CHAPTER I:

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

Society is constituted from the combination of different caste and ethnic groups. Both caste and ethnic groups are defined as per their own characteristics. In the case of ethnic group, the word ethnic means of a group of people recognized as a class on the basis of certain distinctive characteristics such as religion, language, ancestry, culture or national origin (http://www.google.com.np, 2006). According to Smith (1996), an ethnic group is a human population. Usually members of this human population identify with each other on the basis of an alleged common genealogy or ancestry (cited in Wikipedia, Encyclopedia, 2006). The ethnic groups are often united by common cultural, behavioral, linguistic or religious practices. In this sense, an ethnic group is also a cultural community. Generally two types of ethnic group have arisen in the course of human history. The first is kinship based ethnic group which is most closely correspondence to the term 'tribe' and second one is most closely associated with the evolution of 'state'. Though many historians and anthropologists claimed that many of cultural practices are based on recent invention, members of an ethnic group argued that they have strong cultural continuity over the time.

However, ethnic group has own specific features. Particularly, a member of an ethnic group maintains the language or customs of the group. In most of the cases, they belong to a national group by heritage or culture but sometimes some of them are residing outside from its national boundaries (Wikipedia, Encyclopedia, 2006). Besides, Barth (1969) argued that an ethnic group maintain the following characteristics: (a) largely biologically self perpetuating (b) shares fundamental cultural values, realize in overt unity in cultural forms (c) makes up a field of communication and interaction (d) has a membership which identifies itself, and is identified by others as constituting a category

distinguishable from other categories of the order (cited in Dhakal, 1994). Basically ethnic identity has no permanent boundaries but as fluidity form. As a collective form, they often seek to mobilize with sharing certain common characteristics in a given situation (Gellner, 2001). This situation of ethnic group can be found in every nation. They are defined as per their own social context. As per the social context, any anthropologist can study about the people from any perspectives. Basically, here is tried to study about the culture (people's own and outer) and language of ethnic group, which are the main sources to recognize the ethnic group from others as separate form and can be found out others characteristics as well such as identity and living pattern etc.

In Nepal, there are identified 69 ethnic groups (Janajati Development Committee, ND). These ethnic groups are also classified by NEFIN and NFDIN (2004). They are (a) endangered (b) highly marginalized (c) marginalized (d) disadvantaged and (e) advantaged. On the basis of indigenous groups' classification, Paharis are in the mariginalized group category. Though they were mainly found in the village of Khopasi, Saldhara and Palanchok of Kavrepalanchok district, nowadays, they are as minority groups in all hill areas of Nepal. They are also scattered in Lalitpur of Kathmandu valley and elsewhere. According to NEFIN and NFDIN (2004), the total population of Pahari is 11,505 (0.06%). However, they consider Dailekh District as their ancestral place. They are living in their own periphery. The situation of Pahari at Badikhel of Lalitpur district is the same. They are peasant group and traditionally weavers of bamboo trays and baskets. They have their own languages, which is quite akin to the Tamang and Newar languages (HMG/Nepal, 2000). But very few have been known about them. In case of me, I found only two study reports. The first one is "Introduction of Pahari's culture and cultural heritage". The next one is "social, cultural and economic situation of Pahari". As per these studies, Pahari are backward people in case of social, economic and education conditions (Silwal, 2058 BS & Simirik Nepal, 2058 BS). Moreover there are not such literatures that describe about their schooling. Only one recently published book (2062 BS) "Pahari (*Pihi*) Jatiko Chinari Pustak written shows that there is lacked about the study of Pahari, if we compare with other ethnic groups of Nepal so Pahari group is not recognized as very known group than other (Pahari, 2062, BS). Similarly, the

preliminary information that I got from some Pahari youths of Bodikhel of Lalitpur district provides the knowledge that children are deprived of the facilities provided by the government bodies and I/NGOs. They are also devoid of basic needs. With this group of people I conducted research to understand their schooling. In doing so, I examined Paharis' lived reality, perception, and schooling from Derridean standpoints.

Why I am Interested to Undertake This Study

Schooling is considered as "the bones of our civilization" (Goodlad, 1979: 1). By this argument, I understood that every individual is learning, reading and writing from his/her way. They are then shaped by the society as they go through the process of learning. Besides, in Bourdieu's (1992) sense they are shaped by the habitus (sets of dispositions). In this sense, schooling can be considered as all kinds of school which attempt to exercise social control and solve a variety of social problems. Such type of schooling practice has also civilized the primitive society to the modern society. According to Goodlad (p.17),

> In primitive society, the education gap is narrow ……. through parental example, schooling, if, any is a short term ceremony of induction rituals. ……… In societies, education is not a pressing concern. There is little need for school that institution created to provide for needs not otherwise assured in the society.

In Nepal too there are indigenous communities which resemble to what Goodlad called primitive societies. Pahari is one of them whose "world view" (in post modernist sense) is different from the "world view" of the so called modern people because Paharis are peasant group and heavily rely on wage labor for livelihood. Though they have the skill of weaving bamboo tray and others goods, they have been found unable to compete with other. In the school too the Pahari children were reported to be performing less (appendix, 1) than their non-Pahari counterparts (may be it is avoided) because they were interfacing with new worldview of language and socio-cultural patterns of school. This made me interested to know how has been their schooling. What has been their world view to look at education? How have they been schooled at home about education? How have they been schooled at classroom? How have they been schooled by their class and workmates? In order to understand the above questions I went to Pahari community of

Badikhel of Lalitpur district. There I tried to understand the Pahari community in general and some influential youths in particular. In doing so, I examined the Pahari community from Kaupapa theory to understand the ethnic community. But in understanding the schooling of Pahari, I applied some of the Derridean standpoints which are mentioned below:

Theoretical Standpoints

As I said earlier I used Derridean standpoints as theoretical closure to understand Paharis' world view about school. So I have picked up some of the terms that Derrida used. In other words I tried to understand the worldview of the Pahari community towards schooling from the following six terms that Derrida used. For example, Derrida used the term Identity. By this term he meant the identity concern of the marginal groups. While using Derrida's term Identity, I looked for the identity concerns of the Pahari children at school, at playground, and at house. I also examined how these identities match and/or collide each other and create tension to the children and eventually shape world view of the Pahari children towards schooling. Similarly I examined the Pahari children from Derrida's another term called Subversion. As Derrida said I understood the world view of the Pahari children from another angle that is different from the mainstream thinking (Bhattrai, ND). It means I explored alternative approach to school Pahari children. In doing so I was examining Paharis' behaviors, attitudes, socio – cultural pattern, and future hope and tried to develop alternative schooling approach to what Derrida used the term Subversion.

Deconstruction is the third term that Derrida used. For this study I used this term to find out the answer of the questions like what are the beliefs of Paharis? How they are changing their beliefs in the present context? Where they are feeling difficulty to match with the present situation? How Paharis are thinking to face with modern world that is outside of their conventional worldview? On the basis of the answers obtain from the study; I understood the meaning of schooling for Paharis from the deconstruction standpoints. Similarly I will use Derrida's concept of *Difference* and *Differance.* With these terms I understood the schooling of the Pahari community by finding out the

answers of the questions such as how the Paharis see the outside world? And how the outsiders understand Pahari and their schooling? Thus I captured the *difference* and the *differance* between Paharis and non-Pahari's world view in general and about schooling in particular.

Skeptical reality is the next term that Derrida used to understand the perception of the people like Paharis through dialogue and discourse. In the process of finding out Paharis' skeptical reality about them as group and schooling of the children in particular I involved in the Paharis in active dialogue and discourse. Finally I used Derrida's another term interpretation to find out the style of understanding the concept and the construct as well as deconstruct views of the Pahari community.

Objectives

With a view to study on Schooling of Paharis, following objectives were set:

- To understand Pahari from anthropological and social construct
- To analyze Paharis' schooling from Derridean standpoints
- To draw implication for the education of the Indigenous People such as Pahari

Research Questions

In the process of achieving the above objectives I was guided by the following research questions.

1. What has been the world view of the Paharis?
2. How their world view is constructed?
3. How their world view is *difference* and *differance* from the world view of the non-Paharis?
4. What has been the schooling of the Paharis?
5. How the Paharis' and non-Paharis' construct of schooling is matched/unmatched with each other?
6. What can be alternative measures to help Pahari children for their better learning?

CHAPTER II:

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I reviewed the different author's concept of schooling, school as social structure, both individual and collective subjectivity of both Pahari and non Pahari and Derrida's terms: Identity, Subversion, Deconstruction, *Difference* and *Differance*, Skeptical reality and interpretation. I tried to link these all Derridean terms; and their knowledge with the reality of Pahari groups.

Functionally speaking, schooling can be understood as backbone of civilization and socialization process. This socialization process is carried at home as family functions and in school it is a school function. In both locations, it works as the source of power, freedom, and enlightenment (Goodlad, 1979: 18 - 19).

Goodlad further viewed that school helps maintain complex social hierarchy in the society. For example, we can find this complex hierarchy in Hindu society, where both formal and non-formal maintained the caste hierarchy through their contents and pedagogy. This school system was stricter than other, whose impact is remaining still now for some group of Hindu people. But the schooling in Buddhist tradition was liberal than Indo – Aryan education system. It means, all the caste people could have access to the Buddhist schools (Koirala, 1996). Likewise, in modern society, schools can be seen under the control of government and without it a young cannot be socialized to life (Joe, 2002). This argument suggests that schooling is depended upon government, religious guidance, and structure of society no matter it as primitive or complex or modern.

Regarding the difference between school and schooling, Goodlad (1979: 18 - 19) aptly captured and said education and schooling are synonymous but they are different in delivery process. I also subscribe his idea further argue that schooling carried family

functions while education (school) addressed the gap between family function and international knowledge (ibid). Gradually, schooling has become as an instrument of career opportunity as well. Similarly, Ross (cited in Spring, 2001) argued that traditionally, the family, religious schools and the community were only responsible for internal forms of social control. The family and the religious school inspire moral values and social responsibility in the child, which insured social stability and cohesion. These schools are still attempting to exercise social control and solve a variety of social problems in the society. But in the modern age, the family and the religious school have been replaced by the formal public schools as institution. Mann (cited in Spring, 2001) said that these institutions have become the better means for improving the societies and people believed that they are key institutions to reforming society. Now, the school is considered as the symbol and hope for the good society.

School as an institution is related with social structure, social system, individual subjectivity and the interface between them. As a social structure, according to Weber (1864 -1920) it has to respond social actions (cited in McGee & Warms, 2004). As a social system, according to Durkheim (1858 – 1917), it has to cater the learning needs of the society (cited in Bohannan & Glazer, 1988). As an individual and social subjectivity school has to address the feelings and emotions of the individual student (Henriques, et al 1984). And as a product of interface between individual/social subjectivity and social structure, school has to work between the agency and the structure (Giddens, 1982) the former as student and the later as social structure. In this framework this study is designed to understand formal, informal and non - formal schooling of an ethnic group, Pahari of Nepal. In this process I used Derridean standpoints as theoretical closure to understand Paharis' world view about school. I also paid attention to culture and personality theory in knowing Pahari's viewpoints. Generally, all groups have own world view to understand about them and others as well. For example, Nietzsche (1844 – 1900) and Derrida argued that every group of people is a prisoner of his/her perspective. Both Nietzsche and Derrida who are German philosopher and classical scholar and poet, they argued that God is dead which means that creating something of a religious void. But in other's perspective, this argument of both Nietzsche and Derrida attacked on

Christianity and the western metaphysical tradition. So as per the western philosophy, both Nietzsche and Derrida exploded the very center of western thought (Powel, 2003: 14). Similarly, they emphasizes that there is voids and the dance of thought is on the playground of knowledge but westerners don't tolerate voids very well. This implies that perspective varies and so does arguments.

There are three perspectives to understand worldview of the people. For Redfield (1952), it is the outlook of the universe that indicates the characteristic of a people. For Parsonian (1952) it constitutes the set of cognitive orientations of the members of a society (Wallace, 1961: 99). According to Wallace (1961: 101), a worldview is not merely a philosophical by product of each culture like a shadow, but the very skeleton of concrete cognitive assumption on which the flesh of customary behavior is hung. This worldview is embodied in cosmology, philosophy, ethics, religious ritual, scientific belief, and act. These three persons' understanding indicates that worldview shapes peoples' personality through socio-cultural world and the outside. In other words, it is generally agreed that our personalities are the result of an interaction between the genetic inheritance and the life experiences (Ember and Ember, 1977: 364) implying that his or her parents largely shape the child's personality. This shows that culture is embodied in the character/personality of the child (Jha, 2004: 121). It means one person's personality is always be different form others. In other words we can say that all groups or individuals have different worldviews or personality and within worldviews, identities are also different. Particularly, a group or individual shows two types of personality. One is basic personality and another is modal personality. Basic personality primarily rests on the cultural deductive principle. This personality represents the intra-psychic structures of the members of the society (Wallace, 1961: 107). Typical personality on the other hand is assumed from looking at the culture (Rosman and Rubel, 1977: 240). Therefore, it is a similar character of the members because of the similar socialization/schooling process. But in case of modal personality, it represents not only the typical personality but the range of variation as well (ibid). When a person alters his/her behavior in adapting to the changing circumstances model personality emerges (Ember and Ember, 1977). Therefore, this type of personality is not static as the culture (Ibid, p366). Paharis in this case are not

different. In other words they have both basic and model personality. Keeping this in mind I have used Derridean terms to understand Pahari's worldview and examine their linkages with schooling.

Identity

Identity gives the meaning differently in different case. For example, In case of social sciences and psychology, identity has specific meanings, stemming from cognitive theory, sociology, politics, and psychology etc. In case of cultural identity, it is a person's self affiliation (or categorization by others) as a member of cultural groups. Similarly, in case of gender identity, it is the gender with which a person identifies or it is identified by others (Free Encyclopedia, 2006). At this point, I want to discuss about one of ethnic group' called Pahari's identity. Particularly, ethnic refers to a group distinguished by common cultural characteristics, e.g., a linguistic group like the Bantu or Malayo-Polynesian (Tylor, 1990: 191). Like the argument of Tylor, here the term identity of ethnic group is concerned with the marginal groups, Pahari children at school, at playground, and at house whom I want to understand from the perspective of Derrida's term Identity. In Derridean sense, identity is a two – place relation/function. So from the repetition process, identity can be possible because, it is not sameness (Hobson, 1998): 93). Fish argued that any one's identity can be found as agent or subject because any individual person is always constrained by the local or community standards and criteria (cited in Cole, 1994: 40). Exactly, the above mentioned argument is similar with what I observed in the preliminary field of Pahari children in Bodikhel of Lalitpur district. As I found these Pahari children have two kinds of identity. From the language context, Pahari language is their first language identity in their home and villages but in school, they are understood as second language group children, while comparing with national language Nepali. Looking from the caste and ethnic groups, they are identified as different groups, ethnic from the Brahman and Chhetri, caste group. If we are looked from the cultural context, the Pahari children are understood as more cultural group, though they are same group as similar with Hindu religious group because they are more involved in celebrating the festivals than following the rules and regulation of school. In present situation, majority of students are from Pahari group. These groups of school children

9

reported me that they have to face difficulty with rules and regulations of school which are different from the more celebrating the festival calendar. Similarly, initially, they have to face with Nepali language while reading and writing the school books, which are totally different from their home schooling's curriculum. The children further reported that they are feeling difficulty in understanding while teaching in classroom by teachers than their friends from Nepalese language speaking group. This situation creates as what Valintin (2002) argued that most of the modern schools are not fitted with poor class, low status group such as squatter school children, though they promise to provide social justice and equality from the teachers and head teacher. On the contrary, non Pahari teachers, and head teacher are feeling too difficult while they are teaching in class room. In this situation, a tension is creating for both the Pahari children group and non Pahari teachers in school. These situations imply that the identities of Pahari children do not match with other groups of children in school. This situation seems like the argument of Luintel (2006) who argued that identity is an 'evolving self.' This self evolves through representation, power, discourse, culture and sense making. Devies (1992) in this regard argued that if we look from realist perspective, identity is knowable as a separate subject whereas poststructuralists believe that the identity of person is indirectly constructed (cited in Luintel, 2006). Similarly, Hall (1991) remarked Derrida's (1967) notion of *differance*, which allows different and indeterminate new meanings without necessitating the removal of the trace of previous meanings. After remarking this notion of Derrida, Hall described that identity as an historical narrative that allows us to explain where we are from (cited in Piper and Garratt, 2004: 280). It means that identity is separates things for separate group of people. Radhkrishnan (2003: 3) has also supported this view and writes that cultural identities are not up for sale or commercial influence for being the same. Rather it is deferent type of cultural domain which is attached deeply in identity.

Radhakrishnan (2003) further viewed that any community has a given identity that is sedimented by many historical process. In the same line Kearney (1995) argued that identity is produced and reproduced in systems of power (cited in Piper and Garratt, 2004: 280). And Piper and Garratt (2004: 280) told that the relational aspect of identity is existed with its ontological and epistemological implications in more detail. Likewise,

Conquergood (1994: 200) viewed that identity is constituted and proliferated between self and other. According to the Buddhist Vijnanavadins, self is a series of momentary cognitions.

In understanding of *Sruti*, the self is a full of knowledge, an internal light, and an individual self. Individual self is a kind of knowledge or a light and the Knowledge is a soul's recognition of one's nature as 'I" – consciousness. So knowledge is similar with mind and the mind is a collection of different perceptions that comprises identity. Recognition of personal identity thus proves the existence of a permanency (Cited in Sinha, 1999: 247). These arguments suggests that people show their identity whatever they have knowledge or mind. This understanding can be linked with Pahari groups' identity who said me that they are *thimsel* (mix of different group especially Newar and Tamang) but they have their own language and culture. Besides, they do not often share their community concerns with other caste group. In other words they maintain secrecy. For example, in 2058 BS, one man was killed on the occasion of *Austami*, the eighth day of *Dashain*. This is not yet known to the public who killed this person and why.

The above arguments suggest that identity is self constructed image, which may or may not represent a specific culture. From this identity, a person can be introduced to others as a distinctive being. This distinctiveness is a personality. The personality thus formed is the psychodynamic adjustment that has aggregation of the past, environment, and experience (Mead, 1953 cited in Jha, 2004). It is also the combination of the genetic inheritance and life experiences (Ember and Ember, 1973). This aggregated form gradually becomes intellectual system of the specific community (Wallece, 1961). The system is then manifested in the form of basic and model type personality (Benedict, cited in Jha, 2004; Ember and Ember, 1973). With this backup, I examined the basic type personality as their identity and model type personality as the intellects of the Pahari community. Then I tried to understand schooling from etic and emic perspectives.

Subversion

Subversion is another Derridean term that indicates a way of alternative thinking. One can argue that subversion means practice of reversing one's perspective. Both reverse opposites such as subject/object; truth/error; moral/amoral (Powel, 2003). For example, we can make story of any persons from one ideological closure and the same story can be presented in an opposite form or can be thought in another way. Chow (1998: 964) illustrated similar example of trauma of love story about Li, which consists a test of woman's morality against society's requirements as a fundamentally sacrificial form. Zhenniang (name of woman character who plays major role) had to confront with a choice between nightmares on her second wedding night: should she loose her body? or should she die? But this story shows that Zhenniang devoted her whole life to her first husband's memory that she knows hardly. It is only when she properly sacrificed, that a woman can become a respectable woman for others to emulate. On the contrary, Chow (1998) argued that this story can also be presented from the feminized perspective through the method of subversion. This method of subversion is fundamentally formal which exceeds and violates the coherence of cultural forms from within and replaces that coherence with dislocations, perversities, and crudities. This subversive method of feminized perspective is similar to what I listened dialogues during the preliminary field of Pahari students at playground when they were sharing each other about their difficulties in understanding Nepali word clearly. These students were also criticizing the imperialist nature of Nepali language that was used for teaching and learning in school. They further said that school maintains the hierarchy in term of using language. Besides, they were discussing about how could they give high priority to their language at school and save it from being marginalized. This hearsay of the Pahari students of Bodikhel indicates exactly what Derrida says the attempt to subvert the central term of any structure, the marginalized term thus becomes central and temporally overthrows the hierarchy (Powell, 2003: 26). Latter on, people follow code switching method. Bir Bahadur Pahari did the same thing by linking students' with their daily practices. This situation reminded me Paulo Freire's (1983: 19) concept called conscientaizacation. For Freire the term consientatizacation refers to the learning to perceive social, political and economic contradictions and enables to take action against the oppressive elements of

reality or difficult situation of learning and eventually provide the way, code switching. This argument of Freire (1983) is one of the ways of seeking the subversive thought of Derrida who argued that subversion contains an extraordinary story (Danser, 2004).

During my preliminary field visit I asked one question with the students like if all teachers come from Pahari language group, what would happen. In response, they said "it will be easy for us while to understand the text". I reiterated the same question differently and said, "If all non Pahari teachers speak in Pahari language what would happen. The students of grade 4 while plying on a group repeated the same answer. This situation is similar with the argument of Derrida who said that we can think from the opposite of existing structure or existing way of thinking because there is nothing outside the text (Lucy, 2000: 30). Similarly, from the perspective of Lyotard (2000), it is 'metanarratives' like science in which everybody cannot believe for long. Likewise, from the perspective of Nietzsche (2000), it is just like that knowledge where no facts, only interpretations exist. Interpretation, as per the argument of Schleiermacher (1991: 190) involves a playing back and forth between the specific and the general, the micro and the macro. When this interplay is applied to the understanding of persons, one is inevitably drawn into a consideration of how language encourages and constrains a person's self – understanding (cited in Smith, 1991: 190).

Going through the above arguments, I will find out the interpretive dialogues to understood Pahari school children' behaviors, attitudes, socio – cultural pattern, and future hope and try to develop alternative schooling approach such as code switching as suggested by Bir Bahadur Pahari. Freire (1970) offers a similar formulation of developing the alternative schooling approach. Derrida (1978) too advised another way to hermeneutic writing while he critiqued phenocentrism and the western predisposition to privilege speech over writing (cited in Smith, 1991). Likewise, Brown (1994: 25) argued that postmodern criticism subverts dogmatic claims in science, ethics and politics. Attinello (2002: 263) in this regard argued that processes of subversion are evident in the compositional choice, which provides the easy solutions for any raised problems. He further viewed that if this subversion processes are elaborated, the arbitrary operations of

solution can be established as renowned valued in front of society. According to Derrida (1978: 292), disruption of presence is another subversion way for detailing the methods of producing sound in the sector of music (cited in Fellor, 2002: 253).

Reflecting upon the above-mentioned authors' arguments, I will examine the field that has fixed structure and that can be subverted and see whether it gives alternative. But I can see that many of us are facing with the fixed structure like Pahari children at school and their home as well. Even at this point I tried to subvert the structural understanding and substitute the new but plausible way for ethnic justice through educative process.

Deconstruction

Deconstruction is another Derridean term. According to him, any statement can be deconstruction as supposed 'X'. It involves a way of reading that concern itself with *decentering* with unmasking the problematic nature of all centers. In case of center, Derrida said,

> All western thought is based on the idea of a *center* – an origin, a truth, an ideal form, a fixed point an immovable mover, an essence, a god, a presence, which is usually capitalized, and guarantees all meaning. For instance, for 2000 years much of western culture has been centered on the idea of Christianity and Christ. And it is the same in other cultures as well. They all have their own central symbols. The problems with centers mean that western cultures attempt to exclude. In doing so they ignore, repress or marginalize others, this is indicated as *decentered* (Powell, 2003: 21 – 23).

The above arguments of Derrida imply that deconstruction consist both center and *decentering* as binary opposites just like the opposition between man/women; spirit/matter; nature/culture; Caucasian/Black, Christian/Pagan etc. Just like the binary oppositions, all parts of social system or all parts of any statement have relationship. The opposition parts are related, where one is central, natural and privileged, and the other is ignored, repressed and marginalized. This Derridean idea resembles to Pahari school children as well. As I found Pahari School children have beliefs that their school language is Nepali. At school especially in classroom, they must speak in Nepali but at playground and at informal groups they use their own language; especially when they do

not fined the appropriate words in Nepali. Similarly, except the one English textbook, all curricula are in Nepali languages. It means Pahari children have conceptualized that the school language should be different from the day-to-day language. In other words the National language became center and the Pahari language the *decenter*. Similarly, school culture turned out to be center and the home culture the *decentered*. In a simple term Pahari children believed in binary opposition because it is the nature of their lived social structure. Here school, as an institution, is a miniature form of social system, individual subjectivity, and the interface between them embedded in it (Durkheim, 1858 – 1917; Weber, 1864 -1920; Henriques, et al. 2005; and Giddens, 1982). In this similar vein, Radhakrishnan (2004: 141 -142) argued that the reality of a world is in dominance because a world divided into two zones: one the rationality as together and two are as at odds.

According to Derrida deconstruct is an also tactic form of *decentering*. It attempts to change the opposite form of existing practices or subvert the central term so that the marginalized term can become central (Powell, 2003: 26). In another sense, Powell (2003: 46) argued that the deconstruction invert the hierarchy that favors speech as natural and central. This applies in the writing as well. Brown (1994: 26) said that deconstructive activities are the resistance work and hence they face the challenges in establishing moral authority and inventing positive values as central elements of any polity. The above arguments suggest that deconstruction is the changed form of existing situation, where people change their beliefs. In the case of Pahari children they too are changing their speaking habit and nature of their language though it is their dominant language of the house and the locality. It means that before going to school, home language is the dominant form or the centre and others language is opposite to it. It means others language is less emphasized or it is a *decentering* part of Pahari's social structure. But when they start to go to school, initially, they have to face difficulty in learning Nepali language in reading, writing, and doing mastery on it. In fact this is a changing situation for all Pahari children because to go to school is necessary job for them. Moreover, their parents and surrounding environments and government policies encourage them to go to school compulsorily. At the same time, their parents also start

speaking Nepali language in a hope that they can improve Nepali language of their children. As a result their Pahari language slowly disappears from their house. This situation is similar to what Radhakrishnan (2004: 131) talked about the concept of "subject position". As per this concept, he said, "If location fragments the plentitude of representation, subject positionality eviscerates representation in the name of language". Chhetri (2005) gave another example from Dalits' skill and knowledge. As he argued Dalits are marginalized because they ignored their skill and failed to modernize the development efforts. These arguments are similar to the situation of language positionality and bamboo making skill of Pahari children and Valintine's (2002) findings about the paradox of modern schooling. In the both the cases I found that marginalized people are ignoring the local social being. This is the reason that Pahari children of Bodikhel village of Lalitpur district are facing difficulties in matching their lived situation with school's structure especially in pedagogy, language use, and rules regulations of school though they are attending the school for gaining education.

Cixous (2000: 191) view that if we critique the morals and metaphysics, this is also a mode of deconstruction because these morals and metaphysics are one side of social structure, which focus on both *center* and *decenter*. In other words it is binary opposition of this structure, where *centre* dominate the *decenter* (Powell, 2003). I also found binary opposition in the preliminary field of Pahari children at Bodikhel of Lalitpur district. As I found from the language context, Pahari are criticizing the present modern schooling where their language was in *decentering* position. It means their language is dominated by Nepali language, which is a center of school structure. Similarly, their traditional skill of weaving bamboo trays and others goods became *decenter* because they could not compete with global markets because people got plastic and metal made goods in instead of bamboo goods. And yet Pahari community of Bodikhel is following the traditional technology for making bamboo goods. This situation can be understood as what Pier Paolo Passolini (2006) affirmed the older dictatorial forms of societies such as fascism and church or military dominated countries in comparison with television or to any other visual technology equipped countries. This comparison helped me understand that Pahari at Bodikhel are dominated by centers of the existing social structure and they are facing

with modern world that is outside of their conventional worldview. This situation is also consistent with G.H.'s (ND) statement that in a moral and metaphysics, deconstruction comes step-by-step deconstruction. Similarly Paul de Man said that deconstruction demonstrates how a text dismantles its own privileged or traditional meanings (cited in Powell, 2003: 148). Powell (2003) also argued that deconstruction has tended to inspire either adoration or hatred; and in Pahari's case it was both.

After reviewing the concept of deconstruction, we can know two things: (a) schooling of any groups depends of the social structure where *center* and *decenter* exist. Center always dominates the *decenter* and *decenters* are marginalized (b) If *decenter* can be posited at the place of center, any suppressed group can get the justice.

Difference and Differance

Generally, *difference* is a kind of way in which we understand that two people or things are not the same in terms of outlook or meaning or their knowledge or their understanding about each other. According to Hobson (1998:9), *difference* seems each time localized; each time it is used; each time it seems to require an answer to the question 'different to what?' Hobson further argued that *difference* is a relational term, which is frequently used with those relations unmentioned or cut off. Similarly, according to Saussure *difference* is based on relation and these relations produce meanings because they are elements in a system of *difference* (Powell, 2003:116). This *difference* term is similar with the Derridean term '*differance*'. According to Derrida, *differance* is understood as the binary structuration of the self (Radhakrishnan, 2003: 65). Furthermore, Powell (2000: 118 - 121) also clearly expressed about the argument of Derrida, who argued that *differance* includes not only the meaning to 'differ' to be the different form something else – but to defer, to delay, and to put off till later. Or it is ambiguous. Its play hinges on at least two meanings: "to differ" and "to defer" without ever settling into one or the other. According to Derrida, any audience doesn't know about the *difference* while talking about the *difference* or *differance*. The meaning of *differance* can never be achieved because it is always suspended between differing and deferring and the suspension creates a kind of interval or blank in space and time that

underlies all cases of differing of distinction in writing. Thus the *differance* produces and undermines all pairs of binary opposites such as nature/culture; man/woman/ and poison/cure etc.

The above arguments imply that different groups have different understanding about each other's worldviews. This understanding aptly fits with what I found in Bodikhel. For example, Pahari has their own understanding about the non-Pahari groups such as Brahman/Chhetri, Dalits, and others. Similarly, non-Pahari groups have also their own worldview about Pahari groups. This was manifested even with the Pahari students and teachers. From the language context, they understand that their language is different from the language of Chhetri/Brahman. Their non-Pahari friends and teacher's language is the culture of reading and writing at school. Amidst this setting they are feeling that they can see difference between the two languages (Pahri vs Nepali and English) but not heard. This situation is similar to what Derrida viewed *differance*, which is not some mystic, unnameable being and does not exist like the God is existed (Powell, 2003:122).

Similarly, Pahari children reported me that they have many festivals if they compare with non Pahari friends, though they celebrate the Hindu festivals. For example, they spent more money on festivals and feast. They involve more in festivals due to their strong feeling that culture is their life. They have low economic status than non Pahari groups especially if they compare with Brahman/Chhetri. Even at this position, they are holding the knowledge about their *differance*. It means their understanding about themselves and *difference* from the non Pahari can be linked with the statement: can it be found in their sensitized form which is neither a fixed word nor a concept, nor a thing but gives the meaning (Wikipedia, the free Encyclopedia, 2006). Or according to Derrida, *differance* is the condition for the opposition of presence and absence, which is also the "hinge" between inner meaning and outer representation (Scot, 2002). *Differences* are themselves give the meaning by further differences such as house and home are understood by the people as 'building' and 'family' or 'social unit', though it may seem contradictory i.e. the term *differance* is neither word nor a concept (Wikipedia, Encyclopedia, 2006). Radhakrishnan (2003: 174) argued that *difference* is indeed in a state of painful becoming

and really wants "to be" and "be recognized." Like these arguments, Pahari children of Bodikhel also feel difference between the teaching methods of school and their traditional approach to teaching than their non Pahari friends in the classroom. Besides, I can claim that they are less free person than their non Pahari friends because they have to be involved more in their bamboo making goods, though they are children. They earn money for them, though their parents do not value that the earning from their children is not the earning of adults. In other words, children's earning is also considered as the earning of household or parents. This situation can be linked with as what Derrida argued that difference is lost which can be seen but not heard and this *differance* is being marginalized (Powell, 2003:120).

According to Derrida, *differance* refers to the whole complex of its meanings (Rivkin & Ryan, 1998: 341 – 343). Pahari teacher's expression "Only a Pahari teacher cannot make difference" exemplifies this statement. In other words the whole complex is that the Pahari children have to accept every thoughts and working style of other non Pahari, who are minority in their numbers. Similarly, from the gender perspective, the Pahari teacher viewed that women teacher is suitable only for nursery than higher classes. From the argument one can understood that Pahari's worldview as well emphasizes more on male center teacher composition at school. This worldview of Pahari teacher is similar to the argument of Judith Butler (2006) who said, in the structure of masculine – feminine binary, the position of feminine is hoped in less number or loss of sense. This analysis calls for the concept of gender mime and tries to denaturalize compulsorily occurred masculine – feminine binary envisaged in Derrida's concept of *difference*. Similarly, Pahari teacher's argument is similar to Lorde (1998) who said what we see very real *differences* between us in terms of race, age, and sex, meaning the *differences* does not separate us.

On the contrary, non Pahari children and teachers have difference and *differance* views about the Pahari children and about the Pahari in general. This reality is similar to what Derrida conceived the center position holders have own view regarding the decentering part but not as identical. Rather it is a type of silent writing. It indicates the middle voice,

it precedes and sets up the opposition between passivity and activity which is called *differance* (Derrida, 1966). Following Derrida, Pahari are extra skill holders than non Pahari. In this sense, Pahari must be economically stronger than non Pahari because they have two sources for subsistence: One is farming and animal husbandry and another is skill of weaving bamboo tray and others goods. But the field does not prove it. In case of sanitary practices of the household, the Paharis are too dirtier than non Pahari especially while comparing with Brahman and Chhetri. From education point of view, more Pahari children are enrolled at school than the earlier years and yet teachers complain that most of them do not read and write at home. All they do is their assignments because they have to be engaged in bamboo goods weaving work. But the Pahari students do not accept this claim. Here I saw Derrida's concept of binary opposite worldviews, where both centre and *decentering* part have its own understanding about each other. And yet the worldviews sometimes blur, live in loss or in complex form, indicating the *differance* (Hobson, 1998: 215). Or it is also similar to the center part of binary opposition where centers often play dominant role whereas *decenters* seems as inferior or low position (Powell, 2003:15).

After conceptualizing the concept of *difference* and *differance,* I realized to unveil the *centers* and *decenters* of Paharis' and non- Paharis' social structure and understand schooling from that end.

Skeptical Reality

Skeptical reality is the next term that Derrida used to understand the perception of the people. To create the dialogue and discourse is one part of deconstruction because the word deconstruction comes from German philosopher Martin Heidegger's (1889-1976) concept of *Destruction.* This destruction is called for the loosening up of the old tradition of ontology. This is the study of ultimate Rock Bottom Reality through an exposure of its internal development. This says that any structure can be changed through the ultimate dialogue and discourse and help create the new forms of structure. Even with the new form of structure Derrida argued it has both *centre* and *decenters* parts in a hierarchical order. In each part we can discuss about its positionality. It means the proposed

20

discussions are skeptical about the existing structure (Snyder, 2006). In other words both parts of structure are able to prove their skeptical reality. This reality can be changed through the dialogue as new forms where *decenters* can be positioned in high level or in a dominating form. It means that existing situation can be destroyed and new types of position can be developed to which Derrida called deconstruction.

Relating Derrida with the dialogue session between me and the group of people at Bodikhel I realized that if Pahari students are taught by all Pahari teachers, they could understand easily because the Pahari teachers teach through code switching process and link with home schooling practices. My understanding helps me to generate the knowledge that Pahari children are thinking their *decentered* part of school's existing structure and want to change the *decenter* part to *center* and make reading and writing easy. This situation fits well with the argument of Pierre Bourdieu (1977) who offers a similar formulation in his analyses of how orthodox practices of discourse classify some views as admissible and others as marginal (cited in Brown, 1994:31). It means Pahari children are thinking that majority of non Pahari teachers as marginal or *decenters* position and they show the desired of majority of Pahari teachers instead of only one Pahari teacher as center form at school. Similarly, the Pahari students showed interest to be taught in their own language. They told me that if all teachers can speak Pahari language as well, our schooling would be easy. It means that they want to read and write in their Pahari language and want to keep it into center position instead of going to the *decenter* position. In other words they want to put Nepali language in *decenter* position. In this way, they are thinking about the alternative way or opposite of existing situation for comfortable schooling. This situation is similar type what Gergen (1994: 59) said,

> Deconstruction theory demonstrates the internal tension of the text, the dependence of the said on the unsaid and the eternal aporia of the foundational of grounding text. With deconstruction theory, not only does the object of the text disappear as a serious matter, but so does the mind of the author as an originary source. As rhetorical analysis, deconstruction theory further reveals the bag of tricks, ruses and hijinks essential to the intelligibility and persuasive appeal of any text. Under these conditions, all attempts by authorities to establish knowledge convey wisdom or establish values are placed under suspicion.

Gergen further elaborated deconstruction from critical points of view. According to him, feminist, critical theorists and minority groups find oppression and prejudice at every turn such as in film, art, architecture, thinking, even in the design of public toilets. Like the argument of Gergen (1994: 60), my dialogue and discourse with Pahari children showed a kind of skeptical reality as they being in the *decenter* part of existing school structure.

Some of the postmodernists such as Stanley Fish, Barbara Herrnstein Smith and Richard Rorty claimed that oppression begins in the structure with epistemological certitude, particularly of the universalizing nature. This means that anyone can express what is true for all time and for all possible modes of experience (Simons & Billig, 1994: 7). Moreover, Lather (1994: 105) said that deconstruction moves against existed stories that appear to tell themselves. Rather it creates stories instead of previous one, which disclose their constructed nature. But in the school where I organized discussion session, there was a lack of exposing modes of experience and the situated pedagogy learning through the powerful resources of deconstruction. So the Pahari students were trapped in the school structure, which is different from their own social structure in terms of language use, social being, economic status, festivals and feasts celebration, and pedagogical tradition. This implies that oppression begins from the modern school structure for Pahari students. They never get supporting pedagogy for change and thereby create new situations just like deconstructive activities at school through dialogue and discourse. Similarly, most of the Pahari children weave bamboo goods and earn money through selling. But the earning is counted as the earning of their parents. Besides, their parents do not spend this earning for their children's school expenditure. In this sense, children are independent persons but they are devoid of their rights to their earning. It means even the parents dominate these earning children. Here the center dominated the *decenter*, the first being parents' approach to taking their children's earning and the second the position of marginalization of the earning children. The non-Pahari gave their ironical reaction to this occurrence and said this is why the Paharis drop out from the school. This argument resembles to what Attinello (2002: 263) said that there are many cases of sarcastic reaction to ones' surroundings- colleagues, works and training. These reactions can

overturn the modernist universe and create a consciousness and this consciousness can never be forgotten instead it is permanently occurred. Such type of deconstruction a school of thought or a system of thought shows the reality of existing situation as well (Rivkin, & Ryan, 1998: 334-357). I too in this study overturned the *center* and *decenter* and explore Pahari's understanding about their schooling.

Interpretation

Particularly interpretation theory focuses on the multiple perspective of reality from compositional studies such as social critiquing and praxis. Those persons who are interpretative researchers they often go through different traditions for understanding social complexities viz., they use different theories to generate knowledge. The way of generating knowledge has different forms (Koirala, 2005). Among them, Derridean approach to inquiry is one of the forms of interpretative theory. According to Derrida, both *center* and *decenter* part of the structure can be interpreted from different angles (Powell, 2000). Particularly, he interpreted phenomena from deconstruction point of view. From his deconstruction theory, anyone uses an approach to therapy that *decenters* the traditional relationship between therapist and client. Deconstrtuctive therapists feel that all knowledge is influenced by one's perspective and any perspective is the product of dominant cultural influences and ideologies (Powell, 2003: 166). If the knowledge is understood as perspective, then whatever is known must be a result of interpretative understanding. Lived experiences of this cultural setting are the embodiment of cultural convention where anyone can find a basis in the world as cultural construct and perception. This perception is a creative act but not simply the anxiety of absolute givens (Lochhead, 2002:7). Moreover, Lochhead (2000) argued that the interpretive function can be observed in any cultural setting. For example, the interpretation of Roland Barthes's landmark essay "The death of the Author" relocates the source of meaning from the author to an interaction between creator and receiver. Each creator and receiver is understood as part of an intersubjective context that gives meaning. The above arguments imply that in cultural setting, there are different kinds of knowledge and perception which can be interpreted through interaction between creator and receiver. During my preliminary research I found different interpretative understanding towards the schooling

of Pahari. My interaction with Pahari children gave me knowledge that they have to go to school compulsorily though this school is felt as unmatched with them for many reasons such as language and conceptual difficulties. "Really, school is difficult for us while we enter into school" said Santa Pahari from grade six. This reality can be compared with the argument of Marx (1818 - 1883) who criticized the bourgeois society in which one group suppresses the other (labor group), that is a negative part of society (cited in Seymour – Smith, 1986: 182). Derrida also brought this concept as center part of structure is an oppressor and the *decenter* part of the same structure is oppressed (Powell, 2000). He critiques phonocentrism, the western predisposition of privilege speech over writing, and gives another way to hermeneutic writing (Smith, 1991). Brown (1994: 17) also views that many textual leftists respond to an era of conservative politics latter on they retreat into deconstructive hermeneutics and disrespecting civic engagement. Another critical theorist, Poulo Freire (1983) gave his analysis from structural standpoint. His standpoint helped analyze pedagogy of adult learning critically. Pierre Bourdieu's (1992) also stood in the same line and said modern school culture suppresses the local culture.

Referring to the preliminary field, I found that students want to learn from their language and shift to the Nepali as well as English language. This is the constructive views of Pahari children towards language use in school. The constructive view is similar to the argument of Derrida who said," western thought is based on the idea of a center – an origin, a truth, an ideal from, a fixed point and immovable mover, an essence, a God, a presence which is usually capitalized and guarantees all meaning" (Powell, 2003: 21). This constructive view is also resemblance with the argument of Anthony Giddens who remarked (Giddens & Pierson, 1978:77 cited in David Gauntlett, 2002) society has forms, which affects the people. The form of the structure is produced and reproduced along with what people do. Emile Durkheim also states that social structure is one of social facts, which is the central concern of the understanding the society (cited in Seymour - Smith, 1986). The above arguments of Anthony and Emile indicate that society has fixed structure where central parts play the major role and people believe in fixed idea of society like what Derrida pointed out that Christians thought is fixed as center to that culture and Buddhists, Muslims, Jews or anybody different are in the margins or

marginalized and pushed to the outside. But these marginalized groups accept the center thought of society. For example, Derrida was born into an assimilated Jewish family in Algiers. He was grown up as a member of a marginalized dispossessed culture. Unlike him, most of other assimilated members of families also accepted the Christian religion and its followers' societies (Powell, 2003:23). For Pahari as well, they are understood as assimilated with the non-Paharis ways of doing and at the same time they have their differences. It is where I will be exploring these differences related to schooling.

Pahari students in the field expressed their deconstructive views regarding their school. For example, if school emphasizes mother tongue teaching school's culture would not dominate their culture and identity. As a result, their language could be considered as *center* but not the *decenter* or marginalized. Awasthi (2004) in this regard argued that there is monolingual practice and the language is Nepali and Pahari language at this point is *decenter*. But the student composition and the interaction show that non-Paharis comprises majority but the language is Nepali, the alien to many Pahari students. This situation gave two scenarios; the educational problems of the Pahari students and gradual elimination of the children's mother language. Here we can see different interests of the deconstruct views as interpretation of local Pahari school children because school culture is imposed on them through structurally mediated compulsory education campaign. This interpretation provides a lively forum for fresh and forceful interpretations of wide range of literary texts (LIT, 2006). This situation applies with Michel Foucault argument that social discourses and practices fundamentally shape what can be construed as knowledge and give rise to social power. His non – foundational epistemology (1972, 1979, 1980) focuses on not only human constituencies such as the on construction of gender, on queer practices, on ethnicity and on class but also hierarchical artistic categories which segregates people on the basis of high and low practices (cited in Lochhead, 2002: 7). According to Foucault (1972), discourses are systematically organized set of statements and they have the power. For him, discourse communicates the reality to the agents and structures to re-think on the dichotomy of true from the false, right from the wrong. According to Dore (1995: 151 – 176), discourse is another form of social subjectivity. She asks the question like why we can never be outside of 'discourse' (Cleaver, 2005).

Similarly, Radhakrishnan (2003: 162) argued that deconstruction finds itself as an epistemological form of discourse for renewed interpretation. From its epistemological sense, it is an active in - betweeness that makes all differences by attempting to achieve representation. In the same vein, Radhakrishnan furthered the concept of deconstruction as varied forms of interpretation through the argument of Spivak (poststructuralist – affirmative – deconstructionist) about the subaltern group. Geyh, Leebron & Levy (1998: xx) also argued that the suppressed group disputes the idealized notion of language as a transparent "window" of the world. In other words they have different interpretations. It means we unfold another reality and sometimes create alternative options by language. Today, many postmodern authors have been practicing this approach in their fictions. Brown (1994:25) in this regard argued that interpretative openness and moral sensibility are possible through critical metaphorical methods only within the context of certain social and historical conditions. He further noted that the all interpretations are equally valid whether it as negative or positive analysis. But these analyses seem within the limits of the theory that provides the rules of reading for a purely language – analytic philosophy.

The stark reality that Pahari children's earning has not been fully used for their education even by their parents gave another interpretation. This interpretation opens many avenues of understandings as parents' violated children's right; they misused children's earning for household expenses; they devalued children's contributions toward family support. But their parents as I found were not thinking that way. This reinterpretation of Pahari children's reality is similar to the argument of Habermas (1971 & 1987) who conceptualized a word, *practical interest*. *Practical interest/reasons* focus on the process of understanding and mutual determination of the ends to be sought rather that control. He further described the practical interest as 'a constitutive interest'. This constitutive interest can be expanded as the intersubjectivity of possible action – orientated mutual understandings (Deetz, 1994: 177). In addition, the newly constitutive interest can be made as hegemony. This hegemony is a process of positivity, of not only antagonism and deconstruction but also social reconstruction or 'democratic imaginary' of the liberal

state. This means that there is a situation of dominant liberal ideology or core values of individual liberty, which gives justice for the human being (Cloud, 1994: 229).

I presume that the above concept of interpretations helped me understand the schooling of any ethnic group like Pahari and bring different interpretations as the response towards the structure of school and think for locally situated alternatives.

CHAPTER III:

METHODOLOGY

In the previous chapter, I reviewed different concept of Derrida and others understandings about deconstruction. From the structural standpoints, I discussed about formal school as social organizations and from anthropological approaches, I discussed about the worldviews of studied groups regarding the schooling practices of informal and formal social structure. From educational approaches, I explored the existing practices of instruction. Finally, I proposed deconstructed models for the development of targeted group.

In this Chapter, I considered research methodology in general, and looked at research approaches and research methods in particular. Under the approaches to research, I discussed the unit of analysis and qualitative research methodology. And, under the qualitative study, I being an anthropologist by education and training live in the community and observed people until and unless I capture a definite phenomenon. This means for this qualitative study I applied some other methods such as document study, observation, focus group discussions, and case study. First, I discussed the unit of analysis under the approaches to research.

The Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis of my study is Pahari group at Bodikhel, peri urban area of lalitpur district of central hill in general and school children in particular. At Bodikhel, school emerged along with the urbanization process of Kathmandu valley. The questions come why Bodikhel in Lalitpur and why not some other sites or some other districts?

In order to answer these questions, I want to site the argument of Marshall and Rossman (1989: 54) who argue that it is better to choose that place where anyone can entry easily. Or it should be the place where it is possible to entry for everyone. Similarly, if there is

high probability of a rich mix of many of the processes, peoples, programs, interactions or structures of interest and where the researcher can define an appropriate role and be assure of good sampling. Bodikhel of Lalitpur district is suitable for many reasons to me because it is near to my residence. Mainly, my unit of analysis is Pahari group and they live there. Again, as this research is qualitative in nature, it does not require as what Gay (1987) told that there is not necessary to seek the big representative characteristics of the large population or universe. Rather, qualitative studies mostly seek for analytic or theoretical generalization (Blaxter. 1996). In this respect, I focus my research on one single community of Bodikhel of Lalitpur district of Nepal.

Bodikhel is this place where marginalized people, Pahari are living. Particularly, from the language and skill context, Pahari people are being marginalized along with the development of modern school and have faced economic hardships because of globalization, though they are peri – urban dwellers of Lalitpur district. Prior to selection of Bodikhel, I thought and consulted with my professor who suggested choosing an appropriate area of ethnic group especially marginalized section of the community. Besides, more importantly, I considered school as social structure from a wider perspective. In this regard, May & Tim (2001) mention that if there is need to analysis of more than two languages, school is suited from the wider social and political context. Considering the view of these authors, I took school for analysis of the social phenomena like what Patton (1990) viewed that school is a holistic place where head teachers, teachers, students, parents and SMC members are there. With this realization I consulted the principal of Bodikhel lower secondary school where most the Pahari chidren are studying and where most of teachers from non Pahari are teaching. Similarly, this Bodikhel school use Nepali language but students are from Pahari language. These contradictions inspired me to select this Bodikhel School and Pahari children.

Research Design

Generally research design helps to layout the plan for study and explains the procedures for analyzing and interpreting the findings. As per Cohen, Marion and Morrison (2000: 73), research design is the plan of a study, which is determined by purposes of the study.

Similarly, Long, Convey and Chwalek (1985) argued that research design is the plan and structure of a study. It also provides the procedures to address the research questions and interpret the results. Nachmias and Nachmias (1996: 18) in this connection argued that the research design is the strategy that guides the research process for investigators. It is the logical model of proof that allows for drawing the causal relations among the phenomenon during the investigation. Similarly, Pelto and Pelto (1978) mentioned five models of research design in anthropological research. They are (a) Two case comparisons (b) statistical cross-cultural comparisons (c) Intergenerational comparisons (d) natural experiments and (e) Intercultural analysis. These arguments suggest that research design is overall planning framework, which is determined by purposes and structure of the study for providing the procedures to conduct the study. For my study, I planed about the activities of generating and analyzing data, refocusing my research questions and identifying and eliminating potential validity threats and these all functions went more or less simultaneously. My plan is consistent with Hammersley and Atkinson's (1983: 28) statement that in a qualitative study, "research design should be a reflexive process operating through every stage of a project".

Meta – analysis is another part of my study in which I made plans for resolving the apparent contradictions in research findings (Bangert – Drowns & Rudner, 1991). According to Glass (1976), Meta – analysis is like of a philosophy which guides that literature review should be as systematic as primary research and should interpret the results of individual studies in the context of distributions of findings. These findings partly are determined by study characteristics and partly random. Thus it is typically similar with primary research (cited in Bangert – Drowns and Rudner, 1991). For my study also, I used Meta – analysis for reviewing the literature to understand the ethnic group in general and Pahari in particular. In the course of reviewing process, I analyzed the Derridean theory of key terminology: Identity, Subversion, Deconstruction, Difference, Differance, Skeptical Reality, and Interpretation by linking them with my study. For this, I used Kaupapa theory as my base. The main focus of Kaupapa theory is operationalization of self – determination (Bishop, 2005: 114). According to Durie (1995: 16),

> Self-determination captures a sense of studied groups' ownership and their active control over the future. This knowledge is based on the Treaty of Waitangi in which Maori people are able to determine their own policies, to actively participate in the development and interpretation of the law, to assume responsibility for their own affairs and to plan for the needs of future generation (cited in Bishop, 2005: 114).

From the above analysis of Durie, Kaupapa based Meta analysis is needed to draw the studied group's own knowledge, own logic and own policies for their development. In doing so cultural "insiders" are also most important for the research (Bishop, 2005: 111). For this I took help of a Pahari woman as my research assistant. But at the same time I was aware of the insiders' own inherently biases. In this regard I followed Merriam et al. (2001) who argued that both insider access and asking critical questions towards culture of the studied group or cross check analysis are major essential functions of Meta analysis under Kaupapa theory while conducting the research (cited in Bishop, 2005:111). Like the Meta analysis of Kaupapa theory, I drew Paharis' concerns related to their (a) identity (b) double consciousness (c) epistemological presuppositions (d) cultural values and belief systems (e) language issues, and (f) power relation with the non-Paharis. In doing so I declared my mode of inquiry and position, interpret the data critically, and find out the areas related to politicization of schooling related issues of the Pahari children.

Qualitative Research

My research questions suggest that the focus of this research is on a particular groups' schooling. In this respect, they demand an in-depth investigation on how has been constructed the worldview of Pahari regarding their non-formal, informal and formal schooling. Considering the nature of the research questions and the research subject, I used the qualitative research methodology. According to Schwandt (1997: 91-94), research methodology involves analysis of the principles and procedures in a particular field of enquiry. It governs the use of particular methods. He further notes that the methodology includes the examination of general theories about human behavior, society, and more broadly, human nature itself. Similarly, Pelto and Pelto (1981) and Mikkelsen (1995) argue that the term methodology refers to the combination of theories, concepts and selected observation techniques (March; Smyth and Mukhopadhyay, 1999: 11). In

other sense, methodology denotes the 'logic – in – use" involved in selecting particular observational techniques, assessing their yield of data, and relating these data to theoretical propositions (1978:3). Likewise, Silverman (2000:89) argues that research methodology is 'a general approach to studying a research topic', which gives shape to the type and the process of a research method. As per the above arguments, I understood that research methodology is an overarching framework that requires methods of investigation and approaches to an enquiry, which is essential for qualitative research.

Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. From the situated activities I take a set of interpretive and material practices that make the world visible (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005: 3). According to Denzin and Lincoln (1998b:8), the measurement and analysis of different material practices and variables can draw the social experience and give the meaning. They observed that qualitative research places emphasis on the processes and on the socially constructed nature of reality, and establishes intimate relations between the researcher and the research. Like the arguments of Denzin and Lincoln, my research is also closer to qualitative research. In fact I used this process during my preliminary field visit of Bodikhel of Lalitpur district. During this visit I observed the teachers' behavior towards Pahari children, and I gathered the knowledge that Pahari children are facing difficulty to understand many terms and concepts of their textbooks while teaching by non Pahari teachers. This understanding is similar to what Narayan and Nath (1993) argued that qualitative research methods are the better way to understand and predict organizational behavior. Neuman (1991) in this regard viewed that everyday activities are looked microscopically in the organizational research and try to understand the people's perception in-depth. He further argues that if researcher can understand fully about the events and characteristics, this situation calls for the qualitative inquiry. Patton (1990) has also supported this view. According to him, "qualitative methods permit the researcher to study selected issue in depth and detail. This approach of field work contributes to the depth, openness, and detail of qualitative inquiry" without any obstacles (p.13). In the same line, Best (1995) argued that the qualitative method of research is appropriate for in-depth understanding of the events and characteristics. Similarly, qualitative research is itself flexible type, (Denzin and Lincoln,

1994; 1998b: 5 and 2005:7). According to Myers (1997), qualitative research is designed to help researchers understand people and the social and cultural contexts within which they live.

Based on the above discussion, I gathered the knowledge that qualitative research deploys a wide range of methods. In understanding of Denzin and Lincoln (2005: 4), it is wide range of interconnected interpretive practices and always hopes for getting better understanding of the subject matter. Each practice makes the world visible in different way that means there can be used more than one interpretive practice in any study. Myers (1997) in this regard argued that a qualitative method is a strategy of inquiry that moves from the underlying philosophical assumptions to research design and data collection. And another authors, Strauss and Corbin (1998:3) viewed that qualitative research methods are a set of procedures and techniques for gathering and analyzing data. Thus the qualitative research is a method to attempt an in – depth understanding of the phenomenon (Denzin and Lincon, 2005: 5) and it is a tool as providing of deeper understanding of social experience (Silverman, 2000). Furthermore, in understanding of Wolcott (1994:10); Denzin and Lincoln (2005:2) and Patton (1990), methods of qualitative research emphasize on three aspects (a) experiencing (b) enquiring and (c) examining. On the basis of the above three aspects of qualitative research, I observed for experiencing, I took interview and focus group discussion for enquiring and I studied the related documents for examining or I interpreted data as what (Walcott, 1992) argued that data is managed by "watching, asking or examining." These all criteria took me close to a local setting for a sustained period and try to connect with the Derridean terms such as identity, subversion, deconstruction, difference, difference, skeptical reality, and interpretation between Paharis and non-Pahari's worldview about schooling.

Tools of the Study

As a qualitative research design, my study demands data from multiple sources. According to Denzin and Lincoln, 2005: 5), researchers use multiple methods for data generating process. Similarly, Myers (1997) argued that multiple sources include fieldwork, interviews and questionnaires, documents and texts, and the researcher's

impressions and reactions. These sources helped me get a better understanding of the subject matter. Likewise, Wolcott (1994) viewed that multiple sources of data help the researcher to investigate the reality while data are collected through multiple methods and yield the same results. This combination process increases the strengths to compensate the weaknesses of another approach (Patton, 1990).

Like the above arguments, I used the tools for assembly of information about Pahari's children's worldview. For this I started with any of tools as what Denzin and Lincoln (2005) argued that in qualitative research, there are no fixed rules and regulations to start the study by using tools. It means I was aware of the flexible nature of the tools. Similarly, Patton (1990) viewed that it will be appropriate and practicable to have some insight from field reality by observing closely and directly to the phenomena. Likewise, Pelto and Pelto (1978) noted that there is also relationship among some tools for undertaking the study. For example, participant observation and key – informant interviews have generally formed the core of anthropological research (p. 77). My preliminary research also reconfirmed what the earlier authors remarked. During this research I noted the observed information in my diary and revised the tools accordingly. In this context I used five tools such as Document analysis, Participant observation, FGD with key informants, Interview, and Case study. In the following sections, I discussed about the theoretical aspects of these tools separately.

Document Analysis

In research context, documents means supporting materials for study conduction. We can find different interpretations about the document. For example, Holstz (1969:1) described the term document as novels, newspapers, love songs, diaries, psychiatric interviews and the like (cited in Merriam, Sharan B. 1988). Geetz and Le Compte (1984:153) interpret the document as the range of written and symbolic records kept by or on participants in a social group (cited in Merriam, Sharan B. 1988). Similarly, Riley (1963) and Selltiz, Jahoda, Deutsch, and Cook (1959) analyzed document as the available just about anything in existence prior to the research at hand (cited in Merriam, Sharan B. 1988). Likewise, Merriam (1988) argued that documents broadly defined to include public

records, personal papers, physical traces and artifacts are a third major source of data in case study research (p. 117). It implies that documents are valuable things, which need to be analyzed while data-analyzing process is initiated. Besides, there is needed to read about the study related documents, which provide valuable information. For example, the researcher whatever read the documents, these documents provide stimulus for generating the questions. Thus documents and records serve the researcher in following way: (a) they are basic source of information about design, activities and process and (b) they can give the researcher ideas to make questions for interview and focus group discussion and the issues for observations as well (Pottan, 1990). Similarly, document analysis is also useful for confirmation and supplements of the collected information (Blaxter, 1996). Following the above arguments, I got few documents in my preliminary field such as Pahari songs recorded the CD, *Pahari (Pihi) Jatiko Chhinari* and School documents etc. I analyzed these documents and found out the some interesting issues, which encouraged me for observing the phenomena and helped me prepare questions for interview.

Likewise under the document analysis, there is need to study about the political and policy documents as well (Awasthi, 2004). Regarding the political documents, I studied the constitution of the Kindgdom of Nepal, Education Act, and Laws and by – laws. Similarly, in the context of policy documents, I studied about MOES's minutes and policy decisions, Education commission's reports, educational plans and programs, research reports, proposals, progress reports, census reports and official circulars in relation to educational language policies, planning, implementation and pedagogy. Besides, my study focused on school curricula, textbooks and teacher's guides, in-service and pre-service teacher training manuals and materials produced by the NCED, DEC and Faculty of Education. In other sides, my study focused on newspaper reports and articles published in the local media and journals in Nepal's language policy contexts. Particularly, I concentrated on which subject matters are being as center and decenter in those documents? Or how some one is highlighted and how the highlighted subjects exclude or marginalize the others? Which subject matters have been studied and which one have not been studied? Or After analyzing this issue of these documents, I got a basis

for entering into the field of research. These collected documents opened the ways for me in taking stock of the situation of Pahari. These documents gave me the way for forming research questions and help identify critical issues. More importantly, the documents provided information on planning about the research design and theories for the field investigation.

I collected other relevant documents from center and local institutions; research institutions, non-Government and civil society organizations related to my research subjects. As I am engaged in teaching job in campus, I am familiar with Nepal's pedagogy system. Nonetheless, I had not habit to critique about my own teaching nature and even in present time. I never heeded that how some parts are being centre and some parts are being decenter in teaching and learning context because partly I was not allowed to critically analyze the situation and partly I was oriented in hierarchical manner. Besides, I was not even able to visualize the underlying problems of the system due to insufficient my theoretical knowledge for recognizing, realizing and confronting with the inadequacies nature of teaching and learning. However, my growing theoretical insights especially Derridean deconstruction theory and others mold me in wide nature of learning and teaching. This thrusting helped me understand the essential issues in relation to Government's policies on children's schooling in Nepal. Thus the document study and its analysis developed my understanding about the issues related to my research questions. They also open ways for a wider level of interactions and national debates on any ethnic group children' schooling.

Participant Observations

Most likely, Participant observation is a straightforward research technique. Or it is a research strategy. It aims to gain a close and intimate familiarity with a given group of individuals and their practices through an intensive involvement with people in their natural environment (Wikipedia, Encyclopedia, 2006). In another sense, participant observation is the most closely associated with the method of meaning. It refers to the simultaneous occupation of structural position within a social system and study of the system. In practice as well it refers loosely to a variety of activities, ranging from living

among the people studied as Malinowski did, to engaging in the same activities as the people studied are engaged in (Philips, 1988 p.202). Like the above definition of participant observation, I was closed with Pahari children through long term interaction or many times visiting the school and their community. Then my intimate familiarity developed with the Pahari children. After developing intimate familiarity I involved intensively in their classroom at school, which is their natural environment for schooling. This situation provided essence of Pahari school children, their objects, and situations as what Berge (1998) said that any one could know the real situation and objective of the studied phenomena from the participant observation. In this respect, Merriam (1988) argued that participant observation is a schizophrenic activity in what one usually participates but not to the extent of becoming totally absorbed in the activity. At the same time, one is participating, one is trying to stay sufficiently detached to observe and analyze (p.94). Similarly, as per the participant observation, any researchers spend time with relatively small groups of people in order to understand fully the social milieu that they inhabit (Kaminski, 2004).

In my first day of preliminary field of Bodikhel, I was talking with principal of Bodikhel School and other teachers who are non Pahari. At that time, they were telling me about their worldviews toward Pahari but only one Pahari teacher of this school was listening silently. I observed him and gained some knowledge and sensed how majority of non Pahari treat minority group at school. This observation was similar with what Pelto and Pelto (1981) viewed that every individual is a participant observer if not of other cultures, then at least of one's own (p. 69). Similarly, Tedlock (2005) argued that as per the participant observation, researchers reflect on any phenomena and critically engage with their own participation within the ethnographic frame. Malinowski (1922) viewed that anthropological field workers should totally immerse himself in the lives of the people; and what that can only be done through months of residence in the local community. Whenever possible the field worker like me should master the language of people though much of the behavior available for observation is nonverbal (cited in Pelto & Pelto, 1978 p.68). He further said that participant observations also provides the further checking and

monitoring of field information that is necessary for evaluating data gathered by specialized techniques (p. 69).

In my 2nd of Preliminary field, I met Pahari teacher, Bir Bahadur Singly at his home. We talked about the Pahari group of Badikhel area. In course of in – depth conversation between us, he expressed insulting behaviors of the non Pahari teachers at school. I sensed from his understanding that how the majority non Pahari teachers dominate the minority Pahari teacher. In Derridean sense, this situation shows that the majority of non Pahari is in center position at Bodikhel School' structure and less number, Pahari teacher is decenter position. So *center* is always in hierarchy and this hierarchy oppressed the *decenter* in social structure. In this way, my participant observation and understanding is similar with the argument of Kirby and Mckenna (1989: 76). According to him, participant observation gives a full account of how individual make sense of their experiences. Similarly, the knowledge of minority number Pahari teacher about the majority non Pahari teachers can be suited with the argument of Sarup (1989) who said about binary opposition in research. According to Sarup (1989), binary oppositions represent a way of seeing and typical of ideology. Ideologies often draw rigid boundaries between what is acceptable and what is not, between self and nonself, truth and falsity, sense and nonsense etc. (p.41).

The above scenario indicates that participant observation starts from the different events as well. In this regard, Pelto and Pelto (1978) said that by structuring observation and systematically exploring relationships among different events – through interviewing: meticulous eye witnessing, and perhaps administering tests – participant observation can be converted to scientific use (p. 69). Similarly, participant observation usually involves one – visit interviews, which is called relatively more formal observation than either informal observation or participation (Wikipedia, Encyclopedia, 2006). For example, formal ownership and structure of a firm is suited rather than its internal practices and norms. In this regard Zelditch (1962) outlined three empirical approaches to participant observation: (a) enumeration/detail of frequencies of various categories of observed behavior as in interaction analysis; (b) informant interviewing to establish social rules

and statuses and (c) participation to observe and detail illustrative incidents (cited in http://www.google.com.np, 2006). In the course of conversation between the Pahari teacher and me, I understood another sense from Pahari teacher. If Pahari teachers were majority in school, the non Pahari teacher could not insult them. This situation is exactly consistent with what Pereira and Taylor (2005) said that "actions always result from beliefs and interest …. even mine" (p.7) and Habermas' work (1984, 1987 and 1990) on "the knowledge constitutive interest and communicative action" (cited in Pereira and Taylor, 2005: 7). This information can also be compared with the argument of Derrida who talked about reasons to deconstruct writing and speech. According to Sarup (1989), Derrida's attempt to deconstruct the opposition between speech and writing is linked to the uncovering of metaphysics of presence as a whole (p. 39).

The above scenarios imply that I generated other required information from the field through participant observation because my study is qualitative which usually begins with observation in the real world that raise such questions as (a) why don't the every day experiences I am hearing about fit with extant theory (b) why haven't policy and practice led to the predicted result? (c) How do the existing theories, models and concepts apply to this new and different population or setting? (Catherine and Gretchen, 1989: 22)

Focus Group Discussion

A focus group can be defined as a carefully planned discussion designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive, non-threatening environment (Krueger, 1988 p. 19). According to Varenne (2004), a focus group discussion is a qualitative method. Particularly, it aims (a) to obtain in - depth information on concepts, perceptions and ideas of a group and (b) to be more than a question – answer interaction. FGD is also used for exploring relevant local concepts as well as for testing drafts when developing the massage (cited in http://www.google.com.np, September 2006). Similarly, Bakhtin (1986) argued that focus group is a little act which is the part and parcel of unmarked social life – conversations, group discussions, negotiations and so on (cited in Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005 p. 887). More importantly, as a broadest sense, focus

group is collective conversations or group interviews, which can be small or large, directed or nondirected (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005 p. 887).

Following the above definitions of focus group discussion, I conducted FGD among the Pahari school children of different grades at Bodikhel lower secondary school for the generation of the information about their school's language concern and pedagogical system. At that time, I composed of seven to 10 participants who are likely to be unfamiliar to each other (Krueger, 1988 p. 19). As Anderson (1998: 208) said, I explored the concern of discussed topics in great depth, where participants have long experience in the field of schooling in terms of language, pedagogy, and curriculum issues and school behavior towards the Pahari children. Similalry, from this FGD, I also gained the insight of the people that why they hold the view regarding schooling such as language, teaching and learning practices etc. because FGD is unique and important formation of collective inquiry where theory, research, pedagogy and politics meet together (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005 p.888).

Besides, I generated even the new information from this FGD because FGD corresponds to new interests, which come from shared and tacit belief of local setting (Macmagjtem & Myers, 2004: p. 65). For example, in case of learning and teaching, Pahari school children can provide their own way of learning and teaching than formal schooling, which they know from their informal learning practices. Except this case, I conducted the FGD in terms of knowing about essence of non Pahari children towards the Pahari school children.

Despite these characteristics in FGD, it often takes place in several layers of argument, where people show the different beliefs and these beliefs can be confronted with each other. At that time social researchers like me have to present different framing or have to limit of those beliefs (Macnaghten & Myers, 2004 p. 67). In order to compensate for this situation, I organized interviews separately with those groups as what Denzin and Lincoln (2005 p.7) argued about qualitative research, researchers are sensitive to the value of the multi method approach. In this respect, another author, Morgan (1988) said

that focus groups need not to be limited to a preliminary rehearsal for the data collection but go for individual interview beforehand or follow back and forth between the two methods. In doing so I triangulated the data (p. 31).

Case Study

Case study is one of method of qualitative research. This method involves in – depth examination of a definite instance rather than using large samples and following a rigid set of rules to examine a limited number of variables. Instead of following rigid method, it provides a systematic way of looking at events, collecting data, analyzing information and reporting the results. As a result, the researcher like me may gain a sharpened understanding of why and how did the event happen (Wikipedia, Encyclopedia, 2006).

Different people define this case study method. For example, Merriam (1988) defined the tool, case study as the unit of analysis, or 'the case' can be an individual, a program, an institution, a group, an event, and a concept (p. 44). Wilson (1990) interpreted case study as a process which tries to describe and analyze some entity in qualitative, complex and comprehensive terms not infrequently as it unfolds over a period of time (quoted in Merriam, 1988 p.11). Similarly, Mac Donald and Walker (1977:181) analyzed case study from examination point of view for an instance in action (cited in Merriam, 1988 p.11). Cronbach (1975:123) calls case study as 'interpretation of context' (cited in Merriam, 1988 p.10). As mentioned above, the definition of case study can be linked with any kinds of research strategy.

For my study, I discussed some case study under the unit of analysis. In the context of research strategy, Yin (2002) suggested that case study should be taken as an empirical inquiry that investigates a phenomenon within its real – life context. Again he (1994: 1) noted that it is as strategy such as (a) "how" and "why" questions is being posed in the research and (b) researcher has little control over the instance. Since I am concerned with "how" and "why" questions, I used case study strategy in the quest of investigation. In this connection, Lawnek (2005) supported by defining the case study as research approach, situated between concrete data taking technique (cited in Wikipedia,

Encyclopedia, 2006). Beside, I used case study as method and strategy for examining the both formal and informal phenomena in the real life context of Pahari school children in the school and out of school.

Emphasizing the real life context, Stake (1998: 98) said that case study is the setting of local context and interpretation of this event from researcher point of view. In this regard Patton (1990:100) viewed that the key issue in determining the unit of analysis is to decide, "what it is you want to be able to say something about at the end of the study (cited in Merriam, 1988 p.44). From these two authors' arguments I also learnt that case study emphasize on the understanding of the any event within its own surrounding and I as researcher should interpret it from my point of view. In this consistent, Yin (1994) pointed out that case study is depended upon the desire of researcher because s/he has to face with complex social phenomena. From these complex social phenomena researcher has to understand the predicted knowledge. Similarly Hughes (1995: 322) further suggested that the case study approach is particularly depended upon the researcher because s/he has little control over instance. This means that the case study allows an investigation to hold meaningful characteristics of real life instances in the local contexts. Like this understanding, I mirrored the local context and incorporate the actors' views in this study (Tellis, 1997).

Data Analysis and Interpretation
According to Miles and Huberman (1994), data analysis is that step which builds a conceptual framework (rational, brief description and illustration). They (1994: 12) further mentioned about interactive model as well. Their Interactive Model consists of data collection; data reduction; data display and draw the conclusion drawing. Similarly Power (1996), Susan & Stainback (1988) and Maclean & Mohr (1999) argued that researcher can analyzed the data in different way. They suggested at least 13 way of data analysis. They are: (1) triangulate (2) compare constantly (3) categorize and sort (4) order (5) contrast (6) speculate (7) restate the question (8) visualize (9) abstract the distill (10) talk and validate (11) confer with the students (12) take a break (13) state your theories

(cited in Painter & Rigsby, 2005). It implies that researchers can analyze the data as per their convenience.

For my study, I analyzed the generated field data by two ways. They are (a) Thematic analysis (b) Thick description. Both are used in anthropological research. Under the thematic analysis, I focused on identifiable themes and patterns of living or behavior (Aronson, 1994). This thematic analysis has own flexible steps so I analyzed the data in different steps. Similarly, under the thick description, I analyzed the data as what Clifford Geertz (1973) said that the researcher should analyze the data as per own mode of study in which researchers interpret the sign of people and their culture and living patterns to gain their meaning within the culture itself. In this regard, Wolcott (1994: 12) suggested three frameworks: description, analysis and interpretation. Similarly, Derrida argued that the analysis of data and its interpretation is concerned with content, form and style as deconstructive exercise. In this line, Silverman (2000) viewed that content analysis is depended upon the sequence of talk, speaker's role and outcomes of the conversation. Thus, I focused on the form and meaning of the text and content of the field generated information by using the Derridean standpoints. At the same time I analyzed the Paharis from Kaupapa theory and answer all the research questions and the objectives of this study.

Data Management

Data management is one of the important parts of research techniques. It is useful in referring to the pragmatics of primary data collection (Pelto & Pelto, 1978:3). Similarly, it is as the operations needed for a systematic, coherent process of data collection, storage, and retrieval. This technique of data management is the ongoing process characterized by careful planning, crisp implementation and continuous documentations (Pogash, 2002). According to Pogash (2002), this process begins right before the data are collected and ends right after the data have been analyzed and archived. So the question like how data are stored and retrieved is the heart of data management. There are three kinds of sub processes are included in it. They are data reduction, data display, and conclusions i.e. drawing/verifying (Miles & Huberman, 1984/95).

For my study, I began data management before the data collection process. In this process, I deduced the potential universe of data in an anticipatory way as conceptual framework, research questions, cases, and instruments. Actual field notes, interviews, tapes or other available data, data summaries, coding, finding, themes, clustering, and writing stories are all instances of further data selection and condensation.

I organized and compress all the assembly of information about Pahari's children's worldview. Through this information, I will find out their schooling that they get from the home, classroom, and workmates that will help me understand their action against what Miles and Humberman (1984/1994) call structured summaries/synopses. At last, I involved myself in interpretation by drawing the meaning from displayed data.

I collected the qualitative data, which provide essence of Pahari school children, their objects, and situations (Berge, 1989) through participant observation, FGD with key informants, and case study. Then I converted the raw experience that I call data into words and write extended text. As Ball and Smith (1992) said, I saw the images which are not more realistic than words and are as subject, language to interpretation, captioning, and dependent context.

I interpreted data by "watching, asking or examining" (Wolcott, 1992) under the data management. This type of data obtained from observations, interviews, and document review will take me close to a local setting for a sustained period. These modes of collecting data largely opened, unstructured, and event driven or more tightly defined, structured and researcher driven. Like the argument of Wolcott, I picked up the data from the participant observation and interviews tools and try to connect with the Derridean terms such as identity, subversion, deconstruction and *difference* and the *differance* between Paharis and non-Pahari's worldview in general and about schooling in particular.

Data analyzing is another part of data management. In this section I made brief discussion about the Derridean theory. I also discussed about the approaches of analysis that how analysis and interpretation was made in the analysis of data.

Since I am doing qualitative study I described and explain (at some level) about patterns of relationships that can be done only with a set of conceptually specified analytic categories (Mishler, 1994). For this, I analyzed the data from a peculiar life cycle, which spreads collection and analysis throughout the study in different modes of inquiry at different moments. Thus I ensured the analysis of the data from both interim (generative, constructive and illuminative analysis) and iterative (a succession of question – and – answer cycles – that entails examining a given set of cases and then refining or modifying those cases on the basis of subsequent ones) way.

I know encoding, coding, and decoding qualitative data is a painstaking process. So while managing the data I examined the field notes carefully, organizing the data, looking for patterns against the data, cross-validating data sources and findings, and making linkage among the various parts of the data (Patton, 1990, p.379). These procedures correspond to the grounded theory that shares important features with other approaches to interim analysis (Glasser & Strausss, 1967).

I did inductive and deductive analyses (ibid) to ensure the mix of different cases. And then I figured out a new inductive cycle that helps me move for data verification and finding confirmation. As I analyze the field information I tried to understand it by reading the data text repeatedly. After that I tried to put the information into number of categories. First I developed the themes and under this, I reorganized and rearranged the obtained information. At the same time, I arranged the data in different sub themes for introducing Paharis and non-Paharis' lived context that shape their world view about schooling of their children. Thus I concluded my data management part by thematic analysis and Derridean interpretation of it.

CHAPTER IV:

PAHARIS'S ANTHROPOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL CONSTRUCT: DISCUSSION ON SOCIALIZATION/ENCULTURATION

In this chapter, I want to discuss about the socialization process of Pahari children in Bodikhel community of Lalitpur district. As I know socialization process indicates all parts of life cycle but here I want to focus only on skill and health knowledge of Pahari children as unit of discussion. From this unit of discussion, I conceptualized the overall anthropological and social construct of Pahari community in general and emphasized more on bamboo goods making and health related knowledge in particular to understand their socialization process. The following paragraphs display them in detail.

Socialization/Enculturation Process of Pahari Children

Pahari children's socialization/enculturation begins from taking bath, feeding breast, and basking charcoal. It means the child obtains loving care during feeding, protection from cold and other discomforts. In other words, the Pahari children learn the culture of loving care from their parents. It means child's getting care is the 'action design' of their parents and other family members (http://www.google.com.np, September, 2007). In Freud's (1923) view, child identifies his/her primary caretaker, the mother. If s/he feels discomfort, the child simply reacts through crying. With this crying, Pahari children like others learns skills such as feeding, pissing, and excreting time (Rao, 2001: 215). When Pahari child reaches at 11 day of the birth, his/her formal socializing process called naming ceremony is conducted. In the course of learning, Pahari child has interacted with Pahari culture and formed his/her personality. This formed personality in Rosman and Rubel's (1981: 240) sense, is the '*basic personality type*'. Similarly, in Margaret Mead's (1946) sense, it is a '*national character*'. This character was evident as a trait in the Pahari culture and the personality (cited in Jha, 2004: 128).

In the eye of medical personnel, the ritual of Pahari children's socialization is related to health practices (NESAC, 1998: 56). But Pahari people did not conceptualize that way.

According to them, go to hospital is indication of bodily treatment or care. But human health is also understood from cultural and social context because health of human being is very much influenced by their life-style, the kind of community where they live in and by their natural environment (Tuckett 1976: 3-36). As anthropologist/sociologist claim this is a social dimension of health (Acharya, 1994: 234 - 238). It means both socialization process and good health of medical science have the same meaning but delivery place and processes are different. It means there are social as well as medical cosmos of health in the socialization of Pahari children. Pahari has number of rituals to go under the "social cosmos of health". These rituals include naming, feeding, *Chhewor, Bratabanda, and Guneucholo offering*. Every ritual has its meaning. Though meanings are different, these wide range of rituals form the basic as well as model personality (Rosman & Rubel, 1981: 241; Ember & Ember, 1973: 366). Some of these personalities differ from the son to the daughter. For example, *Chhewor and Bratabandha* are done exclusively for son and *Guneucholo Offering* is only for daughter. Here, we can see the variation of the model personality between the son and the daughter.

(a) Socialization/Enculturation through Parents' Action Design

Naming ceremony starts with mother and child's bath. They do *lippote* (clean by using cow dung). The family members cut nail, take bath, and wash clothes. They call priest for worship. They bring sacred grass called *dubo*, put into cow's milk, and sprinkle to child and all family members to make them all pure. Then they worship child and maternal grandmother gives name for the baby. If maternal grandmother is not available at the time of naming, this child is given his/her name by his own paternal grandmother. After this naming ritual is over the family members go to temple and offer *veti* (present/a gift or coin). This naming ritual tells two things viz., (a) child gets his/her name as formal identity (b) immediate relatives of the newborn baby clean their house. The first is related to social cosmos and the second to the health cosmos.

(b) Socialization/Enculturation through Food and Relationship

Pasni is the second ritual of Pahari socialization. In this ritual Pahari gives solid food to the newborn baby. Girl Pahari get solid food a month earlier than the boy Pahari (4/5 months to the girl and 5/6 months of their birth). This difference can be understood as gender discrimination but they have functional reason as well. The reason is not yet known, said Ashu Maya Pahari. Regarding the causes of celebrating Pasni Pahari people viewed,

> Through Pasni Pahari child enters into the new world of relationship. The child is not confined only with his/her mother; others can take him/her and kiss too i.e. father, grandmother/father, brother/sisters can feed, feed and change dipper. Maternal grandmother gives new clothes (Interaction Date: 10/7/2007).

The above quotes gave me three areas where Pahari child learns about his/her new food and new relationship. They are (a) food ceremony is the hidden symbol of getting extra meal/diet (b) child learns about new food with his/her growth (c) child learns about new relationship apart from his/her mother. These socialization processes indicate the basic personality of Pahari child. Being a member, they first inculcate Pahari culture and represent the intra-psychic structure of the Pahari society (Wallace, 1961: 106-107 and Mead, 1953 cited in Rao, 2004: 125). Then the base of formation of Pahari child' personality is mediated by close personal relations of his/her parents. It means the Pahari child acquires a common set of habits, which we call basic culture of the society (Linton, cited in Jha, 2004: 132). This is also a process of adaptive psychological skills for Pahari child (Kadiner, 1945, cited in Jha, 2004: 133).

© Socialization/Enculturation through Male Personality and Maternal Relation

At the age of three Pahari boy child goes for another ritual called *Busangkhau* (first hair cut ceremony). I asked the reason of cutting hear. In answer, local Pahari people told me "from birth to 3 years old age, the child's hair has been long. Since we do not have the tradition to putting long hair so we cut boy's long hair". For this, they have especial day such as *Dashain, Tihar* and *Shreepanchami.* In this occasion, they invite child's maternal

uncle to shave child's hair. Maternal uncle brings cap, worshiping stuff and some food especially wine and meat at nephew's home. From this *Busangkhau* ritual, Pahari child learns two things viz., (a) way of shaving his hair (b) knowledge of being male as male should not keep long hair on his head.

(d) Socialization/Enculturation through Ethnic Identity and its Linkage with Maternal Uncle's Relation

Usually at the age of 5/6, Pahari celebrates *Bratabandha* of the boy child. But this ritual can be celebrated before marriage. *Dewali puja* is the appropriate day of this ritual. In this occasion as well, maternal uncle performs the whole function. The child gets linage of Pahari identity and learns socially devised dos and dons through *Bartabanda* ritual. Besides, the Pahari boy learns further relationship with maternal uncle. These rituals shape their modal personality and make them different from the girls.

(e) Socialization through Bamboo Goods Making Skill

As Pahari children grow, they are socialized/enctured in farming, animal husbandry and making bamboo goods, which are their subsistence source of living. Bamboo goods making skill is cash earning source for them. Regarding this occupation, Bodikhel Pahari's community has own history. According to local people, at least hundred years ago, an educated person called Khusman Pahari used to teach adult education classes in Bodikhel. As educated person, he visited different places. In the course of his visit, he brought bamboo goods making knowledge. Latter on he taught the local people about it through adult education. In Pahari society, his personality seemed different and he was granted some special privileges. As Linton (1936) said, this condition leads to form a "status personality" in the society (Jha, 2004: 132). Latter on, he taught the local people about it through adult education. Gradually, local people learnt and practiced these skills in their life. Latter on, they took this skill as Pahari's occupation. In this manner, this bamboo good making skill has been transferred and internalized as one of the occupations of the Pahari community. Literatures on Pahari (Pihi) Community Introduction Book (1999) also reiterate the same findings. Based on this information, Paharis understood that this skill has now been their identity. It means this occupation is

so internalized among the Paharis that they believe it is the knowledge of their soul and their socio-cultural identity. This identity in Sinha's (1999: 247) sense is permanent existence and common cultural characteristics like that of Bantu or Malayo-Polynesian groups (Tylor, 1990:191). This fact in Durkheim's sense is social structure and the central concern of the Pahari society (cited in Seymour - Smith, 1986). At the end, this personality turned out to be basic personality of the Pahari people in Bodikhel community. Through this social structure we know the socialization process of the society. By definition socialization is one, which is "process of learning to become a member of society, including both formal education and the informal induction into social roles" (ibid). Anthropologists call this process as enculturation. In sociological terms it is the general process of acquiring culture and anthropologically, it is the process of being socialized to a particular culture (http://www.google.com.np, October, 2007). Using this frame of understanding I discuss Pahari children's approach to acquiring culture or being socialized. In other word I analyze how the society provides making bamboo goods skill through its socialization process? How do children understand the society at large? What they do over the period as per their understanding? How they reshape their society? Similarly, form individual lens, I explore how does a child work? How does a child think as male/female from this society? The following paragraphs present the children's socialization/ enculturation through bamboo goods making skill.

When a child reaches three and fours years, naturally s/he explores the social world around him/her. Pahari children at this stage find many areas where their parents are working and seeing pleasurable as well as exciting goods. Among them, bamboo goods making area is one. It means they find bamboo work as situated learning condition (Leve and Winger, 2001) and respond to it. This situation is called social interaction (Schaefer and Lamm, 2005). Through this process, Pahari child starts to be dependent on particular individual and shapes his/her behavior and identity called social relations. It means family environment interchangeably social structure teaches organized patterns of relationship. They thus learn their structure, parents' or family members' positive motivation, loving care, and rewarding opportunities that help them cope well with life (http://www.google.com.np, October, 2007). Through parents' action design, Pahari

children have shaped their personality. This personality i.e. Pahari child's habit is the organized form of psychological process (Linton, 1945 cited in Rao, 2004: 131). Linton further said that the child as individual undergoes a similar type of socialization, custom, traditions etc. As a result, this individual acquires a common set of habits of bamboo goods making (Jha, 2004: 132).

When Pahari children reach at nine or ten they start to do household chores. Even as schoolchildren, they continue this job because it is also a regular function of their house like the regular attendance of school. Here some questions emerge like how and why they do learn this skill? In an answer, I found that they first observed their parent's job. During observation, their parents asked them for support. In the name of support, children played with bamboo equipments making, and also imitated the process of bamboo goods making for their parents. It means bamboo goods making is the situated as well as peripheral learning (Leve and Winger, 2001) for Pahari children. In this condition they learn the process of making goods such as binding function/tie upping. Step by step they become able to make any kinds of goods, as they like and/or require. In Marxist sense, Pahari children reproduce their knowledge through mechanism of family structure and give continuity (cited in Seymour - Smith, 1986). Similarly, as sociologists understood, Pahari children in this age show interest and interact with family structure and develop their personality (Encyclopedia, 2006). Anthropologists also claim that children learn through parents' working environment. They touch any object as a toy and naturally join to the process of cultural transmission (Tylor, 1990). It means they are enculturated to their Pahari culture by their parents and the other members of family who pick up/care them. In Talcot Parson's understanding, Pahari children (a) adapt to the physical and social environment (b) coordinate with family structure as a solid form, and (c) maintain the role of individuals according to social/family expectation (Encyclopedia, 2000). In Radcliff Brown's (Bohannan & Glazer, 1916: 296) view, they observe and touch the surrounding goods and transmit its knowledge through functional relation between the social structure and social life as home schooling. It means Pahari children's learning occurs in the function of the activity, context and culture. They also learn bamboo goods making skills in the context and activity of parents' working environment. It means the

interest of learner i.e. Pahari children and duty of parents i.e. socialization occurs in situated condition and molded into schooling. In this schooling, the Pahari children learnt more and adopted the learning into their society through the process of situated learning. Gradually they shaped them as the responsible citizens (Goodlad, 1979:6) for handling this bamboo goods making skill. As responsible citizen, anyone can go for further interest. In Durkheim sense, they are educated in the process of being converted. In other words they inculcated the particular beliefs for the creation of general attitude i.e. 'a certain habitus' (Bourdieu, 1977: 78). It means the Pahari children valued the habitus and internalized the bamboo goods making skill during their self –actualization process (http://www.google.com.np, September, 2007). In Abram Kardiner's (1939) sense, this reality is the basic personality that comes through primary institution (a part of social structure) (Jha, 2004: 134).

Human beings' learning is never ending process. So, in this self-actualization stage as well, any individual can learn anything from anywhere. Like this, some of children from Pahari community, have been started to take additional knowledge to be specialized in bamboo goods making skill in their life with their grown up age. It means they entered into secondary socialization. As an example, I found a case of Gita Pahari, who has completed the grade twelve and currently she is taking the training of the social mobilizer. As she said, during her higher secondary school period, she was socialized in bamboo goods making business. During that time she learnt to weave bamboo basket, small basket, and *naglo*. Now she has taken extra training for making modern goods out of the bamboos such as *mudha*, curtain, sofa set, *rak*, basin, flower-pot etc. from NGO but she has not yet started to make this skill as earning source. Similarly, Ambika Nagarkoti (Pahari), a SLC graduate lady whom I met at her home said, she is perfect in cupboard making and is regularly involved five/six hours a day with her eldest brothers. Her brothers work more than her up to ten/eleven hour a day. Occasionally, one month training program on bamboo goods making has been conducted by NGO such as ETC (Education the Children), *Gharelu Sang Santha* (Cottage Industry) etc.   But the community gets the training for free. During such training people like Ambika can join and learn new technology for modern bamboo goods making. It means according to

internalization theoretical school of Talcott Parsons, Pahari children participate in various levels of organization of society and internalize making bamboo good-skill as a cognitive frame of reference (http://www.google.com.np, October, 2007).

In rear case, I found some Pahari children involved in bamboo goods making business especially when their parents go for farming and other forms of household chores. If these forcefully involved children also did not show interest in bamboo goods making business, they might not get the school expenses timely from their parents. It means whether they are engaged in school or not interested in bamboo goods making business, they were compelled to produce these goods. It means they were less free person than their non-Pahari school friends. Besides, at their school, they did not study about their inherited bamboo goods making skills. It means making bamboo goods business is out subject for them in comparison with their non-Pahari friends. This shows that Pahari children got unmatched school for their traditionally inherited skill while comparing with their friends. It means the modern schools are not fitted with Pahari and other types of cultural groups (Valintin, 2002), though schools promise to provide social justice and equality for them too.

Why does most of the children Pahari community learn bamboo goods making skill, the Pahari children and their parents told me that it was associated with earning. The earning from this occupation used to support them to meet household expenses especially during the time of celebrating festivals and feast; buying clothes for family members; and paying school fees and other expenses. In relation to it, the children of grade seven said, "we often support our parents in bamboo goods making ". Among these informants were Suresh, Kamal Raj and Srijana Pahari who further said,

> We are not forced to do this work per se but we are motivated by the parents' request to support them. We are encouraged to support our parent's work. Therefore, we involve in this job happily and learn how to make these bamboo goods. In the beginning, we make waste of many bamboo sticks and latter on we know how to utilize them in a better way. During this learning stage, our parents do not scold us, though we destroy many bamboo sticks. When we become perfect in binding/tie

upping/knitting pin/pull form, we help our parents willingly. In morning and in evening at least two hours in a day, we spend our time for bamboo work. (Interaction Date: 10/7/2007)

The above quote tells that Pahari children are oriented about the bamboo work with the "silent support" of their parents. It means in the name of support, Pahari children learn the process of preparing bamboo goods and internalize it as part of their life. It means the family shapes them as they go through the process of learning. In Bourdieu's (1992) sense they are shaped by the habitus (sets of dispositions). This habitus making process of the parents is called a form of socialization (Andersen & Taulor, 2002: 446), which is similar to schooling and this schooling performs the family function. In this way Pahari schoolchildren socialize them in making bamboo goods business.

The above discussion makes clear that Pahari children's schooling on bamboo goods making business is totally different from their formal schooling process. In other words formal school socializes Pahari children through law enforcement, verbal abuse, and periodic corporal punishment. Ideally speaking both schooling are synonymous to each other but they are different in delivery process (Goodlad, 1979: 18-19). Following Goodlad every individual learns to read and write in her/his own way to be "civilized". To be more civilized a child is sent to the formal school to crystallize his/her knowledge and develops it as the source of power, freedom and enlightenment. The school thus is expected to provide career opportunity. But Pahari children had not got opportunity to crystallize their previous knowledge, skills, and the process of learning at school. In Freud's (1923 cited in Erickson's theory of Humand development, 2007) sense, Pahari schoolchildren looked from super ego because they did not find symbolic representation there. In Marxist perspective, I found there the subjectivity of Pahari children who understood that formal school is different from their cultural identity. And it is also the place of dominating relationship. Here I realized that gap exists between the family socialization function and the function of school for imparting "international knowledge" through the so-called universal process of socialization. This gap obliged the Pahari children to form modal personality in school.

(f) Socialization/Enculturation through the Way of Maintaining the Bodily Changes

Guneucholo Offering ritual is celebrated only for girl in Pahari community. This ritual is done when the girl child reaches at 13/14 years of age. . As Erickson (1950) said, this is adolescent stage of human development (winters, 2007). It is also the menstruation period for girls. At the time of first menstruation, until the seven days they are kept in neighbor's home. During these days, they take bath early in the morning. In the daytime they get food. Only the woman of the family gives food to the menstruating girls. The same woman teaches the dos and dons during menstruation. She also teaches to change sanitary pad, the pieces of clothes wash this daily, and reuse after making it dry. At the 7 days, Parents worship the menstruating girls and give new dress especially *Gunewcholo*. This symbolizes that girl has been entered into puberty age and they should care about their body changes by wearing adult woman's dress. This type of learning had shaped the basic personality of the Pahari girls because they had internalized the knowledge of *Gunewcholo* Offerings ritual and did accordingly.

From the second time of menstruation, girls use to dry the used pads in the sun. According to the girls whom I interviewed, initially, they did not know about the logic of drying the pad in the sun but latter on they knew the logic of it said, Shreejana Pahari. According to her, her grandmother (local Pahari Sudeni) often goes to the hospital. When she comes back to home she brings reproductive health related books from there. In home, grandmother suggests her to read it for her. But Shreejana was hesitant to read this book. So she preferred to listen her grandmother. According to Shreejana her grandmother learnt that sundry clothes are good for health than the dried in the sunless environment. Shreejana also shared this knowledge with her friends whether they are from school or from neighboring home. Here Shreejana is shaped by the modal personality amidst her many other Pahari girl friends. She further said,

> In case of reproductive health books, sometime I read and try to share my learning with my eldest sister but she does not show interest and tells me that such books are not worth reading. Following her advice I threw that book. It means I lost the book. Now I am sharing my knowledge with my friends. In this sense I disobeyed my sister. Anyway, I remember my grandmother's sharing and do accordingly. (Interaction Date: 20/7/2007)

55

The menstruating girls also shared me their knowledge about body care. According to them, they should not eat hot and sour food at the time of menstruation. It may cause excess bleeding during menstruation. They further said small stomach pain during menstruation, can affect womb and it will be difficult to them to have baby in future.

Apart from health knowledge, the menstruating girls are taught to be refrain from male friends and even with own brothers for fear of sexual relation. So they were also advised not sleep even with their own brothers. Traditionally brothers and sisters sleep together. This is a different culture from the West where sleeping together equates to sexual relation.

The above discussions and quotes gave some areas where the Pahari girl children learnt basic important knowledge from *Guneucholo* Offering ritual. They are (a) secrecy maintenance of their menstruation period (b) regular cleanlines of body and used pad (c) use of elderly people's dress (d) skill to verify knowledge obtained from hospital and from grandmother (e) importance of collegial learning for well-being personality. It means, along with their age, Pahari school aged girls had shaped their modal personality through collegial learning practices.

(g) Socialization/Enculturation through the Mechanization of General Treatment
Pahari children are socialized/encultured through the treatment of general sickness as well. Because of this enculturation, they are very much knowledgeable about the treatment of diarrhea, teeth paining problem, cold and cough problem, headache, jaundice fever, *runche* (weepng disease), eczema, dog biting, barbed problems, scented arm-pit problems etc. In the treatment of jaundice, they use a kind of grass called jaundice grass. If urine function is stopped, they use the apex of *Jaiko* flower. It is also used when blister comes in tongue or around mouth. Similarly in weeping disease they bath child with cow's urine. For the treatment of eczema, they prepare juice of bitter plant, mix with the water, and take bath with it. This is also useful for arm-pit bad smell. . While they suffer from cold cough they use *viksko* plant. According to them, when anybody has dog bite,

they wash the wound with soap water. Then they apply the solution of *pidalu*. Similarly they use *Battighass* while feet or hand is pricked by thorns and gets swelling. In case of serious sickness, they worship god/goddess by sacrificing the male chicken, duck. They also worship ghost, evil spirit and witches. Then only they take the patient to the hospital for medication. Apart form this traditional health knowledge the schooled Pahari children know modern health. It means Pahari children learnt the social way of well-being by observing and participating in family's function for their good health (Weikang, 1985: 1 cited in Acharya, 1996). This discussion indicates that Pahari children's personality has been depicted in the Pahari culture in terms of health knowledge. Looking from culture and personality school of thought, this personality of Pahari children is the development of basic personality in their socialization process.

The socialization/enculturation process of Pahari children determines their social personality or well-being. This social personality is composed in response to social actions in functionalist sense and reproduction of the structure in Marxist and neo-Marxist sense (Allahar, 1989). It is also a way to transfer the learning of the elderly people to the new generation. It has also addressed the feelings and emotions of the Pahari child. Here I could see the relationship between agency (Pahari as individual and or group) and the Pahari social structure to what Giddens (1982) called dual structure. It is also the relation of space between the structure and the people. This space in postcolonial discourse is generally understood as social relation. This relation indicates a definite assertion about social interaction (Soja, 1989 and 1996 cited in Luintel, 2007). It is also the base for both structure and people for shaping their behavioral identity (Schaefer and Lamm, 2005). Due to this relation, social reproduction occurs continuously, which is the function of social structure. Therefore, looking from functional perspective, to socialize the children is a kind of social system, which is integral part of the society as a whole. This social system perpetuates the reoccurrence of the structure. This structure in Talcut Parson's view is a socialization process. This process works in a particular way and maintains the whole system (Encyclopedia, 2006). Similarly, as functionalist Durkheim stated social structure is one of the social facts that comes from the social community and socializes each of its members. This social fact is the social

norm and each individual internalizes it within collective representation. In other word, it is socialization process (Encyclopedia, 2006). Here Weber sees rationality to socialize the child. In Giddens and Pieson's (1987: 77) view it is the form of the society. This form of social structure affects the people that they live in (Gauntlett, 2002). It is through this live in children are socialized. In other words socializing the children is the end product of society and culture (Brown, cited in Seymour - Smith, 1986). This implies that social continuity is ideal, interest and interaction (Encyclopedia, 2006) of each society.

If we examine socialization/enculturation of Pahari children from critical point of view we can see another facet of it. For example both Marx and Marxist viewed socialization as the fact/form of norms or the mechanism of ensuring the social continuity (cited in Seymour - Smith, 1986). Due to the action, this continuity is possible to alter anybody's life (Carnoy, 1984: 46). In this regard, Althusser said without creating subject, individuals are the bearers' of the structural relation in which they are situated. It is also the relation of social closure. In this process children are the subjects of history but not individual actors as free agent (ibid). Education banks knowledge on them (Freire, 1983: 58). Socialization also follows the banking process to deposit knowledge on the newborn child. It means socialization/enculturation process reproduce the knowledge of the society.

Addressing the feelings and emotions of the individual child is another form of socialization. Through this form society shapes newborns' social personality as his/her self. In the understanding of Sruti, self is knowledge, an eternal light and individual ego. The Individual self is a kind of consciousness that recognizes owns soul (Cited in Sinha, 1999: 247). Question like, who am I– comes from consciousness. The consciousness is the collection of different perceptions. These perceptions come from society. This implies that mind is social (Cooley cited in Rao, 2001: 212). For Mead this social mind or I-consciousness or individual is a part of overall social process (cited in Ritzer, 1996: 374 - 377). From this social process individual comes to know about himself/herself. Mead further said,

In seeing himself/herself as others see him/her, the individual is actually putting himself/herself in the place of others, and imagining what their response might be. This is role-playing. Here, means of other may be parents, close associates, and finally, society as a whole" (cited in Rao, 2001: 213).

The analysis of Sruti, Cooley and Mead's arguments helped me understand that Pahari children have addressed their individual feelings and emotions in the process of socialization. . In the analysis of Freud (1923), the socialization of Pahari children is the result of their super ego that they acquire from their parents' standards of right and wrong. It means the Pahari children imbibe the standards of their parents into their own personality through different rites, rituals, and other forms of dos and dons. The standards of their parents are no other than the Pahari society.

Working between the Pahari children i.e. agency and the Pahari's social structure, I found that human agency and social structure are not two separate things but two ways of considering the social action (Giddens, 1982). According to Giddens, this is structuration because both human agency and social structure are integrated. Pahari child in this respect integrated him/her with Pahari social structure. It means as Giddens said, the socialization process of Pahari child is the result of dual structure. In other words, Pahari child is the situated social actor who undertakes social action, interaction, and forms their knowledgeable activities in various situations. In this process she/he imbues the rules, resources, and social relationships that are produced and reproduced through social interaction. Latter on they give logic of their doings. This 'social logic' or 'rationality' of the community is habitus (Bourdieu, 1977: 82 cited in Hansen, 1996). This rationality relates to the interaction and dialectic relationship between the objective of Pahari social structure and premises of Pahari children's social action. Moreover, as Bourdieu said, Pahari children's social action is mediated by Pahari group's social and historical practices. And Pahari children internalize the experiences of Pahari's social structures and fixed dispositions of own individual actors.

After analyzing the different school of thought regarding the socialization/enculturation process of Pahari children, I came to know that socialization/enculturation of Pahri

children is the (a) functional relationship between the different ritual practices and Pahari society (b) Pahari children are the bearers of the rituals (c) they are the developers of social individual and social subjectivity, and (d) they are the composite of individual child and Pahari social structure called social well-being personality. This personality making social business is the most productive policies that empower Pahari child to maximize their capacities, resources, and opportunities (WSSD, 1995 cited in NESAC, 1998). It is where Pahari children had developed their basic as well as model personality.

CHAPTER V:

PAHARIS'S SELF AND OTHERS: THE DISCUSSION ON INTERFACE

In this chapter, I explored the worldviews of Pahari schoolchildren toward self and others. I also examined their interface. In doing so, I triangulated the perspectives of Pahari schoolchildren, non – Pahari schoolchildren, teachers, and parents. In addition, I used the case as testimony. Then I analyzed the information thematically and made meanings from Derridean standpoints.

Everyone has a worldview and it is set by education, upbringing, culture where s/he lives in, the book s/he reads, the media and movies s/he observes (Wayne, 2007). Following this meaning of worldviews, I became eager to know the worldview of the Paharis and the ways they constructed. Within this scenario, I categorized this theme into a number of sub-themes, which helped me clarify the self-worldviews of Pahari schoolchildren's schooling.

Identity: Language, Ethnicity, Culture and Schooling

To understand the self and others - worldviews of Pahari schoolchildren, I observed Pahari schoolchildren at playground of their school. I found that most of the time Pahari schoolchildren were speaking in their own language. But the same students latter on were speaking in Nepali language in the classroom. On the way to home and at home, they were again speaking in Pahari language with their friends and parents.

Following these Pahari students, I asked why do you use different language in different situation. In response, Anuja Pahari, Surya Kumari Pahari and Naresh Pahari, students of Grade 7 told me,

I feel easy to speak Pahari language but in the classroom, we are supposed to speak Nepali language compulsorily. I think this is the rule of school rule. In our home and village, I often speak Pahari language because I am speaking since my childhood and we are learning everything and understanding about our life from this language. Our parents also speak in Pahari languages. But we are not given permission to speak our language at classroom. This makes us feel, that our language is last and lost. Except the classroom, we have to speak in Nepali while we go to market for selling bamboo goods. Besides, we are different from the ethnic point of view but we are more cultural group than the caste groups though we follow the same Hindu religion in school and in our community. But school's calendar is based on their culture and festivals, which is not suited with our culture and festivals because we are more involved in celebrating the festivals which hamper the regular school attendance. (Interaction date: 25/11/2006)

The above quotes gave me four areas where the Pahari children look for their identity. They are (a) identity against the hidden rule of school to speak Nepali (b) identity associated with the preservation and development of Pahari language (c) identity related to the unmatched school culture with the pahari culture, and (d) identity in the none-synchronized Hindu festivals based holidays with Pahari festivals. These areas of seeking identities were further elaborated by Anuja Pahari who shared her feeling a bit differently during my discussion

Though whatever we feel uneasy, difficult and unmatched, schooling has made us able to speak and write in Nepali language and at the same time, it made us literate in English language as well. In case of improvement of English language, what we government school enrolled students have condition of English and Nepali language, same case is found to the boarding school. Only paying cost is different. But we cannot write our Pahari language though this is our own language because we have not trained to write in Pahari language at our home and even in this school. In this sense, Nepali language is easy for us because school never taught to write in Pahari language. But we can write if we use same Devanagari script in our Pahari language, which supports to live Pahari language as well like the Nepali language. In this sense, formal schooling is good for us. (Discussion Date: 27/11/2006)

Anuja gave utilitarian perspective that nurtures double identities, the first being the Pahari and the second being the person of the larger world by learning Nepali.

She also created the hope that Nepali script can be used to write in Pahari language.

Parents on the other hand shared the present context of their locality and past experienced in terms of language. In sharing, I found that most of the parents were compelled to speak Nepali language because their children need to speak this language in school. As they said "If our children got an opportunity to speak Nepali even in the home, it would help them practice Nepali more so that we can also speak Nepali language with our children at home". Parents thus opened another avenue to learn Nepali through their children. This implies that parents also looked for double identity.

Apart from the parents I met Kanchha Pahari, who is the president of Pahari Sangh. According to him, Pahari language has been marginalized in Nepal. This situation hampered on the identity of Pahari group. Therefore, Paharis in Bodikhel are trying to save their language and culture.

The above discussion indicated that Pahari school children, their parents and local Pahari people emphasized on only Pahari language for four reasons. One, they felt easy in communication at individual level. Two, their home environment encouraged to speak Pahari language at the family level. Three, they feel easy to think in their own language. Four, they showed their concern for their language. The reason is that self, which emphasizes more on individual and leads itself as per its own interest. This individual is a part of overall social process (Ritzer, 1996: 374 - 377). This self-form of individual is a full of knowledge, the knowledge of identity, the knowledge of utility of Nepali language, the desire for the protection of language, and the consciousness that they are oppressed groups of people are some of the examples in the case of Pahari. This means knowledge is a soul's recognition of one's nature as I – consciousness. The I-consciousness is the psychologically reflexivity. It means it is the ability to put ourselves unconsciously into others' places and act as they act (ibid). In Shruti (Cited in Sinha, 1999: 247), the self is a full of knowledge, an internal light, and an individual self, which

proves the existence of a permanency (Cited in Sinha, 1999: 247). Similarly, in socialists' view, it is different social system.

Similarly, Pahari students talked about Nepali language. From their discussion, I found that they portrayed Nepali language as looking others worldview. According to them, they speak Nepali language especially in school. The reason behind is that especially they have been compelled to speak Nepali in classroom. In school compound as well, school force them to speak Nepali than Pahari language. It means they are seen as "colonialized condition". Because of school' rules and regulation, Pahari language is dominated by Nepali language and being as *decenter* of the school structure. Here I bring Derrida who said structure is a binary opposition and *center* part always ignores, repress and marginalize the *decenter*. As per this school structure is concerned, the position and status of school language is a specific form of imperialism. This dominant language Nepali for Pahari worked as colonial authority (direct rule) that replaced local language speaking authority even in the local areas. On the other hand, the local language is incorporated into the colonial power structure (indirect rule) of modern school (Seymour - Smith, 1986: 42). In this situation, Pahari schoolchildren could not get chance to speak as per their interest. It means, this group of students was colonialized by Nepali language (Coulombe, 2002: 182).

In this imposition or colonialism environment of school, Pahari schoolchildren saw the first/superior identity of their non – Pahari students from three reasons. One, they found others', school' and national language are the same. Two, they found the culture of others is the culture of school. Three, they found the textbooks alien to them no matter they are in Nepali or in English. These three findings helped them to see the value of Nepali language and culture and hence they accepted their non-Pahari friend's identity as *center*. This *center* ultimately turned out to be structural power of school to oppress Pahari language in school. It means school was enabling force to put Pahari language in *decenter*. Even the teachers and head teacher were neglecting Pahari language. As a result, non-Pahari schoolchildren never felt that their language and culture are neither superior nor inferior. It means non-Pahari schoolchildren did not have any concern about

language and culture like the Pahari have. So, they felt that their non-Pahari friends are indifferent to them.

In Derridean sense, Bodikhel School attempts to exclude the Pahari language and ignore, repress, or marginalize it. It means Pahari language become the "other's language" in school (Powell, 2003: 20). As a student of Bodikhel School, Santa Bahadur Pahari commented schooling does not do justice to the Pahari from the ethnic, culture and language context. This argument is similar to what Koirala (2006) said most of our schools are lacking the culture of listening others and creating mosaic in Nepal. If we look from the Koirala's point of view, the structure of the School cannot ensure educational justice because this school does not listen to the Pahari groups and never tries to a create mosaic environment. In Freire's (1983: 8) sense, this school is an "instrument of oppression" for Pahari children. Similarly, as an oppressor, non-Pahari teachers and head teacher want to change the consciousness of Pahari schoolchildren (the oppressed group) but not the situation of the oppressed which oppress the Pahari schoolchildren and Pahari teacher (Freire, 1983: 60). These oppressed group and oppressor groups are made as social facts, which is called social structure i.e. school and it represents the moral order for schooling (Durkheim, cited in Seymour - Smith, 1986: 85 - 86). In this structure, according to Derrida, oppressors dominate the oppressed group and they become *central* and oppressed turns into *decenter* (Powell, 2003: 23). These *centre* and *decentre* parts of school create inequality which in Bourdieu's (1976: 113 - 114) sense is a currently created "cultural products".

Following the argument of Bourdieu, non Pahari teachers and head teachers are the product of a system of the study school because it transmits an aristocratic culture in the name of schooling for Pahari schoolchildren. Therefore, Pahari students understood that this school is promoting the language, culture and caste domination and symbolic violence. According to Freire, non – Pahari teachers bank their knowledge to the culturally alien students. It means there is no exchange of Pahari's knowledge with the non-Pahari children. As a result, Pahari schoolchildren understood that their schooling is only the promoter of a Nepali language and socio-cultural pattern. It is also the oppressor

of Pahari cultural capitals and depositors of the structurally recognized authority knowledge of only school i.e. Nepali socio-cultural based content to the "non-recognized people" like Pahari.

Unlike Naresh's image, Anuja Pahari sees some benefits from schooling to the Pahari children. The benefits are her ability of speaking and writing skills in Nepali and literacy skills in English.She also indicated the possibilities of the development of Pahari language through Nepali language by using the same script. According to her, before entering school, she could speak in Pahari language but could not write in this language. But now she claims that she can write whatever she likes in Pahari language by using Devanagari script. This implies that some of the Pahari schoolchildren didn't see this School as only the oppressor type social structure but they understood it as liberator as well. It means inequality is the characteristic of society because in society, there are many groups and they are regarded as unequal. These unequal groups of people belong to different races or castes or different ethnic, language, or religious groups. These groups though unequal are regarded as "natural" in the eye of the members of the dominant group (Ogbu, 1978: 1). Following Ogbu, socio-cultural diversities are not the problems but as naturalness. It means to be inequality in school is regarded not as a "cultural product" but as "natural" process which is thought especially by the members of the dominant group, the non-Pahari teachers and head teachers. These "unequal realities" are made as myths and legends that often rationalize it and latter on make them legal and provide moral sanctions for keeping the inequalities. It means school structure gave legal and moral sanctions to a specific knowledge i.e. unequalness to the Pahari schoolchildren Like in school, Pahari schoolchildren speak Nepali language in the market. One reason is that they have to sell their bamboo goods. Secondly, they need to go to the market for shopping. It means Nepali language has been the strategy of the Paharis' for entering the broader market. So the ability to speak Nepali for the Pahari children is the measure of relative happiness or satisfaction for them (Encyclopedia, 2007, http://www.google.com.np). This happiness or satisfaction can be seen as utilitarianism. According to Bentham (1748-1832), utilitarianism is the belief/behavior/conduct, which is determined by the balance of pleasure over pain in a given act (cited in McGee and

66

Warms, 2004: 562). In Gaize's (1975: 118) understanding, this Nepali language is a kind of business activity, which is carried on and used at maximum level in the market area, from where, itinerant traders or craftsmen (person) like Pahari meet the local people. Therefore, Pahari use Nepali language at market without feeling the language dominance. At maximum level, they use Nepali language with their Nepali language-speaking customers for selling their goods. So to speak Nepali language is a double obligation for maximizing Pahari's well–being (Velasquez et. al. 2007 http://www.google.com.np). According to utilitarian theorists, this situation is as the utility level of language use. To accept Nepali language from utilitarian standpoint is the cause of both self and other psycho perspective of Pahari schoolchildren. Because of this benefit, the selfness of Pahari group presupposes speaking Nepali language as a social process i.e. the communication among humans.

After analyzing the language use of Bodikhel Pahari schoolchildren I could sense two kinds of language identity, directly and indirectly. Directly, informal schooling taught them that Pahari language is their first language as their identity and Nepali language is their second language for them. It means informally they are maintaining their language identity, though formal schooling did not provide the environment for the development of written form of Pahari language. For the development of Pahari language, there is need of additional education, which is interchangeably used as schooling and it is considered as the source of enlightenment and instrument of carrier opportunity (Goodlad: 1979: 18 – 19). Therefore, Bodikhel Pahari people sent their children at school and hoped that school is key institution where their children can learn, read and write in their own way to be civilized. Oppositely, school taught them Nepali language as the first language and automatically their own Pahari language was pushed as second language for them. It means Pahari schoolchildren are forced to develop only Nepali language in all learning, reading and writing through single language culture. Similarly, market led them think from the utility aspect of the language use. As a result, Pahari language became "unwanted language" to the outer world, i.e. school. And yet children used their language as their identity (Lunitel, 2006) which is indirectly constructed as what poststructuralist believes in selfness (Devies, 1992). In other words it is attached deeply with identity as

separate cultural domain rather than selling or commercial influencing to the others (Radhakrishan, 2003). Thus, it can be said that Pahari schoolchildren are maintaining dual language identity as what Derrida said that identity is a two-place relation/function (Hobson, 1998: 93). So, looking from the Derridean sense, the Nepali language has functioned as first language in school and in market and Pahari language has functioned as second language. But at the same time they are using Pahari language indirectly in those places where school's rule does not touch and cannot control even in school playground.

Except the language identity, Pahari schoolchildren have cultural and ethnic identity as well. Looking from the caste and ethnic groups, I found that most of them (Bodikhel school student record, 2063 BS.) of schoolchildren were from Pahari community. In this regard, Bir Bahadur Pahari, the schoolteacher told me,

> Hindu is our religion and we Pahari society celebrate different kinds of festivals and rites. Since we are the cross breed of Newar and Tamang we have many festivals borrowed from both groups. We have our unique language that mixes Newari and Tamangi. Besides, we Pahris do not share community concerns with other caste groups. In fact we maintain communal secrecy. (Interaction Date: 25/11/2006)

Besides, Bir Bahadur Pahari I interacted with head teacher and other teachers who were non – Pahari. From this interaction, I understood that Pahari teacher and children do not come to school during their festivals. And the non-Pahari teachers blame them for being irregular in school. The above quotes provide the knowledge that Paharis hold double identity genetically, the identity derived from Newar and Tamang community as their offsprings. Religiously they have the third identity that came out of Hinduism, Buddhism, and Animism as a third group in religious dogma.

Literatures on Paharis' socio-culture (Silwal, 2058 BS; Simirik Nepal, 2058 BS; and Pahari, 2062, BS) also reiterate it. It means Paharis have multiple self (social and individual) with their own knowledge or internal light. They assume their knowledge as their soul's recognition of one's nature or consciousness. Therefore, I can claim that

Pahari socio-cultural parts are their recognized identity to prove their existence of permanency (Sinha, 1999: 247). School in this respect has affected them indirectly. It means their original identity has been presented as mismatch for them in school attendance. This attendance creates the tension to them. So they shape their worldview of formal schooling with their self.

Pahari students reported me that they are feeling difficulty in understanding teachers than their Nepali speaking friends. On the contrary, non-Pahari teachers, and head teacher also reported me that they are feeling difficulty in teaching Pahari schoolchildren. In this situation, both the Pahari and non-Pahari teachers feel tension in school. These situations imply that the identities of Pahari children do not match with other groups of children in school because it is an 'evolving self' and it evolves through representation, power, discourse, culture and sense making (Luintel, 2006). Furthermore, in poststructuralists' sense, it is indirectly constructed (Devies, 1992 cited in Lintel, 2006), but the school does not realize it.

> The analysis of Pahari schoolchildren's self led me to generate two realities, the reality generated through critical lens of Boudieu and Freire and the reality created through functional lens of Ogbu. But I could see another lens that was indicated by Anita Pahari who could extend her Pahari identity by using Devnagari script to write Pahari.

From Anuja's lens I can argue that School is oppressive in one hand, functional to the other. At the same time it leads to co-existence. This reminded me the Derridean concept of binary opposites. According to this concept any language, culture, caste/ethnicity not only creates center and *decenter* (Powell, 2003) it also creates new thing through the fusion of these opposites. This fusion gave birth to the double identity among Pahari children through reciprocal learning.

Subversion: Alternative Perspective in Teaching and Learning

Schooling for almost all Paharis schoolchildren is equated with compulsory education as outer secondary socialization process, which yields a new world for them because they are different from mainly cultural, language and subject to be learnt contexts in school.

During the fieldwork, I found a group of students, grade 6, who were dialoging at playground. Because of already familiarization with them, I easily mixed up with that group and listened their dialogue carefully. In that dialogue, Shreejana Pahari, Ramita Pahari, Anita Pahari, Kamal Raj Pahari, Bishnu Kumar Pahairi and Subas Pahari were criticizing each other about the way of classroom teaching. Herein below is my field note:

> I felt difficulties in understanding Nepali word clearly, Bishnu, did you understand about the today's topics in science classroom? said Shreejana Pahari. In answer, Bishnu said no. This word is totally new for me. I asked the teacher and teacher cleared in other words of Nepali term but I cannot understand. In this line, Sailesh Pahari raised a question like why our teachers always use Nepali word only. Sometime, if they use our Pahari language word, it would help to understand. But teacher don't want to use our Pahari word.

> According to teachers and head teachers, students should only speak Nepali in school, which is the principle of school, said Kamal Raj Pahari. At that time, Ramita Pahari reminded that sometime, Anjan Kumar Acharya (head teacher) tried to solve the classroom problems by calling Bir Bahadur Pahari Sir who solved the difficulties by linking the word of topics and context with Paharis' daily practices (code switching method). It made easy for us. Is it always possible to teach in all classrooms by Bir Bahadur Pahari?, these students asked each other. At last, they agreed in one point that due to the second position or inferiority or not given value to the Pahari language in classroom by school, we are bearing the difficulties in understanding Nepali word and sentence clearly. (Interaction date: 25/11/2006)

The above dialogues gave me areas where the Pahari schoolchildren criticize on pedagogy process of school. They are (a) the use of code switching in teaching against the mono-socio-culture structural design of school (b) the practice of listening others for the creation of mosaic cultural environment against the single language group and cultural domination (c) the regularization of code switching method against the periodical effort made by the head teacher. After conceptualizing these areas, I confirmed with them by asking some questions differently

> If all teachers come from Pahari language group, what would happen? In response, they said "it will be easy for us to understand the text". I

70

reiterated the same question differently and said, "If all non - Pahari teachers speak in Pahari language what would happen. These students said, "This situation will also make easy for us to understand the classroom discussion". (Interaction date: 25/11/2006)

Following the above discussions I realized that Pahari students gave two perspectives for changing the rigid type of school structures. One, if it is possible, majority of Pahari teachers can be appointed for teaching in school because this policy represents the voice of the majority of Pahari students and at the same time it solves the often occurred difficulties in classroom. Two, if non – Pahari teachers learn Pahari language and socio-cultural practices it will also be equally useful for the students. It means school can develop co-learning environment between the teachers and students. This implies that one has to go for looking the self. Due to the looking self nature, Pahari schoolchildren were ready to take part in the conversation with others for fulfilling their desire (Freud, cited in Ritzer, 1996). Moreover, it is 'Id-ridden', which indicates a sense, a mass of instinctive drives and impulses and demands immediate satisfaction (Freud cited in Encyclopedia, 2007). Here this looking self and Id-ridden psychological perspective of Pahari schoolchildren helped the school to create mosaic environment. This practice ensures the educational justice for both Pahri and non – Pahari groups of student.

During the discussion, there were few non – Pahari students of grade 6 and head teacher as well. The head teacher teaches science. After listening the response of students, head teacher said,

> It is impossible in this school because in this Bodikhel community, there are not many educated people from Pahari community like Bir Bahadur Sir in one hand. And on the other hand, how can we all non-Pahari teachers learn Pahari language fluently? (Interaction date: 25/11/2006)

Head teacher showed his rigid perspective towards the school structure. His rigid perspective can be analyzed from two parts. If I look from the first part, he is right in his perspective because in Bodikhel community there are not much educated Pahari people, like Bir Bahadur Pahari. On the other hand, without government quota, SMC of

71

this school cannot enroll other Pahari teachers in school. In this sense, he sees many constraints in employing all Pahari teachers instead of the existing non- Pahari teachers. Similarly, if I looked from the second part, I can say that partly the head teacher never thought about school's plural management, though he is facing the reality that school has more than one language and socio-cultural groups' student. Partly, he doesn't see the importance of Pahari language like English language. Partly, he has traditional mindset so he never thought that all non-Pahari teachers can learn Pahari language from the Pahari students like how Pahari students are learning Nepali language strictly from the teachers and non-Pahari friends. Because he has mentality that teachers are superior and more knowledgeable than students. Students always should obey the teachers. These "social facts" according to Emile Durkheim, come from the social community and socialize its members. Therefore, they are the central concern of the society and work to please the mainstream society accordingly (cited in Seymour - Smith, 1986). It means head teacher is the part of school structure and works in a particular way and maintains the whole system of the school. Therefore, this school structure has no creative subjectivity at its core. In other words it doesn't think of the pluralist management (Althusser, cited in Carnoy, 1984: 89). The creative subjectivity is often depending on self so head teacher looks this school not from the self-sense but from the looking other. In this looking others relationship, he doesn't think that there is necessary to manage the pluralism by listening the Pahari group students.

On the contrary, this area of seeking pluralism management was further elaborated by parents who shared their feeling a bit differently during my discussion. One of the parents, Sanu Maiya Pahai, a married with three children said,

> At first, we were in tension while our children were supposed to enroll our in school. Because our children spoke only Pahari at home and in school they have to speak only in Nepali language. However, due to the compulsory provision of school enrolment by the Pahari community itself, we were obliged to send our children at school. Therefore, we looked an alternative way and immediately we thought that if our children got an opportunity to speak Nepali even in the home, these situations help them to practice Nepali speaking. So we started to speak Nepali language with

our children in our home. Other parents also reiterated such statement.
(Interaction date: 26/11/2006)

In this sharing, I found that most of parents were creative subjective characters because they took the compelled situation as an opportunity. For example, they started to speak Nepali language with their children in a hope to improve own and their children's Nepali speaking. It means they were ready to speak two languages at the same time. This reality implies that parents never stayed at fixed structure. Rather they looked for an alternative that ensured children justice to the management of language pluralism.

After examining the above – mentioned dialogue with Pahari students, head teachers, school realities, and parents, I came to the decision that Pahari schoolchildren were criticizing on school's fixed/inflexible rule of language use in teaching and learning practices. It means school has still monolingual practices (Awasthi, 2004), though country has emphasized on mother tongue education. According to my informants, school never tries to find the problems of schooling of Pahari children, though teachers know the language problems indirectly. In this sense, the Pahari students found that their learning in school has contradicted with their own Pahari's socio-cultural practices. This reality in Bourdieu's (1977) sense is hegemony of the cultural capital. In other words, because of this school's no provision of alternatives, Pahari students are standing critically against the school structure. It means Pahari students consciously/unconsciously looked that school as the place of others. As Mead (Ritzer, 1996: 375) said, because of reflexivity, Pahari schoolchildren developed their ability to put themselves unconsciously into classroom where they found only the outsiders of their world and tried to adjust by looking self for understanding the pedagogy process of teachers. Or, this reality is exactly opposite from the super ego concept of Freud because Pahari students didn't symbolically internalize their ownness and cultural regulation. Except this reality, their criticism indicated that they were looking for alternative. Chow (1998) called this alternative is subversion. According to her, the method of subversion is fundamentally formal which exceeds and violates the coherence of cultural forms from within and replaces that coherence with dislocations, perversities, and crudities. In Derridean sense, this is the attempt to subvert the central

73

term of any structure; the marginalized term thus becomes central and temporally overthrows the hierarchy (Powell, 2003: 26). The reason behind this that the Pahari students were very much impressed from the way of teaching and learning i.e. code switching method of Pahari teacher of this school. Besides, as they compared themselves and argued, "We and our parents have been made literate in Nepali language and socio-cultural practices, though we were non-Nepali speaking groups. Like this why not non-Pahari teachers try to speak and learn Pahari language to facilitate the learning of the Pahari students? Similarly, in case of learning the English language, the teachers were found ready to learn it, though it was considered as very difficult. At this point the Pahari students asked why not our teachers try to learn Pahari. If both teachers and students are ready to listen and learn each others language then pedagogical process will be justifiable for both". These questions of the Pahari students thus opened an avenue for non-Pahari teachers to learn Pahari from the students and teach Nepali to Pahari children. This reminded me the argument of Derrida, who said that we could think from the opposite of existing structure or existing way of thinking because there is nothing outside the text (Lucy, 2000: 30). Similarly, it is 'metanarratives' like science in which everybody cannot believe for long (Lyotard, 2000). It means the structure depends on subjectivity of students, not the as fixed/rigid type of specific language, socio-cultural and religious groups. This implies that Pahari schoolchildren looked for alternative for educational justice. For making easy, listen others and learn others are the genealogical characteristic of Pahari group. But this characteristic of Pahari groups was ignored by the non-Pahari teachers.

The above analysis of school led me to generate two veracities, the veracity generated through flexible lens of Giddens who talked about high value of human subjectivity in social structure. This human subjectivity looks for alternative or challenges the structure for ensured social justice. The second veracity was created through critical lens of Bourdieu who viewed about cultural hegemony of capital. He says the cultural capital always nurtures the hierarchy or inequality by ignoring other cultures or groups in same place. Amidst these veracities I could see the possibility of co-existence between human subjectivity i.e. Pahari schoolchildren and the ignoring group i.e.

schoolteacher. This possibility prompted me to subscribe Derridean statement i.e. two parts (center and decenter and they have relationship) of structure can co-exist and adjust by valuing each other. It means there is a chance of fusion of both parts. This fusion gives the place to the both parts for living in one social structure by understanding each other.

Paharis' Schooling: Relationship between the Center and Decenter/Deconstruction

As mentioned above in identity section of this chapter five, whether students and teachers are from Pahari group or non-Pahari groups, they are understood as opposites. Because of the language, culture and caste/ethnic identity factors, they are different group to each other. Besides, due to the schooling process, they have hierarchal status. This hierarchical status indicates the inequality. Gintis was probably right when he argued that nowadays schooling is increasingly seen to have inequalitarian and repressive features (Sarup, 1978:156). A study done by Awasthi (2004: 3) in Nepal supports this idea when he found that monolingual groups dominated the school setting and created their reality for "the others" as well. Similarly, a study conducted with squatter schoolchildren in Ramghat of Kathmandu district has showed the paradox of schooling. This further reiterates that schooling represents inequality. Some of this trend of creating the inequality was related to the difficulty of the kind of schooling Paharis got and their belief that school and its schooling process kept them in downward position and others/their counterparts as upward position. Such type of schooling is similar with formal socialization process and it is also the basis of self development of Pahari schoolchildren. The self arises through social activity and social relationships that is determined by school for Pahari schoolchildren. Under their social relationship and social activity of school, as I found Pahari schoolchildren have beliefs that their school language is Nepali. In this connection I wrote my field note on 25/11/2006 that reads out:

> Shree Krishna Pahari has conceptualized the the school language and teaching and learning subjects should be different from the day-to-day language and home schooling. In other words the National language and Brahman/Chhetri's socio-cultural based curricula are the high status

occupying subjects. And Pahari language and its socio-cultural are the disvalue subjects. Such type of our thinking was started, when Pahari students entered into school. Due to the described low position of the Pahari language and compulsory provision of speaking, learning and teaching of Nepali language, Pahari language has been marginalized.

I also wrote in my field diary that Shambhu Pahari also thought the same thing but in an opposite way before entering school. Before going to school, he thought that home language is the dominant form or the *center* and others language is opposite to it. It means others languages such as Nepali has less importance in their life or it is an inferior part of Pahari's social structure. But when Basanta started to go to school, initially, he had to face difficulty in learning Nepali language in reading, writing, and doing mastery on it. In fact this is a changing situation for all Pahari children because to go to school is mandatory for them. Moreover parents and surrounding environments and government policies also encourage them to go to school compulsorily and follow the rules of school. At the same time, Pahari parents also started speaking Nepali language with their children in a hope that we also can improve Nepali language. As a result there is a there is a threat that Pahari language will gradually disappear from their houses.

The above field note gave me four areas where Pahari schoolchildren set their mind. They are (a) School is the institution of hierarchical structure (b) Pahari students conceptualized that they are second position holder students than non-Pahari friends and teachers so they are opposite to each other (c) at home and community they found their first position (d) home schooling is different from formal schooling and both are holding the first position in their own place (d) Due to the maximum use of Nepali language, both parents and Pahari schoolchildren found that their language has been marginalized (e) they found that home schooling is more flexible than formal schooling.

Except the above conceptualization, Pahari schoolchildren were looking for structural change of school that was further elaborated by other some of the Pahari schoolchildren. During this discussion, I asked the Pahari schoolchildren like how can you change your existing schooling in school? What types of example do you have to change the nature of schooling that made it possible? In answer, Subash Pahari told me,

We have three experiences. One, initially we were able to change our Pahari language speaking habit into Nepali language speaking. Two, our parents also did the same for creating Nepali speaking environment at home. Three, our Pahari teacher used code switching method in classroom. As a result, we are now able to sell our bamboo products by using Nepali language in the market. We believe that one day we can compete with plastic and metal made goods and claim that we also produce high quality bamboo goods to sell at the market. (Discussion Date: 25/12/2006)

The above answers of Pahari schoolchildren provided me some knowledge that (a) center position of school can be changed (b) Pahari students are looking for co-existence between the Nepali and Pahari language groups (c) On the basis of students' socio-cultural lived reality, school can develop its curriculum to address the local problem.

The discussion with the schooled Pahari children implies that the school structure in Bodikhel has a hierarchical relationship between the Pahari and non Pahari students. So was the case between the non-Pahari and Pahari teachers where one group has considered as high status holder and other has low status holder. It means the different status holders groups seem as opposite groups. Due to the relationship between Pahari students/teachers and non-Pahari schoolchildren/teachers in terms of schooling they were opposite groups like man/woman; nature/culture; caucasian/black; Christian/Pagan, Muslim/Hindu, up/down etc. According to Derrida, these examples of opposite groups resembles with center and decenter as binary opposites, the main part of deconstruction theory. Following this theory, Pahari schoolchildren understood themselves as opposite part of school structure and its schooling. Or in the sense of deconstruction theory, they understood themselves as *decenter* and non-Pahari schoolchildren/teachers as *center*. Because of the use of Nepali language course book, dialogue and practice of Brahman/Chhetri socio-cultural pattern in school, non-Pahari schoolchildren were being natural and privileged in one hand and other hand Pahari schoolchildren and teacher were being ignored, repressed and marginalized. Besides, they found that their formal schooling and home schooling were also standing in binary opposition. It means school culture turned out to be *center* and the home culture the

77

decenter. In simple terms, due to the nature of Pahari schoolchildren' lived social structure, they believed in binary opposition. As Durkheim (1858 – 1917); Weber (1864 -1920); Henriques et al. (1984); and Giddens (1982) viewed, the studied School is an institution and a miniature from of social system, individual subjectivity, and the interface between them embedded in it. Similarly, in understanding of Radhakrishnan (2004: 141-142), this school is the reality of a world and it is in dominance and divided into two zones: the rationality as together and rationality as odds.

Similarly, I found that schooling could be again changed as per the interest of students. As I noticed present schooling practices and past experience made the Pahari schoolchildren self aware and enabled them develop their own ideas, which can be called individual subjectivity. This subjectivity is continually formed and reformed under changing social and historical circumstances (Henriques, 1984). Due to the majority number of Pahari schoolchildren in school, their interests or demand has challenged the school, but the school was not taking it seriously. It means Pahari schoolchildren's interest was understood as social subjectivity of this school. The social subjectivity gave a room to think that this school should do educational justice by managing the multi lingual and socio-cultural groups of students. This is also possible because school, as an institution, is also a miniature form of social system, individual subjectivity, and the interfacing place between more than one parts of school where they are embedded (Durkheim, 1858 – 1917; Weber, 1864 -1920; Henriques, et al. 1984; Henriques, et al 1984 and Giddens, 1982). It means Pahari schoolchildren want to get their own place in school through self looking process. In other words, while they are the victims of linguistically and socio-culturally biases, they have showed their subjectivity by sharing them with others and while as a structurally victimized person they have planned to work against the oppressive school structure. In Freud's (1923) sense, this is super ego of individual or collectivity because the Pahari students act as the conscience. These all scenario resembles with the deconstruct theory of Derrida, which is an also tactic form of *decentering* or the changed form of existing situation, where people change their beliefs (Powell, 2003: 46). This change condition of *center* into *decenter* and *decenter* into *center* is a kind of criticism. It means how Pahari

schoolchildren found mismatching their lived situation with school structure that is a criticism of morals and metaphysics of school. This types of criticism is another mode of deconstruction (Cixous, 2000: 191) because these morals and metaphysics are one side of social structure, which focus on both *center* and *decenter*. In other words, it is binary opposition of the studied School. In this school, Nepali language, Brahman/Chhetri's socio-cultural based pedagogical process and rules and regulation have dominated the Pahari's language, socio-cultural practices. In other words the *center* dominated the *decenter* (Powell, 2003). Following this Derridean deconstruction theory, Pahari schoolchildren want to change the *decenter* position of their language and socio-cultural value based pedagogical process into *center* position. Similarly, in Radkhakrishnan (2004: 131) sense, Pahari schoolchildren want to change the *decenter* position of their language, linkageless pedagogy with their socio-cultural practices, and multicultural based rules regulations of school into center position at school. If it is done, I believe that Pahari schoolchildren can change the dictatorial forms of societies into egalitarian (Passolini, 2006). They also can dismantle privileged or traditional meanings of school and schooling (Paul de Man cited in Powell, 2003: 148).

After reviewing the mode of thinking of Pahari schoolchildren about schooling, I could reflect two issues. One, Pahari schoolchildren looked for own ness in schooling as well in school. This indicates that I could find the lens of Giddens that focuses on established ways of doing things in social structure. In Giddens sense the structure of school can be changed when the majority of Pahari schoolchildren start go ignore existing situation, replace this or reproduce this differently (Gauntellt, 2001). It means School can also be looked from different angle other than the critical lens of Bourdieu and functional lens of Ogbu. Moreover, this school's function can be changed on the basis of student's subjectivity. Two, on the basis of their own experience and their parent's experience, Pahari schoolchildren challenged the old tradition of school structure and provided the way for getting the educational justice. This reminded me the Derridean concept of binary opposites. According to this concept any structure has both center and decenter parts. These center can be changed into decenter and decenter can be changed into center. It means both existing parts can be managed in flexible

ways. These two reflections have created a new avenue through the fusion of the concept of Giddens and Derrida. This fused concept, which I call "reciprocal action" under any forms of social structure can give birth to the flexible structure. This structure will challenge the notion of critical thinkers as dominant and dominated and at the same time gives "third eye" to address human subjectivity by understanding them as equal partner no matter they are in majority or minority and/or the representative of the state/state apparatus.

Differance: The Understanding of Pahari Schoolchildren

My first observation on language use of Pahari schoolchildren at school playground and latter conversation with them helped me understand that schoolchildren use both language as per their convenience and situation. In other word, they are maintaining dual language identity. At the same time, they are thinking that they had to face difficulty in school. This situation was presented by Ramesh Pahari in subversion section of this chapter V. This reality is the *difference* for school's own rules and regulation, non-Pahari schoolchildren and teachers, where they do not care the intention of the majority of Pahari schoolchildren. It means, Pahari schoolchildren understood that this situation is just *difference*. This understanding of Pahari schoolchildren's in Derridean sense, is called the *differance* which is not some mystic, unnameable being and does not exist like the God is existed (Powell, 2003:122).

The following quote of a student of grade 6 elaborates more about it.

> Kamal Raj Pahari: Neither our non – Pahari teacher teaches nor school authority listens our voices.   As you know we are suffering from this language and identity problem since grade one of our schooling. When we were too young, we just bear this situation; we could not express our sufferings even with our friends. With this difficulty we read books and wrote whatever we could understand. So we could get just pass score in the exam. This is how I'm in grade six. (Interview date: 925/12/2006)

The quote above told me three things. They are (a) Pahari students are humming against the school structure and schooling pattern but they are not listened by the teachers and

school (b) Thinking of Pahari schoolchildren is different from the thinking of teachers and school, and (c) Pahari schoolchildren always felt uneasy in school whether it was in the first day of school or latter on during the school life but the non-Pahari students didn't feel uneasy.

Celebrating the festivals is another context where Pahari and non-Pahari schoolchildren put own views. In sharing, Pahari schoolchildren reported me that they have to celebrate many festivals and feast while comparing with their non-Pahari friends. As they said "during the festivals and feasts, we spent more money and more time because we have strong belief that culture is our life. Therefore, we leave the school at the time of celebrating the festivals and feasts but school calendar does not match with our cultural celebrating festivals". Oppositely, non-Pahari schoolchildren shared their feeling that they don't need additional leave except school calendar. It means school calendar is suitable for them. It means, the statement of Mann (cited in Spring, 2001) "school is considered as the symbol and hope for the good society" resembles with the non-Pahari schoolchildren.

Pahari school children also shared me that they are often involved in bamboo making and farming activities more than the non-Pahari school friends. Due to this heavily involvement in household chores, they are labeled as weak students Kamal Raj Pahari, student of grade six said that Pahari students are also feeling difference between the teaching methods of school and their home. But the non - Pahari friends do not see any difference in teaching of classroom and home.

At home as I found the Pahari children were not recognized as the earning members. To quote Suresh Pahari, student of same grade six "we earn money by the sell of bamboo goods but our parents do not give value to that earning. For them it is the earning of parents". In other words, children's earning is also considered as the earning of the parents.

The paragraphs above imply that school and home did not and could not visualize what Derrida calls the *difference* and *differance* (Powell, 2003) between the non-Pahari and Pahari students, parents and children.

Contrary to the learning of the home and school Pahari schoolchildren are looking for own ness by understanding the context of classroom. School on the other hand wants to regulate Pahari schoolchildren in its own structural context. Likewise parents give the importance for household chores. Male teacher see that they are only capable person in teaching. Non-Pahari schoolchildren and schoolteacher are thinking that they are superior group of school so they never feel they are in tension out of school culture. This finding shows Paharis' self that leads overall social process and individual is a part of this process (Ritzer, 1996: 375). It means Pahari schoolchildren see the knowledge of difference. For example, they found the difference between Pahari and Nepali language or Pahari vs Nepali and English. These two things are fundamentally different for both Pahari schoolchildren and school itself. The reason is that there is a binary structuration of self and it does work in two ways. This two ways' working, according to Derrida, is the binary structuration of self and also understood as *differance* (Radhakrishnan, 2003: 65). Furthermore, Powell (2003: 118 to121) also clearly expressed about the argument of Derrida, who argued that *differance* includes not only the meaning to 'differ' to be the different form something else – but to defer, to delay, and to put off till later. Or it is ambiguous. Following the arguments of Derrida, school's structuration of self is different from the self of Pahari schoolchildren but this difference is not yet heard by school. It means school knowingly or unknowingly maintained the difference. This differance along with the difference maintained by the school gave Pahari schoolchildren a kind of pinch. It means discomfortability remained within Pahari schoolchildren but not with the non-Pahari schoolchildren. In other words the *differance* produced the unheard situation and undermined the Pahari schoolchildren.

Similarly, Pahari students told that the school calendar is not based on their cultural world so they illustrated this as looking others worldview. According to them, they have to follow compulsorily the school calendar but sometimes it affects them because

they don't get leave from school for their own festivals. It means they got the sense that they are not valued by school but they have to participate in the time of celebrating their festivals so they need holiday. This situation creates tension between the school rules and Pahari schoolchildrens' social upbringing. And the tension nurtures inequality (Koirala, 1996). In Valentin's (2002) understanding this school intends to eliminate social differences in the name of modern schooling. From the arguments of Koirala and Valintine, it can be said that my study school does not address the heterogeneity of students in classroom. In other words, this school is symbol of colonial development world and it bypasses the practices of real inhabitants, the Pahari schoolchildren (Iversion, 1978: 153). In this sense, education system of this school does not touch the hearts of the Pahari schoolchildren who are native inhabitants and the majority students of this school. The Pahari schoolchildren are thus the marginalized and lost; despite their presence in majority they are only seen but not heard (Powell, 2003: 153).

Regarding the overall performance of Pahari schoolchildren I found that they are weak than non-Pahari schoolchildren in classroom. I asked the reason for their poor performance. In response they said, they have to be heavily involved in household chores than their non-Pahari counterparts. It means the Pahari schillchildren compared them with their friends and felt that they are not getting sufficient time. However; the school record shows that they attend class regularly. It means in Bourdieu's (1992) sense they are shaped by the habitus (sets of dispositions). On the contrary, children's involvement in household chores is the socialization process of Pahari society. Or it is another form of education that can be called home schooling. This home schooling prepares the young children for the entry into family and then into society (Andersen & Taulor, 2002: 446). Therefore, the Pahari schoolchildren whom I met were consciously involved in their household chores as well. They supported the family in making bamboo goods, cutting grass, cooking food, and so on. Among them, bamboo goods making is the earning source for them but their parents oriented their children not as individual earner but as "unpaid supporters" of the household's income. Even the Pahari schoolchildren were not demand their wage from the parents. It means the Pahari schoolchildren are shaped by the home schooling habitus (Ibid). In this sense, all

kinds of schooling can be considered social habitas whether Pahari schoolchildren learn from the school and their friend or get orientation from their parents and elders in home. These informal schools and the schooling process attempt to exercise social control; solve a variety of social problems; guide to go further and help to visualize the overall scenario. But Pahari schoolchildren saw the differances between these and their schooling habitas.

The reason of being the minority and majority groups of school structure and male bias of gender analysis in teacher's composition in school can be understood from the different lens. I therefore analyzed it from Talcot Parsons structural functionalist standpoint. This standpoint helped me understand that maintaining difference is the system of school and they are integral parts of social system. These integral parts are also called as variable and based on their relationship and hence school acts as minority and society acts as majority even within the school.

In case of gender I found that majority of male teachers are working in school and they conceptualized that they are only suitable person than their female counterparts especially for teaching in higher grades. If we analyze this situation from the critical lens the minority and majority group relation in School is the result of action that altered the circumstances of Pahari and non-Pahari schoolchildren and schoolteacher. According to Marx, the circumstances of both the groups in school are the result of human consciousness. This consciousness is not from the general development of the human mind or from the collective will of the human beings but depends on the relation of production (Carnoy, 1984: 46). Due to this consciousness, Pahari schoolchildren felt that they are minority group in school because this school made them in this decentering position. The same analysis is true in teachers' gender composition. It means , both structural functionalist and critical analyst highlight the relationship. This relationship works in one side as legitimate function and in other side it works as consciousness of majority and minority, and male and female in teacher composition. It means Pahari schoolchildren don't see other reasons but look differently though they understood the relationship between the majority and minority from the same base. At

this point they they always ask question like why the languages and socio-cultural practices are localized differently, different to what? and so on. These questions are also localized on the basis of human consciousness. This human consciousness in Freud's sense is ego nature of human being and the subject of change on the consciousness of Pahari schoolchildren and schoolteacher.

After analyzing the overall understanding of Pahari schoolchildren in terms of both home and formal schooling, I understood that they neither see the occurrence from functional relation of Talcut Parsons nor critical lens. It reminded me the alienation theory of Karl Marx and inequality theory of Bourdieu. But they see difference and ignored what Derrida viewed *difference,* the condition for the opposition of presence and absence, which is also the "hinge" between inner meaning and outer representation (Scot, 2002). However their understanding of *differences* give the meaning by further *differences* such as house and home are understood by the people as 'building' and 'family' or 'social unit', though it may seem contradictory to some and similar to others. Or it is neither word nor a concept (Wikipedia, Encyclopedia, 2006) for them.

From the deliberations above I understood that Pahari schoolchildren found the sense of *differance* in (a) cultural differences (b) investment of time (c) economic status (d) involvement in household chores (e) the classroom performance, (f) the concept of teaching between the Pahari and non – Pahari schoolchildren, and (g) children's earning right. These *differances* gave them sometimes a kind of pinch. For example, when they compare with their non-Pahari friends in school, they find that they are less free person from the very beginning of their childhood. They have also noticed that their non-Pahari counterpart's language and socio-cultural practices are used in school but not theirs. These two *differances* that they realize gives them an avoidable pinch.

On the contrary, in case of home schooling though they see *differances*, they also enjoy these *differances* because they are oriented that way through their home schooling. But their lived differances are not heard in school. With this unheard feeling, they have shaped them as they go through the process of learning through what Bourdieu (1992)

85

calls habitus (sets of dispositions) based on living experience of differences, realization of Pahari schoolchildren, and their obligation to internalize the habitus of school

Skeptical reality: The Decentered Pahari Schoolchildren

After understanding the deconstructioning mode of Pahari schoolchildren, I went back again after a month and met the same students of grade six. I asked the students whether you get any change in your school? In answer, they said,

> No, Teachers lecture in front of the first row students and we make noise at the backside of the classroom. So we cannot understand the content of the book. To improve this situation, school does not take initiative to make school friendly for us. School does not regard our interest. (Interaction date: 26/12/2006)

> Bishnu Pahari: we Pahari students are suffering from not only in school but also in home. Even our parents do not care whether we have pencils, books, copy, and school fee or not. Sometime, I fight with my parents for money. If they don't give me, I tell them that I'll not work any more (Discussion date: 26/12/2006)

The above quotes gave me the knowledge that Pahari school children feel (a) difficulty in learning contents of the school (b) unattractive or unsuitable schooling for them (c) indifferent against school's behavior towards them (d) teacher domination (e) difficulty to manage the stationary and school fee

The above learning is similar with the argument of Pierre Bourdieu (1977) who said that the orthodox practices of discourse classify the interest of Pahari students. It also makes them not admissible into school and makes them marginal (cited in Brown, 1944: 31). In home as well, Pahari schoolchildren are devoid of their right to their earning. It means the parents also devalue the earning of their children. Here the *center* dominated the *decenter*. Parents are prime authority for using their children's earning and children are second authority for using this money. It means the earning position of children is marginalized and children are in tension.

In Derridean sense the *decenter* can be changed into *center*. It means *decenters* can be positioned in high level or in a dominating forms. This changed position creates new discourse, which is skeptical about the existing structure (Snyder, 2006). Because of the self, Pahari students are reacting against the unsuitable School. In the understanding of Mead (1996: 378), this situation is called the issue of individual creativity, which gets more voice than the voice of the community. In Freud's (1923) sense due to the super ego of students, they are looking for comfortable pedagogical process. Therefore, it can be said that there is room for change in the favor of the generalized others. This means, Pahari schoolchildren need a new form of dialogue where *decenters* can be positioned in high level.

This critical looking is not found in Pahari schoolchildren but also in non-Pahari students as well. For example, non – Pahari students such as Manita Tamang said that their Pahari school friends drop out from the school. The reason as they found is that Pahari schoolchildren cannot pay exam fee and cannot buy pen and exercise books regularly. It means non-Pahari schoolchildren as well gave their ironical reaction to this occurrence. In Attinello's (2002: 263) understanding this sarcastic reactions are often found to ones' surroundings – colleagues, works and training.

From Pahari and non-Pahari schoolchildren's understanding, I came to the understanding that the internal tension of Pahari schoolchildren in school and home is not only the indication of the Bourdieu's theory of inequality which focuses on fixed orthodox practices for creating the unequal ness. But as the Pahari student said the internal tension can be thrown or minimized if the existing structure of school and home is produced and reproduced through interaction between the teachers and Pahari students and between the Pahari children and their parents. This scenario is called the moderate approach of Giddens that focus the producible social structure in the support of human agency and leads to social change. In Derrida sense, this process is center to decenter and decenter to center of the same structure. This implies that Pahari schoolchildren see the resolution of tension as well in their schooling. Therefore, from the Pahari schoolchildren's lens I can argue that they don't need to live only in tension

in one hand, inequality to other. But they can live in tension free environment of school and home. This reminded me the Giddens concept of dual structure and Derridean theory of deconstruction. Both theories focus on creation of new things through fusion of tension ness and tensionless dialogue and discourse and opposites. This fusion which I call the fusion of center and decenter provides amicable learning environment for both Pahari and non-Pahari schoolchildren, and schoolteacher and parents through reciprocal learning.

Paharis' Schooling: Hybridization of Interpretative Theoretical Schools

In the course of interaction with Pahari schoolchildren, I understood their different realities. For example, Binod Pahari, a student of grade 5 told me about his initial stage of school. According to him, he had to go to school compulsorily, though he felt that school was as unmatched with him for many reasons such as language difficulties. The reality of Binod Pahari gave me an indication that formal schooling is not suitable for all children. This indication implies that schoolchildren seek the compatible school for them but the school did not provide educational environment as per the interest of Pahari schoolchildren. This was further elaborated by Ramita Pahari, a student of grade 6 who said, she went to school happily, though the language of the school was different for her. The reason was that she wanted to know new things. Here Ramita gave utilitarian perspective for learning.

The experiences of Binod and Ramita Pahari can be interpreted from different school of thoughts. For example, the reality of Binod Pahari in Marx' (1818 - 1883) sense is unmatched schooling. This unmatched means school is bourgeois' society and Pahari children are labor group where school suppressed the Pahari schoolchildren in terms of language and socio-culturally biased contents. This is a negative part of society. Form Derrida's point of view as well, school is *center* and Pahari schoolchildren are *decenter* where school oppressed the Pahari schoolchildren (Powell, 2003). In Poulo Freire's (1983) sense, school structure suppressed the Pahari schoolchildren in terms of language and course content. Similarly, in Pierre Bourdieu's (1992) sense, modern school culture suppressed the local culture of Pahari schoolchildren.

In Goodlad's (1979: 1) sense Ramita Pahari, happily agreed to go to school and showed her readiness for bearing both matched and unmatched situation that indicates the bones of her civilization.   In other words her readiness to go to school is her own 'knowledge, attitudes, values, skill, and sensibilities' that require individual's "deliberate, systematic and sustained effort" (p. 106).   Likewise, in understanding of Edward (1976: 392), Ramita Pahari's happily acceptance is viewed as a hope in which schooling potentially makes a difference for her in sofar as it contributes to what she brings to her outside experiences in order to make education significant. In Spring's (2001) view, Ramita consciously assumed that school is a place of enlightenment and an instrument of career opportunity.

In the above discussion I noticed two phenomena The first phenomenon is the unmatched situation or compulsory force from government's rule and parents should be looked from Pahari schoolchildren's perspective where different critical theorists and interpretionists coverge. The second phenomenon is that Pahari schoolchildren are stressing on looking self, which is compared with self concept of Mead, social psychologist and Id and ego concept of Freud, the psychoanalysist. According to Mead (Ritzer, 1996: 374), Pahari schoolchildren showed their self-nature with the development of their personality and through social activity and social relationship. Similarly, according to Freud (1923), this self nature of Pahari schoolchildren or this argument of Bishnu Pahari can be understood from both Id and ego part of looking self. For example, go to school compulsory is the natures of Id because Bishnu Pahari, went school forcefully to satisfy his parents.   In school, he was forced by school's rule and regulation for regular attendance in school. At the same time, ego concept of Freud can be linked with Hari's consciousness. Here, Bishnu knew consciously the oppressive nature of school. In case of Ramita Pahari, she is consciously agreed to go school. It means she understood that school is benefit giver for her because she knew that all children go to school and learn more. Here she is opting for the dialogue between the students and teachers; between the teachers and parents; and between the students/children and parents about the looking of self world of Pahari schoolchildren.

These self- worlds could be understood from the questions like, why do Pahari school children think the school as unmatched place? Why do they accept the formal school, though it is very difficult for them? In which condition, Pahari schoolchildren are feeling difficult? It means looking from the interpretative theory, Pahari schooling is not inquired or is not looked from different angles and is not thought from Pahair schoolchildren's perspective.

While I analyzed the language use of schooled Pahari children I realized that there is a danger of gradual elimination of Pahari language. This elimination is similar to the argument of Michel Foucault (1972) who viewed that school practices are fundamentally as structure of power to eliminate the others. In Dore's (1995: 151 – 176) sense, Pahari schoolchildren has now given birth to a new discourse, which is another form of social subjectivity for awaking the suppression of school structure. Similarly, the argument of Radhakrishnan (2003: 162) indicates that the subjectivity of Pahari children as epistemological form of discourse for renewed interpretation.

During the fieldwork, I found that most of the Pahari schoolchildren wanted to learn in their language while they feel difficulty. It means they need code switching from Pahari to Nepali and to English language and vice versa. They further said that if school emphasizes mother tongue teaching policy as well, Nepali, the national language would not dominate their culture and identity. As a result, both languages get equal value in terms of language development in school. It means the monolingual practices will be replaced by code switching approach to teaching. This is a constructive view of Pahari children towards the language use in school. In Derridean sense, this constructive view of these students is the tactic form of *decentering* of deconstruction theory because it attempts to change the opposite form of existing practices or subvert the central term so that the marginalized term can become central and get chances to develop (Powell, 2003: 46). It means students brought the productive ideas for treating the equal value to all language in school. According to Anthony Giddens (Giddens & Pierson, 1978: 77 cited in David Gauntlett, 2002), this productive idea is similar with produced and reproduced form of social structure along with what people do.

Regarding Pahari schoolchildren's earning for their parents, I argue that there is "*practical interest/reasons*" (Habermas, 1971, 1975, 1984, and 1987). According to Habermas, *practical interest/reasons* focus on the process of understanding and mutual determination of the ends to be sought rather than control. He further described it as "a constitutive interest". This means it is the intersubjectivity of possible action-oriented mutual understandings (Deetz, 1994: 177). In addition, the newly constitutive interest can be made as hegemony. This hegemony is a process of positivity, of not only antagonism and deconstruction but also social reconstruction or 'democratic imaginary' of the liberal state. This means that there is a situation of dominant liberal ideology or core values of individual liberty, which gives justice for the human being (Cloud, 1994: 229).

The above mentioned paragraphs imply that Pahari schoolchildren have constructive ideas for the betterment of their schooling. They could bring their constructive idea because both structure of formal and home schooling suppressed them. It means both home and formal schooling are the place of taking the social experiences for Pahari schoolchildren and develop their self or mind with creative ideas Mead (Ritzer, 1996). In Freud (1923)'s interpretation, Pahari schoolchildren made conscious choice from the social experience and created the deconstructive mode for their schooling. But there is lacking the dialogue and discourse between the concerned parties such as between the school structure and Pahari schoolchildren's subjectivity; between the teachers and students, between non – Pahari students and Pahari students for implementation of justifiable schooling for them.

Based on Pahari schoolchildren's lens, I can argue that the situation of their formal and home schooling can be understood as oppressive in Marxist/Freire/Bourdieu's terms and as utilitarian/source of enlightenment in Goodlad's term. At the same time, it leads to locally situated alternatives/knowledge rather than measured against all – encompassing universal structures (Solomon, 2003: 1). This helped me to look from the Derridean concept of tactic form of decentering that indicates deconstruct.

According this concept any marginalized conditions not only becomes central (Powell, 2003:26), but also becomes a new thing through hybridization of differently situated knowledge.

CHAPTER VI:

FINDING, CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATION

In chapter IV and V, I analyzed secondary as well as empirical information under different theoretical approaches. In this process I also reflected upon the home and formal schooling. Following these processes I drew some findings, conclusions and implications out of the above information.

Major Findings and Conclusions

Since there are number of findings I have categorized them into groups and displayed them in the following paragraphs.

(a) Socialization/Enculturation Process of Pahari Children

1. As I found the social cosmos of well-being or personality has determined the Pahari children's socialization/enculturation process or vice versa. Like the children's personality of other cultures, this social cosmos of well-being personality of Pahari children was the outcome of the 'action designed' of the parents/family/community/society. With this action designed children were found moulded in Pahari society and culture to make Pahari social being. In moulding process, they had learnt Pahari's social ways of acting and feeling. These acting and feelings were the family function or home schooling. The same home schooling was found incompatibility with the formal school under the rubric of "reproduction of social habitus" and "dual structure" process, which brought it.

2. Pahari rituals were designed to conceptualize their pure consciousness and shape their personality according to the socially accepted knowledge and practices. This means home schooling/socialization process was silent subject for Pahari children and formal school process was talkative/gossiping/grumbling which sometimes similar with the concept of Freud's (1923) "internal emotional conflict" and sometime similar with the concept of Derrida's fusion of *center* and *decenter* i.e. binary opposition (Powell, 2003) as creative place.

3. Pahari children learnt bamboo good making skill along with parents' praise but in school they learnt through punishment. This contradictory approach to socialization/enculturation in Pahari society had created as binary opposite relation in their understanding.

On the basis of the above findings I came to the conclusion that socialization/enculturation process is related with social cosmos of well-being personality for Pahari children, though it is action designed of Parents/family/community/society.

(b) Identity: Language, Ethnicity, Culture and Schooling

1. As I reflected in by lingual/cultural/caste/ethnic group setting of school, I found that students of an ethnic group like Pahari find the utility of mainstream language at one time and in other times they find linguistic oppression. In both situations they just look for their identity. In the course of looking for identity, some of the Pahari students like Anita Pahari and Kamal Raj Pahari who understood school as oppressive found (a) unseen Pahari identity in school culture (b) question of preservation and development of Pahari language, culture, caste/ethnic (c) school unmatched with Pahari identity (d) identity is possible only in the Pahari festivals. Similarly some of the Pahari students like Anuja Pahari who understood the school as mosaic environment found that (a) school is associated with double identity, the first being the students of a particular mother tongue and the second being the person of the larger world and (b) there is a possibility of developing new script or writing Pahari language in Devenagari.

2. Pahari students gave the experiential knowledge that school can be a place of reciprocal learning between the ethnic group and the mainstream school. This co-learning approach can help change the center to the *decenter* or vice versa. This fusion also cultivates double identity among ethnic groups. It means by lingual setting of school can also create co-existence through binary opposites relationship between the opposite groups.

3. This study also found that teachers' pedagogical process has created difficult situation to the Pahari students and hence they think that school is oppressive and at the same time it is functional.

On the above backstop, I came to the conclusion that pedagogical changes can ensure the fusion of the center and *decenter* to make the now identities.

© *Subversion: Alternative Perspective in Teaching and Learning*
1. As I found school has been working under (a) mono-socio-culture structural design (b) single language group and cultural domination and (c) occurrence of difficulties through teachers' pedagogical process.

2. Pahari students developed alternative ways to manage their identities through (a) code switching in teaching to address the difficult situations, and (b) the practice of listening others for the creation of mosaic cultural environment.

3. As I found Pahari children were looking for creativity in pedagogical process. But school's stereotype teachers' composition structure ignored the Pahari student's experience of creativity.

4. Pahari children possess genealogical character to learn more than one language and socio-cultural context because they are the mixed group of Tamang and Newar in terms of language and socio-cultural pattern. By capitalizing these genealogical characteristics, their parents learned Nepali language and facilitated them in a hope to improving their children's Nepali language, though parents usually speak Pahari language in their home. This also helped Pahari Parents strengthen their Nepali language by speaking with their children.

5. Though school enrolls students from pluralist background it has no orientation for pluralism management. In other words school structure has no creative

subjectivity, teachers has no idea of self-sense of the students and hence look them as others.

6. As I visualized Pahari students' looking self-glass has search for symbolic representation at the time of learning and teaching process and teachers were failed to do so.

The above findings helped me conclude that each of us should look for alternatives in each criticism for educational justice no matter it is related to teacher and the students. .

(d) Paharis' Schooling: Relationship between the Center and Decenter/Deconstruction

1. Bilingual and bicultural students have maintained the relationship between the *center* and *decenter*. In this process they have found their first position at home/community and second position at school through their home schooling and formal schooling. In case of flexible rules and regulations, Pahari schoolchildren found home schooling more flexible than formal schooling. It means some schooling was powerful and center at home and school education remained *decentered* for Pahari children. But in school they learnt to value school as center and home as *decenter*. Even at this point Pahari students tried to maintain the relationship between the center and the *decenter*.

2. Action design of school obliged Pahari students to feel that they are inferior/low/second/*decenter*. In home/community, the same action design of Pahari group obliged them to feel that they are superior/up/first/center. The same was true between the non-Pahari and Pahari teachers. It means both teachers and students considered them as high status holder and low status holder. In other words, they were moulded in two types of social being at both home and school. These two parts represented the lived social structure of Pahari schoolchildren. Therefore they learnt to believe in binary opposition. In this binary opposition Pahari children developed four types of consciousness: the first consciousness is the swinging from center to *decenter* and *decenter* to center; the second is to look

96

for the care of their individual subjectivity through school; the third is the feeling that school is an oppressive agent for them; and the fourth is that school is a ladder to make them functional into the non-Pahari world.

3. While swinging between center and *decenter* Pahari children realized that their formal schooling can be changed and teachers can do so. But the non-Pahari teachers were not found aware of Pahari children's individual as well as social subjectivity. It means Pahari students brought the mode of deconstruction in their schooling process which can provide educational justice to the students of ethnic groups.

4. As I found the nature of creating the social subjectivity of Pahari students and the flexible nature of *center* and *decenter* parts of deconstruction theory indicated the need of 'reciprocal action'. This 'reciprocal action' is possible in any form of structure. This reciprocal action can addresses the human subjectivity by understanding them as equal partner and at the same time it makes them functional in the non-Pahari world.

5. As I found the obliged situation of being in decenter position at school made the Pahari schoolchildren able to look for their own ness. In order to understand it, moderate approach of Giddens can be used for the development of flexible rules and regulation in the school structure i.e. creation of dual structure in school. This dual structure can address Pahari schoolchildren's subjectivity and create reciprocal learning environment.

From the above findings I concluded that Derrida's concept *center* and *decenter* relationship can address ethic groups' individual as well as social subjectivity. It also can minimize the culturally nurtured unequal relationship with the students of the subaltern groups.

(e) Differance: The Understanding of Pahari Schoolchildren

1. Though the Pahari schoolchildren were found as maintaining the dual language identity, they are thinking that they had to face difficulty in school. But school's own rules and regulation and non-Pahari schoolchildren never felt like the Pahari students in school. In case of non-Pahari teachers, they also felt difficulty to understand the Pahari students but they didn't care this problem and thought that unable to understand is the problems of Pahari student not that of the teachers. It means there is a condition of *"no hearing"*. This condition called *differance* in Derridan sense is neither any kind of mystic nor the condition of existed God.

2. At school Pahari students found a number of *differances*. These *differances* were observed in the understanding gaps between students and teachers; unmatched schools rules and regulations between the school and the Pahari community's calander; and different understanding between the parents and children about the share of earning from bamboo work

3. Because of the binary structuration of different self *differances* were observed. This binary structuration has two kind of self. One is school's structuration of self and other is Pahari schoolchildren's self. These two self has worked in two ways and hence Pahari children had faced difficulty in school.

4. In the condition of maintaining the *difference* and *differance,* school has shown that (a) there is tension between the school rules and schoolchildren's social upbringing (b) this tension is nurturing inequality by maintaining social differences in the name of modern schooling (c) it does not address the heterogeneity of students in classroom, and (d) it does not unveil the subjectivity of the native students (e) it does not address the subjectivity of the marginalized groups of student.

5. As Pahari students understood, school was neither functional nor critical. It was just condition of difference that ignored their social subjectivity. Consequently

Pahari children were suffering from cultural differences and classroom performance.

Following the above finding I came to the conclusion that children of ethnic groups are always humming but because of the hierarchal setting of the school, non-listening culture of school to the "small voice", and teachers' traditional orientation.

(f) Skeptical Reality: The Decentered Pahari Schoolchildren

1. Both school and home classified the interest of Pahari schoolchildren. In this situation the children were feeling (a) difficulty in learning contents of the school (b) unattractive or unsuitable schooling for them (c) indifference against school's behavior towards them (d) teacher domination (e) difficulty to manage the stationary and school fee.

On the basis of the above findings I came to the conclusion that home structure also classifies the interest of Pahari schoolchildren. In this *decentered* situation, they had visualized the possibility of different creation of new discourse and dialogue. This interaction could produce a new system of school and home, where both opposites could get educational justice.

(g) Paharis'Schooling: Hybridization of Interpretative Theoretical Schools

1. As I found the existing situation of both home and formal schooling has determined the place of social experiences for Pahari schoolchildren. Based on the experiences the Pahari students have developed their self or mind with creative ideas.

2. Conditions of school, schooling process, and different angle of Pahari schoolchildren's understanding have developed a new hope to change school system through the dialogue between *center* and *decenter* i.e. by the creation of hybridized closure to look at school and the children of the ethnic groups.

On the above backstop, I came to the conclusion that Pahari schoolchildren interpreted the school from different angles. This angle should be hybridized with teachers to make a new culture for educational justice of the Pahari children.

Implications:

1. As this study found socialization/enculturation process of Pahari children has been determined the social cosmos of well-being. This implies that formal schooling can be redesigned to bridge social cosmos with school's cosmos. This effort can bridge the gap between home schooling and formal schooling for the improvement of ethnic children's personality. Teachers' reorientation can make it happen.

2. As this study found Pahari has culturally built in praising approach to teaching/learning. This approach can be synchronized with school's pedagogical process through teachers and community elites' interaction. School can initiate this process.

3. As this study found there is a need of linking student's language and socio-cultural identities with the need of school. This implies that formal schooling can encourage non-local teachers to learn student's mother tongue and facilitate them through code-switching approach to teaching.

4. As this study found Pahari children inculcated double identities from their school and the social cosmos. But the teachers and non-Pahari students had no understanding this reality. It implies that school should value socio-culturally different students' subjectivity and promote co-learning approach in school.

5. As this student found that Pahari schoolchildren were looking for alternatives to address their social subjectivity that came out of their different positions in school. . It implies that school's teacher should always look the alternatives to address all kinds of students' individual and social subjectivities.

6. As this study found school has different language and socio-cultural groups as teachers.   This implies that teachers should learn students' home culture, traditionally handed down teaching learning practices. Once they learn it they are supposed to ensure the linkages between the school and students' approach to learning and teaching

7. As this study indicated school did not manage pluralism, though it is already in plural setting in terms of language, culture, caste/ethnic group. It implies that school should be reoriented to manage pluralism that has come out of different socio-cultural and linguistic orientations. Following these management teachers should recast their teaching technique.   .

8. As this study found teachers used self-focused pedagogical process and ignored students' subjectivity. This means school structure has no creative subjectivity at its core. In this regard, teachers should be made aware of the school and its opposite language and socio-cultural groups. In doing so they should be prepared to understand students' self and their ways of looking others. .

9. As this study found school has both structure and human agency along with the oppositional hierarchical relationship. This relationship has made difficulty to the students of the different language and socio-cultural groups. This implies that school should develop flexible relationship between the two identity holding groups, the teachers and the students. In this flexible relationship, both teachers and students can change the existing structure of school through 'reciprocal action'. This reciprocal action latter on challenge the dominant and dominated groups and address the human subjectivity

10. As this study found that both school and home did not do educational justice to the subjectivity of the schoolchildren. In this regard, school and home should

interact frequently. This frequent interaction can change the existing structure and lead to social change of both school and home.

References

Acharya, Bipin Kumar (1994). Nature cure and indigenous healing practices in Nepal: A medical anthropological perspective. In Allen, Michael (eds.), *Anthropology of Nepal: Peoples, problems and processes* (pp.234 – 238). Kathmandu, Mandala Book Point.

Allahar, Anton L. (1989). Sociology and the periphery: Theories and issues. Toronto. Garamond Press.

Andersen & Taulor (2000). *Understanding a diverse society in sociology* (p. 446). UK: Wadsworth, Thompson Learning

Anderson, Gary (1998). *Fundamentals of educational research (2ⁿᵈ Edn.)* (p. 208). London: The Falmer Press.

Aronson, Jody (1994*). A pragmatic view of thematic analysis*. The Qualitative report, Volume 2, Number 1, Spring. http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/BackIssues/QR2-1/aronson.html

Attinello, Paul (2002). Imploding the system: Kagel and the deconstruction of Modernism. Lochhead & Auner (eds.), *postmodern music postmodern thought* (p. 263). New York and London: Routledge

Awasthi, L.D. (2004). *Exploring monolingual school practices in multilingual Nepal* (p. 3)*.* Unpublished Ph. D Thesis. Copenhagen, Denmark: Danish University of Education.
Ball, M. S., & Smith, G. W. H. (1992). *Analyzing visual data*. Newbury Park, CA: sage

Bell, J. (1993). *How to complete your research project successfully*. New Delhi: UBS Publishers' Distributors Ltd.

Berg, B. L. (1998). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (3ʳᵈ ed). California: Allyn and Bacon.

Berge, B. L. (1989). *Qualitative research methods for the social science*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Best, J. W. & Khan, J. V. (1987). *Research in education*. 6ᵗʰ edition. New Delhi: Practice Hall.

Bishop, Russel (2005). Freeing Ourselves from neocolonial domination in research: A Kaupapa Maori approach to creating knowledge. In Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research. Third Edition*. (pp. 111 - 114).

Blaxter, L et al.(1996). *How to research.* Buckingham: Philadelphia. Open University Press.

Bohannan, Paul and Glazer, Mark (1988). *High point in anthropology* (p. 296). Second Edition. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1976). The School as a Conservative Force: Scholastic and Cultural Inequalities. Roger Dale, Jeoff Esland, Madelina Macdonald (eds.), *Schooling and capitalism: A sociological reader* (pp. 110 – 117). London. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. R. Nice, trans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1977). *The school as a conservative force: Scholastic and cultural inequalities* (p. 78). Chapter 12.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Passeron, Jean –Claude (1979). *The Inheritors: French students and their relation to culture*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. Translated by Richard Nice.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1990). *The logic of practice*. Pp.122-134. Polity Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Wacquant, Loic J.D. (1992). The purpose of reflexive sociology (The Chicago Workshop). In P. Bourdieu and L.J. D. Wacquant (eds.), *An invitation to reflexive sociology* (pp.61-215). Chicago: University of Chicago Press:

Brown, Richard Harvey (1994). Reconstructing social theory after the postmodern critique. In Simons, Herbert W & Billig, Michael (eds.), *After postmodernism: Reconstructing ideology critique* (pp.17, 25 – 26, 31). London. Thousand Oaks. New Delhi: SAGE Publication.

Burgass, Catherine (2000). Postmodern value. In Lucy, Niall (ed.), *Postmodern literary theory.* UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Bush. T. (1998). Collegial models. *In Organizational effectiveness and improvement in education second edition* (pp.69-79). Buckingham: Open University press.

Carnoy, Martin (1984). *The state and political theory* (pp. 46 89). New Jersey: Princeton University Press. Retrieved on April 2006 at www.google.com.np

Catherine, Marshall & Gretchen B. Rossman (1989). Designing qualitative research (p. 22). New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Chheri, Ram B. (2005). Is the concept of development always useful in reading the society and culture? In Dahl, Kapil & Simkhada, Sharad C. (eds.), *Perspectives on society and culture* (pp.3 - 4). Kathmandu: Nepal Center for Creative Research (NCCR).

Chow, Rey (1998). Maindarian Ducks and Butterflies: An exercise in popular Readings" (1991). Rivkin & Ryan (Ed.), *Literary theory: An anthology* (p. 964). UK: Blackwell publishers Ltd.

Cixous, Helene (2000). Writing and the law: Blanchot, Joyce, Kafka, and Lispector. Lucy (eds.), postmodern literary theory (p. 191). An anthology. UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Cleaver, Harry (2005). Marxian categories, the crisis of capital and the constitution of social subjectivity today. *The constitution of socials subjectivity today*. Austin: University of Tesax.

Cloud, Dana L. (1994). 'Socialism of the Mind': the new age of post – Marxism. Simons & Billig (eds.), *after postmodernism: Reconstructing ideology critique* (p. 229). London: SAGE Publication.

Cohen, Louis; Marion, Lawrence and Morrison, Keith (2000). *Research methods in education* (p. 73). London & New York: Routledge.

Cole, Steven E. (1994). Evading the subject: the poverty of contingency theory. In Simons, Herbert W. and Billing, Michael (eds.), *After postmodernism: reconstructing ideology critique* (p. 40). London. Thousand Oaks. New Delhi: SAGE Publications

Conquergood, Dwight (1994). For the nation! How street Gangs poblematize patriotism. In Simons, Herbert W. and Billig, Michael (eds.), *After postmodernism reconstructing ideology critique* (p.200). London. Thousand Oaks. New Delhi: (SAGE Publications).

Coulombe, Renee T. (2002). Postmodern Polyamory or Postcolonial Challenge? Cornershop's dialogue from West, to East, to West ………… In Lochhead, Judy & Auner, Joseph (eds.), *Postmodern music/Postmodern thought* (p. 182). New York And London: Routledge.

Deetz, Stanley (1994). The new politics of the workplace: Ideology and other unobtrusive controls. In Simons, Herbert W. & Billig Michael (eds.), *After postmodernism: Reconstructing ideology critique* (p. 177). London. Thousand Oaks. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (2005). Introduction. In Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research. Third edition* (pp. 2 - 7). Thousand Oaks. London. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S (1994). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.), 1-18. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (1998a). Introduction to this volume. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*, xi-xxi. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Denzin, Norman K. and Lincoln, Yvonna S. (1998b). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry*, (p. 5). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Devies, (1992). Women's subjectivity and feminist stories. In C. Ellis & M.G. Flaherty (eds.), *Investigating subjectivities: Research on lived experience* (pp. 57 – 76). Newbery Park CA: SAGE Publications.

Edward, Scott (1976). "Western Civilization" After Revolution. In Lucas, Christopher J. (ed.), *Challenge and choice in contemporary education* (p. 392). New York: Macmillion Publishing Company. Inc.

Ember, Carol R. and Ember, Melvin (1977). *Anthropology* (p.366). Second Edition. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.,

Encyclopædia Britannica (2006). Retrieved on April 2006 at www.google.com.np

Encyclopedia (2002). Retrieved on April 2006 at http://www.google.com.np

Encyclopedia (2006). Retrieved on April 2006 at http://www.google.com.np

Encyclopedia, (2007). Retrieved on April 2006 at http://www.google.com.np

Fellor, Ross (2002). Resistant Strain of Postmodernism: The Music of Helmut Lachenmann and Brian Ferneyhough. In Lochhead, Judy and Auner, Joseph (eds.), *Postmodern music/Postmodern thought* (p.253). New York and London: Routledge

Foucault, M. (1980). Knowledge/Power: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977. C. Gordon, trans. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1983). On the genealogy of ethics: an overview of work in progress. In H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp. 229-252). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1984). The subject and power. In B. Wallis (Ed.) *Art after postmodernism* (pp. 417-432). Boston: David R. Godine, Publ. Inc.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality, volume one: An introduction*. New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, Michel (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith*. New York: Pantheon Books

Foucoult, M (2006). http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michel_Foucault9/23/2021

Freire, Paulo (1983). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (pp. 8, 19-60). New York. The Continuum. Publishing Company. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramous. Thirty – First Printing.

Gaize, Frederick H.(1975). *Regionalism and national unity in Nepal* (p. 118). USA: University of California Press.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Gay, L.R. (1987). *Educational research competencies for analysis and application* (3rd ed.). Landon: Merrill Publishing Company.

Geertz, Clifford (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays* (pp. 6-10). New York: Basic Books

Gergen, Kenneth J. ((1994). The limits of pure critique. In Simons, Herbert W. Herbert & Michael Billig (eds.), *After modernism: Reconstructing ideology critique* (pp. 59 - 60). London. Thousand Oaks. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Geyh, Paula, Leebron, Fred G. & Levy, Andrew (1998). Introduction. In Geyh, Paula, Leebron, Fred G. & Levy, Andrew (eds.), *Postmodern American fiction: A Norton anthology* (pp. xx). New York. London: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Giddens, Anthony (1982). *Profiles and Critiques in Social Theory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Glasser B. G. & Strausss, A. L. (1967). *Discovery of ground theory: strategies for qualitative research.* Chicago: Aldine

Goodlad, John I. (1979). *What schools are for* (pp. 6, 18 - 19). Kappa Education Phi Delta. USA: Education Foundation.

Grabb, Edward G, (1984). *Social Inequality: Classical and contemporary theorist*. Toronto. Hott, Rinehart and Winston of Canada.

Habermas, J. (1971). *Knowledge and human interest*. J.R. Shapiro, trans. Boston: Beacon Press.

Habermas, J. (1987). *The philosophical discourse of modernity: Twelve lectures*. F. Lawrence, trans. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1990a). *Moral consciousness and communicative action*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1990b). Justice and solidarity: on the discussion concerning "stage six" ', in M. Kelly (ed.), *Hermeneutics and critical theory in ethics and politics* (pp. 32-52). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hansen, Lars Ivar (1996). *The Saami hunting society in transition: Approaches, concepts and context*. Ugricae: Societas Historiae Fenno. Retrieved on April 2006 at www.google.com.np

Henriques, et al (2005). *The constitution of social subjectivity today. Marxian categories, the crisis of capital and the constitution of social subjectivity today*. Austin: Cleaver University. Retrieved on April 2006 at www.google.com.np

Hobson, Marian (1998). Replications. In Hobson (ed.), *Jacques Derrida opening lines* (pp. 9 - 215). London and New York: Routledge.

Human Development (2007). *Erickson's theory of human development*. Retrieved on April 2006 at www.google.com.np
Iversion, 1978: 153

Jha, Makhan (2004). *An introduction to anthropological thought* (p.125 - 134). New Delhi: VIKAS PUBLISHING HOUSE PVT LTD

Kamberelis, George & Dimitriadis, Greg (2005). Focus groups: Strategic articulations of pedagogy, politics and inquiry. In Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research. Third edition* (p. 887 - 888). Thousand Oaks. London. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Kaminski, Marek M. (2004). *Games Prisoners Play*. Princeton University Press. ISBN 0691117217 http://webfiles.uci.edu/mkaminsk/www/book.html. Retrieved from "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Participant observation" Retrieved on April 2006 at www.google.com.np

Kirby, Sandra L. & Mckenna, Kate (1989). *Experience research and social change: Methods from the margins* (p. 76). Toronto: Garamond Press.

Koirala, Bidya Nath (2005). *Interpretationists' knowledge of understanding social complexities including education*. Handout given by Prof. Bidya Nath Koirala, Ph. D

Koirala, Bidyanath (1996). *Schooling and the Dalits of Nepal: A case study of Bungkot Dalit Community*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: International/intercultural Education Department of Educational Policy Studies.

Koirala, Bidyanath (2007). *Opportunities for multi lingual education in Nepal*. Presented at the Seminar organized by Government of Nepal/UNESCO/SIL. October 1, 2007.

Koirala, Bidyanath (ND). *Educational Justice for diversified Nepali children*. (Unknown)

Krueger, Richard A. (1988). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research* (p. 19). New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Lather, Patti (1994). Staying Dumb? Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern. In Simons, Herbert W. Herbert & Michael Billig (eds.), *After modernism: Reconstructing ideology critique* (p. 105). London. Thousand Oaks. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Lave, J. (1991). *Situated Learning*. Retrieved on June 2005 at www.educationau.edu.au/archives/cp/o4k.htm.

Lave, Jean & Wenger, Etienne (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York. Cambridge University Press

Lochhead, Judy (2002). Introduction. In Lochhead, Judy & Auner, Joseph (eds.), *Postmodern music/Postmodern thought* (p.7). New York and London: Routledge

Long, Convey and Chwalek (1985) Long, T. J., Convey, J. J., & Chwalek, A. R. (1985). *Completing dissertations in the behavioral sciences and education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Lucy, Nail (2000). Introduction (on the way to Genre). Lucy (Ed.), *postmodern literary theory: An anthology* (p. 30). UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Luitel, Balchandra (2006). *My identity through a poetic lens*. Unpublished article
Mac Donald and Walker (1977:181)

Macnaghten, Phil & Myers, Greg (2004). Focus group. In Seale, Clive; Gobo, Giampietro; Gubrium, Jaber F. & Silverman, David (eds.), *Qualitative research practice* (pp. 65 - 67). London. Thousand Oaks. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

March, C.J. (1997). *Planning, management and ideology: Key concepts for understanding currcululum 2* (p. 11). Hong Kong: Roultedge Falmer, Taylar and Francis Group.

Marriam, Sharan B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach* (pp. 44 & 94). Jossey – Bass Publishers. London

Marriam, Sharon B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach* (pp. 10 – 11, 44 &117). London: Jossey – Bass Publishers.

Marshall, 1994: 486

Marshall, Catherine & Rossman, Gretchen B. (1989). *Designing qualitative research* (p.54). New Delhi: Sage Publication.
Marshall, Catherine and Rossman, Gretchen B. (1999). *Designing Qualitative Research* (3rd Edn).Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

May, Stephen (1999). Language and Education Rights for Indigenous Peoples. In Stephen May (ed.). *Indigenous Community-Based Education*, 42-66. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

May, Stephen (2001). *Language and Minority Rights: Ethnicity, Nationalism and the Politics of Language*. England: Pearson Education Limited.

May, Stephen (2003). Misconceiving Minority Language Rights: Implications for Liberal Political Theory. In Kymlicka, Will & Patten, Alan (eds.). *Language Rights and Political Theory,* 123-152. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

May, Stephen and Hill, Richard (2003). Bilingual/ Immersion Education: Indicators of Good Practice (first draft). *Milestone Report* 2. The University of Waikato. Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Waikato, Hamilton.

May, Tim (2001). *Social research: issues, methods and process* (3rd Edn.). Buckingham: Open University Press.

McGee, R. Jon and Warms, Richard L. (2004). Anthropological *theory: An introductory history, third edition* (pp. 85 – 91, 115 – 127, 562). New York: McGraw Hill Higher Education.

Miles, M. & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd edn). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1984/1995). *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Mishler, E. G. (1994). *Validation in inquiry – guided research: The role of exemplars in narrative studies*. Harvard Educational Review, 60, 415 – 441.

Morgan, David L. (1988). *Focus groups as qualitative research. Qualitative research methods*. Vol. 16. (p. 31) The Publishers of Professional social sciences. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Myers, D.M. (1997). *Qualitative research in information system*.
http://www.qual.auckland.ac.nz.-Qualitative Retrieved on April 2006 at
www.google.com.np

Nachmias, C. F. & Nachmias, D (1996). *Research methods in the social sciences* (p.
18). New York: St. Martin's Press

Narayan, V.K. & Nath, R. (1993). *Organizational theory strategic approach*. Bostom:
IRTWIN.

NESAC. (1998). *Nepal Human Development Report* (p. 56). Kathmandu: Nepal South
Asia Centre.

Neuman, W.L. (1991). Social research methods. Lodon: Allyn and Bacon.

Ogbu, John U. (1978). *Minority education and caste: The American system in cross-
cultural perspective* (p. 1). New York: Academic Press.

Pahari Sangh, (1999). *Pahari (Pihi) community introduction book*. Kathmandu: Pahari
Sangh

Painter, Diane & Rigsby, Leo (2005). *Teacher research: Data analysis*. Tuesday, 05-Apr
2005 20:12:03 /etc/localtime. Graduate school of education. George Mason University.
Retrieved on

Parson, Talcott (1937). *The structure of social action*. New York: McGraw Hill.
Retrieved on April 2006 at www.google.com.np

Patton, Michael Quinn (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Second
Edition* (p. 13 & 100). Newbury Park, London: SAGE publications

Pelto, Pertti J. & Pelto, Cretel H. (1978). *Anthropological research: The structure of
inquiry* (pp. 3 & 68 - 77). Second Edition. Cambridge University Press.

Pelto, Pertti S. & Pelto Gretel H. (1981). *Anthropological research; the structure of
inquiry* (pp. 3 - 69). Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.

Philips, Susan Urmston (1988). The language socialization of lawyers: Acquiring the
'cant. In Spindler (ed.), *Doing ethnographic of schooling* (p. 202).

Piper, Heather & Garratt, Dean (2004). *Identity and citizenship: Some contradictions in practice*. British Journal of Educational, Studies, ISSN 0007-1005. Vol. 52, No. 3, September 2004, pp 276-292

Pogash, R. (2002). *Data management: It's all in the planning*. Retrieved on July 23, 2006 at www.google.com.np

Powel, Jim (2003). *Derrida for beginners* (pp. 15, 20, 21 - 23, 26, 46, 116, 118 - 121, 122, 148, 166). Anna Salai, Chennai 600 002, India: Orient Longman Private Ltd.

Radhakrishnan, R. (2003). The use and abuse of Multiculturalism. Radhakrishnan (ed.), *theory in an uneven world* (p. 65, 162). USA: Blackwell publishing Ltd.

Radhakrishnan, R. (2004). *Theory in an uneven world* (pp.131 - 174). USA: Blackwell publishing Ltd.

Rao, C.N. Shankar (2001). *Sociology*. Third Revised and Enlarged edition (pp. 215). 7361, Ram Nagar, New Delhi: S. Chand & Compamy Ltd.

Riley (1963) and Selltiz, Jahoda, Deutsch, and Cook (1959)

Ritzer, George (1996). *Classical sociological theory* (374 – 377). New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, INC.

Rivkin, Julie & Ryan, Michael (1998). Introduction: "The class of 1968-Post-structralism par lui-meme". In Rivkin, Julie & Ryan Michael (eds.), *Literary theory: An anthology* (pp. 334 – 357). Revised Edition. UK: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Rosman, Abraham and Rubel, Paulea G. (1981). *An introduction to cultural anthropology: The tapestry of culture* (pp. 240-241). Glenview, Illinois of America: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Said, Edward W. (1979). *Oreintalism*. Ventage Books. New York: A Division of Random house.

Sarup, Madan (1978). *Marxism and education* (p. 156). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Sarup, Madan (1989). *On introductory guide to post-structuralism and postmodernism* (pp.41 – 63). Lonrid Press.

Schwandt, Thomas A. (1997). *Qualitative inquiry: A dictionary of terms* (pp. 91 – 94). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Schwarz, C., Davis, B., Kanter, D., Smith, S. (2006). Learning Progressions for Describing Teachers' Use of Curriculum Materials. *Paper presented at the Center for Curriculum Materials in Science Knowledge Sharing Institute*. Michigan: University of Michigan.

Scot, Alex (2002). *Derrida's of grammatology*. Retrieved on October 2006 at www.google.com.np

Seymour-Smith, Charlotte (1986). *Macmillan dictionary of anthropology* (p. 42, 82, 85 - 86). London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.

Shaefer & Lamm, (2005). *The constitution of social subjectivity today*. Retrieved on April 2006 at www.google.com.np

Silverman, David (2000). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook* (p. 89). London: Sage Publications.

Silwal, M. (2058 BS). *Pahari Jatiko samajik, sanskritik ra arthik abasthako ak adhayan*. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Kirtipur, Kathmandu: T.U.

Simirik Nepal (2058 BS). *Pahari jatiko sankriti tatha sanskritic sampadako adhayan ak parichhaya*. Maitidevi, Kathmandu: His Majestry Government Rastriya Janajati Bikas Samiti.

Simons, Herbert W. & Billig, Michael (1994). In Simons, Herbert W. Herbert & Michael Billig (eds.), *After postmodernism: Reconstructing ideology critique* (p. 7). London. Thousand Oaks. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Sinna, Jadunath (1999). *Indian philosophy* (p. 247). Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited.

Smith, David G. (1991). Hermeneutic inquiry: The hermeneutic Imagination and the Pedagogic Text. In Edmond C. Short (ed.), *Forms of curriculum inquiry* (p. 190). SUNY Series, Curriculum Issues and Inquiries.

Snyder, Tom (2006). *Deconstructing deconstructionism*. Retrieved on October 2006 at http://www.google.com.np

Socialization (2007). Retrieved on October 2007 at www.google.com.np

Solomon, L.S. (2003). *Postmodernism* (p. 1)**.** Retrieved on November 2005 at http://www.google.com.np

Spring, Joel, (2002). *Critical pedagogy in American education.* New York: McGraw – Hill

Stake, Robert E. (1998). Case studies. In Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.), *Strategies of qualitative research inquiry* (p. 98). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Stanley, W. B., & Brickhouse, N. W. (2001). *Teaching sciences: The multicultural question revisited*. *Science Education, 85*, 35-49.

Strauss, Anselm and Corbin, Juliet (1998). *Basics of qualitative research*. (2nd Edn.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Taylor, S.J. & Bogdan, R. (1984). *Introduction to qualitative research methods: The search for meanings*. New York: John Wiley & Sons. Retrieved on

Tedlock, Barbara (2005). The observation of participation and the emergence of public ethnography. In Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research. Third edition* (p. 469). Thousand Oaks. London. New Delhi: SAGE Publications

Tuckett, David (ed.) (1976). *Medical sociology* (pp.3 – 6). London: Tavistock Publishers.

Tylor, E.B. (1990). *Dictionary of anthropology* (p. 199). Delhi: Aswabu Goyal for GoylSaaB,

Valentin, Karen. (2001). *The paradox of schooling: The possibilities of formal education for squatter.* Denmark. University of Copenhagen: Institute of Anthropology.

Velasquez et. al. (2007). Retrieved on October 2007 at http://www.google.com.np

Velasquez et. al. (2007). *Socialization.* Retrieved on October 2007 at http://www.google.com.np

Wallace, Anthony F. C. (1961). *Culture and personality* (pp. 106 – 107). New York: Random House, Inc.

Wayne, Israel (2007). *What is Christian world view?* Retrieved on September, 15 at http://www.gooogle.com.np

Weber, Max (2006). *Sociology at Hewett. Social action approach. Micro sociology*. Hewett.. Canada: Depth ICCAP. Retrieved on April 2006 at www.google.com.np

Weikang, F. (1985). *Traditional Chinese medicine and pharmacology* (p. 1). Beijing: Foreign Language Press.

Wikipedia, Encyclopedia (2006). *Participation observation*. Retrieved on October 2006 at http://www.google.com.np

Wikipedia, Encyclopedia, (2006). *Case study*. Retrieved on April 2006 at
www.google.com.np

Wikipedia, Encyclopedia, (2006). *Ethnic group*. Retrieved on October 16, 2006.
http://www.google.com.np

Wilson, Margaret (Peggy) Ann (1990). *Cultural change and academic achievement: The
transition from Indian reserve elementary school to public high school. (*Doctoral
Dissertations). University of Santa Barbara.

Winters, Angela (2007). *Erickson's theory of human development*. Ezine @rticles.

Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia. *Worldview*. Retrieved on October 2007

Wolcott, H. F. (1992). Posturing in qualitative inquiry. In M.D. LeCompte, W.L. Millroy,
& J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp.3-52). New
York: Academic Press.

Wolcott, Harry F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Descriptive, analysis and
interpretation*. Thousand Oaks. Sage Publications.

Yin, Robert K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods (2nd Edn.)* (p. 1).
Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Zelditch, Morris (1962). Some methodological problems of field studies. *American
journal of sociology*, Vol. 67, No. 5: 566-576. Retrived http://www.google.com.np,
2006).

Zembylas, Michalinos and Avraaanidou, Lucy (2007). Open University of Cyprus and
Intecollege, Cyprus. Contact address: 5 Ayiou Antoniou ST. Strovolos 2002, Nicosia,
CYPRUS. Email: m.zembylas@ouc.ac.cy

Appendix 1: Exemplar Performance of Grade IV Students

Exemplar Performance of Grade IV Students

Subjects	Tamang	Pahari Boys	Pahari Girls	Average
Nepali	63	39	43	41
English	70	42	50	46
Math	51	34	38	36
Science	58	44	48	45
Social Studies	54	38	41	39

Source: Shree Path Pradasak Secondary High School, Bodikhel, Lalitpur, September 2007

Appendix 2: Checklist

Checklist

) How Pahari children are socializing /enculturalizing in Pahari community of Bodikhel?
) In which sense, the home schooling and formal schooling are different for Pahari schoolchildren?

Identity
) How do Pahari children understand them in school and home/community?
) How do others understand Pahari children in school?
) How do Pahari children understand others in school?
) What the Pahari children do for the preservation of their identity?
) Which are their areas of identity?
) How do Pahari children think about their language and socio-cultural practices?

Subversion
) How Pahari students are feeling about the pedagogy of the school?
) How are they looking for the use of Pahari language in school?
) What will happen if all teachers are female in school?
) What will happen if all teachers are female Pahari in school?
) What will happen if all teachers from male Pahari in school?
) What will happen if all subjects are taught in English?
) What will happen if all subjects are taught in Pahari language?
) What will happen if all subjects are taught in Pahari language first and switch the code later on?

Difference and Differance

) How the Paharis see the world outside them?
) How the outsiders understand Pahari and their schooling?
) What are the difference and differance between Pahari and non-Pahari children?
) What are the differences and differances between the Pahari and non-Paharis' ways of observing festivals?
) What are the difference and differance between the Pahari and non-Paharis' socialization process?

Deconstruction

) What are the beliefs of Paharis?
) How are they changing their beliefs in the present context?
) Where are they feeling difficulty to match their beliefs with the present situation?
) How are Paharis facing with modern world with their conventional worldview?
) What are the relationships between the Pahari language and Nepali language groups?
) What are the relationships between the teachers and students?
) What are the relationships between non-Pahari teacher and Pahari students and vice versa?

Skeptical reality

) How do Pahari students think about the school?
) Why do Pahari children think about school?
) Why do Pahari schoolchildren feel difficulty in learning?
) Why are the Pahari children indifferent towards school's behavior?
) What are their alternatives to adjust with the given situation?
) How do they create the alternative ways?

Interpretation

) How do Pahari schoolchildren understand school?
) How do they view about the process of learning in school?
) How do they conceptualize their Pahari teacher and non – Pahari teacher?

Appendix 3: Student Participants of Focus Group Discussion

Student Participants of Focus Group Discussion

Participants from students	Participants from school teachers	Participants from parents	Participants from Pahari Sangh
Grade 4	1. Anjan Kumar Acharya	1. Sanu Maiya Pahari	1. Kanchha Pahari
1. Manita Tamang	2. Rajendra Chalise	2. Rashmi Pahari	
2. Babita Pahari	3. Bharat Prasad Acharya	3. Ashu Maya Pahari	
3. Bikina Pahari	4. Trilochan Acharya	4. Sakuntala Pahair	
4. Anita Pahari	5. Niranjan Acharya	5. Manju Pahari	
5. Rita Pahari	6. Bir Bahadur Pahari	6. Amar Bahadur Pahari	

6. Gita Pahari	7. Ganga Neupane	7. Bichar Sing Pahari	
7. Abinas Pahari	8. Krishnakala Ghimire	8. Dhan Kumar Pahair	
8. Hari Pahari	9. Menuka Acharya	9. Sundar Pahari	
9. Santosh Pahari	10. Kamala Nagarkoti	10. Kedar Pahari	
10. Niroj Pahari			
11. Anil Pahari			
12. Binod Pahari			
Grade 5			
1. Nilam Pahari			
2. Shanti Pahari			
3. Indra Pahari			
4. Sabita Kumari Pahari			
5. Usha Pahari			
6. Gayatri Pahari			
7. Binod Pahari			
8. Sundar Pahari			
9. Purna Bahadur Pahari			
10.Mitha Ram Pahari			
11. Sandesh Pahari			
12. Durga Raj Pahari			
Grade 6			
1. Ramita Pahair			
2. Mangal Kumari Pahari			
3. Putali Pahari			
4. Anita Pahari			
5. Sita Pahari			
6. Srijana Pahari			
7. Bishnu Raj Pahari			
8. Kamal Raj Pahari			
9. Suresh Pahari			
10. Chandra Man Pahari			
11. Shree Krishna Pahari			
12. Subas Pahari			
Grade 7			
1. Durga Kumari			

Pahari			
2. Surya Kumari Pahari			
3. Jamuna Pahair			
4. Ganga Pahari			
5. Susila Pahari			
6. Anju Pahari			
7. Naresh Pahari			
8. Rameshwor Pahari			
9. Kul Bahadur Pahari			
10. Shambhu Pahair			
11. Ram Krishna Pahari			
12. Sano Kumar Pahari			

Source: Focus Group Discussion/Interaction, 2006/2007