 123–135.
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2006). The development turn in comparative education. *European Education*, 38(3), pp. 19–47.
- Tomasevski, K. (2003). The promise of the 1948 universal declaration of human rights. In: K. Tomasevski ed., *Education denied: Costs and remedies*. London and New York: Zed Books, pp. 36–50.
- UN News Centre. (2017). *World leaders gathered at UN commit to boosting investment in education*. Available at: [www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/blog/2017/09/world-leaders-gathered-at-un-commit-to-boosting-investment-in-education/](http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/blog/2017/09/world-leaders-gathered-at-un-commit-to-boosting-investment-in-education/) (Accessed on 2 March 2018).
- UNESCO. (2016). *Education 2030 incheon declaration: Towards inclusive and equitable quality education and lifelong learning for all*. Available at: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0024/002456/245656E.pdf> (Accessed on 20 December 2017).
- United Nations. (1948). *The universal declaration of human rights*. Available at: [www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml](http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml) (Accessed on 22 October 2017).
- . (2017). *The sustainable development goals report 2017*. New York: United Nations.
- Vally, S. and Spreen, C. A. (2012). Human Rights in World Bank Education Strategy. In: S. J. Klees, J. Samoff, and N. P. Stromquist eds., *The world bank and education: Critiques and alternatives*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, pp. 173–187.
- Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The modern world-system I: Capitalist agriculture and the origins of the European world-economy in the sixteenth century*. New York: Academic Press.
- . (1980). *The modern world-system II: Mercantilism and the consolidation of the European world-economy, 1600–1750*. New York: Academic Press.
- . (1989). *The modern world-system III: The second era of great expansion of the capitalist world-economy, 1730–1840s*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.
- . (1994). The agonies of liberalism: What hope progress? *New Left Review*, (204), pp. 3–17.
- . (1995). *After liberalism*. New York: The New Press.
- . (2003). *The decline of American power*. New York: The New Press.
- . (2011). *The modern world-system IV: Centrist liberalism triumphant, 1789–1914*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wallerstein, I., Collins, R., Mann, M., Derlugian, G. and Calhoun, C. (2013). *Does capitalism have a future?* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Warmington, P. (2015). Dystopian social theory and education. *Educational Theory*, 65(3), pp. 265–281.
- Young, M. F. D. ed. (1971). *Knowledge and control: New directions for the sociology of education*. London: Collier-Macmillan.
- Ball, S. J. (2007). *Education plc: Private sector participation in public sector education*. London: Routledge.
- Fourcade, M. (2009). *Economists and societies: Discipline and profession in the United States, Britain, and France, 1980s to 1990s*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Goodson, I. F. (2005). The long waves of reform. In *Learning, curriculum and life politics*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 105–129.
- Goodson, I. F. (2014). *Curriculum, personal narrative and the social future*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Goodson, I. F. and Lindblad, S. eds. (2011). *Professional knowledge and educational restructuring in Europe*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Hess, A. (2009). The backstory of the credit crunch. *Times Higher Education*, December 17/24.
- Mason, P. (2016). Paul Mason on why the left must be ready to cause a commotion. *The New Statesman*. 23–29 September.
- Marquand, D. (2015). *Mammon's kingdom: An essay on Britain, now*. London and New York: Penguin.
- Profknow (Professional Knowledge in Education and Health). 2002–2008. *Restructuring work and life between state and citizens in Europe* (funded by the EU. University of Brighton – UK, University of Gothenburg – Sweden, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens – Greece, University of Joensuu – Finland, University of Barcelona – Spain, University of the Azores – Portugal, St. Patrick's College, Dublin City University – Ireland, University of Stockholm – Sweden). [www.profknow.net](http://www.profknow.net) (Accessed on 3 January 2018).
- Wilson, A. (1990). *Interview with Melvyn Bragg on the South Bank Show* (Series 2: Episode 25). Available on Sky: <http://go.sky.com/vod/content/SKYENTERTAINMENT/content/videoId/fdea6ff4605a0510VgnVC M1000000b43150a> (Accessed on 10 January 2017).
- Agnihotri, R. K. (2015). Constituent assembly debates on language. *Economic and Political Weekly*, L(8), February 21, pp. 47–56.
- Agrwal, P. (2018). NCERT textbooks to be 'optional' for UP Madrasa students; Books to be available in Urdu. *The Times of India*, January 5. <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/lucknow/uttar-pradesh-madrassas-to-have-ncert-books-yogi-govt/articleshow/61342533.cms> (Accessed on 4 July 2018).
- AIFRTE. (2012). *No to Anti-Constitutional 'School Choice' Model of PPP, Voucher Scheme, Commercialization, and Profiteering in Education!*, handbill issued on 03/12/2012.
- Allahabad High Court. (2015). *Judgment pronounced on 18/08/2015 on a bunch of petitions, first amongst them being the WRIT No. 57476 of 2013*. Shiv Kumar Pathak and 11 Others Versus State of UP And Three Others.
- Apple, M. W. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, First Published 1993.
- Bangalore Mirror. (2014). State cannot make Kannada mandatory language in private, unaided schools. *Bangalore Mirror Bureau*, May 6, 2014. <https://bangaloremirror.indiatimes.com/bangalore/others/kannada-language-primary-education-bangalore-karnataka-constitution-kannada-primary-education-constitution-of-india-fundamental-rights-language-of-parents-choice-ruling-victory-english-medium-schools/articleshow/34741617.cms> (Accessed on 22 June 2018).
- Bhat, P. (2017). Kannada made 1st or 2nd language in all Karnataka schools: Parents and student question move. *The News Minute*. 17 October. [www.thenewsminute.com/article/kannada-made-1st-or-2nd-language-all-karnataka-schools-parents-and-teachers-question-move](http://www.thenewsminute.com/article/kannada-made-1st-or-2nd-language-all-karnataka-schools-parents-and-teachers-question-move) (Accessed on 16 July 2018).

- Bhatty, K., Anuradha, D. and Rathin, R. (2015). The public education system and what the costs imply. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 50(31), 1 August.
- Bourdieu, P. (1973). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In: Richard Brown, ed., *Knowledge, education and cultural change*. London: Tavistock.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1947). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. London, Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Brown vs Board of Education. (1954). Brown vs Board of Education of Topeka. *United States Report*, 347, 483.
- Chatterjee, S. (2018). Mandatory Kannada rule. *The News Minute*, January 31. [www.thenewsminute.com/article/mandatory-kannada-rule-cbse-schools-approach-karnataka-hc-solution-75664](http://www.thenewsminute.com/article/mandatory-kannada-rule-cbse-schools-approach-karnataka-hc-solution-75664) (Accessed on 22 June 2018).
- Chavan, D. (2013). *Language politics under colonialism: Caste, class and language pedagogy in Western India*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Chaudhary, I. K. (2013). Sanskrit learning in colonial Mithila: Continuity and change. In: Deepak Kumar, Joseph Bara, Nandita Khadria, and CH. Radha Gayathri, eds., *Education in Colonial India: Historical Insights*. New Delhi: Manohar, pp. 125–144.
- Constable, P. (2000). Sitting on the school verandah: The ideology and practice of ‘untouchable’ educational protest in the late nineteenth-century Western India. *Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 37(4), pp. 383–422.
- Desai, R. B. (2016). Karnataka wants Constitutional amendment to make mother tongue compulsory in schools. *The Hindu*, Raichur, December 02, [www.thehindu.com/news/national/karnataka/Karnataka-wants-Constitutional-amendment-to-make-mother-tongue-compulsory-in-schools/article16742504.ece](http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/karnataka/Karnataka-wants-Constitutional-amendment-to-make-mother-tongue-compulsory-in-schools/article16742504.ece) (Accessed on 22 June 2018).
- Dreze, J. and Sen, A. (2002). *India: Development and participation*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Financial Express. (2018). UP: Adityanath government approves introduction of NCERT books in madrasas. New Delhi, May 23. [www.financialexpress.com/india-news/up-adityanath-government-approves-introduction-of-ncert-books-in-madrasas/1177680/](http://www.financialexpress.com/india-news/up-adityanath-government-approves-introduction-of-ncert-books-in-madrasas/1177680/) (Accessed on 4 July 2018).
- Fitzpatrick, S. (1970). *The commissariat of enlightenment: Soviet organization of education and the arts under lunacharsky October 1917–1921*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GoI. (1968). *National policy on education*. New Delhi: Government of India.
- . (1986). *National policy of education 1986*. New Delhi: Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
- . (1995). *The persons with disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act*, Government of India.
- . (2006). *Social, economic and educational status of the Muslim Community of India: A report of Prime Minister’s high level committee under cabinet secretariat*. Chairperson: Justice Rajindar Sachar.
- . (2009). *The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act*.
- . (2016). *The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act*.



- Government of Bihar. (2007). *Report of common school system commission*, June 8. <http://teacher-ed.hbcse.tifr.res.in/documents/common-school-commission-bihar-report> (Accessed on 20 September 2015).
- Goyal, B. S. and Sharma, J. D. (1987). *A study of the evolution of the textbook*. New Delhi: NCERT.
- Gupta, A. and Giri, A. (2015). Will Sending Kids of Govt. Servants to State-Run Schools Stop The Rot. *The Pioneer*, 29 August. [www.dailypioneer.com/columnists/oped/will-sending-kids-of-govt-servants-to-state-run-schools-stop-the-rot.html](http://www.dailypioneer.com/columnists/oped/will-sending-kids-of-govt-servants-to-state-run-schools-stop-the-rot.html) (Accessed on 20 September 2015).
- Gupta, V. (2013). Discourse and politics of home-based education. *Reconstructing Education*, (Joint Issue), 1(4), Sept-Dec, 2012 & 2(1), January-March, pp. 11–16.
- . (2014). Changing discourses on inequality and disparity: From welfare state to neoliberal capitalism. In: R. Kumar, ed., *Education, state and market: Anatomy of neoliberal impact*. New Delhi: Aakar, pp. 19–57.
- . (2015). *Aspects of structure of education and curricular knowledge in colonial India*, Paper Presented in the XXXVIII Indian Social Science Congress at Visakhapatnam (29 March–2 April 2015) on the theme of ‘Knowledge Systems, Scientific Temper and the Indian Peoples’.
- . (2016). Politics of the guarded agenda of new education policy. *Economic and Political Weekly*, L1(42), October 15, pp. 59–69.
- Hany Babu, M. T. (2017). Breaking the chaturvarna system of languages: The need to overhaul the language policy. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 52(23), June 10, pp. 112–119.
- Hastkshp.* (2015). Weekly Supplement of Hindi newspaper Rashtriya Sahara, Saturday, 29 August.
- Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling society*. New York: Harper and Row.
- India Today*. (2017). Schools in Gujarat replicate NCERT textbooks. *New Delhi*, February 8. [www.indiatoday.in/education-today/news/story/gujarat-replicate-ncert-textbooks-959610-2017-02-08](http://www.indiatoday.in/education-today/news/story/gujarat-replicate-ncert-textbooks-959610-2017-02-08) (Accessed on 5 July 2018).
- Jain, I. (2017a). UP to have 5,000 English-medium ‘sarkari’ schools’. *Times of India*, 7 October 2017. <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/lucknow/up-to-have-5000-english-medium-sarkari-schools/articleshow/60985800.cms> (Accessed on 22 June 2018).
- Jain, S. (2017b). Rajasthan Textbooks Revised to Glorify Modi Government. *The Wire*, June 16. <https://thewire.in/education/rajasthan-textbooks-revised-glorify-modi-government> (Accessed on 16 July 2018).
- Jain, M. and Sadhana, S. (2010). Politics of low cost schooling and low teacher salary. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 45(18), pp. 79–80.
- Jain, P. S. and Ravindra, H. D. (2009). Feasibility of implementation of right to education act. *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLIV(25), pp. 38–43.
- . (2010). Right to education act and public-private partnership. *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLV(8), pp. 78–80.
- Joshi, S. (2014). U.P. govt. to open English-medium schools. *The Hindu*, Lucknow, 29 November 2014. [www.thehindu.com/news/national/other-states/up-govt-to-open-englishmedium-schools/article6646342.ece](http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/other-states/up-govt-to-open-englishmedium-schools/article6646342.ece) (Accessed on 22 June 2018).
- Kamal, A. S. (2018). Karnataka govt. makes Kannada medium compulsory: Here’s why it is a terrible idea. *Firstpost*. 1 April [www.firstpost.com/india/](http://www.firstpost.com/india/)

- kannada-in-primary-schools-how-karnataka-got-its-mother-tongue-theory-wrong-2182269.html (Accessed on 23 June 2018).
- Kapur, A. (2015). The Wrong Way to Fix Government Schools, *Business Standard*, September 3, [www.business-standard.com/article/punditry/the-wrong-way-to-fix-government-schools-115090201545\\_1.html](http://www.business-standard.com/article/punditry/the-wrong-way-to-fix-government-schools-115090201545_1.html) (Accessed on 20 September 2015).
- Karnataka Government. (2015). The Kannada Language Learning Act, 2015, Karnataka' Act No. 22 of 2015, *First Published in the Karnataka Gazette Extraordinary on the Second day of May, 2015* (Received the assent of the Governor on the Twenty Ninth day of April, 2015).
- Kulkarni, T. (2017). Many CBSE Schools Add Another Subject to Accommodate Kannada. *The Hindu*, Bengaluru, 20 November. [www.thehindu.com/news/national/karnataka/many-cbse-schools-add-another-subject-to-accommodate-kannada/article20557202.ece](http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/karnataka/many-cbse-schools-add-another-subject-to-accommodate-kannada/article20557202.ece) (Accessed on 16 July 2018).
- Kumar, K. (2015). A Common Schooling System Would Bring Us Together as a Society, *Hindustan Times*, Sep 02, 2015 [www.hindustantimes.com/analysis/a-common-schooling-system-would-bring-us-together-as-a-society/article1-1386498.aspx](http://www.hindustantimes.com/analysis/a-common-schooling-system-would-bring-us-together-as-a-society/article1-1386498.aspx) (Accessed on 20 September 2015).
- Kumar, S. M. (2010). Is there a case for school vouchers? *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLV(7), pp. 41–46.
- MHRD, and GOI. (2007). *Public Private Partnership (PPP) in education: A concept note*.
- Ministry of Education, GoI. (1966). *Education and national development*. New Delhi: Ministry of Education, GoI.
- Mullick, R. (2018). UP government set to run 5k English medium primary schools, *Hindustan Times*. Lucknow, 2 April 2018. [www.hindustantimes.com/lucknow/up-government-set-to-run-5k-english-medium-primary-schools/story-KzuEVGlS9Y3Ulj7e3eEPjP.html](http://www.hindustantimes.com/lucknow/up-government-set-to-run-5k-english-medium-primary-schools/story-KzuEVGlS9Y3Ulj7e3eEPjP.html) (Accessed on 22 July 2018).
- Muzaffar, I. and Ajay, S. (2011). Public-private debates in education: Whither private without a public? *Journal of Social and Policy Science*, 1(2), June 2011, pp. 1–25.
- Nana, P. and Shri, A. T. (M.P.). (2016). *The Basic and Primary Education (Compulsory Teaching In Mother Tongue)*, Bill No. 98 of 2016, New Delhi, 3 March 2016.
- Naregal, V. (2001). *Language politics, elites, and the public sphere*. New Delhi: Permanent Black.
- NCERT. (2006). *Position paper, national focus group on teaching of Indian languages*. New Delhi: NCERT.
- NITI Aayog. (2017). *India: Three year action agenda 2017–18 to 2019–20*. New Delhi: Government of India.
- Pai, T. V. M. (2018). *This language policy, good or bad*, *Deccan Chronicle*, Jun 15. [www.deccanchronicle.com/nation/current-affairs/150617/this-language-policy-good-or-bad.html](http://www.deccanchronicle.com/nation/current-affairs/150617/this-language-policy-good-or-bad.html) (Accessed on 25 June 2018).
- Patnaik, R. (2012–2013). The supreme court verdict in favor of 25% reservation in private unaided schools. *Reconstructing Education*, 1(4), 2(1), pp. 5–11.
- Planning Commission. (2010). *Mid-Term Appraisal of Eleventh Five Year Plan 2007–12*. [http://planningcommission.nic.in/plans/mta/11th\\_mta/chapterwise/chap6\\_edu.pdf](http://planningcommission.nic.in/plans/mta/11th_mta/chapterwise/chap6_edu.pdf) (Accessed on 20 September 2015).

- . (2013). *Twelfth Five-Year Plan (2012–2017)*. GOI. First published, Sage Publications India. [http://planningcommission.gov.in/plans/planrel/12thplan/pdf/12fyp\\_vol3.pdf](http://planningcommission.gov.in/plans/planrel/12thplan/pdf/12fyp_vol3.pdf) (Accessed on 20 September 2015).
- Rai, A. (2001). *Hindi nationalism*. Delhi: Orient Longman.
- Rajalakshmi, T. K. (2011). The Interview with Senior Advocate Ashok Agarwal. *Frontline*, July 15, pp. 16–17.
- Ramachandran, V. (2009). Right to education act: A comment. *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLIV(28), pp. 155–157.
- Ramani, C. V. (2008). Mother Tongue as the Medium of Instruction. *The Hindu*. Karnataka, February 20. [www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-national/tp-karnataka/Mother-tongue-as-the-medium-of-instruction/article15170042.ece](http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-national/tp-karnataka/Mother-tongue-as-the-medium-of-instruction/article15170042.ece) (Accessed on 23 June 2018).
- Registrar General and Census Commissioner India. (2011). *Census of India, Ministry of Home Affairs*, Government of India.
- Sabharwal, M. (2015). Because elites opt out. Is forcing government servants to send their kids to government schools absurdity or common sense? *The Indian Express*, 28 August 2015 <http://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/because-elites-opt-out/> (Accessed on 20 September 2015).
- Sadgopal, A. (2009). *Sansad Mein Shiksha Ka Adhikaar Chhenanewala Bill*. Bhopal: Kishore Bharati.
- . (2010). Right to education act Vs right to education. *Social Scientist*, 38(9–12), pp. 17–50.
- . (2013). *Shiksha men PPP: Sarvajanic Niji bhagedariya Nav Udarwadi Loot*. Bhopal: Kishore Bharati.
- Sarangapani, P. M. (2009). Quality, feasibility and desirability of low cost private schooling. *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLIV(43), pp. 67–69.
- Sharma, R. (2017). NCERT textbooks to replace GCERT in classes III, V and VII. *The Indian Express*. Ahmedabad, 28 June. <https://indianexpress.com/article/cities/ahmedabad/ncert-textbooks-to-replace-gcert-in-classes-iii-v-and-vii-4725405/> (Accessed on 5 July 2018).
- Sharma, S. (2015). Implement Allahabad HC order across country, RTI activist to SC. *Tribune News Service*. 26 August 2015. [www.tribuneindia.com/news/haryana/courts/implement-allahabad-hc-order-across-country-rti-activist-to-sc/124372.html](http://www.tribuneindia.com/news/haryana/courts/implement-allahabad-hc-order-across-country-rti-activist-to-sc/124372.html) (Accessed on 20 September 2015).
- Smith, A. (1976). *The wealth of nations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Soysal, Y. and Strang, D. (1989). Construction of the first mass education systems in nineteenth-century Europe. *Sociology of Education*, 62(4), pp. 277–288.
- Supreme Court of India. (1993). Judgment pronounced on 14/05/1993 in the matter of Unnikrishnan P. J. And Others versus State of A. P. And Others. Review Petition Nos. 483 of 1993 in Writ Petition No. 678 of 1993. Etc.
- . (2002). Judgment pronounced on 31/10/2002 in the matter of T.M.A.Pai Foundation & Ors Versus State Of Karnataka & Ors in Writ Petition (civil) 317 of 1993.
- . (2010). Judgment pronounced on Writ Petition (C) No. 95 Of 2010, Society For Un-Aided Private Schools Of Rajasthan Vs U.O.I. & Anr.
- Teltumbde, A. (2012). RTE: A symbolic gesture. *Economic and Political Weekly*, XLVII(19), pp. 10–11.

- Thakore, D. (2018). Why the RTE Act Should Be Scrapped. *Educationworld*. (April). [www.educationworld.in/Magazine/EWIssueSection.aspx?Issue=EducationWorld\\_April\\_2018&Section=Cover\\_Story](http://www.educationworld.in/Magazine/EWIssueSection.aspx?Issue=EducationWorld_April_2018&Section=Cover_Story) Browsed on (Accessed on 6 June 2018).
- The Hindu*. (2010). *Rajasthan to go for NCERT Syllabus*, 7 April. [www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-national/tp-otherstates/Rajasthan-to-go-for-NCERT-syllabus/article16016500.ece](http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-national/tp-otherstates/Rajasthan-to-go-for-NCERT-syllabus/article16016500.ece) (Accessed on 5 July 2018).
- The Indian Express*. (2015). *Minister to write to officials: Admit your kids in govt schools*. 27 August. <http://indianexpress.com/article/cities/lucknow/minister-to-write-to-officials-admit-your-kids-in-govt-schools/> (Accessed on 20 September 2015).
- The Times of India*. (2015). Allahabad HC order an opportunity to improve standard of education, *The Times of India*. 26 August 2015, <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/home/education/news/Allahabad-HC-order-an-opportunity-to-improve-standard-of-education/articleshow/48686084.cms> (Accessed on 20 September 2015).
- . (2017). Uttar Pradesh Madrassas to have NCERT books: Yogi govt. *The Times of India*, Lucknow 30 October.
- . (2018a). Devnani's 'revisionist' ideas, NDA schemes guide NCERT books. *The Times of India*, Jaipur, 3 June. [http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow/64434992.cms?utm\\_source=contentofinterest&utm\\_medium=text&utm\\_campaign=cppst](http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow/64434992.cms?utm_source=contentofinterest&utm_medium=text&utm_campaign=cppst) (Accessed on 16 July 2018).
- . (2018b). *Rule to make Kannada mandatory in schools still in limbo*, April 17. <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/bengaluru/rule-to-make-kannada-mandatory-in-schools-still-in-limbo/articleshow/63790595.cms> (Accessed on 16 July 2018).
- Tooley, J., Dixon, P. and Gomathi, S. V. (2007). Private schools and the millennium development goal of universal primary education: A census and comparative survey in Hyderabad, India. *Oxford Review of Education*, 33(5), pp. 539–560.
- UNO (United Nations Organization). (2007). United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD).
- Vellanki, V. (2015). Government vs private schools in ASER 2014: Need to avoid binaries. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 50(7), February 14.
- WHO. (2011). *World disability report*. World Health Organization (Who).
- Willis, P. (1981). *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.