PAHARIS' SCHOOLING: A POSTMODERN LENS

Anju Khadka

Introduction
This paper analyses the Paharis schooling with post-modern approach and discusses the ways that transform the existing education system. The postmodern lens embraces fluid and multiple perspectives while analyzing the field information/data. Besides, it refutes the definite 'truth claim' over another (Gilley 2002). Similarly, it is in itself a dialogical word with various positive and negative connotations and a current historical, social and cultural epoch (Allen 2007: 181). Though the analysis and discussion of this paper show the multiple interpretation, the scope of this paper is limited to (a) examining the relationship of the established theory with field (b) drawing the perceptual and theoretical interpretation of Pahari's schooling and (c) exploring the multiple identities of Paharis.

The qualitative information that I got through empirical study helped me to argue that only the knowledge of the center is not sufficient for social justice to the students, though school structure is made by the relationship between the center and decenter. I further argue that the amicable relationship between the center and decenter of school structure is the best way for ensuring service delivery to the students. For this, I found that school and its teachers could learn the delivery technique from the students' social cosmos. On the contrary, the school structure that works through center knowledge merely presents a hierarchical education to the students. This means school automatically makes the institution oppressive (Freire 1983). It also ignores, represses, or marginalizes the non-centered multi-knowledges (Derrida), which comes from students' side (Powell 2003). In addition to it, I used functional, critical and dual structural theories to examine Pahari's schooling. This helped me understand how school structure can be redesigned for ensured educational justice to the students and the society.

Theoretical Perspective
In course of looking the theoretical relevancies, I used Derridean standpoints to understand the Paharis' schooling or their worldview about school.

Derridean theory examines the interrelationships between center and decenter part of social structure. This is main principle of deconstruction theory (Powell, 2003). Furthermore, this theory analyzes social subjectivity and the worldview associated with the socio-cultural world and the outside in
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a given social structure. Such analysis and discussion do have closer affinity with the theory of cognitive anthropology as well. Cognitive anthropology focuses on people's own conceptual models of the world that is created from the field. In other words, it concentrates on the emic perspective on communities' actions/decision-making processes. This emic analysis emphasizes on digging out epistemological and operational things of the cultural idealism that is shared by social groups (Harris 1968: 569). Harris further said that emic study helps to know the culture or language as an order whole (1968: 571). Here, the perspective of emic reminded me the aim of anthropology as viewed by Milton (1997) who says anthropology is not simply to describe human cultures but to explain why they are as they are (Uprety 2007: 184). My paper explores the rationale of the shaping schooling or the worldview of the Paharis about school, the way they constructed through education process. For understanding the worldview of Paharis' formal schooling, I related it to the Derridean theoretical standpoints. In other words, my paper explores the rationale of seeking the re-socialization (reflection) and/or de-socialization (rethinking or re-confirming process) process of the Paharis.

In the context of using the Derridean theoretical perspective, I examined the field based on only three terms of Derridean theoretical perspective that Derrida used. They are (a) Deconstruction, (b) Difference and Differance, and (c) Interpretation. Through these three terms, I tried to understand the worldview of the Pahari community towards schooling. In Deconstruction term of Derrida, I used it 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 are they 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 obtained from the study, I understood the meaning of schooling for Paharis from the Deconstruction standpoints. For the concept of Difference and Differance, I understood the schooling of the Pahari by finding out the answer of the questions such as how the Paharis see the outside world? And how the outsiders understand Pahari and their schooling? For the answers of these questions, I captured the difference and differance between Paharis and non-Pahari's world view in general and about schooling in particular. Finally, for the understanding of the term interpretation, I tried to find out the style of understanding the concept and construct as well as deconstruct views of the Pahari children and their community.
Anthropologists often argued that the production of knowledge relies on the adoption of the type of theoretical and methodological approach while undertaking a research effort. Besides this, they have posited the strong opinion that anthropology is an interpretative quest because it is a search for meanings, for hidden connections, for deeper silences than those presented by the surface evidence of ethnography (Keesing 2006: 258). Furthermore, this interpretative nature of anthropology always focuses on the understanding of persons and groups about any phenomena that require an understanding of their meanings (Spiro 2006: 523). With this meaning, it focuses on subjective data for anthropological research (McGee & Warms 2004: 576, 577). Likewise, this interpretative study is also a set of activities of qualitative research (Denzin & Lincoln 2005: 6) that privileges not only single methodological practice over another but also involves an interpretative approach that makes the world visible. It means to analyze any phenomena in anthropological research, there is a need of multiple analyses whether it is theoretical or philosophical or different corner of human experience about the subjective meaning. In this line, Margaret Mead views that there is a need of appropriate theories and methods for developing the research framework (Harris 1968: 409). Following these theoretical understanding my study claims very much related with postmodern which is one of the domains of anthropology. It explores the social reality in terms of research. Here I stand on the opposite side of the "traditional anthropologists" in a sense that I just brought the slice of field from the Pahari children who are the decenter part of the school structure but the center part of their community. These "center of the community" are forced to obey the teachers and school's rule and regulations of the mainstream society. In this situation, I have conceptualized to find out the meanings of the activities/behaviors/cultures and understanding the social contexts, experiential learnings, perceptions, consciousness, subjectivities and inter-subjectivities even with the slice of field.

Gradually the traditional anthropologists began to look into the cognitive dimension. But the contemporary anthropological researches ignored the cognitive dimensions of management (Uprety 2007: 185) including that of education, which I argue. They also ignored Margaret Mead's methodological approach, which was developed in 1962. For example, Mead sketched the typical Samoan girl's feelings and emotion from the field during her study and described the collected information in her write up. Latter on she used theoretical perspective for testing in the field (Harris 1968: 413). Following her methodology, anthropologists could develop
theoretical base to understand cultural differences and similarities (Harris 1968: 423). Later on a number of traditions emerged in the methodological world (Denzin & Lincoln 2005: 2-3). These traditions can be classified into (a) traditional period (1900-1950), (b) the modernist or golden age (1950-1970), (c) the blurred genres (1970-1986), (d) the crisis of representation (1986-1990), (e) the postmodern, a period of experimental and new ethnographies (1990-1995), (f) post-experimental inquiry (1995-2000), (g) the methodologically contested present (2000-2004) and (h) the fractured future (2005-untill now). These methodological traditions help ensure methodological rigor in qualitative research.

Going through these methodological changes over the years, I claim that (a) anthropologists are still focusing on "thick description" (b) only a few studies examine the relationship of the field with the established theory (c) they paid less attention to reconfirm, challenge, and pinpoint the gray areas of some of the established theories, and (d) they failed to diagnose the slice (peep) of the field for greater understanding. This means anthropologists can bring "window description" and analyze the human being as "miniature society" (Durkheim) even with the slice of information (Encyclopedia 2008). In this sense, I do believe that I could change the traditional "thick description" of the anthropologists to the "window description".

Methodology

Research site: In 2006-2007, I did the fieldwork in a Pahari community and its school at Bodikhel Lalitpur. This is a marginalized community (NEFIN & NFDIN 2004) though Pahari settle with Brahman, Chhetri, Dalit and Tamang. Paharis are peasants and traditional weavers of bamboo trays and baskets. They have their own language, which is quite similar to the Tamang and Newar languages (MOLDNCFDON 2000). It means they have unique language that mixes Newari and Tamanggi. They are Hindu religious group but they are different from the other Hindu religious group like Brahman, Chhetri and Newar because they have many festivals and feasts that make them distinctive. Since they are crossbreed of Newar and Tamang they have many festivals borrowed from both groups. Besides this, they have unique characteristic that they do not share community concerns with other caste and ethnic groups. In fact, they maintain their communal secrecy.

I studied Pahari school children of grade 4-7 at Shree Path Pradasak Secondary High School. There I found that majority of the teachers were the Brahman/Chhetris to teach Pahari children. This made me interested to find out the following realities: (a) experiences of the human agency (center and
decenter part) of the school that has multilingual and multicultural settings; (b) emic perspectives of the Paharis by using multiple theories; (c) relationship between the grand narratives and local and small theories; and (d) my etic perspective as a researcher.

**Method:** In this research, I used interconnected interpretative/qualitative approach for the generation of the information/data as principal method. The approach involves a direct and participant observation, interview (with key informants), case study, focus group discussion, and review of the documents. In addition, data management techniques have been used for storing and retrieving and interpreting the data by "watching, asking or examining". In the end, I concluded my data management part by thematic analysis and theoretical interpretation by using Derridean concept of deconstruction.

**Information/Data Analysis and Interpretation**
I analyzed the qualitative information thematically. In doing so, I tried to understand the self and others-worldviews of the Pahari school children (grade 4-7) and their interface with the society that they live in. For the interpretation of the generated information I used Derrida's deconstruction theory along with some others' theoretical perspectives.

**Slice of the field:** Contrary to the traditional anthropologists, at first I brought the slice of the field. And I began to analyze and interpret it by connecting the slice with different theoretical lenses and literatures. Further, I analyzed the information by fusing and hybridizing more than one theoretical lens. Thus, I could see the connection of the slice with the larger society. It means I used the postmodern theory for analyzing the field by selecting the slice of life as sample. In doing so, I made themes and sub-themes out of the slice, which helped me to understand the self and other's worldviews of Pahari school children.

**Paharis' Schooling: Relationship between the Center and Decenter/Deconstruction:** In bi-lingual and bi-socio-cultural setting of Shree Path Pradasak secondary school, the students and teachers of Pahari and non-Pahari groups were considered as opposites. Because of the language, culture and caste/ethnic identity factors, they are different groups to each other. Besides, due to the schooling process, they have hierarchies in 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 school children in Ramghat of Kathmandu district 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 in upward position. Such type of schooling is similar with formal socialization process and it is also the basis of self development of Pahari school children. The self arises through social activity and social relationships that is determined by school for Pahari school children. Under their social relationship and social activity of school, I found Pahari school children have beliefs that their school language is Nepali. In this connection I wrote my field note that reads out:

Shree Krishna Pahari has conceptualized 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 through reading, writing, and being proficient in 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 hoping they can also improve Nepali language. As a result there appears a threat that Pahari language gradually disappears from their houses.

The above field note gave me four areas where Pahari school children set their mind. They are: (a) school is the institution of hierarchical structure (b) Pahari students conceptualized that they are second position holder students in relation to 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 school children found that their language has been marginalized (e) they found that home schooling is more flexible than formal schooling.

Except the above conceptualization, Pahari school children were looking for structural change of school that was further elaborated by some other Pahari school children. During this discussion, I asked the Pahari school children how they could change 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.

The above answers of Pahari school children provided me with 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) other basis of students’ socio-cultural lived reality, school can develop its curriculum to address the local problem.

The discussion with the 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. One
group considers as high status holder and other low status holder. It means the different status holder groups seem as opposite groups. Due to the relationship between Pahari students/teachers and non-Pahari school children/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 resemble with center and decenter as binary opposites. Pahari school children 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 school children/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 school children were being natural and privileged on one hand and on the other hand Pahari school children 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 decenter. In simple terms, due to the nature of Pahari school children' lived social structure, they believed in binary opposition. As Durkheim (1858-1917), Weber (1864-1920), Henriques et al. (1984), and Giddens (1982) viewed this school is an institution and a miniature form of social system, individual subjectivity, and the interface between them embedded to 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 school children self-aware and enabled them to 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 numbers of Pahari school children in school, their interests or demand have challenged the school, but the school was not taking it seriously. It means Pahari school children'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 school children 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 school children found mismatching their 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 school children want to change the *decenter* position of their language and socio-cultural value based pedagogical process into *center* position. Similarly, in Radhakrishnan’s (2004: 131) sense, Pahari school children 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 school children can change the dictatorial forms of societies into egalitarian (Passolini 2006). In Paul de Man’s sense, they also can dismantle privileged or traditional meanings of school and schooling (Powell 2003:148).

After reviewing the mode of thinking of Pahari school children about schooling, I could reflect two issues. One, Pahari school children looked for ownness 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 school children start to ignore existing situation, replace this or reproduce this differently (Gauntlett 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 school children 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 partners no matter they are in majority or minority and/or the representative of the state/state apparatus.

**Differance: The Understanding of Pahari School children**

I observed the language use of Pahari school children at classroom, playground, on the way to school, and home. I also had conversation with them at different places. These efforts helped me to understand that school children use both Nepali and Pahari languages as per their convenience and situation. At the same time, they are thinking that they had to face difficulty in school. This reality is the difference for school's own rules and regulation, non-Pahari school children and teachers, where they do not care the intention of the majority of Pahari school children. It means, Pahari school children understood that this situation is just difference. This understanding of Pahari school children's in Derridean sense, is called the differance which is not some mystic, unnameable being and does not exist like the God 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 to 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 had to 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.
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 to by the teachers and school (b) thinking of Pahari school children is different from the thinking of teachers and school, and (c) Pahari school children always felt uneasy in school whether it was on the first day of school or latter during the school life but the non-Pahari students didn’t feel uneasy.

Celebrating the festivals is another context where Pahari and non-Pahari school children put their own views. In sharing, Pahari school children 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”. Opposite to this non-Pahari school children shared their feeling that they do not need additional leave. It means school calendar is suitable for them. It means, the statement of Mann “school is considered as the symbol and hope for the good society” (Spring 2001: 11) resembles with the non-Pahari school children.

Pahari school children also shared that they are often involved in bamboo making and farming activities more than the non-Pahari school friends. Due to the involvement in household chores, they are labeled as weak students. In this regard, 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 the Pahari children were not recognized as the earning members. To quote Suresh Pahari, student of same grade six "we earn money selling 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 school children are looking for own-ness by understanding the context of classroom. School on the other hand wants to regulate Pahari school children in its own structural context. Likewise parents give the importance for household chores. Male teachers see that they are only capable persons in teaching. Non-Pahari school children and schoolteacher think 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 school children 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 school children 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: 118-121) 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. Following the arguments of Derrida, school's structuration of self is different from the self of Pahari school children but this difference is not yet heard by school. It means school knowingly or unknowingly maintained the differance. This differance along with the difference maintained by the school gave Pahari school children a kind of pinch. It means discomfortability remained within Pahari school children but not with the non-Pahari school children. In other words the differance produced the unheard situation and undermined the Pahari school children.

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 do not get leave from school for their own festivals. 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 school childrens' 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 Valentin, 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 school children (Iversion 1978: 153). In this sense, education system of this school does not touch the hearts of the Pahari school children who are native inhabitants and the majority students of this school. The Pahari school children 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 school children I found that they are weaker than non-Pahari school children in classroom. The reason was they had to be heavily involved in household chores than their non-Pahari counterparts. The Pahari school children compared themselves with their friends and felt that they were 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 school children 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 school children did not demand for their wage from the parents. The Pahari school children are shaped by the home schooling habitus (Ibid). In this sense, all kinds of schooling can be considered social habitus whether Pahari school children learn from the school and their friend or get orientation from their parents and elders at 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 school children saw the differences between these and their schooling habitus.

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 Talcott 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 more suitable person than their female counterparts especially for teaching in higher grades. If we analyze this situation with 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 school children 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 (Camoy 1984: 46). Due to this consciousness, Pahari school children felt that they are minority group in school because this school brought 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 on one side as legitimate function and on the other side it works as consciousness of majority and minority, and male and female in teacher composition. It means Pahari school children do not see other reasons but look differently though they understood the relationship between the majority and minority from the same base. At this point 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 school children and schoolteacher.

After analyzing the overall understanding of Pahari school children 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 *differance*, 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 (Encyclopedia 2006) for them.

It can be asserted that Pahari school children 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 school children, and (g) children's earning right. These *differences* gave them sometimes a kind of pinch. For example, when they compare themselves with their non-Pahari friends in school, they find that they are less free 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
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Paharis' Schooling: Hybridization of Interpretative Theoretical Schools

In the course of interaction with Pahari school children, 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 did not match 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 school children seek the compatible school for them but the school did not provide educational environment as per the interest of Pahari school children. 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. 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’s (1818-1883) sense is unmatched schooling. This unmatched means school is bourgeois' society and Pahari children are labor group where school suppresses the Pahari school children in terms of language and socio-culturally biased contents. This is a negative part of society. School is center and Pahari school children are decenter where school oppressed the Pahari school children (Powell 2003). In Paulo Freire’s (1983) sense, school structure suppressed the Pahari school children in terms of language and course content. Similarly, in Pierre Bourdieu’s (1992) sense, modern school culture suppressed the local culture of Pahari school children.

In Goodlad’s (1979: 1) sense Ramita Pahari, happily agreed to go to school and showed her readiness to bear 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
Likewise, in understanding of Edward (1976: 392), Ramita Pahari's acceptance is viewed as a hope in which schooling potentially makes a difference for her in so far 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 school children's perspective. The second phenomenon is that Pahari school children are stressing on looking self, which is compared with self concept of Mead, social psychologist and Id and ego concept of Freud, the psychoanalyst. According to Mead (Ritzer 1996: 374), Pahari school children 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 school children or this argument of Binod Pahari can be understood from both Id and ego part of looking self. For example, go to school compulsory is the nature of Id because Binod Pahari went to 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 Binod’s consciousness. Here, Binod 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 school children. 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 school children are feeling difficult? Looking from the interpretative theory, Pahari schooling is not inquired or is not looked from different angles and is not thought from Pahari school children’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 school children have 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 school children wanted to learn in their language while facing any difficulty in learning. It means they need code switching from Pahari to Nepali and to English language and vice versa. They further said that if school emphasizes on 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 school children's earning for their parents (Habermas 1971, 1987, 1990a and 1990b) argue that there is "practical interest/reasons". 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 transformed into 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 to the human being (Cloud 1994: 229).

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

From Pahari school children's perspective, 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 to this concept any marginalized conditions not only become central (Powell 2003: 26), but also become a new thing through hybridization of differently situated knowledge/theoretical schools.

Conclusions
I examined the worldviews of Pahari school children from postmodern anthropological lens. In this process I captured their subjective meaning of the activities/behaviors/cultures and understanding of the social context, experiential learnings, perceptions, consciousness, subjectivities and intersubjectivities associated with the schooling process. For example, I captured the understanding of Pahari school children who found school structure as the relationship between and center (non-Pahari school children and teachers) and decent (Pahari school children, teacher). In this relationship, they found school structure very much rigid and in some cases it was sometimes flexible. As they noticed, especially, pedagogy of non-Pahari teachers was very much rigid. In other words, they didn't use Pahari language to facilitate classroom teaching while Pahari school children expressed difficulty to understand the Nepali language including the vocabularies. They just explained the subject matter in the classroom. Pahari school children and non-Pahari teachers held different thoughts. This difference compelled the Pahari children to hum against the school and its pedagogical process. Here the decenter group, Pahari school children found school hierarchical, non-listening institute to the "small voice". In this sense the non-Pahari teachers had traditional orientation. Oppositely, Pahari teachers were very much flexible to use both Nepali and Pahari language including the local socio-culture. So, the Pahari
teachers could teach students to link their language and socio-cultural reality in the classroom instruction. It made them easy to understand the text and the context. This reality provided the knowledge that (a) center position of school can be changed, if it is very difficult to the students, (b) Pahari students are looking for co-existence between the Nepali and Pahari language groups to get educational justice, and (c) based on students' socio-cultural lived reality, school can develop its curriculum to address the local problems. In other words, Pahari school children saw deconstruction mode in school structure. Besides these, the Pahari school children looked the school from the critical perspective as well and found school rigid for them. They also interpreted school from functional point of view and found that the school was maintaining inequality on the name of "social good". At the same time, they looked this school from the perspective of co-existence, while they got benefit from both bilingual and bi-socio-cultural nature of school. In these different realities, they developed a new hope to change school system through the dialogue between the center and decenter i.e. the creation of hybridized closure to look at school and the children of the ethnic groups. These subjective experiences of the Pahari school children (Denzin & Lincoln 2005: 2-3) yielded alternative facts (the difference in Derrida's terms) that were unheard so far.

Notes
1. These anthropologists are promoting chronological description. Some are connecting the field information/data with the established theory.
2. This means we need to challenge the established theories and explore alternative theories.
3. It explores different theoretical lenses and looks for alternatives no matter the come out of the fusion of opposites or from hybridization of different theoretical knowledge of the field information/data.
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