'Shed', 'shed makkalu', and differentiated schooling: narratives from an Indian city

Vijitha Rajan

Published online: 03 Jul 2022.

Submit your article to this journal ☞

View related articles ☞

View Crossmark data ☞

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=rtwt20

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

'Shed', 'shed makkalu', and differentiated schooling: narratives from an Indian city

Vijitha Rajan

Faculty Member, School of Education, Azim Premji University, Bangalore, India

ABSTRACT

'Shed makkalu' (literally translated as 'shed children') is a phrase frequently used by NGO functionaries to identify children (from temporarily migrating families) living in 'shed' houses (made of either tarpaulin or tin sheets) situated in the squatter settlements of the Indian city of Bangalore. Temporary migrants in India belong to marginalised socio-economic strata of society and face multiple inequalities in both source and destination areas. This article focusses on the socio-spatial marginalisation of temporary migrant children in the city as an important identity dimension through which migrant children and their education were engaged with in the city. It explores the categories of 'shed' and 'shed makkalu' as vantage points to understand the socio-spatial marginalisation of migrant children in the city and how children themselves engage with their marginal locales in the city and its schools. This article draws on existing critiques around the theoretical canons of multiple childhood(s) and children's agency to highlight that while migrant children actively engage with uncertain and erratic contexts of mobility and their marginal locations in the city, the structural conditions of development and education that shape their experiences of schooling should not be overlooked.

Introduction

This is the big room for my parents. This is the kitchen, and this is the drawing room. It has doors on both sides. This is my grand parents' room. And this is mine and my sisters.' On the top, this is the space to keep clothes for drying. This is not like our 'jhopdi' ('shed').

The above description was given by Anita, an eight-year-old migrant child in the city of Bangalore, about the toy house she built using lego blocks in the NGO school. The imaginary house that she built during her everyday play with friends in the school was unlike the one room 'shed house' (made of tarpaulin or tin sheets) in the squatter settlement of the city that she and her family inhabited (see Figure 1). She explained to me how the latter did not qualify as a 'good house' that she imagined and aspired for. Conversations with Anita and other migrant children constantly brought out how migrant families' socio-spatial locations in the city shape their identity and belonging in the city. These also show that questions of social inequalities and marginalisation are central to

CONTACT Vijitha Rajan ✉ vijitha.rajan@apu.edu.in

Figure 1. Children's constructions of 'real' and 'ideal' houses. Source: field data.

how migrant children perceive themselves and the neighbourhoods they inhabit (Sime 2017). While inhabiting the 'shed' was central to children's identity and belonging in the city, NGO functionaries frequently used the phrase 'shed makkalu' (literally translated as 'shed children') to identify migrant children living in 'shed' houses. The identity construct of 'shed makkalu' was also used in educational policy and practice to legitimise the substandard schooling (or no schooling) that these children have access to in the Indian educational landscape.

Research in India shows that children on the margins are constructed as educationally deprived, lacking, and uneducable in the dominant discourses of education and development (Dalal 2015; Velaskar 2005). Such discourses of lack and educability construct children from marginalised communities as 'non-epistemic' beings (Batra 2015, 4) and as responsible for their learning failures (Dalal 2015). Furthermore, it has a detrimental impact on children's educational experiences (Balagopalan and Subrahmanian 2003). For instance, Yunus (2022) in her research with urban poor in an Indian city discusses how the identity category of 'labour class', which reflects intersections of caste and class, is often used by teachers to refer to children from working-class backgrounds and resulted in perceptions around marginalised children as 'unteachable' and their families as 'irresponsible' and 'uninterested' in children's schooling (p.110). This article contributes to the body of literature that problematises such constructions around marginalised families and children.

Elsewhere, I have argued how the spatiotemporally immobile schooling system in the Indian context is in fundamental disenfranchises with the lived realities of migrant childhoods and therefore educationally disfranchises them (Rajan 2020b). This article focusses on the construct of 'shed makkalu' as situated in the aforesaid landscape of schooling, how migrant children themselves engage with it, and the ways in which it shapes educational imaginations for marginal children in contemporary India. In the first section of the article, I lay out the structural locations of temporary migrants in the Indian context and highlight their socio-spatial marginalisation in urban areas. Furthermore, I draw upon existing critiques around the theoretical canons of multiple childhood(s) and children's agency to highlight that while migrant children actively engage with uncertain and erratic contexts of mobility and their marginal locations in the city, the structural conditions of development and education that shape their experiences of schooling cannot be overlooked. In the second section, I briefly share the context of the study and its participants

and some ethical considerations of doing ethnographic research with marginalised children in Global South. In the three sections that follow, data from fieldwork is discussed through narratives around children's socio-spatial locations in the city, how children engage with their marginal locales, and in what ways the category of shed and shed makkalu shapes the construction and provision of educational opportunities by the state and NGOs in the city.

Structural locations of temporary migrants and agential imperatives of children

Continuing the colonial legacy of modernisation and development, the Nehruvian dream in post-independent India constructed the village as a 'waiting room', that is antithetical to the city and its industrial modernity (Parry 2003, 247). Breman (1996, 1) argues that though policies based on such 'economic dualism' facilitated labour transition 'from field to factory' and massive migration of people 'from rural to urban areas', the conceptualisation of both the village and the urban informal sector as 'waiting rooms' for unskilled rural workers has remained a fallacy in the Indian context. This is because increased casualisation and informalisation of labour that occurred after the LPG (liberalisation, privatisation, and globalisation) phase in the 1990s have made the living and working conditions of migrants more exploitative and vulnerable, particularly of those situated in contexts of temporary 'footloose' migration. Temporary footloose migrants are those who circulate between villages and cities throughout the year and are unable to get sustainable livelihood and foothold in both the village and the city and thereby lead transient and marginalised lives (Chu and Michael 2019).

Structural factors such as changing dynamics of the agrarian context, environmental factors, uneven regional variations, rural–urban divide, the exclusionary nature of neoliberal urbanisation processes, socioeconomic inequality, and informalisation of labour shape the experiences of temporary migrants in both source and destination areas (see Keshri and Bhagat 2012; Mishra 2016; Srivastava 2011). As opposed to permanent and semi-permanent forms of migration, temporary migration, which is seasonal, short term, and circular in nature, is found to be undertaken by poorer and socially marginalised sections of the society such as those belonging to low monthly per-capita income (MPCE) quintile classes and Scheduled Caste (SC) and Scheduled Tribe (ST) communities. Furthermore, village studies across India show that there is a significant increase in the number of people undertaking temporary migration for work and are entangled in new forms of labour bondage in contemporary India (Breman 2010). Temporary migrants increasingly come to depend upon agents, brokers, and contractors, as the state and the law fail to protect their rights (Mosse, Gupta, and Shah 2005).

Such systemic denial of rights, welfare, and resources to migrants by state is also caused by their other intersecting identities based on caste, class ethnicity, gender, and religion (Deshingkar 2022). These structural locations of temporary migrants shape their experiences of poverty, inequality, and marginalisation in the city. Scholars have argued that the neoliberal city in contemporary India has transformed into an 'extraction site', and the poor migrant stands at the centre of its paradoxes (Samaddar 2015, 54). This reflects the marginal location of poor migrants despite their substantial contribution to the growth and development of the city. On the one hand, though many migrants come

to the city with hopes towards social mobility and better livelihood options, patterns of migrants' access to space are highly unequal in many Indian cities, which in turn reflects intersecting forms of marginality in social, political, economic, cultural, and ecological realms. On the other hand, active negotiations of migrants expose the discursive 'contradictions of their liminal status in the city' in opposition to 'peripheral' and 'parasitic' perceptions around migrants and their marginal locations in the city (Woronov 2004, 301). Hence, it is important not to trivialise urban spaces either as fully resisting or as constrained by structural conditions of precarious labour, displacement, and discrimination (Aceska, Heer, and Kaiser-Grolimund 2019) but understand the spatial question as central to questions around right to the city and its resources such as education (Nambissan 2021). Scholars have argued that spatial restructuring and the resulting socio-economic and political marginalisation and marking out poor in Indian cities have worsened post the LPG phase in the 1990s (Tukdeo and Mali 2021; Nambissan 2017). In the context of Bangalore, Tukdeo and Mali (2021) argue that urban development policies after the 2000s were largely focussed around global imaginations of infrastructure and entrepreneurialism such as building flyovers, airports, roads, and buildings, instead of housing, natural resources, and sanitation. Furthermore, she argues from her observations of two dislocated neighbourhoods that are moved into resettlement colonies that constructions of places where children live as inadequate and unstable significantly mark their success or failure at school.

This article engages with this problematic through children's negotiations and agential engagements because migrant experiences have largely been explored in research, policy, and practice through an adult male-centric perspective, which in turn constructs children (and women) merely as vulnerable, passive followers of men, dependents, or left-behind (Gatt et al. 2016). This is evident from dominant theorisations around migration that have engaged with children either as economic liabilities to migrant parents or as cheap labour for capitalist economy but not as social actors having experiences and perspectives in their own right. While migrant children face numerous barriers in the city such as lack of opportunities for social networking and civic participation, confinement to the domestic space, and adult fears around safety, how children and young people navigate, negotiate, and engage with their structural locations has received limited attention (Sime 2017). This article's focus on migrant children's socio-spatial marginalisation in the city and their active negotiation and engagement with their marginal locations is based on the premise of a middle ground where children's marginal locations and their agential engagement are not isolated from each other but are in turn relational. Building on existing critical literature around Western normative framing of universal childhood, multiple childhoods, and children's agency, this article looks at migrant children's agency and structural locations as mutually constitutive of each other.

While since last two decades various criticisms have emerged in the Indian context reiterating the hegemonising and exclusionary tendencies of Western framings of childhood (see, for example, Kumar 2016; Raman 2000; Vasanta 2004; Balagopalan 2011; Nieuwenhuys 2009), more recently studies have also begun to question the frameworks of multiple childhood and romanticised versions of children's agency (see Nieuwenhuys 2008). For instance, offering a postcolonial critique, Balagopalan (2018) demonstrates how discourses of multiple childhoods simultaneously hold exploitative liberal underpinnings. She argues how colonial modernity built multiple child figures on existing

cultural constructions of childhood in India. In this frame, marginal native children were constructed as 'incapable of inhabiting universal, singular shared threshold of childhood' (p.39). Furthermore, various scholars in childhood studies caution us about the limits of privileging children's agency and voices without adequate definitional clarity, conceptual rigour, and reflexivity while studying and theorising children's lives (Tisdall, Kay, and Punch 2012; Gleason 2016; Spyrou 2011). Such constructions of agency following development of social construction of childhoods and multiple childhoods have often been employed as 'mantras' (Tisdall, Kay, and Punch 2012, p.7) or 'obligatory act of faith' (Nieuwenhuys 2013, 6) by scholars of childhood studies and other allied disciplines.

Many contemporary scholars of childhood see the possibility of going beyond ironclad and dichotomous conceptual categories (that ignores the 'messier in-between') within and beyond childhood studies to understand children's lives and experiences wherein relationality, contextuality, and macro-level structural constraints of children's lives and agency are given their due place (Tisdall, Kay, and Punch 2012; Gleason 2016, 448). For example, in order to navigate the deadlock between universality and relativity in children's rights, Imoh (2011) argues that it is essential to formulate a 'middle ground', where children themselves live their lives. This, she argues, would in turn facilitate better means of dialogue and community participation. Analysing dichotomies such as agency/structure, nature/culture, and being/becoming in the modernist sociology of childhood, Prout (2011, 8) explains that dichotomies such as these 'exclude all that lies beneath and between them, effacing their mutual dependence and occluding important features about the way in which contemporary childhoods are constructed'. He argues that it is necessary to include the aforesaid 'excluded middle' to understand the complex phenomenon of childhood. Drawing upon the aforesaid critiques around the theoretical canons of multiple childhood(s) and children's agency and middle ground(s) in understanding migrant children's experiences, this article argues that structural locations of migrants' socio-spatial marginalisation and children's own agential engagement with the margins are central to questions of exclusion and discrimination in sites of education.

Research design and some ethical considerations

The main objectives of the present study were to explore migrant children's everyday experiences of living, working, playing, and making sense of place in the city; understand their experiences and aspirations of schooling; and know how developmental agencies such as the state and the NGOs engage with the educational inclusion of migrant children in the city. Fieldwork for the study was spread over 13 months, between January 2017 and May 2018 in the city of Bangalore (located in the South Indian state of Karnataka), which is also a locus for migrant workers from both within the state and outside. Most families of the child participants of the study undertook temporary forms of migration wherein they moved frequently and erratically between their villages and the city or between different informal work sites within the city for livelihood. The families belonged to marginalised caste and religious communities such as Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and Muslims. Intra-state migrants came from drought-ridden North-Karnataka districts such as Gulbarga, Raichur, and Yadgir;

interstate migrants largely came from states of Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, and West Bengal. Temporary migrants hardly had access to basic resources such as housing, sanitation, and water in the city; and children's educational access was affected in both source villages and Bangalore city.

The educational district of Bangalore South, where the research sites were situated, is also known to be having the highest number of out-of-school children in Karnataka on account of migration. I interacted with approximately 88 migrant children – 53 females and 35 males, majority belonging to the age group of 7–12 years – across three different NGO sites, visited their settlements, and interacted with most of their families. Apart from observations and conversations with migrant children, who are the primary participants, and their families, classroom observations in NGO sites and conversations with NGO and state education functionaries were also part of the fieldwork. Data was collected using ethnographic methods – participant observation and informal conversations in children's every day spaces of living, learning, and labouring. Initial data cleaning, coding, and organising were done through the qualitative data analysis software ATLAS.ti, and in later stages, manual analysis of categories and themes was done for a nuanced engagement with data.

Elsewhere, I have laid out the methodological implications of employing Western frameworks around universal/multiple childhoods and children's agency for otherising marginal childhoods in Global South research (Rajan 2020a). Here, I further elaborate upon this problematic by highlighting some of the ethical negotiations in the field. An important ethical requirement of doing research is obtaining consent from the research participants. While I obtained formal verbal consent from the NGO management by submitting a letter from the university, which in turn gave me the licence to be present in the NGO schools and interact with children who attend these schools, obtaining direct consent from children was complicated for many reasons. In the Indian context, it is institutions like family and school that make decisions on children's behalf. When it comes to poor children, this hierarchy is all the more evident, as along with the family and the school, developmental actors like the state and NGOs also claim ownership and responsibility. On the one hand, these are accommodations that researchers in Global South make – though contradicting standard procedures of ethical guidelines – these do raise critical questions about the placement of children's agency in the course of one's research. For instance, how may such accommodations render marginalised children exotic 'subjects of the ethnographic gaze' (Balagopalan 2014, 7)?

The following words of an NGO teacher reflect how this problematic get actually manifested during the course of fieldwork. During one of the classroom interactions, the teacher talked about me to the children, elaborating upon my purpose of observing the classroom. In her own words,

> . . . her (the researcher's) research topic is children like you. What are the problems that you face? Are you able to do something in life? What are your parents doing? How is organization such as ours helping children like you? All these details she will collect. That is why she is coming for so many days. Sometimes she comes with you to your homes, right? And when you do naughty things, she will note down that also. If you speak bad words, she will note down that too. So, don't think that she is just sitting here quietly. She is noting down everything about you.

In the above situation, altering my projected image as a judgemental adult researcher involved multiple and long-term processes such as hanging out with children and their families in their settlements, having sincere and open-minded conversations, facilitating, and helping them with school learning and gradually creating a relationship of trust.

Such engagement is in many ways mediated through the researcher's own personal and social subject positions. For instance, my growing up in a working-class family and my parents' experiences of labour in the informal sector have enabled me to construct a critical perspective towards social exclusion of marginalised communities and thereby engage with them in empathetic and socially just ways. Yet, my current appearance as an educated middle-class woman with short hair, not wearing any cultural symbols of marriage (such as a mangal sutra or a toe ring), often resulted in families perceiving me as an outsider who do not share their socio-cultural and economic locations. There were instances when families offered me food and drinks in vessels that were exclusively kept for 'big (upper caste) people' or 'privileged guests'. Some families were hesitant about sharing sensitive information such as exploitation by their labour contractors for they feared I would report them to the contractors, which might in turn result in loss of their jobs. While such hindrances to establishing a full-fledged rapport with participants continued, there were also identity axes that enabled access to participants more than what I hoped for in the fieldwork. For instance, my gender identity as a woman often facilitated access to women's and children's domestic spaces where they interacted with me much more informally and freely. Similarly, my access to spaces in one of the NGOs was far easier for most of its founder members were my friends and acquaintances.. At the same time, two other NGOs where I did not have this personal relationship encouraged only professional and formal engagement and were even suspicious at times about me learning the inside workings of the NGOs.

The everyday negotiations that the researcher have in the field are thus embedded in networks of social relationships that constitute the field which are in turn mediated through hierarchies such as teacher-student, adult-child, and researcher-participant. The migrant child on the margins of the city – who stand at the intersection of marginalised caste and class locations – get constructed here as objects of developmental work, devoid of agency, to be observed and studied. While the researcher enters the field with an 'obligatory faith' around children's agency, establishing non-patronising rapport and relationships with participants inhabiting the margins of the city within such dominant framing is an ongoing process of negotiation and meaning making for the researcher as well as the participants.

The 'shed' and socio-spatial marginalisation of migrants in the city

As indicated earlier, migrant groups are marginalised not only economically through insecure work and poor pay in the city but also socially through residential segregation, lack of political capital, and limited informal networks of support (Sime 2017). In Indian cities, as elsewhere, the relationship between migrant labour and urban space is so complex that thousands of migrant labourers simultaneously develop the city and occupy its squalors. In Bangalore too, migrants, along with urban poor and other marginalised groups, living in segregated and under-resourced informal settlements are a common sight.

The size of migrant settlements where the participants of the current study lived varies significantly, ranging from around 20 people in smaller settlements to more than a thousand people in larger settlements. These majorly fall under two categories. The first kind is located in privately owned land, where families pay rent ranging from 300 to 2000 rupees to the landowners depending on the size of the shed. The second kind is located in labour camps and construction sites, where the rent is either paid to the contractor or included in the wage. Apart from squatter settlements and labour camps, a small proportion of families live in one/two room houses. Most of these houses have sheet or concrete roofs, with rent ranging from 2000 to 5000 rupees depending on the size of the rooms. While families living in squatter settlements and labour camps are employed in more vulnerable informal labour sectors such as construction work or waste picking, those lived in the third category of houses are engaged in slightly better off informal-sector jobs such as driving, painting, domestic work, or as security guards.

An average shed in the squatter settlement and labour camp measures 4/5 feet, just enough space for the family to sleep, cook, and store their minimal belongings including food and groceries. Most settlements clearly lack basic infrastructure as well as access to resources. For instance, families do not have access to clean water, electricity, waste disposal, and other sanitation facilities. Only some labour camps and settlements are seen having access to solar-powered electricity and makeshift bathrooms. Everyday activities such as bathing and washing clothes and vessels are done in open and unhygienic spaces in and around the settlements. Open defaecation (in the gutters, behind the bushes, along the railway tracks, or in other secluded spaces) is the only option available for most families. Women and young girls are most affected by the lack of sanitation facilities. Such living of everyday domestic life under the public gaze is central to migrants' experience of substandard housing in the city (Jha and Kumar 2016). The life of migrant families thus operates through the politics of visibility and invisibility that ensures the spectral presence of migrants in the economy along with their absence in the formal organisation of social and political life in the city (Samaddar 2020). Migrant families' living conditions are further exacerbated by the apathetic attitude of other stakeholders in migrant lives such as landowners, contractors, builders, and the state. Many families attested to how private landowners ensure that migrants' occupation of their land is temporary. Landowners strictly control the everyday activities of migrant families and impose restrictions on the usage and maintenance of space such as not being allowed to dig a bore well or apply for electricity or water connection using the land address. This is done primarily to prevent migrant families from legally using the address proof in future to claim tenancy rights. This, in turn, makes it difficult for families to apply for identity cards or address proofs in the city that could help them avail of state subsidies and entitlements. Many labour contractors acknowledged that builders do not want to keep the labourers (especially women and children) on the work site, as that would involve legal obligations such as providing facilities for housing and crèches. The shed therefore is not only a physical location that migrants inhabit but symbolises the larger structural context of their precarity and exclusion in the city.

Children's constructions of the classed 'other'

Holistic frameworks around understanding the experiences of communities living on the margins of the city with respect to their residential segregation, stigmatisation, exclusionary citizenship, and marginalised social locations (Aceska, Heer, and Kaiser-Grolimund 2019) are yet to be developed. In particular, understanding how children are situated in unequal and segregated urban areas without access to basic resources and state entitlements is an emerging area of research (Sime 2017). Observations from the current study bring out children's experiences in the city from the vantage point of their socio-spatial marginalisation in the city for it is seen to significantly shape their identity construction, belonging, and agential engagement in the city.

Child participants in the study constantly spoke about their ideas and aspirations around 'good house'. Children would often warn me during the walk towards their 'shed' that their house in the city is not good and that I would not like it. For instance, one child asked me when I visited his squatter settlement, inhabited largely by rag picking families, 'seeing all these, do you feel good about this place? I am not feeling good about this place. I do not like living here. One has to live in a city locality'. Despite being physically located in the city, children were aware how they belonged to the peripheries and not the mainstream of the city. Their marginal locations in the city had implications for their everyday lives in the city, which were often gendered. For instance, it was girls who often shared inconvenience and fear about lack of access to resources and safety in shed houses such as having to go to toilet in open spaces, begging for water with neighbours living in apartment house, and not being able to wear good clothes and ornaments for fear of thieves who target shed houses.

In other instances, parents were heard to be telling their children to study well so that they can build a 'good house' later. Children in their everyday make-believe play in the NGO schools or in the half-built construction sites where their parents laboured imaginatively constructed spacious and differentiated rooms like the bedroom, bathroom, and kitchen, which they aspired to have in the future house. Living in a 'good house' thus seemed central to the process of how migrant children make sense of place and belonging in the city. Figure 1 illustrates Anita's construction (as described in the introductory quote) of the 'real' house she inhabited in the city and the 'ideal' house she desired to inhabit. Their 'aspirational' homes invariably were made of concrete and had multiple rooms and facilities comparable to a middle-class house.

On the one hand, having to inhabit 'shed' houses in the margins of the city, migrant children saw themselves as the 'other' in the city who are socially and spatially excluded from the city's infrastructure and resources. On the other hand, for migrant children, the privileged, who do not have to inhabit the margins of the city, is the classed 'other' from whose space they are excluded. This indicates how experiences in marginal socio-spatial locations of the city are closely connected to 'their relationship with what lies outside of them' (Castañeda (2012) as cited in Aceska, Heer, and Kaiser-Grolimund 2019, 6). Constructions of 'us' and 'them' based on the physical spaces that people inhabit are manifested in many of the observations and conversations with migrant families and children. The following conversation with Lingamma (a 24-year-old migrant woman,

previously worked as a domestic help, now taking care of her two children), Kavitha (Lingamma's neighbour and a 12-year-old migrant child working as domestic help), and Tulasi (11-year-old, Kavitha's sister and out-of-school) illustrates the point.

Lingamma: Where are you staying? Rented room or building?

I: I stay in a hostel; It is like a rented room.

Lingamma: Which water do you drink? Is it Kaveri water (provided by the city water supply board)?

Tulasi: She must be having filter water.

I: Yes, there is a common water filter in the hostel I stay.

Kavitha: You are so lucky. To buy water, its costs us two rupees per pot. It is good that you have a water filter. For us we must beg for each pot of water. For you, water comes to where you are. We must look for it. It is so difficult for us. You should not get born as poor people. It is our fate. If you are in building (house), you get everything. Otherwise, you must wander like us. It is difficult to carry heavy pots with water all the way back to the settlement.

I: I can imagine that. It is not fair.

Lingamma: How do you cook? You might be having all facilities in the kitchen, gas stove, cooker, and mixer.

I: I have an electric stove, have not got gas stove yet. Cooker and mixer, I have.

Lingamma: We also have it in our homes in village. Here there is no electricity in the shed and mixer cannot be used. Cooker will get spoilt here. When we were in Kengeri (another part of the city) last year, we were in tin sheet house in a labour camp. There we used to get water inside the settlement.

I: (pointing towards a makeshift stove made using a paint box, in which Lingamma was cooking roti (bread)). Does this stove work well?

Lingamma: Yes, it works well. For just two pieces of firewood, I can cook rice (anna) and curry (sambar).

Tulasi: Do you have plants and roses in front of your home? Do you have a dog?

I: I just had one plant at my room. I do not have a dog.

Lingamma: (Looking at my hands) Girls, see her hands, how white they are.

I: That is because I do not do physical hard work like you all in the sun.

Tulasi: No, it must be like this from the time you are born.

Lingamma: You are listening to our lives! Your life is only good. One should not be born as poor.

In the above conversation, Lingamma, Tulasi, and Kavitha were trying to know more about where I belonged in the city. The socio-spatial place I inhabit in the city and its associated modes of living are central to their inquiry. Not just the physical structure and

form of home in the city but its cultural and material embodiments matter to families and children. A well-equipped kitchen, a garden around the home, plants and pets, and access to water and electricity are perceived as integral to ideas of a good home. Their identification of the comparative whiteness of my hands as an inherent characteristic that embodies identities of gender and class is reflective of how they construct the researcher as part of the 'privileged other' in the city.

Research with migrant children shows that they are often aware of their marginal locations and the social hierarchies that reproduce them (Woronov 2004). In the Indian context, for instance, Crivello and Crivello and Vennam (2012, 224) discuss how children in poor communities list attributes that distinguish 'poor', 'middle-class', and 'rich' families in their communities. This classification is based on three criteria: one, material goods and services that rich and poor families have access to; two, social relationships and interdependence between poor and rich families in the community; and three, differential lifestyles and access to schooling that rich and poor families. In the current study, what emerged as central to children's classification of the 'other' in the city is the houses people inhabit, which in turn is mediated through caste and class locations. In one instance that I have discussed elsewhere (Rajan 2021b), Kanaka, an 11-year-old migrant child from Raichur, talked about three types of houses in the city: 'Thakidu mane', 'badege mane' and 'building' *(shed house, rented home and building)*. For Kanaka and her friends, it was poor people who lived in 'shed houses' and the rich and dominant caste people who lived in the 'buildings'. And such inhabiting was relational as she elaborated further how the rich has money and the poor has debts, and the reason why the poor continue to have debt is because they are dependent on the rich for money. Furthermore, 'social class is always already casted' (Yunus 2022, 110), particularly in the case of temporary migrants as most of them belong to marginalised caste categories as indicated earlier. Kanaka thus not only captured physical modalities of houses people inhabit in the city but also the socio-economic and structural modalities that marginalise migrant families into 'shed houses.'

Such embodied place-making makes evident, one, the involvement of human agency in the physical construction and social production of a place and, two, the close connection between physical environment and people who experience it in their everyday lives (Sen and Silverman 2014). Furthermore, both agency and structure are implicated in children's construction of 'us' and 'them' (Gustafson 2009).

Imaginations of 'shed' and 'shed makkalu' in sites of schooling

Migrant families' marginalised socio-spatial locations not only lead to challenges related to documentary evidence such as residency proof in obtaining access to schooling but to various other forms of exclusion such as lack of transport to school, absence of physical and social support structure for education at home, safety and security in places of stay, and discrimination and differential treatment at schools. Furthermore, informal livelihoods of families living in shed houses also meant that children take up substantial part of household work such as cleaning, washing, cooking, collecting water, and sibling care, which were responsibilities of girls in most families. Though some of the boys too engaged in aforesaid work, they were largely involved in works such as safeguarding

sheds in the squalor from thieves, snakes, or rats and building new sheds in circumstances of relocation to a new settlement. A small number of children supported their family by helping parents in their jobs such as domestic labour, construction work, and rag picking.

Formal schooling system does not address or accommodate these lived realities of 'shed makkalu.' To elaborate an example, the work of collecting water is an everyday activity that migrant children engage in. Since public water supply does not reach migrant families, they often collect water from generous apartment owners/dwellers in the neighbourhood for two rupees per pot. This work was mostly done by girl children, as adult members were largely away for work during the daytime. In many settlements, children waited and collected water on those days of the week when the state water authority supplied water, even if it meant taking off from school on those days. State schools did not have any flexibility in the school schedule for children to attend to such household chores that can be done only at specific times of the day. In NGO schools where some flexibility was allowed, learning was only minimal, and school only acted like a day care space where children spent their time while parents are away for work.

Research shows that even in contexts where migrant children were excluded from mainstream schools, they perceived these schools as superior to the differential schools on account of quality of teaching and opportunities for social integration (Wang 2008). In similar veins, child participants of the current study who are enrolled in NGO bridge schools often seem to aspire to enrol themselves in 'real' schools whether government or private. While children differentiate government from private schools in terms of their capacity to afford and differences in the quality of teaching, learning, and resourcefulness, they view NGO schools as lacking the features of a 'real' school. For some of them, the lack meant school uniforms, which were freely distributed in the government school, but not available or mandatory in NGO schools. For some, it meant the presence of a same aged peer group in a mainstream school, which was absent in NGO schools where children of all age groups were made to sit together in the same classroom. And for some children, what mattered was the absence of 'real' subjects such as science and mathematics in NGO schools that focussed only on bare minimum skills on literacy and numeracy.

The small percentage of children who managed to get mainstreamed to regular schools through the mediation of NGO schools experienced differential belonging in schools on account of their marginal location in 'shed houses' and identity tag as 'NGO children' in the city. The following conversation, Shreya, a 16-year-old migrant girl from Bihar who got enrolled into a low-cost private school, illustrates the point.

I: How was your experience in the (private) school?

Shreya : It was good. There were 48 children in my class, out of which only 10 were from the NGO school. Most of the other children were from big families, they will not be become friends with us easily. I had good friendship with one girl, but not so much with others.

I: Did the teachers treat you differently?

Shreya: Not really. We were treated equally. But sometimes we are called as 'NGO wale' (those belonging to NGO school). Then I ask (myself), 'Are we different? We are also students at this school. Outside this school we may be attached to the tag of NGO, but inside we belong here like everyone else. Why do you call us NGO children, NGO children?' I had a class teacher in 6th, when I was not able to talk in English, she encouraged me. She has never treated me,

taking the name of the NGO. But not all teachers are like that. Everyday there are complaints that NGO children are not neat and clean. During morning assembly time, they check if our hair is tied properly, if we have come clean and so on. If not, teachers take those children out of line and hit them. Most of them come with ribbon. But if someone has got a different colour ribbon, they will hit. When the bell rings, automatically we have to organise ourselves. If we do not do homework, we are made to do sit ups and will be hit. Some children leave their hair uncombed, and shoes uncleaned. What to do? Many of them live in 'shed houses' (emphasis added) and difficult environments. One or two children do not come neat, but everyone is blamed together in the meeting as 'NGO children.'

While children made sense of the 'shed house' in terms of what it means to inhabit the margins of the city and aspired living in 'good houses' that the 'privileged other' inhabit, the school classroom presented a depoliticised imagination of where people lived their lives. The following excerpt, about the characteristics of how a good house should be, from a textbook lesson taught in an NGO school for migrant children illustrates the point.

There should be sufficient light and fresh air in the house. So, it should have large windows and doors. There should be sufficient space around the house. There should be a kitchen garden in this space. There should be protection from thieves and robbers. So, the windows and doors should be strong. To avoid the worms and insects, the house should be cleaned every day. To protect it from rain and to avoid the entry of snakes and rats, the roof should not have cracks or holes. Wastes should not be put around the house. It should be swept, and the surroundings kept clean. The wastes must be put in the dustbins. The wastes in the dustbins should be kept far away from the house. Care should be taken to avoid the stagnation of water around the house and in the drainage. Dunghills and drainage stagnation around the house should be avoided.

The textbook further listed a poem which discusses types of houses that people inhabit:

The tent is easy to carry. A hut is easy to build. House of red and brown tiles. House with a thick roof. Terraced house with cement. All houses are beautiful. All of us need a house to live in.

Such a description of a 'good house' was in reality an antithesis to the 'shed houses' where children lived. While children were encouraged by the teacher to aspire for a 'good house', the curriculum and classroom conversations were silent about how marginal locations of migrant families and children were structurally shaped in the city and how children themselves aspired to escape their locations, despite their agential engagement in making sense of the place. Such texts further expose the discordance between children's own experiences and curricular conceptions that label their lives as 'low quality' and thereby reproducing their marginality (Woronov 2004).

Such identity construction around marginalised children is reinforced through its everyday use in schools, which in turn is a characteristic of Indian modernity within which the institution of formal schooling has often played a 'civilising role among marginalised populations' (Balagopalan 2003, 56). Verbal and physical aggression, humiliation, and undignified treatment by teachers often reflect a deficit model which in turn ignores the structural locations of children from marginalised communities such as the 'labour class' children (Yunus 2022) or in the case of this research, the 'shed makkalu'. Many teachers in regular schools, whom I interacted with, believed that migrant children are out of school because of parental indifference and erratic mobility patterns of families

and that migrant families and children are interested in collecting freebies from the state but not in real education (Rajan 2021a). Furthermore, children from poor migrant families living in shed houses are perceived as undisciplined, unhygienic, and having broken families.

It is emphasised by many functionaries that 'shed makkalu' are under negative influence in terms of behaviours and attitudes, where instances such as not taking bath regularly, uttering bad words, using substance, keeping surroundings unclean, and experiencing violence at home are all attributed to their poor background. Consider for instance the following words by educational functionaries.

> . . . we try to understand behaviours of drop out children. The problem is that even if they are enrolled, they do not leave their regular antisocial activities. We cannot even imagine the things they do . . . They learn these habits in slums. All these are challenges for teachers . . . (Cluster Resource Person, Government School)

> There is lot of violence these kinds of families. One man has many wives, wives also have multiple relationships. Their family ties are not strong. The child is also not much bothered about all these . . . These parents are not much bothered about children . . . Mother and one child will be staying here (in the city), and father and another child will be staying in village. This will affect the children. They do not have any family bonding . . . (Teacher, Government School)

> Though we assume that migrant children are vulnerable, at the end of the intervention, we feel that they are no longer vulnerable. They get everything free for their education. Migrant families also have their own system of survival and perceptions, their own decision making. They spend a lot during festivals and marriages. They buy smart phones and eat lot of non-veg food too. But when it comes to investment in their children's education, they are not willing. Sometimes we think poor are really poor, but they earn good amount of money. (Founder member, NGO school)

> . . . You cannot imagine how these children were when they first came. They were so raw, so dirty. Even to talk to them, you need to maintain some distance. And now you can see the improvement, how they are developing. Still, a few of them are dirty, it is okay. Some people will remain dirty, what to do . . . (Teacher, NGO School)

The reality of migrant families' lives often stood in contrast to aforesaid narratives. For instance, most migrant families and children have very close family ties, both with their immediate and extended families. Many of the migrant families are in debt due to events such as marriages that happened in their extended families. Many families have strong social family networks across the village and the city. Yet, differential constructions of migrant families as deficient and as having dysfunctional families shape the dominant discourses of their realities.

Such normative discourse of the 'poor' childhood is also used to justify differential access to education and schooling. For example, in a high-level meeting with civil society organisations, one Block Education Officer in the city suggested that sports schools must be started for migrant children, as children from such backgrounds are good in physical activities rather than cognitive skills that regular schools teach. He summed up his talk by saying that a 'dog's tail can never be straightened', indicating that 'poor' children can be taught only what they 'can' learn. In contrast to this, a district education functionary suggested in the same meeting that what is needed is more standardisation and universalisation in terms of language and curriculum. This view does not consider the varying

geographical, linguistic, and cultural backgrounds of migrant children and the difficulties these pose for children's school enrolment in the city where the available medium of instruction is only Kannada (in government schools) or English (in private schools). Instead, it proposes an alternative and differential model of education for migrant children on account of their 'multiple childhoods' and need for active participation in schooling. This exposes the contradictions of how narratives around multiple childhoods and children's agency are manifested in practice. As Bordonaro (2012), from his research in Cape Verde, argues that there exists a constant tension between how developmental interventions imagine child protection and reformation and how children's agency is imagined in the canons of childhood studies. Bordonaro rightly points out that it is not the absence of agency that is an issue here but how the agency of marginalised children gets interpreted as deviance that is to be manipulated through educational interventions.

Conclusion

The current study was delimited to understanding the experiences of temporarily migrating children with families in the city. There are various other groups of children situated in the context of temporary migration such as those left behind in source sites and independently migrating without families. The educational experiences of migrant children in these various contexts need to be studied and critically analysed. Another research direction emerging from the current study is to understand migrant children's experiences longitudinally along a spatio-temporal continuum. Such an exploration can create new knowledge in connection to long-term impact of developmental interventions and real possibilities of social mobility that they offer to children on the margins.

Socio-spatial marginalisation in cities is closely connected to provisions and experiences of schooling, and therefore to imagine cities that are 'inclusive, diverse, and socially just', it is necessary to reimagine education in ways that would correspond to such imagination (Nambissan 2017, 316). Yet, there is limited engagement in the Indian context about how larger socio-material context in urban areas shapes children's experiences of education (Yunus 2022). This article explores this crucial link between socio-spatial marginalisation and education in the context of temporarily migrating children who stand at the intersection of multiple structural and inequalities and marginalities such as caste and class. It discusses some of the implications of this socio-spatial marginalisation as mediated through the constructs of 'shed' and 'shed makkalu' and argues that children's location in the margins not only impacts their access to schooling but also shapes how their identities are constructed in teacher beliefs and curricular conceptions.

Through children's own perceptions of their marginal locations in the city and the differential educational landscape in the Indian context, this article critiques dichotomous conceptions around universal/multiple childhoods and romanticised notions of children's agency. I emphasise that while migrant children actively engage with uncertain and erratic contexts of mobility and their marginal locations in the city, the structural conditions of development and education that shape their lives and experiences of schooling cannot be overlooked and subsumed under the theoretical trap of either agency or multiple childhoods. Furthermore, though both ideals of multiple childhoods and children's agency may provide a spectrum within which Global South researchers can conceptually situate their study, real questions around children's lives and educational

inclusion cannot be abridged to such theoretical debates alone. The normative projects of both mainstreaming 'shed makkalu' into universal childhood and schooling and sentimentalising the multiple contextual locations of temporary migrant children (and thereby a differential substandard education) can be exclusionary.

It is thus imperative for Global South scholars to engage in reflexive research (Spyrou 2011) and with structures of marginalisation while contesting simultaneously the Western hegemonic formulations of childhood and children's agency. The task envisaged is not only epistemological and methodological but also ethical and political.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributor

Vijitha Rajan is a faculty member in School of Education, Azim Premji University, Bangalore, India. Prior to joining the university in 2020, Vijitha was a Senior Research Fellow at University of Delhi (2015–2020). In 2018 – 19, she was a Commonwealth scholar at School of Politics and International Studies, University of Leeds, United Kingdom. Her doctoral research is on understanding educational exclusion of migrant children and foregrounds the discord between mobile childhoods and immobile schools in the Indian context.

References

Aceska, A., B. Heer, and A. Kaiser-Grolimund. 2019. "Doing the City from the Margins: Critical Perspectives on Urban Marginality." *Anthropological Forum* 29 (1): 1–11. doi:10.1080/00664677.2019.1588100.

Balagopalan, S. 2003. "'Neither Suited for the Home nor for the Fields': Inclusion, Formal Schooling and the Adivasi Child." *IDS Bulletin* 34 (1): 43–54. doi:10.1111/j.1759-5436.2003.tb00058.x.

Balagopalan, S., and R. Subrahmanian. 2003. "Dalit and Adivasi Children in Schools:." *IDS Bulletin* 34 (1): 43–54. doi:10.1111/j.1759-5436.2003.tb00058.x.

Balagopalan, S. 2011. "Introduction: Children's Lives and the Indian Context." *Childhood* 18 (3): 291–297. doi:10.1177/0907568211413369.

Balagopalan, S. 2014. *Inhabiting "Childhood": Children, Labour, and Schooling in Postcolonial India*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Balagopalan, S. 2018. "Colonial Modernity and the 'Child Figure': Reconfiguring the Multiplicity in 'Multiple Childhoods.'." In *Childhoods in India: Traditions, Trends, Transformations*, edited by T. S. Saraswathi, S. Menon, and A. Madan, 23–43. South Asia: Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315098395-2.

Batra, P. 2015. "Quality of Education and the Poor: Constraints on Learning." Working Paper 4. TRG Poverty & Education. India Branch Office: Max Weber Stiftung Foundation.

Bordonaro, L. I. 2012. "Agency Does Not Mean Freedom. Cape Verdean Street Children and the Politics of Children's Agency." *Children's Geographies* 10 (4): 413–426. doi:10.1080/14733285.2012.726068.

Breman, J. 1996. *Footloose Labour: Working in India's Informal Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Breman, J. 2010. "Neo-Bondage: A Fieldwork-Based Account." *International Labor and Working-Class History* 78 (1): 48–62. doi:10.1017/S0147547910000116.

Castañeda, E. 2012. "Places of Stigma. Ghettos, Barrios and Banlieus." In *The Ghetto: Contemporary Global Issues and Controversies*, edited by R. Hutchison and B. D. Haynes, pp. 159–190. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Chu, E., and K. Michael. 2019. "Recognition in Urban Climate Justice: Marginality and Exclusion of Migrants in Indian Cities." *Environment and Urbanization* 31 (1): 139–156. doi:10.1177/0956247818814449.

Crivello, G., and U. Vennam. 2012. "'Ridiculed for Not Having Anything': Children's Views on Poverty and Inequality in Rural India." In *Childhood Poverty: Multidisciplinary Approaches*. by Jo Boyden, edited by M. Bourdillon and A. Komanduri, 218–236. Palgrave Studies on Children and Development. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dalal, J. 2015. "The Indelible Class Identity." *Economic and Political Weekly* 50 (8): 7–8.

Deshingkar, P. 2022. "Structural Violence and Normalising Human Suffering: Labour Migration during the COVID Pandemic in India." *Journal of South Asian Development* 17 (1): 134–140. February,09731741221077496 Doi: 10.1177/09731741221077496.

Gatt, S., K. Hazibar, V. Sauermann, M. Preglau, and M. Ralser. 2016. "Migration from a Gender-Critical, Postcolonial and Interdisciplinary Perspective." *Österreichische Zeitschrift Für Soziologie* 41 (3): 1–12. doi:10.1007/s11614-016-0236-4.

Gleason, M. 2016. "Avoiding the Agency Trap: Caveats for Historians of Children, Youth, and Education." *History of Education* 45 (4): 446–459. doi:10.1080/0046760X.2016.1177121.

Gustafson, K. 2009. "Us and Them – Children's Identity Work and Social Geography in a Swedish School Yard." *Ethnography and Education* 4 (1): 1–16. doi:10.1080/17457820802703457.

Imoh, A. T.-D. 2011. "Searching for a Middle Ground in Children's Rights in Ghana." *Journal of Human Rights* 10 (3): 376–392. doi:10.1080/14754835.2011.596067.

Jha, M. K., and P. Kumar. 2016. "Homeless Migrants in Mumbai." *Economic and Political Weekly* 51 (26–27): 7–8.

Keshri, K., and R. B. Bhagat. 2012. "Temporary and Seasonal Migration: Regional Pattern, Characteristics and Associated Factors." *Economic and Political Weekly* 47 (4): 81–88.

Kumar, K. 2016. "Studying Childhood in India." *Economic and Political Weekly* 51 (23): 12–14.

Mishra, D. K. 2016. "Introduction: Internal Migration in Contemporary India—An Overview of Issues and Concerns." In *Internal Migration in Contemporary India*, edited by D. K. Mishra, 1–15. India: SAGE Publications.

Mosse, D., S. Gupta, and V. Shah. 2005. "On the Margins in the City: Adivasi Seasonal Labour Migration in Western India." *Economic and Political Weekly* 40 (28): 3025–3038.

Nambissan, G. B. 2017. "The 'Urban' and Education in India: Section Editor's Introduction." In *Springer International Handbooks of Education*, edited by W. T. Pink and G. W. Noblit, 299–318. Vol. I. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.

Nambissan, G. B. 2021. "The Changing Urban and Education in Delhi: Privilege and Exclusion in a Megacity." In *Education and the Urban in India: Working Paper Series*. German Historical Institute London. doi:10.25360/01-2021-00001.

Nieuwenhuys, O. 2008. "Editorial: The Ethics of Children's Rights." *Childhood* 15 (1): 4–11. doi:10.1177/0907568207086941.

Nieuwenhuys, O. 2009. "Editorial: Is There an Indian Childhood?" *Childhood* 16 (2): 147–153. doi:10.1177/0907568209104398.

Nieuwenhuys, O. 2013. "Theorizing Childhood(s): Why We Need Postcolonial Perspectives." *Childhood* 20 (1): 3–8. doi:10.1177/0907568212465534.

Parry, J. 2003. "Nehru's Dream and the Village 'Waiting Room': Long-Distance Labour Migrants to a Central Indian Steel Town." *Contributions to Indian Sociology* 37 (1–2): 217–249. doi:10.1177/006996670303700110.

Prout, A. 2011. "Taking a Step Away from Modernity: Reconsidering the New Sociology of Childhood." *Global Studies of Childhood* 1 (1): 4–14. doi:10.2304/gsch.2011.1.1.4.

Rajan, V. 1 2020a. "Ethnography and Migrant Children: Perspectives and Challenges." *NEOS: A Publication of the Anthropology of Children and Youth Interest Group* 12. http://acyig.americananthro.org/neos/neos-current-issue/

Rajan, V. 2020b. "The Ontological Crisis of Schooling: Situating Migrant Childhoods and Educational Exclusion." *Contemporary Education Dialogue* October, 0973184920948364. Doi: 10.1177/0973184920948364.

Rajan, V. 2021a. "Migrant Children and 'Free' Education in India." *Economic and Political Weekly* 56 (48): 18–21.

Rajan, V. 2021b. "Migrant Childhoods and Schooling in India: Contesting the Inclusion-Exclusion Binary." *Children's Geographies* 1–14. doi:10.1080/14733285.2021.2015288.

Raman, V. 2000. "Politics of Childhood: Perspectives from the South." *Economic and Political Weekly* 35 (46): 4055–4064.

Samaddar, R. 2015. "Migrant and the Neo-Liberal City." *Economic and Political Weekly* 51 (26–27): 7–8.

Samaddar, R. 2020. *Borders of an Epidemic: COVID-19 and Migrant Workers*. Kolkata: Calcutta Research Group. https://ruralindiaonline.org/en/library/resource/borders-of-an-epidemic-covid-19-and-migrant-workers/

Sen, A., and L. Silverman. 2014. "Introduction: Embodied Placemaking: An Important Category of Critical Analysis." In *Making Place: Space and Embodiment in the City*, edited by A. Sen and L. Silverman. 1–18. USA: Indiana University Press.

Sime, D. 2017. "Migrant Children in Cities: The Spatial Constructions of Their Everyday Lives." In *Movement, Mobilities and Journeys*, edited by C. N. Laoire, A. White, and T. Skelton. 271–288. Singapore: Springer.

Spyrou, S. 2011. "The Limits of Children's Voices: From Authenticity to Critical, Reflexive Representation." *Childhood* 18 (2): 151–165. doi:10.1177/0907568210387834.

Srivastava, R. 2011. "Internal Migration in India: An Overview of Its Features, Trends and Policy Challenges." In *Workshop Compendium Volume 2. Internal Migration in India Initiative*. New Delhi, India: UNESCO & UNICEF in Collaboration with Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR) | & Sir Dorabji Tata Trust (SDTT). http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/FIELD/New_Delhi/pdf/Internal_Migration_Workshop_-_Vol_2_07.pdf

Tisdall, E., M. Kay, and S. Punch. 2012. "Not so 'New'? Looking Critically at Childhood Studies." *Children's Geographies* 10 (3): 249–264. doi:10.1080/14733285.2012.693376.

Tukdeo, S., and A. Mali. 2021. "Urban Dislocations and the Politics of Educational Access: Metro Colonies, Bengaluru." In *Education and the Urban in India: Working Paper Series*. German Historical Institute London. doi:10.25360/01-2021-00008.

Vasanta, D. 2004. "Childhood, Work and Schooling: Some Reflections." *Contemporary Education Dialogue* 2 (1): 5–29. doi:10.1177/097318490400200102.

Velaskar, P. 2005. "Educational Stratification, Dominant Ideology and the Reproduction of Disadvantage in India." In *Understanding Indian Society: The Non-Brahmanic Perspective*, edited by S. M. Dahiwale. 196–220. New Delhi: Rawat Publications.

Wang, L. 2008. "The Marginality of Migrant Children in the Urban Chinese Educational System." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 29 (6): 691–703. doi:10.1080/01425690802423361.

Woronov, T. E. 2004. "In the Eye of the Chicken: Hierarchy and Marginality among Beijing's Migrant Schoolchildren." *Ethnography* 5 (3): 289–313. doi:10.1177/1466138104044631.

Yunus, R. 2022. "'Labour Class' Children in Indian Classrooms: Theorizing Urban Poverty and Schooling." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 43 (1): 104–119. doi:10.1080/01425692.2021.2003181.