Teaching And Learning In The School Education System: A Critical Understanding Through Sociological Literature

[1]Dr. Nabanita Baruah

Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology,Silapathar College, Assam

Abstract

Education and collection of Information are many a time used as identical terms. Training on the assimilation of social ideas in the school education system is believed to be the primary step in the process of character formation for a child to live in a society. The role of the teacher hence seems significant for preparing the child for its future adult roles. However as society gradually moves for better, new issues and challenges come into the system and thus training is to be changed as per the situational environment. In other words, the meaning of teaching needs to get changed within a critical framework of learning experiences. The present paper tries to argue as to how the notion of teaching-learning in the school education system could be understood differently in various sociological literatures.

Keywords: Teaching, Education, School System, Functionalism, Critical Pedagogy, Post-Modernist Approach.

Introduction

With the constant progress towards capitalism, 'education' has been identified with a newmiddle-class identity which is associated with the new style of living, values, power and ideologies. In this new definition of education again the sources which play a crucial role are the schools and the teachers. Therefore teaching profession could not be studied in a vacuum rather as integral part of the school and the education system. The significance of teaching and learning holds significance much in the school system because schooling is the structural base on which a child moves to the ladder of higher education in the subsequent phase of his life or then enters into his job career. Hence the role of the teacher holds utmost significance here. Recommendations concerning the Status of Teachers enumerates that the status of teachers should correspond with the requirements of education as entailed in its aims and objectives; it is required to realize that for the complete recognition of these aims and objectives of the education, enshrining proper status of teachers with due public regard for the profession of teaching are of major requirements (UNESCO, 1966).

Sociology of Education involves extensive works on comprehending education and schooling system, from classical sociological context to the contemporary ones, from the notion of objectivities to the subjectivities and the role of the teachers in this shift. In other words, theoretical perspectives are those manifestations which lead a researcher to correspond or deconstruct the existing knowledge system in the light of the empirical data collected for his/her research. Thus, these theoretical bases are the lens to shape the collected data towards proper analysis and perfection.

There are different theoretical perspectives in Sociology such as Functionalism, Structural Functionalist approach, Phenomenological perspective, Structural theory etc. through the lens of which the area of sociology of education can be studied beautifully. In the

present paper within the Classical Sociological Context, the structural-functionalist approach and in modern Sociological context, Critical pedagogical approach are brought into picture as without understanding these important theoretical perspectives of sociology, the position of education in the society cannot be comprehended properly.

Functionalist Approach to Education

The functionalists conceive of society as an integrated whole made up of interdependent parts. So Functionalist approach tries to explain the persistence of social life i.e. how does the society persist. And this persistence of society is explained in terms of the contributions of the parts towards the fulfillment of the needs. While Durkheim restricted himself to the societal needs because of his extreme social realism, Malinowski argued that parts of society satisfy both the societal needs as well as individual needs. Functionalist tradition is established in the works of Durkheim, Malinowski, Redcliff-Brown and later on Parsons and Merton.

Emile Durkheim in his *Moral Education* focuses on the role of teachers or the meaning of the vocation of the teachers in the accomplishment of the act of transaction of ideas and knowledge, traditions from the adult generations to the younger generations, from the old to the new generations and that is how his ideas become relevant in making sense of social and institutionalized location of teachers. Durkheim emphasizes the moral reality while discussing his views on education. To enhance moral integration of the society he addresses the seedbed for its germinating in the public school and here specifically emphasizes the role of the teacher. To Durkheim, morality involves consistency and regularity of conduct which comes with disciplined life. His definition of morality is essentially related with the society. Since education is a means to a social end and the teacher is a social agent, so he/she is responsible for cultural transmission to create social and moral beings in the image of a man in the society (Durkheim, 1961). So the question naturally arises what is the teachers' role in their vocation. The larger sensitivity of society is expected in the calling of the teaching profession. In this sense, the self-perception of the teachers seems significant as to how teachers look at their profession. These are some sociological and pedagogical questions.

Durkheim in his *Moral education* (1961) argues that role of family members as primary teachers of their children are not sufficient because there is an element of affection and emotion in that environment. The children under such environment cannot develop their own personality as there is also always a feeling of protection towards the children. School in that sense takes the child out of that affective environment and 'excessive dependency' (*ibid*: 145) and moves the child to an impersonal disciplined environment. To be more concrete he argues that the child should be instructed by different teachers in school for the simple reason that he/she could not develop a dependency of instruction from the same teacher but develop a command from the abstract and impersonal rule. The requirement of inculcating such a habit lies in the fact that absence of an ordered life would result in irregularity and once this habit starts taking its root it would be very difficult to undo that habit from the child. He is in view that "to act morally is to conform to the rules of morality" (*ibid*: 146).

Now it is the duty of the teacher to exert influence on the children to crystallize the generalized dispositions in a particular way. Familial education though prepares the child for moral life but it especially the small family is inadequate with respect to preparing the child

towards the spirit of discipline or the respect for the rule. Therefore morality within a familial set up is a matter of emotion and sentiment which loses its earlier nature of impersonality found in joint familial setup. But the child must learn how to respect for the rule and do his duty in a larger social set up so that social coherence and solidarity can remain intact. This particular task is done in school by the teacher. The teacher first teaches the child to adhere to the school discipline by learning his lessons on time, doing his homework, do well in the classroom practices etc. To inculcate this school discipline is the moral function of the teacher which h/she has to perform not in a simple superficial way for peace and order in the classroom because in that situation children could find these imperative requirements as barbarous and may protest against these kinds of tyrannical regulations. Instead, school discipline should be such that each social group, each societal group could have its own morality. School acts as a miniature society where students from different social and cultural background come together not by any personal feelings or preferences but by general and abstract rules and the teacher has to perform his role of maintaining morality through discipline so that the children now learn to connect with others with reason and not with feelings and emotions. The teacher in school plays the role of mediator between the affective morality of the family and the rigorous morality of society. By respecting the school rules the child also learns the habit of self-control and restraint which is the first step towards fulfilling the duty in a civilized society and the teacher has to inculcate this habit and so his responsibility is huge (*ibid*: 1961).

Talcott Parsons, another sociologist talked about teaching for adult roles. He put the structure into functionalism evolving towards Structural Functionalist Approach in which he argues that society is a living entity with a life and structure of its own. Parsons developed a systems approach. He viewed all societies as distinct and self-sufficient systems made up of a wide variety of sub-systems namely organism system, personality system, cultural system and social system through which adaptation, goal attainment, integration and pattern maintenance need of society are fulfilled respectively which parsons beautifully explained in his AGIL model. All these subsystems are interconnected and interdependent (Parsons, 1951). For instance, the economic system is dependent on the education system for the supply of adequate skilled workers; schools depend on family for their supply of future students etc. Structural-Functionalist Approach views society as created by culture. Talcott Parsons, one of the eminent pioneers of this approach opines that social action is culturally shaped. Using his systems approach, he viewed all societies as distinct and self-sufficient systems consisting of some sub-systems but all interconnected and independent. Influenced by the ideas of Emile Durkheim, a functionalist Parsons emphasized on the values and set of norms to make sure perfect harmonization among all the sub-systems and hence to integrate society or to ensure efficient social system. Parsons argued that this could be achieved only by socialization, social control, and role performance and therefore emphasized the importance of morality as the central value system. He portrayed hence the deviant behavior as the result of inadequate socialization (Parsons, 1951).

Parsons is a functionalist to analyze school system as one of the sub systems within the social system and questions as to how the school class functions to internalize the future adult roles in the minds of the children and then he moves on commenting the school class as 'the focal socializing agency' which play a vital role in 'manpower allocation' on the basis of

their achievements. In this process the role of both ascribed factors such as socio-economic background of the child and the achieved factors such as personal achievements based oh child's capacity is influential. Nevertheless the core point of differentiation lies on the line of achievement and this differentiation occurs when a bifurcation happens between the groups of college goers and non-college goers from their high school level. After the familial socialization, the formal education of the child begins in the school where h/she first learns the lessons of sex roles that is either as boy or girl. The family is a socializing agency where the child is rewarded or punished on ascribed position that is sex, age, generation etc. while the school is the first institutionalized socializing agency where the child is rewarded only on the basis of its achievement. The child has to prove him/herself of his differential capacity by qualifying the performance which is set by the teacher who acts as an agent of the school system and not as an agent of family to show special favors to any child on emotional terms. The teacher represents the 'adult world' and s/he relates him/herself to the pupils in the school classroom by systematically evaluating their performances and then either offers rewards or punishments through different means. This reward or a punishment gradually starts signifying the basis for the selection in their future status in the society. Amidst the similar age group pupils and the universalistic form of the school it is quite difficult for the teacher to provide any 'particularistic treatment' to any single child. Parsons argues, "A progressive teacher, like any other, will form opinions about the different merits of her pupils relative to the values and goals of the class and will communicate these evaluations to them, informally if not formally" (Parsons, 1959: 303).

School achievements can be categorized broadly into two: Cognitive and Moral. Cognitive achievement relates to learning the information, skills, gaining empirical knowledge, mastery over technology while moral achievement relates to learning to be responsible such as respect for teachers, maintaining a cordial among fellow-pupils, inhabiting good work culture etc. A good pupil shows the capacity in achieving on both Cognitive and Moral fronts. Thus socializing function of the school is different from that of family because in school the learning of achievement-motivation 'is a process of identification with the teacher, of doing well in school in order to please the teacher' (*ibid*: 306) and through this process of identification a reciprocal pattern of role- relationship occurs. An analytical interpretation of the elementary teacher's role in American society suggests that the teacher-figure is similar to some extent and different to some other aspects from the parent-figure of the pupils and the teacher is an adult 'characterized by generalized superiority. The teacher is nevertheless not related to pupils ascriptively 'rather performing an occupational role- a role' in which the pupils are associated to her services with full 'solidarity'. She is associated with the pupils more universalistically and not in particularistic fashion as happens in family and hence she should be more oriented towards performance and not towards the emotional side of the pupils so that she can see the distinction between high achievers and low achievers (*ibid*).

Merton (1968), an eminent American sociologist and pupil of Talcott Parsons, developed his concept of role model while analyzing his theory of reference group behavior. A role model according to him is an individual whose behavior, instance or success is imitated by others, especially by newer people. Merton illustrates that individuals relate themselves with the people of that reference who inhabit that social role which the individual

aspires. It must be noted in the context of school system that for many pupils, teachers have been seen as their primary role model and a positive reference group. But in the threshold of the changing dynamics whether teachers continues to be a role model for the pupils possess some challenging question that requires further study.

Critical Pedagogical Approach to Education

Critical Pedagogic approach is based on the concepts of critical theory and it is used in the field of education. The goal of critical pedagogy is liberation from oppression through an awakening of the critical consciousness.

Paulo Freire in his '*The Pedagogy of the oppressed*' (1970) argued his essentially pedagogic exercise of overcoming the culture of silence in which large part of the society is the victim of this culture of silence who lost their languages and all their hopes. But he questions as to how it is possible for the oppressed people to overcome the culture of silence in recreating the world and freeing themselves from the oppression. Here he emphasizes on the pedagogic question. In the context of education he says that it is the teacher who imposes cultural silence on their students through banking form of education in the name of maintaining silence and discipline in the school. It implies that in teaching environment the teacher is like a depositor who just deposit or fill the accounts of the students that are empty. In other words Teachers fulfill the so considered empty minds of the students with all sorts of theories, facts, information, knowledge, ideas etc. in which students are seemed to be empty without any reflection. Thus banking form of education imposes silence on the part of the learners.

As opposed to this banking form of education Freire talks about problem imposing education or humanitarian education where both teacher and the students are the collective projects and becomes part of mutual exploration and thus the relationship of dialogue is established. This is hence not teacher vs. student relationship, but teacher-student relationship engaged in the act of perpetual discussion. As opposed to banking form of education, problem imposing education is full of criticality and reflexivity, dialogues, discussions, questions, thoughts. Thus dialogic education can bring a liberating relationship between the oppressor and the oppressed. It is the dialogic education which makes us realize that we are not mere objects of the world; we are also procreator of the world. For dialogues to happen communication between the teacher and the students is the basic principle. Without dialogue no critical thinking is possible and without critical thinking education has no meaning.

What concerns Freire more is the bureaucratization of the learning institutions due to which the spirit of the vocation is lost and the mechanical homogenous criteria are replaced. Bureaucratic machinery dislikes charisma and as such it has reduced teachers to a cog in the learning mission. Teachers are too powerless to decide on the content of curriculum, syllabus, mode of evaluation. Everything is already deciding by the centralized codes. Teachers are instructed what ought to be taught or what ought not. Teachers fail into powerlessness also because they have become mere clerks with heavy bundle of copies, files moving fast from one class to another, maintaining records of attendance of the students in the registers, making them involved in Census, Election duty due to which large part of their energy is wasted and as such any kind of critical thought gets a setback.

Illich (1971) argues that in every education system there are a declared curriculum and a hidden curriculum. Whatever is already planned in the education system is a part of declared curriculum but the process of education by which these plans are brought to action is part of hidden curriculum such as not permitting a child to ask question in the classroom, to control a child through the process of examination, to expect from the child that answer what system wants etc. Thus how the state plans the education system in its favor by imparting that type education to the children they aspire is the hidden agenda of education. In the declared agenda these are then termed that these are for the development of the children, preparing the children for future and to build their bright career ahead.

To have equal opportunity for education is a feasible goal, but schooling has confused this goal by making false promises of salvation to the poor in this technological age. The state has adopted the curriculum that results in more of diplomas specifically for the meeting the needs of job requirements. In such a system of education or schooling where teachers just focus on providing packages of instruction with legal certification actual learning could hardly take place. Learning in schools implies acquiring new skills and insights which would help an individual in his promotion. It means learning needs certification from others that a person has learned so that it helps in getting selection in the job market.

An illusion that Illich is pointing out in such school system of ours is that learning is the outcome of teaching. Illich argues that in certain circumstances learning might take place with the contributions of teaching, but mostly people acquire knowledge and learning outside the school. He feels that learning happens casually from our everyday experimentation and intentional learning is not the outcome of the programmed instruction of teachers. For instance, to substantiate his argument he puts that children learn their languages casually and not in schools, they learn even faster if parents pay special attention to their learning. And those who learn second language they did so due to circumstantial pressures and not due to sequential teaching. Circumstances such as living with grandparents, travelling to different places, falling in love with a foreigner could benefit an individual towards learning a different language other than his mother language.

Similarly fluency in reading is also the outcome of one's engagement in the extracurricular activities. Also in schools those who learn to read with pleasure learn so to discard the illusion or the challenges put on them. Great learning even today happens casually or due to one's involvement in work, leisure etc. Nevertheless it is also not the case that planned instruction can never benefit in planned learning and its improvement. But here also the strongly motivated students can acquire more complex skills due to his/her engagement with old schoolmaster who taught him/her how to read. But schools these days rarely deal with such kinds of rare teaching.

There are many such skills which a motivated student can learn in a few months if taught in the traditional way. This is true in case of learning the reading and writing of the second and third languages, computer programming, learning algebra, and other skills such as wiring, typing, driving etc.

Illich argues that certification of knowledge is only a form of market requirement which is done through a schooled mind. There are teachers who are less skillful in arts and trades and less communicative or there are teachers of French or Spanish who could not speak the language correctly but their pupils learn in a couple of years. Citing the research

experiment done by Angel Quintero in Puerto Rico Illich suggests that there are pupils if provided proper incentives and access to tools can prove much better than most of their schoolteachers in explaining things of different issues.

The demand of millions of children's education in schools has created the market for market for teachers. And schools are the space or the institution where it is assumed that learning derives from teaching and this illusion is getting legally established worldwide despite the evidences tells us the contradictory views. Most of us have learned most of our life lessons from outside the boundaries of the school. Pupils also do and learn most of the things without their teachers. Interestingly, majority of the great men who are known to the world today never went to school for learning. Everyone can learn how to think, speak, feel, work, play, love, dance etc. living outside the school. Therefore the argument of Illich lies towards an alternative model of learning by de-schooling society.

Apple (1979) argues that school functions for the production of individuals as required by the economic sector. The school enables the manpower capable of allocating positions in different parts of the economy. Thus the school teaches a hidden curriculum to make it suitable in maintaining the ideological hegemony of the powerful classes in the society. In school a certain type of knowledge is distributed among the children which is considered 'legitimate knowledge'. In the context of American society it is thus 'technological' knowledge which serves the interests of the corporate class and therefore this knowledge gets the 'high status knowledge' compared to other knowledge form. In this way the educational knowledge is a study of ideology due to which educational system has both manifest as well as latent functions.

In this process of imparting knowledge the teacher also plays its role within a controlled situation. There are four prime skills that are expected from a teacher that is to make small children learn "to share, to listen, to out things away, and to follow the classroom routine" (*ibid*: 53). In his study, Apple found that the kindergarten students were trained in such a way that they could do things only when teachers permitted for so which reflected that only those students who were quiet and obedient were considered good children in teacher's eyes. In the process of maintaining discipline and internalizing the socialized human behavior at times children learned to grow up with discomfort and ambiguity in the classroom. Both the teachers and the children gradually in this type of education system preferred work over play activities.

In the context of United States and English Apple (1986) argued that teachers had been facing the issue of being deskilled due to heavy technological encroachment into the educational curriculum. The integration of management system with pre-specified teaching resulted in a loss of control to their profession. Thus the restructuring of teaching had put significant implications. Apple is not necessarily arguing that teachers fall into the middle classes only, but definitely fall in between the upper and lower classes and they share the interests of both the petty bourgeoisie class and the lower class. Therefore technological restructuring changed a lot to the class structure of the teachers. Teaching is not only influenced by class factor, but also by gender. Apple argued that an overwhelming majority of teachers are women teachers in primary and secondary school levels but the managerial positions such as principals or head teachers are male teachers which show a clear cut sexual division in the teaching profession. Hence in 1950s and 60s when a strong pressure came

from the state force to institute education as per the need of the market, everything that a teacher has to di was also prescribed. As school adopted new technological material as part of their curriculum, teachers (mostly women) did not find themselves sophisticated enough immediately making them deskilled. It separated conception of teachers from execution. It gradually led to the 'intensification' of the teaching profession, that is, most concrete ways of privileges of teachers eroded. Intensification also shattered sociability, leisure time and self-direction of the teachers and the risk of isolation increased. Those not equipped with the technological skill had either to leave or to make them reskilled as per the requirement. Also teaching required constant evaluation of the student's mastery over their subjects and maintaining the records of the evaluations of the students. Teachers thus had to busy from 7.30 to 4.30 in the school and two hours more for different academic tasks at home. It is because of this reason that teachers just wanted to get done with their works without having time to be creative for other academic contributions.

Kumar (1992), on the other hand, raises the problem of curriculum and remarks that there is no principle for evolving curriculum. He puts three major questions while discussing the problem of curriculum, that is, a) what is worth teaching? b) How should it be taught? And c) How is the opportunities for education distributed?

The question 'What is worth teaching?' in itself implies the obvious issue as to how to define 'worth'. How different types of knowledge can be valued to differentiate between worthy and unworthy kinds of teaching Kumar distinguishes between two routes to answering the problem. The first route is determining the worth of what we want to teach from the point of view of the learner. The second is defining worth in terms of the inherent value of what actually is wished to be taught. From learners' point of view the worth of teaching depends on something we are giving taking the consideration of the receiver's point of view. But the problem arises here is that we as adults might try to think from children's point of view but may not exactly submerge with their feelings.

Kumar articulates three reasons for this difficulty. First, children can develop interest in any form of knowledge depending on the way knowledge is presented to them and their interests keep on changing on and off. So the question of what is worth teaching and what is not worthy are not predominantly appropriate questions from children's viewpoint. Secondly, we cannot expect children to articulate their viewpoints on the worthy of the kinds of knowledge which is abstract in nature as the children are not capable of deciding what they should learn and other things for themselves. Obvious at best children can articulate their preferences or likings. Thirdly, the likings articulated by children keep changing, as they keep growing due to which it cannot provide a consistent basis for making justifiable decisions on the matter of what we should be taught to them.

Now if we go by the route that it is better thinking on behalf of the children rather than going by the route of what they think then one basic question that immediately follows us is how 'worthy' can be determined. It is worthy to teach anything if the child can learn it. Kumar mentions of psychology and pedagogy is of utmost relevant in this regard especially in effectively organizing and teaching knowledge and skills. Psychology and pedagogy though cannot tell us what is worthy teaching, but it can guide the teacher when and how to teach. Mentioning the recent researches on the pedagogy of learning, he informs that it requires giving encouragement to the children to apply their prior knowledge.

The second route to decide what is worthy to be taught depends on the intrinsic value of the knowledge which definitely has to take into consideration children's perspectives. What is needed ultimately is imparting kind of knowledge that is valuable essentially and what needs to be really learned and such knowledge must find its place in curriculum. The problem with education lies when we treat education as a mundane business because unlike philosophy which deals with the dualities between true and false knowledge, education deals with people, specially people as parents, teachers, as collective individuals which can give shape to out thought process of a particular social context and period.

The school knowledge is generally a reconstruction deriving from the manifold interaction. Interaction consists of construction, categorization, distribution etc. and the economy, politics, culture of the nation all influences the shaping and selection of the process of school knowledge. The school thus supplies people with such knowledge that is reinforced by the country's politics and culture.

Teaching has got a new dimension with the imposition of the bureaucratically controlled system of education. At the time of colonial control, teaching as a vocation had its root in the caste structure and teaching was known to people as a different kind of social activity. Teachers traditionally enjoyed respect in their vocation. Therefore teaching was also often associated with the priestly function. Kumar refers survey by Adam in 1835 of the indigenous schools where teachers used to enjoy autonomy in choosing what was worth teaching and how to teach the pupils. Curriculum consisted of the knowledge relating to learning of skills which would be useful to the village society. Teachers had the freedom to make choices on the conventions made for them. Nevertheless the new centralized system of official control took away lots of teachers autonomy by denying them any role in interfering in curriculum making. The new system also imposed on teachers the responsibility to complete official routine works such as maintaining daily diary, records of registers of pupils, records of examination results etc.

Kumar here questions the freedom of the teachers in terms of syllabus preparation, choosing suitable textbooks or even with their identities and therefore he is hoping for the possibility of such a nature of the teaching profession where teachers would be granted autonomy only on conditions that is collaborative demand from the teachers or reforms in the educational policy where low salary and status of the teachers must get prime emphasis.

Post-Modernist Approach to Education

Post-modernist approach negates the idea of having the ultimate reality or just one truth of this world. Massive pace of globalization and technological influence has been constantly changing those determinants which used to bind society earlier. New relationships of different structures have constantly been replacing the earlier structures. This can be understood well with reference to Giddens' notion of 'structuration' which underlies that within the structures of society, the individual equally has the power and freedom to express him or herself and over time to change those structures for the better and in this way neither the society nor the individual are all powerful. Social structures such as the family, community, work etc. are created by human action, so also they define and determine human behavior and social life. Social structures and human action do not exist independently of each other; rather they are independent and intertwined. For Giddens, therefore, there exists a

'duality of structure' by which social structure both constitute human agency and create it (Giddens, 1984). Michal Foucault, one of the post-modernist has explained how new dimension of power has replaced the traditional power relation in society and changes impacting the education system.

Michel Foucault while talking about 'multi-focality' of power argues that there are two modern forms of power, one, the disciplinary power and another, bio-power. In the pre-modern period sovereign power existed. It is in the context of disciplinary power that the school system and teaching could be understood. Foucault feels that the disciplinary power is the correct means of training for the children. In a school system this disciplinary power operates at different levels. The principal operates power on the teachers and the teachers on students. Thus disciplinary power "trains the moving, confused, useless multitudes of bodies and forces into a multiplicity of individual elements – small, separate cells, organic autonomies, genetic identities and continuities, combinatory segments" (Foucault, 1977: 170). The disciplinary power in the schools operates through three mechanisms: 'hierarchical observation', 'normalizing judgement' and 'the examination'.

Through the apparatus of observation, the exercise of discipline is effectively induced on the children or in other words the sense of coercion seems visible on them. Thus it creates a space of 'hierarchized surveillance'. The school building is such a mechanism of training on pedagogical fronts that it makes the disciplining of vigorous bodies and creates obedience by a single gaze of the teacher in the classroom. Thus the surveillance of the children is very much integrated into the relationships of teaching. With the increase of the number of pupils to regulate the activities of the whole class and to regulate the disorder and confusion the necessity of the supervision of the teacher gradually emerged. In the context of French society of eighteenth century Foucault placed the role of the teacher in disciplining those pupils who indulged in talking inside the classrooms while studying, learning lessons, indulged in other offences etc. Therefore teachers had to play this pedagogical role in teaching and guiding the pupils properly so that they can avoid mistakes while learning socialized norms and behaviours. Thus teaching, Foucault said, associated with three procedures, "teaching proper, the acquisition of knowledge by the very practice of the pedagogical activity and a reciprocal, hierarchized observation. A relation of surveillance, defined and regulated, is inscribed at the heart of the practice of teaching, not as an additional or adjacent part, but as a mechanism that is inherent to it and which increases its efficiency" (*ibid* : 176). By such surveillance, disciplinary power gradually became part of the system. Surveillance is operated on individuals through a network of relations from bottom to the top and vice versa and this entire network creates a tremendous power relations that derives from the supervisors. It thus functions 'like a piece of machinery'.

In the process of normalizing judgements, a 'small penal mechanism' works within the disciplinary systems. This penal mechanism helps in defining and repressing the mass behavior through the system of punishment. Foucault emphasizes that punishment is capable of making children free the fault they have made and also capable of humiliating them. In his words, "by way of punishment, a whole series of subtle procedures was used, from light physical punishment to minor deprivations and petty humiliations. It was a question both of making the slightest departures from correct behaviour subject to punishment, and of giving a punitive function to the apparently indifferent elements of the disciplinary apparatus so that if

necessary everything might serve to punish the slightest thing. . . .What is specific to disciplinary penalty is non-observance, that which does not measure up to the rule, that departs from it. The whole indefinite domain of the non-conforming is punishable" (ibid: 178-79). Thus disciplinary punishment has the essential function of reducing gaps by making corrections on the part of the wrong doer.

At the same time Foucault also argues that punishment is only one way of ensuring discipline. The teacher must avoid punishing children to the extent teachers can manage with another way of disciplining that is reward system. In the process of training and correction, the teacher can use the mechanism of rewards more frequently than punishment. The disciplinary mechanism, either rewards or punishments used by the teacher defines the behavior and performance of the children in two divisions, either positive behavior or negative behavior; either good marks or bad marks. In the process of rewarding, the distribution also happens of hierarchical qualities, aptitudes and skills. Disciplinary rewards make the children leaning more towards attaining higher marks and positions. Thus disciplinary power normalizes individual actions.

Conclusion

The classical sociological literature tries to understand the teaching-learning experience from the point of view of social integration and the teacher within the functionalist tradition plays his/her roles for moral teaching or preparing the child for adult roles in the society by making them learned on different norms and values of the society. Such social coherence is focused much over individualism in the classical sociological approach to education and learning mechanism. On the contrary the Critical Pedagogical Approach to Education makes use of the critical understanding in the field of education and aims at developing a sense of awakening or critical consciousness of the present education system, teaching and learning experiences. Post-Modernist Approach to Education again brought multiple realities of teaching and learning episode surrounding the issues of power, disciplinary mechanism and importance of punishment. Thus different sociological literatures look at this vital context of teaching and learning modalities on different ideological vantage points.

References

1. Apple, Michael. (1979). *Ideology and Curriculum*. London: Routledge &Kegal Paul.
2. Durkheim, Emile. (1961). *Moral Education*. New York: The Free Press.
3. Foucault, Michel. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Pantheoon Books.
4. Freire, Paulo. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, New York : Seabury Press.
5. Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society*. Cambridge : Polity Press.
6. Illich, Ivan. (1971). *Deschooling Society*. New York : Harper and Row.
7. Kumar, Krishna (1992). *What is worth Teaching*, New Delhi: Orient Longman.
8. Merton, R.K. (1968) *Social Theory and Social Structure*, New York : Free Press.
9. Parsons, Talcott (1951). *The Social System*. New York : Free Press.
10. UNESCO (1966). *Recommendations concerning the Status of Teachers*. Paris. Retrieved on 13.03.2017 from http://www.unesco.org/education/pdf/TEACHE_E.PDF