Social Marginalisation and Education in Pakistan – Findings of a Qualitative Survey

Azmat Ali Budhani, Haris Gazdar, Hussain Bux Mallah and Noorulain Masood

October 2006
(First Draft – Do Not Cite)

Collective for Social Science Research

This report was prepared for the Ministry of Education, Government of Pakistan and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) as part of a research project, led by Dr Emma Hooper, on educational interventions for marginalised groups in Pakistan. The authors would like to acknowledge the guidance received from UNICEF staff in Islamabad and in all the four provincial offices. The Sindh Agricultural and Forestry Workers Coordinating Organisation (SAFWCO), Strengthening Participatory Organisation (SPO), AMAL Human Development Network and Bonded Labour Liberation Front (BLLF) are gratefully acknowledged for their support during the fieldwork. Fieldwork was carried out by the authors. In addition they would like to thank Ms Ghazah Abbasi, Mr Fazeel Ahmed, Ms Fouzia Aziz, Ms Zakia Mangrio, Ms Zumrud Karim, Mr Humayoon Khan, Mr Nazeer Mohib, Mr Kamran Rafeeq, Ms Maimoona Rauf, Ms Saqba Yunas, Mr Ahmed Yusuf, and Ms Rehana Zawar for their assistance in the fieldwork. The authors are grateful to Mr Sohail Javed for his assistance with tabulation and formatting, and to Mr Irfan Khan for editorial support and oversight. The Ministry of Education and UNICEF cannot be held responsible for any views and opinions expressed in this report, which are the sole responsibility, as are any errors, of the authors.

Glossary

autaq	male reception room or area/gathering place for villagers mostly owned by landowner in Sindh
bachak	child house servant, Mekran, Balochistan
badasal	caste without pure linage
baithak	reception room/gathering place for men
begaar	unpaid work, customary and/or forced
bhatiaray	caste with hereditary occupation of water carrying
biraderi	kinship group
chuhra	pejorative term used for sanitary workers/Christians
deen	religion
dera	farm house, or male reception house/area in central Punjab
dunya	world
ghee	cooking fat
Goh	type of lizard
goth	settlement or village in Sindh
hamsaya	tenant or service worker who resides in house provided by Khan in NWFP
haram	food or drink that is not allowed to be consumed in Islam
hari	term in use in Sindh for sharecropping tenant
hisab-kitab	accounting
huqqa	hubble-bubble, traditional water-filtered smoking pipe
Jaangli	pejorative term for original inhabitants of western part of Punjab where land was developed as canal colony
jaati	sub-caste
jaidadi	one who own hereditary land
jamadar	middleman between employer and worker, head of work-gang
jand	milling stone
jhuggi	makeshift hut
jolaha	caste with hereditary occupation of cloth-weaving
jut	traditional camel herders in Balochistan and surrounding areas
kalma	recitation, usually referring to the Arabic verse used for declaring one's acceptance of Islam
kamdar	supervisor of sharecropping tenants in Sindh
kammi	generic term, pejorative, for service castes in Punjab
karobar	business
katcha	non-durable, usually mud construction, or unpaved road
kharkar	Pashto-speaking families who kept donkeys for clay/mud supply in brick kiln
killi	village in Pashto-speaking areas
kisabgar	generic term for service castes in NWFP
kisba	generic term for service castes in NWFP
kuchi	nomadic, traveller
kumbhar	potter, caste with hereditary occupation of making earthen pots
lorhi	pejorative term used for Sarmastani durm beaters
madaris	plural of madrassah
madrassah	institute for Islamic religious education

makhloot	mixed, refers to people of mixed caste or tribe parents in NWFP
maurusi	hereditary, usually refers to hereditary tenants
med	various caste groups in fishing work in coastal Balochistan
mirasi	minstrel, caste with hereditary occupation of drum-beating, musical performance, entertainment, and work for landowning caste as source of information for deaths and marriages
mochi	shoemaker or cobbler, a caste with hereditary occupation related with animal hides or shoe making
mohalla	locality
mureed	disciple
Mussali	pejorative term used for Muslim Shaikhs
nafrat	contempt, repulsion
nai	barber, also caste with hereditary occupation of hair cutting
nambardar	landlord recognized as agent of revenue department in village
naukar	servant
neech zaat	low caste
paoli	caste with hereditary occupation of cloth-weaving
para	culster of households within village separated by hedge particularly in Sindh
paro	cluster of houses marked by thorny bushes, also used for close relatives
peer	saint, mystic, spiritual leader
peesh	palms leaves gathered from wild trees used for rope-making etc
pucca	durable, brick houses, or metalled roads
qasai	butcher, caste with hereditary occupation of butchering
quom	kinship group, caste, tribe, nation
Riksha	three-wheeler taxi
sardar	head of tribe
seyp	system in which service castes get grain for their work at the time of harvest from landowning castes
sifarish	personal recommendation
takhti	tablet used for writing and reading alphabet during primary schooling
tameez	culture, etiquette, manners
thekedar	contractor
usta	artisans who sell their products for cash, mostly Balochistan
vasti	settlement, commonly used in southern Punjab
zaat	caste, race

Introduction

Key definitions and questions

This report provides an analysis of social marginalisation and education in Pakistan, based on a qualitative field survey conducted in August-September 2006 in rural and urban areas of all four provinces of the country. The research is part of a study commissioned by the Ministry of Education and the United National Children Fund (UNICEF) Islamabad office, for contributions to national policy-making. The fieldwork design was based on a secondary review of material on social marginalisation and education reported in an Overview paper, and a paper outlining "Approach and Field Strategy".

The Overview and Approach papers for this study defined social marginalisation in terms of societal processes that systematically place individuals, families and groups outside the mainstream. The construction of a mainstream itself leads to the creation of marginalised groups. The processes of marginalisation were seen as active ones in which some groups tended to dominate others. Five main sources of disadvantage and social marginalisation were identified at an earlier stage of this study. These were: (a) legal status, (b) caste/kinship/traditional occupation, (c) ethnicity/language, (d) religion, and (e) disability.

The former four sources of marginalisation are related to issues of social identity whereas the latter is a matter of individual circumstance. The primary focus of the fieldwork approach was to be on the former types of issues, while matters pertaining to individual circumstances such as disability were to be addressed using the available secondary material. Specific groups were known, *a priori*, to be socially marginalised on the grounds of legal status (e.g. those without full citizenship rights), caste, kinship and traditional occupation (such as people belonging to various service castes), ethnicity and language (local minorities), and religion (non-Muslims, or those belonging to minority sects).

Fieldwork objectives and methodology

The fieldwork was motivated by four sets of research questions. First, who are the marginalised? Starting from the prior list of identified socially marginalised groups, it was important to verify the presence and scale of marginalisation. Second, what are the processes of marginalisation? It was expected that there would be diverse processes of marginalisation within and across locations and these would have given rise to different types of marginalisation. Third, what is the interaction between the socially marginalised groups and the formal system of education? There is not sufficient knowledge, *a priori*, about access of marginalised groups to government schools. Once in school the way children from these groups are treated is likely to affect their chances of success. It is important to know, moreover, the extent to which educational participation reduces or reproduces the effect of social marginalisation. Fourth, what is the experience of socially marginalised groups with non-formal – even indigenous – systems of schooling? The study hopes to document these other forms of education, if any, that have been used by marginalised groups that are outside formal schooling.

In order to address the above questions (discussed in more detail in the Overview and Approach papers) it was decided to rely on qualitative fieldwork based on community profiling, school case studies and individual and family case studies. The process of marginalisation was to be understood through community profiles, and the interaction between education and social marginalisation was to be examined using school and individual/family case studies. A total of 25 fieldwork days (including travel) were available for 8 types of sites – i.e. rural and urban sites, respectively, in each of the four provinces. It was decided, therefore, to deploy questionnaires and checklists (appended in Annex 1 below) alongside more flexible and adaptive tools such as informal interviews, group interactions and participant observation.

Field site selection was done in a purposive manner in order to ensure the coverage of the various aspects of marginalisation, as well as the representation of different types of marginalised groups. A number of specific marginalised groups had been identified for study in the Overview and Approach papers. On the basis of that identification, and given the resource constraints, a fieldwork plan was submitted that attempted to maximize the coverage of diverse regions and groups in the limited time available. An effort was made in that fieldwork plan to include as many different generic types of marginalised groups as possible. In the fieldwork plan it was decided to focus on one site respectively, in rural and urban areas of each of the four provinces. Over the course of the fieldwork with consultation from colleagues in UNICEF the number of sites were increased in some of the provinces (particularly Punjab) in order to ensure greater diversity of coverage. Table 1 provides details of the sites where fieldwork was carried out and the target marginalised group covered.

Table 1: Field Sites and Coverage of Marginalised Groups

Region/province	**Sites identified in approach paper**	**Sites actually visited**	**Socially marginalised group covered**
Urban Sindh	Low-income settlement in Karachi	Karachi Shahdadpur	Seraiki, Hindu Bagri, and low-caste Punjabi migrants
Rural Sindh	Villages in Sanghar district	Villages in Sanghar district; Badin; freed bonded labourer camp in Hyderabad	Bheel share-tenants, including bonded labourers; Kolhi labourers; low-caste Muslim tenants; Muslim migrants from arid zones; freed Kolhi bonded labourers
Urban NWFP	Low-income settlement in Peshawar	Low-income settlement in Peshawar	Service caste families; "*kisabgar*"; "*hamsayas*"; migrants from tribal areas; Kuchi Afghan refugees; Punjabi Christian

			sanitary workers and others
Rural NWFP	Settled village in Peshawar district	Settled village in Peshawar district	Former and current "*hamsayas*"; service-caste families ("*kisabgar*"); mixed marriage families; migrants from tribal areas
Urban Punjab	Low-income settlement in Faisalabad	Brick kiln Islamabad; two low-income settlements in Faisalabad; low-income settlement in Dera Ghazi Khan	Muslim Shaikh brick kiln workers; Christian sanitary workers and others; Changar (rag-pickers); Baloch "*usta*" traders; Haans beggars/travelers; Meerasi and other service caste groups
Rural Punjab	Canal colony village in Faisalabad	Canal colony village in Faisalabad; Canal colony village in Toba Tek Singh; Village in Dera Ghazi Khan; Nomadic groups in Rajanpur	Christian menial workers and brick kiln workers; various service occupation ("*kammi*") groups such as barbers, weavers, potters; Muslim Shaikh bonded farm servants; weak and vulnerable tribes; Pashtun seasonal migrants; traditional "Jut" camel-herders
Urban Balochistan	Low-income settlement in Quetta	Low-income settlement in Quetta; coastal town in Gwadar district	Lachhi; conflict-displaced Marris; Sarmastani, Afghan Kuchi, Bagri, Afghan and other transhumant groups[1]

[1] Transhumance refers to the pattern of habitation whereby families or groups of families maintain homes in more than one location. Although traditionally associated with livestock rearing, transhumance is practiced widely even by people not involved in, or no longer involved in, animal husbandry.

Rural Balochistan	Village in Kech district	Villages in Kech district	Darzada/Ghulam; nomadic Baloch; Zikri; Lorhi

The fieldwork was documented in terms of discrete "interactions". An interaction could be a school inspection, a group discussion, an individual or household questionnaire-based case study, a key informant interview, or an in-depth individual interview. These interactions comprise the substantive qualitative data generated by the fieldwork, and will form the primary basis for the remainder of this report. A complete list of interactions, alongwith a summary of key points documented in that interaction is provided in Annex 2. The specific interactions (identified by Interaction Number) that contributed to particular fieldwork findings are cited in footnotes along the text of the report.

In the interest of respondent confidentiality, names of locations, people and dominant castes and tribes have been anonymized in the report. The anonymized location code conveys the name of the province by the first initial - "S" denotes a site from Sindh, "P" from Punjab, "B" from Balochistan, and "F" from the NWFP. The second initial represents whether the site is urban or rural with "U" representing the former and "R" the latter. The number at the end of the code is the enumeration of the site in the particular urban or rural group in a province. Names of people have been anonymized in interaction notes in Annex 2 to denote the province and gender of the respondent. For example, PF1 is a female respondent from Punjab. In the report, like in Section 4, fictional names have been provided for ease of presentation. Only marginalized caste and tribe names have been anonymized. In some cases, where an otherwise marginalized caste occupied a dominant status in the field site, for example Baloch5 in Dera Ghazi Khan, Punjab, the caste name has been anonymized.

Limitations

The present study marks a new beginning of sorts. There is relatively little empirical research explicitly on the subject of social marginalisation in Pakistan. This is understandable given that the concept is a new one in the policy discourse. There are also very few studies that examine issues of social marginalisation in the context of the education sector. The limitations of this study, however, also need to be stated at the outset.

The study does not claim to be a comprehensive survey of social marginalisation or socially marginalised groups in the country. It proposes a working definition of social marginalisation and applies that definition to actual conditions in a selected number of sites. The definition proposed here emerges from theoretical literature on the issue, but must be regarded very much as a starting point. There is much more work to do before we can have a broadly agreed operational view of social marginalisation in Pakistan.

The study is limited also in the number of sites it was able to cover. There were time and resource constraints within which the work had to be carried out. It is not claimed therefore that all, or even all the significant, forms and processes of social marginalisation have been covered. One obvious omission is marginalisation due to

remoteness. The fieldwork was constrained to relatively more accessible locations, whereas remoteness is a critical feature of social marginalisation in Pakistan. The idea, however, was to provide at least a template based on more accessible areas for possible future studies in remoter regions.

The coverage of specific marginalised groups is also relatively limited. It is clear that there are many more marginalised groups within the districts selected for study, and that these districts themselves represent only a small proportion of the country. For example, the conditions found in plains settled villages of Peshawar valley are likely to be quite different from those in the mountainous areas of the NWFP, or in the districts of the south of the province. Similarly there is much variation within districts, and across districts within provinces. There are also, nevertheless, commonalities in the processes and forms of marginalisation across the country, and it is the identification and analysis of these patterns that is a source of insight.

Finally, more advanced work on social marginalisation will need to take the route of quantitative estimation and verification. This was neither appropriate nor possible within the present study. It is hoped, however, that the present study and similar future studies will contribute to the design and implementation of quantitative surveys in order to better guide policy-making in this area.

Outline

The remainder of this report consists of four substantive sections. Section 1 provides the spatial context of marginalisation covered by the fieldwork. Section 2 reports on the various processes of social marginalisation and their implications for the economic, political and social conditions of the marginalised groups. In Section 3 the findings on the interaction between education and marginalisation are reported. The extent to which the marginalised groups have access to schools and schooling are discussed here, and the main constraints to access and/or utilization of schooling facilities are identified. Section 4 analyses the dynamics of change as well as the patterns of stagnation through individual, family and group case studies. Conclusions are offered in Section 5.

1. Spatial Contexts of Marginalisation

The section provides brief descriptions of the main fieldwork sites with respect to social marginalisation. Settled villages with agriculture at the core of their economies have specific patterns of hierarchy and marginalisation. In many instances the division of space itself is an instrument of marginalisation. Settled agrarian villages also provide the opportunity for observing the relations between the mainstream and the marginalised. In urban settings the dynamics of marginalisation might be less directly observable, as the mainstream and the marginalised might not reside in physically contiguous spaces. Finally, there are varied groups of people that are marginalised not within particular spatial settings, but because they are considered outsiders. These groups consist of families and communities that either consider themselves to be homeless or transhumant, or are regarded by others as being temporary residents.

1.1 Settled villages – hierarchies and margins

Rural field sites included settled agrarian villages in Sindh (Sanghar district), NWFP (Peshawar), central Punjab (Faisalabad and Toba Tek Singh), south Punjab (Dera Ghazi Khan), and Balochistan (Kech district in the Mekran region). These districts and the field sites were purposively selected to represent specific forms of marginalisation, and various marginalised groups that were known to be resident in these locations. Prior knowledge of the sites, therefore, facilitated the field investigations. Brief summaries of the field sites in each area are provided below.

Sanghar, Sindh[2]

The administrative village in Sanghar district where the fieldwork was conducted consisted of a number of smaller *goths* (villages) of various sizes. [3] The largest one, after which the administrative village was named, consisted of over 150 households, while a number of smaller hamlets comprised fewer than 10 households. The area was located at a distance of around 16 km from the nearest town. Although the main settlement SR1 was connected to the town by metalled road, other smaller villages and hamlets within the administrative village were accessible only via dirt track. There was a palpable sense of remoteness, therefore, even within an otherwise well-connected village.

The village economy was primarily agrarian, and the lands were irrigated with canal water. The main winter crop was wheat and in the summer cotton was the most common and profitable cash crop. There were relatively few people in the village who had non-agrarian sources of livelihood, and these included some in the transport sector, and some individuals in government employment. The commute to the nearest town was time-consuming and expensive in relation to the daily wage rate, and it was not feasible for many people to travel every day to seek casual wage labour.

[2] See Interaction Notes IA6-IA28 in Annex 2.

[3] An administrative village, refered to as *deh* in Sindh and *mouza* in other provinces, is the lowest officially-recognized unit of land and population in the Population Census. The administrative village is, in essence, derived from the land revenue administration system, and may not correspond with the actual settlement pattern in any given area. It is possible, for example, for there to be several distinct settlements, with their own social structures, within any given administrative village.

Agricultural land was clearly the most important economic asset, and land ownership was dominated by a handful of local and absentee landlords. One locally resident family belong to Baloch1 caste owned around a thousand acres, while two other absentee landlords (both originally migrants from India) owned several hundred acres each. Another smaller but political influential family of the Sammat1 caste owned two hundred acres. Most of the other residents were either relatively smaller landowners (a small minority) or landless sharecroppers (a majority). In terms of population the largest single caste group consisted of the Bheel community (around 15 per cent of the population). Apart from two or three households who owned some land, all of the Bheels of this area were landless sharecroppers. The Bheels were regarded by other residents as being among the poorest people in the administrative village.

The village SR1 was dominated numerically by the Baloch2 group who were known to have migrated to the area as landless tenants. They too, like the Bheels, were mostly landless. Their social and political status, however, was considered to be stronger than the Bheels. The group that dominated the main settlement of SR1 were the Talpur1 who claimed to be descendents of a ruling family of Sindh. The Talpurs did not own much land, but had experienced upward economic and social mobility from the 1970s onwards through the strong connections that one of their leading number had with a political party and its provincial leaders. The Talpur1 had, like the Bheels and the Baloch2 been landless tenants in the past but had now acquired some land. They were also the most educated in SR1, and both the teachers of the local government school were Talpurs.

The Bheels of this administrative village were spatially divided into four types of settlements. First, the largest group lived in the main settlement of SR1. There was a separate Bheel enclave or *paro* where several Bheel families resided. They claimed that the village area was officially sanctioned as government land, and that they did not depend on any individual landowner for the security of their homestead. Second, a large number of Bheel families were scattered in tiny 2-3 household hamlets located close to the plots they farmed. These families lived on land that belonged to their landlords and faced eviction in case they stopped being that particular landlords tenants. Third, a group of 50 Bheel families had got together to buy land and established their own village. They were the most well off and autonomous among the local Bheels, and had even fielded a candidate in the previous local government elections.

Fourth, a number of Bheel families lived in the village of Sammat1 landlords (SR2) under conditions of high dependence and low autonomy. They faced conditions closest to bonded labour, with frequent vulnerability to verbal abuse and physical violence at the hands of the landlord. The women and men of these Bheel families were generally at the beck and call of their Sammat1 landlords. It was interesting, however, that even among the Bheel residents of the Sammat1 village there was resistance to the will of the landlord – they claimed, for example, that their homesteads were located on officially sanctioned government land even though the Sammat1 landlord asserted property rights over it.

There were at least three other groups that started off some decades ago in a similar position to the Bheels. The Talpur1 of SR1 acknowledged that they were not direct descendents of the former rulers of Sindh, but were an offshoot lineage that was looked down upon by the original Talpurs. Until the 1970s these Talpur1 were all landless tenants of absentee landlords. Before 1947 they had been tenants of Hindu Vanya landowners. They briefly enjoyed property rights as they, alongside other former tenants of the Vanya landlords, were awarded ownership rights to the tenanted plots when the Hindu Vanyas left Pakistan for India. This moment of property ownership did not last very long, as the government re-allocated this land to incoming Muslim migrants from India, reducing the Talpur1 as well as other beneficiaries to tenant status. Another group that, on the face of it, had similar economic conditions to the Bheels were the Baloch2 group that had migrated from upper Sindh to do tenancy in this area. Both the Talpur1 and the Baloch2, however, had strengthened their political and social position, though not necessarily their economic position. The Bheels remained more vulnerable to exploitation by landlords. Another Muslim group that had started out at the same level as the Bheels were the Ibupotas. They remained poor and landless, and without much political influence. Many of the Ibupotas were clearly worse off than some of the Bheels in the area in terms of livestock ownership and housing conditions. Yet the Bheels reported a greater degree of vulnerability to exploitation than the Ibupotas.

Finally, there was a small cluster of households belonging to the Kolhi community residing at the edge of the administrative village. These Kolhis were among the poorest people in the area. They worked not as sharecroppers but as casual labourers for local landowners as well as employers further afield. In terms of physical isolation and social marginalisation their position appeared to the most precarious as they were considered to be temporary migrants from Nagar area of Tharparkar.

There were several government primary schools in the administrative village under study, located in the various smaller villages and even hamlets. The largest school, in terms of the number of teachers and pupils, was the one in SR1. There was also the building of government girls primary in SR1 but the school had not functioned for over 6 years. All of the government boys' primary school operated, *de facto*, as coeducational institutions. The SR1 school was established in the early 1980s and had a small decrepit building with just one functional room. Children of all 6 grades (*katchi* till 5th) were seated in this one room. The officially appointed teachers had kept another local man to take classes in their place, and were often not present. This was not an uncommon story in schools in the local area. In some cases the private teacher was paid solely by the itinerant government teachers, while in other cases he got paid by the parents. The government school in village SR2 had just one teacher, who attended only intermittently.

Peshawar, NWFP[4]

The village of FR1 in Peshawar district was accessible by metalled road. It was 15 km from the city, and accessible through a frequent and relatively inexpensive transport connection. While agriculture remained an important – perhaps the most important – source of livelihood, there were also other activities including daily wage

[4] See Interaction Notes IA62-IA90 in Annex 2.

labour, government sector jobs, and migration to urban centres and abroad. The village area and population was divided into several distinct *mohallas* and *killi*s (small villages), though the bulk of the population resided in or around the main settlement of FR1. The village was well-served with infrastructure – road, electricity, telephone – for several decades. The agricultural lands were well-irrigated and wheat and sugarcane were the main crops.

There was an established traditional hierarchy of land ownership and status with the Khans at the top. Originally all land, including homestead land, belonged to the Khans. The Khans considered themselves racially distinct and superior to other inhabitants and traced their land ownership through lineage. The other groups in the settlement were the *hamsaya* or *kisabgar* of the Khans. Some were tenant farmers whereas others were service workers and artisans. All had lived in houses provided by the Khans, and could be evicted at will. There were some among the tenants, however, who claimed to be hereditary tenants (*maurusi*) and claimed rights to land on that basis. The cultivators were referred to as Awans and Maliks, and the other service castes by their various occupational names or by generic derogatory terms such as *kisabgar*. Numerous families from other neighbouring regions, particularly tribal Mohmand areas had also settled in FR1 and mostly worked as *hamsayas* and tenants of Khans. There was also a group of families known by some as *makhloot* (or mixed) who were thought to be of mixed tribal ancestry.

Various segments of the original village were identified by the fortress of the particular Khan who lived in the locality. Although the other groups – which were clearly more in number than the Khans – enjoyed a great deal of autonomy, the Khans continued to dominate land, politics and social structures. While most of the former *hamsayas* and *kisabgars* had bought plots of homestead land from the Khans, there were still many who lived in houses provided by the landlords. Among the former dominated groups, the Awans and the Maliks – i.e. traditional cultivators with hereditary interests in land – had emerged as upwardly mobile. The tribal migrant *hamsayas* and the former service castes (*kisabgars*) remained at the bottom of the social hierarchy.

FR2, a small settlement at the distance of around one and half kilometre from the main settlement of FR1, had families from various castes of the tribal Mohmand migrants. The tribal migrants, or *hamsayas*, lived in a remote part of FR1 and continued to work on the lands of Khans. None of the Mohmand families owned agricultural land, although some had purchased plots for constructing their homes. Many lived in *katcha* houses owned by Khans. FR2 had poor infrastructure – a connection to the larger settlement though an unpaved tract and no phone connections. FR2 had been electrified a year ago.

Being at a lower social stratum, Mohmands were often subject to verbal abuse by the Khans and had to regularly perform *begaar* (coerced labour). The few educated and upward mobile Mohmand families had achieved economic improvement through family members working abroad.

The Union Council headquarter, which was around 2 km from FR1, had a number of government and private schools. There were two government primary schools, separate for girls and boys. Both girls' and boys' primary schools were functional and

more than four decades old. The boys' school was upgraded in 2006 as a model school. Children are enrolled in *awal adna* to class 5 and attendance of students and teachers was satisfactory.[5] There were two teachers posted in government girls' primary school and ten in boys' primary school.

While the headmaster of the boys' school was from a dominant caste group, seven teachers were from the *maurusi* castes and two from *hamsaya* or *kisabgar* castes. Both the teachers in the girls' school were not local. The headmistress was a Punjabi speaking woman from Peshawar and the other teacher was a Pashto speaker from a nearby urban locality. In both schools, religious symbolism was used in teaching and Quranic verses and religious sayings were inscribed on school walls. Although the male teachers were aware of the social hierarchies in the community, they claimed to know nothing about its manifestation in the school premises.

A private primary school, established in FR1 in 2002, had a student body of almost hundred children from landowning classes and upwardly mobile families. A charity primary school, established in the last five years close to FR2, also had almost hundred students. Population of the *hamsaya* settlement prefered to send their children to the charity school instead of the government or private schools due to the shorter and safer route to school. The proportion of girl pupils in the charity school was higher than in the private school.

Faisalabad and Toba Tek Singh, Punjab[6]

PR1 and PR2 were settled rural settlements created during the development of canal colonies in the early twenthieth century in central Punjab. PR2 had four hundred households and was almost twenty kilometres from the Toba Tek Singh city. PR1, with close to 300 housheolds, was around fifty kilometres from district headquarter Faisalabad and connected by a fifteen kilometre long metalled road to township "J".

Land cultivation, livestock rearing, daily wage work and government jobs were the common livelihood strategies adopted by residents of PR1 and PR2. Traditional cultivator castes had a monopoly over land ownership with the size of landholdings not exceeding 25 acres. In PR1, upwardly mobile families were involved in the transport business as truck owners or other transport related workers. In PR2, most of the population was involved in agriculture related daily wage work in the village and its surrounding areas. In both villages, people were also employed overseas but the proportion of such people was relatively higher in PR2. Sugarcane, wheat and maize were common crops in both villages. Most of the streets and lanes in these two villages were brick-lined, with open *pucca* drains running alongside.

In PR1, there were three dominant castes - Jat, Rajput1 and Syed, all of whom had migrated different parts of India decades ago. Syeds, due to their small numbers but influential position, were often a sought-after ally by the other two dominant groups.

[5] It was a norm in government schools to manage a class before class 1 to acquaint children with basic concepts. This class was referred to as the *awal adna* in some areas and *katchi* in others, and the students in this class were not registered. This class will be referred to as pre-school, *katchi* or *awal adna* interchangebly in the report.

[6] Interaction Notes for Faisalabad and Toba Tek Singh are given in IA123-IA134 and IA137-IA138 respectively.

nai, mochi, Mughal (ironsmiths) and Baddu were the traditionally socially marginalised groups, which were also locally referred to as *kammi* caste groups. At the time of the migration from India, Jats and Rajput1 brought these service castes with them to work for payment in kind (referred to as *seypi*). The Christian brick kiln workers were also marginalised on the basis of religion. In PR2, there was only one landowning caste, Araeen, which dominated other cultivator and non-cultivator caste groups. Another marginalised group of internal migrants, pejoratively called *Jaangli* Baloch, was also landless and in the lower rungs of the social hierarchy.

Seyp was the name of a livelihood system present in both villages. By this system, *kammi* caste groups worked for landowning castes and were paid in kind at the time of harvest. The number of *kammi* families involved in this system had been declining over the last few decades, though some families continued to be engaged in *seyp*. Many families of the Muslim Sheikh caste group in PR2 also worked as *naukars* (paid servants) for the Araeens. *Naukars* were amongst the lowest strata in the social structure. They were derogatorily treated and physically punished. They were often indebted to the Araeens, some over generations, and their employment could be categorized as bonded labour.

The government boys' primary school in PR1 was administered by the headmaster of the Government High School and was near the main entrance of the village. The government primary school for girls was inside the settlement. The boys' primary school was in one of the four buildings within one boundary wall of the PR1 Boys High School. In PR2, there was no high school for boys or girls and the government primary schools for both were on the main road connected to the village extension. A sizable majority of the teachers in the primary schools were from landowning or upwardly mobile cultivator caste groups. Shortage of furniture and delay in receiving textbooks were common complaints from teachers. At the primary level, teaching Urdu and English using Punjabi was also amongst their concerns. While the teachers of the government schools had information on the caste hierarchy in the society, they refrained from an open discussion on the caste system inside the schools. Cases of religion related food taboos in schools were also reported. Muslim children and teachers did not share eating or drinking utensils with Christian children. There were private schools in both the central Punjab fieldwork sites.

Dera Ghazi Khan, Punjab[7]

PR3 was an area which had experienced a rapid increase in agricultural value over the last few decades. With canal irrigation, this previously barren land has become an area for rice and wheat cultivation. The *mouza* PR3 consisted of over 9 localities or *vastis* within approximately 5 kilometres of each other, with four out of nine *vastis* linked with the road. Eight out of these nine *vastis* were solely populated by the Baloch5 caste, while one *vasti* was of the non-Baloch *kammi* caste group of *qasais* (butchers). Overall, the power and politics in the surroundings of the *mouza* was centred around the Baloch3 tribe which was believed to be the "actual Baloch". Thus this predominantly non-Baloch3 *mouza* was also somewhat marginalised from development efforts. However, within the mouza, the Baloch5 marginalised the *qasais*.

[7] See Interaction Notes IA139-IA148 in Annex 2.

Previously *qasais* and other *kammi* castes were called upon by the cultivator Baloch to render services, but this connection had been severed in the last few years. A large number of Baloch5 families owned homestead and agricultural land, while none of the *qasais* owned either types of land. Other than agriculture and daily wage labour, many people from the Baloch5 caste were also employed in skilled jobs in a private firm. No one from the *qasai vasti* was employed in this company.

There was only one school building in the mouza. The school was sanctioned in 1989 but had been closed for most of the time since then due to no teachers. Its building was in poor state of repair, and there were overgrown fields that had blocked the only path to the building. Children from the Baloch5 and *qasai vasti* of PR3 traveled for three kilometres on dirt track by rickshaw or foot to access government and private schools in a predominantly Syed village. Parents criticized the quality of both private and government schools, and the unfair distribution of textbooks and ghee, and the "rude" behavior of female teachers in government schools.

Another field site, PR4, with around 300 *katcha pucca* houses, was inhabited by *kammi* and *Muslim Shaikh* castes who lived under the domination of Syed, Baloch5 and Baloch3. This settlement was within the premises of the Union Council headquarter, close to the metalled road. A primary school was sanctioned for PR4, which was believed to have been moved to a village of an influential Baloch3. The *mirasi* (minstrel) caste group followed its traditional occupation of performing music at weddings and other functions. Other *kammi* and "*mussali"* castes such as *paoli* (weavers), *khumbhar* (potters) and Bhatti groups had gained some upward mobility though education and overseas jobs. People from the marginalised caste groups expressed concern about political intervention in posting and transfer of teachers, other jobs of teachers and their closeness with dominant caste groups.

Kech, Balochistan[8]

Within Kech, the team visited four sites BR1, BR2, BR3, and BR4. BR1 was 60 km from Turbat with 55 km on metalled road and 5 km on an unpaved route. It was a village with close to 300 households in *katcha pucca* houses. The dominant social groups in the area were Rind and Baloch4, with many landowning families. Darzada, Ghulam and *usta* families were amongst the marginalised, with very few families owning land. The majority of population in BR1 was of the Ghulam and Darzada caste. Ghulams were also refered to as *naukars* in this village.

BR2 was more remote than BR1. It was 60 km from Turbat and 6 km from the main road with the route from main road to village sandy and unpaved. A pickup, which made a daily trip from BR2 to Turbat, charged Rs.100 each side. The village had mostly unpaved roads within the village. Houses of influential people within the community were *pucca* unlike those of most of the population. The major social groups in the area were Baloch, Darzada and Ghulam with the latter two being marginalised and close to 70 percent of the 250 households. Ghulams were refered to as *karangish* in this area.

[8] See Interaction Notes IA171-IA189 in Annex 2.

BR3, around 25 km from Turbat, and approximately 3 km from the metalled road, was in a mountainous region with unpaved roads. Many houses in BR3 were *katcha* or partly *katcha*. BR4 was selected to explore the dynamics of Zikri marginalisation. BR4 was along the main road around 20 km from Turbat, with unpaved roads within the village and populated primarily by Zikris. There was no access to electricity or gas in all four rural sites.

The local economy in all four rural sites centred on farming and date plantations. Both local and migrant workers worked on agricultural land in Kech. Economic improverment was perceived to be related to military recruitment for the Oman Army and migration to the Gulf regions in the 1970s.

Schools in all four sites were reported to be functional. The BR1 boys' high school was established in 1938 and upgraded in 1962 and 1994. The school was located in the centre of the village and had a predominantly "pure Baloch" student body. Ghulam and Darzadas were identified by the community as caste groups who did not send their children to school, primarily because of their low economic standing. The BR1 girls' middle school was close to the village centre. It was established in 1991 and upgraded in 1999. The building was small with rooms and teachers less than the number required for the 170 children student body. The idea of multi-class teaching seemed inherent in the design. The teachers expressed concern about apathetic attitude of families towards their children's education. Teachers in this school, like those in the boy's school, identified Ghulam and Darzada as caste groups who did not send their children to school.

The boy's school in BR3 was near the entrance to the village. The school catered to around 200 students in the primary section, 64 students in the middle section and 95 in the secondary section. Due to a lack of a girl's high school in BR3, around 50 girls studied in the boys' high school. The student body consisted of Baloch4, Darzadas, Bizenjos and Ghulams. The girls' school in BR3 was more remote, on a mountain, around 1 km away from the village centre. This posed issues of security and accessibility to female students and teachers. While the girls' school was supposed to conduct classes from *awal adna* to class 8, the senior most class was not being held because of a lack of teachers. The teachers identified an increase in the number of students over the years and reported a growing trend amongst various groups in the area of sending their daughters to school. Ghulams were identified as a group with continued poor access to education. The teachers believed that the reason for this was that the "Ghulam children were not as smart as those of other castes".

The schools in BR2 and BR4 were reported to be functional by the community. In BR4, a Muslim teacher was appointed to teach a predominantly Zikri student body. The curriculum here was the one followed in other schools, including Nazra classes and Islamiat.

The social structure in these sites was dominated by landownding *sardars* from dominant caste groups - Rais, Gichki, Rind etc. Groups marginalised vis-à-vis the Muslim dominant castes were (i) Darzada/Ghulam (ii) nomadic Baloch, and (iii) Zikris.

Darzada and Ghulams were perceived by the mainstream as being racially different from the Baloch. Proofs of this were claimed to be the difference in physical appearance of the two, or more intangible factors like differences in lifestyle and morality. Understood to be of African origin, Ghulams and Darzadas were seen as descendents of slaves bought by Baloch ancestors. Amongst these two marginalised groups, Darzadas were perceived to be of a mixed – Baloch and Ghulam – origin and thus occupied a higher position in the social structure than Ghulams. Although slavery had been abolished a long time ago, many members of Ghulam families continued to work as servants in Baloch houses for little monetry compensation. On marriages and deaths, Ghulam families adhered to their traditional roles of workers in Baloch houses and lands. A general impression amongst both the mainstream and marginalised population in these communities seemed to be that marginalised groups had little access to government jobs.

Nomadic Baloch were also locally perceived to be "different" from the mainstream population due to the unsettled or nomadic lifestyle of this community. Referred to as *koohi* Baloch (mountain Baloch), many members of the community had led a nomadic or transhumant life, traveling from place to place with their livestock. The teachers in different schools said that children of nomadic Baloch families either do not attend school or drop out early because of their unsettled lifestyle.

Zikris perceive themselves as a sect within Islam, while orthodox Muslims regard them as non-Muslims. The differences repeatedly highlighted by orthodox Muslim respondents were of the words in the *kalma* and specifics of religious rituals. However, there was also a parallel iteration of the belief that "simple" or "ignorant" Zikris were "led astray" by their religious personalities. The mountain Baloch were mostly reported to be adherents of the Zikri sect. There were, however, other Zikris too who were from mainstream and even dominant groups.

1.2 Urban settings

Urban field sites included settlements in Karachi, Shahdadpur, Peshawar, Islamabad, Faisalabad and Quetta. These areas were selected to represent specific forms of marginalisation in urban areas. Brief summaries of the field sites in each area are provided below.

Karachi, Sindh[9]

SU1 and SU2 were located near the University of Karachi. SU1 was inhabited by Bagri, Riasati and Marwari Hindu groups, and Afghan refugees, Pashtuns, Punjabi, Sindhi and Baloch Muslims. Around 40 *jhugis* (huts) in SU1 were inhabited by migrants from marginalised caste groups such as *kutanay*, *nai* and Kuraeen Baloch from southern Punjab. The land for SU1 was taken over by the head of a local *madrassah* in 1987, who invited nomadic groups to temporarily settle in on the land. SU2 housed Muslim internal migrants from Punjab and Sindh. The City authorities had demolished huts and other constructions in SU1 several times, and at least once in SU2.

[9] See Interaction Notes IA1-IA5 in Annex 2.

In SU1, a few Muslim households were provided electricity and water from the *madrassah*. For other Hindu and Muslim households, there was no public water facility, and people usually breached water pipelines going to other residential areas to get water. Livelihood patterns in SU1 were segmented according to gender and age groups: old men and women were mostly engaged in begging, young married women in domestic work, young men in vending vegetables, boys and girls in selling small items and begging, and some young boys in rag picking. Common livelihood sources in SU2 were daily wage work, domestic work, and rag picking. Some households were also involved in begging.

The residents of middle class localities around the settlements perceived the inhabitants as illegal encroachers and held them responsible for reduction of land prices of their neighbourhood. Due to this reason, there was a constant tension between the two parties. The Kuraeen Baloch inhabitants of SU1 claimed that this hostility was compounded by their adherance to the minority Shia Muslim sect.

There had been a few attempts to construct a *katcha puuca* school in SU1 by some teachers from the University of Karachi. The City authorities, though, perceived this effort as an encroachment attempt and bulldozed the structures. Very few children were enrolled in the government primary girls' and boys' schools located in the university campus. Some children from SU2 were enrolled in private schools since there were no government schools near the locality and areas further away were considered unsafe. Women domestic workers were inspired to send their children to school by the example set by school-going children of their employers and some were helped by the employers to admit children in private schools near their workplace.

Shahdadpur, Sindh[10]

SU3 was in the centre of Shahadadpur city, stretching on around 3,000 square metres and comprising of 80 Hindu households. It was along the main road and surrounded by double story bungalows and commercial centres on three sides. Houses were made of rags, reeds and wooden sticks except for one cemented house belonging to an upwardly mobile Hindu Bagri family. There was no gas, electricity, drinking water or latrines inside the locality.

Among the Hindus, there were two major castes - Jandavara and Dhamdhora, the latter locally referred to Bagri. Bagris traced their traditional occupation to be working in orchards. The word "Jandavara" refers to people who make "*jand*" or milling stones for grinding grain. Bagris were involved in orchard-related agricultural work, cotton picking and other daily wage work and begging. Jandavaras continued with their hereditary occupation from time to time but were commonly involved in begging and selling cups, bowls and other household items in rural areas.

Historically, both Jandavara and Dhamdhora migrated from India centuries back, lived in Tando Allahyar and then migrated to Shahadadpur few decades ago. They had been displaced numerous times by settled populations or local administrations, but had been living in SU3 for close to a decade.

[10] See Interaction Notes IA29-IA31 and IA33-IA36 in Annex 2.

One Dhamdhora Bagri household, which experienced upward mobility, had a cemented house on their own land and appeared more inclined towards education. No family from Bagri or Jandavara households was sending children to schools and expressed education as a concern of much lower priority than other more pressing issues like homestead land.

The Jandavaras were on a lower social stratum than the Dhamdhora Bagris due to the former's hereditary occupation as artisans and reptile hunters. Bagris and other locals believe that the Jandavaras also ate reptiles and dead animals and thus refrained from eating or sharing cooking utensils with them. While both Bagris and Jandavaras can be seen as marginalised vis-à-vis the rest of the community, the Jandavaras appeared more marginalised than the Dhamdhora Bagris.

Peshawar, NWFP[11]

FU1 was a large settlement within the Peshawar municipal limits. Parts of it were within the densely populated low-income localities of Peshawar and other peri-urban extensions stretched into nearby farmlands. The main sources of livelihood of the population were skilled and unskilled daily wage labour, agricultural work, brick kiln labour, government jobs and traditional occupations of singing and playing instruments. FU1 had electricity but no natural gas facility.

Majority of the population of the urban areas of FU1 belonged to the *kisabgar* castes and a small minority was of internal migrants from Punjab and parts of NWFP. The *kisabgar* or *kisba* belonged to traditionally marginalized castes and continued to render traditional services to the Khans. The peri-urban settlement housed five major social groups: the dominant Pashtun1 landowning caste; *kisabgar* castes (including *bhatiaray, jolahay* and *nai*); the Toorkhel caste derogatorily called *badasal*; Afridi migrants from the tribal areas and Kuchi Afghans from the Mullakhel tribe. The main landlords in this area were Pashtun1, who were locally refered to as *jaidadi*. While many Afridis had purchased lands, *kisabgars*, Toorkhels and Kuchis continued to live on the lands of Pashtun1. There was also a Christian enclave within the peri-urban settlement, with a predominant population of Punjabi-speaking Christians who traditionally worked as sanitation workers. Some male community members had quit their traditional work and worked as cooks or drivers. The Christian community was pejoratively treated by the local Pashtu-speaking communities and alleged cases of sexual abuse and street crime against the Christian community were reported.

There was a large government primary school in the urban area of FU1, which had seven teachers, four of whom were from the Pashtun1 caste. A five-member school management committee, with a Pashtun1 majority, was reported to be functional. Teachers believed that pupils from *kisabgar* families dropped out early because they "kept bad company". Children from peri-urban areas of FU1 were enrolled in the government primary school, which had been functional since 1989. In addition, there were two private schools in the site. Till the recent past, Kuchi children had been studying in a donor-funded school, which had shut down due to unknown reasons. Afridis generally did not send their daughters to school due to traditional tribal restrictions on female mobility.

[11] See Interaction Notes IA38-IA61 in Annex 2.

Islamabad[12]

PU1 is administratively part of the Islamabad Capital Territory (ICT) and around 10 kilometres from the city centre. It was a brick kiln colony close to a residential area around one kilometre from the main road. The colony consisted of three kilns owned by a person from the Raja caste. Nearby there were around thirty other brick kilns and fifty in another community 8 kilometres away.

Thirty households lived in uncemented houses made from bricks. The locality was spatially arraned in rows of houses called *godis* on three corners of a kiln. The houses belonged to the brick kiln owner. There was office on the entrance of the brick kiln colony, which served as a check-in post to all workers. The workers were mostly Muslim Shaikhs or *kharkar* Pashtuns who were divided into two Muslim Shaikh groups and one *kharkar* groups for ease of management. Each group had a *jamadar* responsible for settling wages, advances between worker and owner and work quality.

The *kharkars* were originally from Charsadda and were traditionally a service caste in their place of origin. Muslim Shaikhs were migrant workers from Sargodha. Both these castes were traditionally from the lower social stratum in their home villages – with *kharkars* dominated by Khans and Muslim Shaikhs dominated by and indebted to *chaudry*s.

All 30 households in the locality were indebted to their employer. The brick kiln owner felt that Muslim Shaikhs had to be kept in stronger control than the Pashtuns because they had a history of escaping from the kiln, which translated into a harsher treatment towards the caste group. The kiln owners were perceived to be able to "re-capture" any Muslim Shaikh who absconded without repaying his debt. For the Muslim Shaikhs the alternative was to become bonded labourers of landowners in their own villages. Many preferred to remain on brick kilns than work as farm servants for *chaudrys* because that work was thought to place the entire family at the beck-and-call of the employer at all hours. The Muslim Shaikhs routinely faced physical and verbal abuse, and insulting behaviour on the part of employers and locals. They complained of physical and verbal abuse and extortion of youngsters on streets by employers, local population and police.

There was no government primary school close to the colony. The community faced various problems in sending their children to private schools such as monetary issues of affording the school fees and uniform, maintaining cleanliness of children and managing studies and work on the kiln. There were only two *jamadar* households that had started to send their children to private schools.

Faisalabad, Punjab[13]

Two distinct settlements were studied in urban Faisalabad. PU2 was selected due to prior information about a high concentration of semi-nomadic people in the locality. This perception was however found to be incorrect as the two sites visited in PU2 had

[12] See Interaction Notes IA91-IA102 in Annex 2.
[13] See Interaction Notes IA103-IA122 and IA135-IA136 in Annex 2.

settled populations of long standing. The residents there did, however, have marginalized activities as their main sources of livelihood and were not integrated into the mainstream agricultural or industrial economy of the city.

The first site within PU2 was a Changar residential area. The Changars, some of whom prefer to use other surnames such as Shamsi or Dogar, were mostly involved in rag-picking, recycling plastic waste, and street vending. The smaller sub-site in PU2 was a community of Baloch Ustakars whose traditional occupation was of making wooden items for sale. They differentiated themselves from traditional village carpenters by emphasizing their independence, historically, from personalised patron-client relations. Many Ustakars had given up woodwork and worked as travelling cloth salespeople in surroundings villages.

The Changars of PU2, though a numerically large group, were living under the threat of persecution and insecurity of tenure. The source of this threat was the local Jat landowners, some of whom were interested in claiming possession of the land on which the Changars lived. There had been serious cases of harassment including several alleged rapes of Changar women by a notorious Jat strongman. Changars claimed to have migrated from India a century ago and previously settled on communal land in a Jat dominated canal colony village since 1947. The *usta* Baloch migrated decades ago from the Mekran regoin of Balochistan and stayed at various other places in Faisalabad and had settled at this current location in 1984.

There were government boys' primary and girls' primary schools near PU2. The boys primary school had seven rooms, and ten teachers from Jat, Araeen, Shah and Rehmani caste groups. The five-member school management committee was reported to be functional with only one member from the Changar community. In the government girls' primary school there were nine teachers, out of which five were Araeen. A primary school called the Al-Shams Primary School, targeted the Changar community exclusively and was run by a small local CBO. There were two female non-Changars teachers from a neighbouring locality posted in this school and almost fifty children were enrolled. The perceptions of the teachers about the Changar were not flattering – they thought that the Changars were involved in sex work, did not bathe regularly and used foul language.

PU1 also had a low-income Christian enclave in the middle of the city. Many residents of the locality worked as sanitation workers for the local government or for domestic or commercial concerns. It had a large government middle school, with nine teachers managing classes 1 to 8. One of the nine teachers was Christian. All seven members of the School Management Committee were from the Araeen and Rajput1 castes. The school building was in poor condition.

Quetta, Balochistan[14]

In Quetta, the fieldwork was carried out in three sites: the urban site of JM and two peri-urban sites - HG and FD. There were almost 350 households in JM, provided with no natural gas and drinking water facilities. However, a large number of households in the settlement had an electricity connection. JM was populated by

[14] See Interaction Notes IA150-IA170 in Annex 2.

internal migrants from upper Sindh and various parts of rural Balochistan, who belonged to the Lanjwani, Sarmastani, and Bagri castes. Hindu Lachhis were also settled here and had migrated from India decades ago. The second site, HG, was chiefly popoulated by conflict-displaced Marris, and a few Kuchi nomad households. Many members of the Marri tribe had migrated to Afghanistan in 1970s and repatriated to Balochistan in 1992. The third site, FD, had around 270 Afghan migrant households.

In JM, begging was the most common occupation among the population, along with other marginalized work such as street vending, and traditional occupations of drum beating and singing. Sarmastanis and Bagris lived on rented land and migrated to the plains in November and returned in March. For the last decade, the Lacchis, who also used to migrate seasonally transitioned to a more settled lifestyle and purchased land through collective action. Very few members of this Hindu community were in government jobs. Sarmastanis (also derogatorily referred to as *lorhsi*), Bagris and Lacchis were locally perceived to be involved in "immoral" activities. The Lacchi community reported an element of religious hostility by the surrounding Muslim communities.

There was a double shift government boys' middle school and a single shift government girls' primary school near JM. In the boys' school, classes for pre-school and class 1 were held in the morning shift, and classes for grade 2 to 5 were held in the evening. While children from Lachhi and Bagri households were enrolled in the school, no Sarmastani child was enrolled. There were six teachers in the boys' school - two Punjabi, two Pashtun, one Baloch and one Hindko-speaking. All nine teachers in the government girls' primary school were Punjabi speaking. The Lachhi students in the government girls' primary school were asked to bring their own utensils for eating and drinking. They did not purchase anything from the canteen and brought food from home. The school headmistress reported that the Lacchi students usually ate together under a sheet "because they ate *haram*".

In the peri-urban site of HG, the predominant population was of the perceived nomadic groups of Marris and Kuchis. Marris lived in *katcha pucca* houses and were seasonal migrants to Sindh in harsh winters. Kuchis lived in make shift houses. Schools managed by the Bonded Labour Liberation Front (BLLF) were functional in the Marri locality since 1993. The BLLF managed primary boys' school had a *katcha pucca* building and had classes for grades 1 to 7. All six teachers in this school were from the Marri tribe. In the Afghan settlement FD, there were two government primary schools for boys and girls but the Afghan children were restricted access to these schools since their parents did not posses the National Identity Card for admission.

Gwadar, Balochistan[15]

The urban field site BU2 had developed from being a small coastal village along the Mekran coast to a developed urban centre with business opportunities and basic facilities. BU2 was connected to Gwadar by a double metalled road and separated by a distance of around 15 km. The improvement of the road from single to double in the

[15] See Interaction Notes IA190-IA199 in Annex 2.

last five years was traced as one of the benefits the city had from the infrastructure development for the port city of Gwadar.

The urban centre BU2 was divided in different localities or *mohallas*. The *mohallas* were mixed with one *mohalla*, for example, housing both marginalised (Lohri and Darzadas), and dominant caste groups. Within the locality, however, a compound structure was observed. Around 10 to 15 households, each with their separate kitchen, shared a compound within one boundary wall. Although BU2's spatial organization in *mohallas* did not reflect a strong segregation on the basis of kinship, religious segregation was of a more palpable nature. Zikris lived in a locality separate from all other localities, close to their place of worship and separate cemetery.

Within the city, the conditions of infrastructure varied. While paved and metalled roads lined the market place, unpaved roads connected different localities together. Basic facilities of electricity and telephone were available in the city. The economy of BU2 primarily centred on fishing. Those involved in fishing were called *meds* in the local language. Fishing played an important role in the settlement of the village as well. Many previously *med* families whose members were involved in other jobs traced their migration to BU2 as an attempt to gain from the fishing economy. Several people were also employed in local government jobs. Families from both marginalised and dominant groups were involved in jobs in the Gulf especially in the Oman Army. Many women, particularly from the marginalised groups, were involved in home-based work – stitching clothes and doing embroidery on orders.

The building of the largest BU2 boys' school was in a poor condition. The school was started in 1950s, and upgraded to middle in 1960s and then to high school one decade later. The classes were overcrowded and teachers complained of textbooks coming in late. The girls' middle school in BU2 was built in mid 1980s and had been upgraded from primary to middle in the last five years. The school seemed to be functioning well with relatively balanced teacher student ratio and provision of basic facilities – books, uniforms, furniture, playground etc.

Numerous local and migrant castes lived in BU2. Amongst these were the dominant Zainozai, Jadgal and Pozj and the marginalised Darzada and *lorhi*. The first mainstream-marginalised divide seemed to be the Baloch-Darzada divide. Physically distinguishable from the Baloch, Darzadas were locally perceived to descendents of slaves of African origin. Another divide, of a more religious nature, was between Zikris and Muslims. Since Muslims were in a majority in the area, a strong Muslim domination could be felt in the public space in BU2. Zikris had adopted an approach of peaceful coexistence, maintaining their religious life and public life as separate. Some of them were in skilled government jobs and they were active participants in education.

Within the Muslim Baloch social hierarchy, the Lohri were also marginalised vis-à-vis others. The hereditary occupation of Lorhis was of ironsmiths who made weapons at time of war. Many children from Lorhi families did not go to school. They are seen by the mainstream to be lacking basic morality and etiquette. Lorhi was the only caste group in BU2 which had a minimal participation in fishing work. Many of its male members were involved in singing or playing instruments and women in domestic work and begging.

2. Dimensions and Implications of Marginalisation

2.1 Hierarchies between kinship groups

The kinship group – defined as a group of families linked together by bonds of common ancestry and family relations – was a basic marker of social identity at the local level in nearly all of the rural and urban fieldwork sites. The dynamics of kinship groups differed between and within locations, and different terms were used to describe social relations in various contexts. Terms commonly used were *quom*, *zaat*, and *biraderi*. In the fieldwork site in rural Sanghar, for example, the term *quom* was used to identify the main kinship group to which a person belonged. Within the *quom* further divisions (e.g. lineages or extended families) were sometimes referred to as *para* (which was also a term for a cluster of houses).

In the Peshawar sites *quom* was often used for tribal affiliation, though at times all people speaking Pashto were also referred to one *quom*. In the urban Peshawar site *zaat* was used to refer to people belonging to "lower" status service providers. The term *biraderi* was more common in the fieldwork sites in central Punjab, but here *zaat* was also commonly used, particularly while referring to the service providers and traditionally marginalised groups. In the rural Balochistan sites (in Mekran) the term *quom* was generally used to refer to people who spoke the Balochi language. Kinship groups were important here too and were referred to as *zaat*.

There were several important characteristics of kinship group (whether described as *quom*, *zaat*, *biraderi* or in other terms) across the fieldwork sites. First, group identification was robust. In the public narrative about communities all individuals and families fitted, ultimately, into one or other kinship group. Second, kinship groups were generally endogamous – i.e. marriages were contracted within the group. There were important exceptions to this broad generalization and these were important for understanding marginalisation, but the norm in most cases was some form of endogamy resulting in the reproduction of the group. Third, accounts of mobility and/or stagnation, were as much about individual enterprise or fortune as they were about group-centred outcomes. Even in cases where an outstanding individual had "risen above his/her station" that person became a focus of attention for the entire kinship group, at least within the locality.[16]

In many cases the practice of endogamy was virtually a matter of contracting marriages within extended families. Cousin marriage was the strongly preferred norm among the Muslims in the Sindh and Punjab sites. In NWFP and Balochistan some of the groups had strong preference for marriage with relatives, while the practice of "acquiring" brides from outside was also not uncommon. The acceptability of marriage contracts between groups established a symbolic hierarchy in all cases. Those families or kinship groups that were considered close in terms of relations and social status were suitable sources of marriage partners. Other groups were considered acceptable as "bride-givers" but not "bride-takers". There were yet others with whom no marriage relations could be contemplated under normal conditions. The Afghan Kuchis in Peshawar were known to demand a high "bride-price" and

[16] This is discussed with refernce to sepecific cases in Section 4 below.

were acceptable "bride-givers" for a number of other Pashtun kinship groups.[17] The same Pashtun groups, however, scoffed at the suggestion of contracting marriages with people they regarded as being "*neech zaat*" or low caste. Similarly, the "pure Baloch" in Mekran could contemplate, under some conditions, marriage relations with Darzadas, but not with Ghulams.

The exceptions to these rules of endogamy found in the course of the fieldwork were instructive. The Scheduled Caste Hindus (in Sindh) were strictly endogamous with respect to the group, but also strictly exogamous with regard to their own blood relatives. Bheels, Kolhis, Bagris and Jandavras encountered during the fieldwork insisted on contracting marriages within their respective groups, but strictly followed exogamy with respect to families that were blood relatives. In fact, all of these groups were further sub-divided into *jaati*s that were strictly exogamous. A Marghat Bheel family, for example, could not contract a marriage with another Marghat, though they could with a Karwah Bheel family if the two did not have any blood ties. The same, interestingly, was true of the Punjabi Christians found in Peshawar and Faisalabad who were further sub-divided into *jaati*s and practiced exogamy within *jaati* while maintaining endogamy within the overall Christian community.

Group identity, therefore, was mostly preserved over generations by rules of endogamy (or in the case of the non-Muslims through regulated endogamy and exogamy). In most cases of cross-group marriage – such as those between kinship groups regarded as equals, or those where one lower status group could be a "bride-giver" – it was clear that group identity passed through the male line.

There were two interesting exceptions to this general proposition. In the rural Peshawar field site one group of families was identified by a number of local informants as "*makhloot*" or mixed.[18] It was said that these were people of mixed parentage but were not accepted by the male side of the family, and hence were left out in the cold. Such families were in sufficient numbers to form their own small cluster in the village. The other set of cases related to marriages between "pure Baloch" men and Darzada women in Mekran.[19] In many cases the extended families of such men refused to fully accept and own the children of these marriages, with the consequence that they lost their "pure Baloch" lineage and ability to contract future marriages with the male side of the family.

Hierarchical relations between kinship groups were perhaps the most important form of social marginalisation across rural field sites. In Peshawar, for example, the traditional hierarchy was headed by Khans with the *hamsaya*s and service groups (known as *kisba* or *kisabgar* in one site and *kammi* in another) making up subservient under-classes.[20] While political and economic changes had reduced the power of the Khans and improved the status of the former subservient groups, many of the remnants of the social hierarchy were clearly present. Khans as a group continued to control much of the land, including homestead area, and through that exerted disproportionate political influence.

[17] Interaction Note IA58.
[18] Interaction Note IA64.
[19] Interaction Note IA176.
[20] Interaction Note IA55.

In the central Punjab villages, the situation was less unequal in some ways but more unequal in others. Here land ownership was not concentrated in the hands of a few but shared relatively equally among the dominant castes (Jats and Rajput1 in one village and Araeen in another).[21] The social hierarchy was stronger, however, as the division between the traditional cultivators (Jats, Rajput1 and Araeen) and the traditional non-cultivators service castes such as *nais* (barbers), *mochis* (shoemakers), *jolaha*/Ansari (weavers), *tarkhan* (carpenters), "mussalis" (also known as Muslim Shaikhs) and "chuhras" (sanitary and menial workers) was sharper. The caste-based social hierarchy in these villages was similar to accounts in classic village studies from northern India. Unlike the sites in Peshawar where at some levels the Pashto-speaking identity also became salient, there was no ideology in the central Punjab villages that could counter or subvert the traditional hierarchy of the village society. Traditional service occupations continued to be viewed as being of low status and corporate power of the cultivating castes was strengthened through their control over key institutions such as the village *nambardari*.

Social division based on traditional occupation was clear in southern Punjab also.[22] In Dera Ghazi Khan and Rajanpur, for example, those claiming high status asserted their ancestry to Baloch tribes or landowning Jam clans. Other service castes such as *mirasis* (minstrels), butchers, weavers and carpenters were regarded as being neither Baloch nor Jam. Here the traditional occupation-based caste hierarchy was compounded by another form of hierarchy – namely between powerful and weak tribes. Tribes or sub-tribes with strong *sardars* (chiefs) were feared by others, and were able to assert their influence in the area.

Social division based on kinship group was perhaps the most complex in Mekran. Here the descendents of former African slaves (Ghulam and Darzada) lived alongside kinship groups that claimed to be "pure Baloch". At one level the ethnic "Baloch" identity had become a countervailing factor in blunting this social and historical division. People belonging to all groups insisted first and foremost on being recognized as Baloch before anything else. This was similar in some ways to the wide adoption of the Pashtun identity by Pashto-speaking people in the Peshawar fieldwork sites.

In some of the fieldwork sites social relations between dominant and marginalised groups remained unequal. Substantial changes had occurred in all places but in some the defining feature of one group was its traditional subjugation at the hands of another groups. The *kisba*, *kisabgar* or *hamsaya*s of the Peshawar fieldwork sites were identified as such quite largely with reference to the traditional hereditary land owning Pashtuns.[23] Similarly, in Punjab the position of the *kammi* and Muslim Shaikh groups was not independent of their relationship (historical as well as current) of service and subservience to the dominant cultivating castes.[24] These labels and relationships were embedded within the histories of these villages, but they also operated independently of locale. A Muslim Shaikh or "*mussali"* found it difficult to escape her or his subservient status even after leaving her or his own village.[25] A

[21] Interaction Notes IA129 and IA137.
[22] See Interaction Notes IA139-IA148.
[23] Interaction Notes IA64 and IA68.
[24] Interaction Note IA137.
[25] Interaction Note IA97.

generic hierarchical relationship was understood and invoked over wide geographical domains and the change of surname was no guarantee of escape from subservient status.

2.2 Migrants, travellers and groups on the physical margins

While the traditional rural and agrarian economy had been premised on particular forms of marginalisation, there were many others who were not considered integral to that economy, but remained on its in fringes. Such peripheral groups were, in fact, substantial in number, and could be found in most of the field sites. They were particularly conspicuous in urban sites where their marginalisation was a function of their relationship with the mainstream economy and society in general, rather than with respect to particular dominants groups or castes.

The Bagris and Jandavaras of Shahdadpur, the Changars of Faisalabad, and the Lachhis and Sarmastanis of Quetta were distinct groups that, nevertheless, had some interesting features in common.[26] They were not, by and large, involved in dependent socio-economic relations with specific patrons. They were thought to be semi-nomadic even though many had stayed in their current places of residence for decades. The Bagris were known for seasonal harvest labour, but also had a reputation in mainstream society for begging and sex work. The Jandavaras were mostly engaged in peddling cups and bowls in villages and buying scrap and junk from the villages. Their traditional occupation of making millstones had all but died away, and many of the women and children from this group were involved in begging. The Jandavara men also had been known as hunters and trappers, though that particular skill too had lost its value with the decline in the availability of game.

The Changars were mostly involved in rag-picking. Men, women and children would scour the city and rural areas for scrap, junk, plastic waste, rags, and paper, to bring to stores for sorting and selling onwards for recycling. Many of them were also engaged, like Jandavaras in selling crockery in villages. Unlike their counterparts in Sindh, the Changars were somewhat defensive about their caste identity. Some liked using the term Shamsi associating themselves with a renowned mystic buried in Multan. Despite living in an area where there were dozens of power looms providing employment to hundreds of labourers, the Changars did not work in that particular sector at all. Employers were wary of hiring them, and the Changars themselves expressed a strong preference for their own traditional activities compared with fixed labouring jobs.

While the Lachhi men and young boys generally worked as cobblers, the married women of this group had been involved in begging. Their young girls had stopped working as beggars as they were verbally abused in the streets, and made cloth dusters at home, which were sold by men and young boys. They had also stopped performing songs in the market place for livelihood. As Lachhis had a somewhat permanent residential place in Quetta, they avoided seasonal migration to Sindh. Almost all Sarmastani, Bagri and Mekrani who lived in the same area, were engaged in begging, and were seasonal migrants. The Sarmastani were, however, also involved in

[26] Interaction Notes IA29, IA51, IA54, IA160, IA103 and IA107.

hereditary occupations such as drum beating in marriage ceremonies and in the month of Ramazan.

The *ustas*, who were skilled carpenters and used to make small wooden toys and musical instruments, had migrated from Kech to Faisalabad and were said to be working as travelling salesmen in rural Punjab.[27] They had retained their traditional occupational independence, by not having fixed vendors or getting involved in credit transactions. Groups similar to *ustas* in Balochistan were Sarmastani in Quetta, and Shahzada in Gwadar. The Shahzada were mostly involved in begging and also in music composition and singing in marriage ceremonies.[28]

Unlike the groups discussed in section 2.1 above, the physically marginalised groups identified here were not involved, for the most part, in personalized patron-client relations with dominant groups. Their economic activities, although considered necessary in some cases, were marginal to the main processes of settled agrarian or urban production. Some of these groups, for example, took on seasonal harvest work in agriculture. This was an important source of livelihood, but not their main economic activity. Moreover, they were relatively autonomous of individual landowners or farmers and took up such work as "free agents".

These physically marginalised communities also had a stronger sense of group identity than their more "dependent" counterparts such as the *kammi*s and the Muslim Shaikhs. Some semblance of physical autonomy was an important feature of this identity in virtually all of the cases. The willingness, ability, and in some cases preference for fringe activities such as rag-picking, begging and even sex work was combined with the determination of remaining "free" of personalized relations of dependence. Even the peripatetic lifestyle of some of these groups was ascribed to efforts to remain independent of landlords or other dominant groups. The Usta or those who made things and sold them for cash, or merely traded goods for cash, without forming longer term relationships with their customers compared themselves favourably to those artisans who were bound in *seyp*-type relations with landlords.[29] At the other end of the spectrum beggars considered themselves as being of higher status than those who worked as bonded labourers on farms or brick kilns.[30]

The sense of autonomy of these physically marginalised groups did not mean that they were not oppressed or marginalised. They were generally very poor, lived in cramped and insecure housing, and were vulnerable to physical abuse, sexual violence, and other crimes and transgressions. They relied on a range of non-confrontational strategies – including collective action, evasive behaviour, and selective recourse to powerful individuals from dominant groups – to protect themselves from particularly threatening situations.

In virtually all cases, however, the absence of engagement with the mainstream economy went alongside critical reliance on female and child labour. For the Faqeers (beggars), Bagris and Jandavaras children were the main earners – as they did the

[27] Interaction Notes IA107 and IA151.
[28] Interaction Note IA193.
[29] Interaction Note IA107.
[30] Interaction Notes IA136 and IA96.

front-end "work" of begging.[31] For others such as the Usta too child labour was critical because couples worked out of homes as teams and children were required to either help out, or to look after their younger siblings. The peripatetic lifestyle meant, moreover, that there were often weak ties with local communities and public services such as schools.[32]

2.3 Religion

In the Sindh rural site there was no clear hierarchy based on traditional occupations. The Bheels and Kolhis were at a social disadvantage compared with others but this was not due to traditional relations of subservience.[33] In fact, there had been significant changes in the ownership of land over the past six decades with some former tenants emerging as important landowners. The Bheels and the Kolhis felt that their marginalisation was based on their status as religious minorities. Local Muslims confirmed that religion was an important factor in the social and political weakness of the Bheels and Kolhis.

Other issues were also present. The Bheels traced their origins to Marwar and spoke a dialect of Marwari at home. The Kolhis were from Nagar and their language was distinctive from both the Marwari of the Bheels and the Sindhi spoken by most other local residents. But the difference in language could not account for a lower social status. There were other migrant groups in the area – for example the Baloch2 from upper Sindh – whose home language was a dialect of Seraiki. These Baloch2 were poor but not socially disadvantaged in the way that the Bheels and Kolhis were.

The starkest manifestation of the perceived religious difference was found in the taboos around eating and drinking together.[34] In the rural Sanghar site Muslims refused to eat food prepared by the Bheels. Separate cups and utensils were kept in eateries and tea stalls for Bheels, who would wash these themselves after use. This situation was found not only in the villages, but also in urban areas where the Bheels and other Scheduled Caste Hindus such as the Bagris were not allowed to share utensils with the Muslims. On the Muslim side the food taboo was explained with reference to the allegation that the Bheels and others consumed foods (such as pork, and *goh*) that were forbidden to Muslims. By virtue of this prohibition, Muslims were not allowed to eat with, or share utensils with the Scheduled Caste Hindus. Similar food taboos were found in NWFP and Punjab with respect to the Christian community.[35] In the fieldwork villages in central Punjab where the *huqqa* was shared unconditionally among people of all classes, Christians were nevertheless excluded. The reasons provided by the Muslims were identical to those offered in Sindh.

A variant of the food taboo was found with respect to the Zikri community in Mekran.[36] This community which regards itself as a sect of Islam is considered a heretical non-Muslim group by many orthodox Muslims. Traditionally the difference between the Zikris and other Muslims was considered to be a difference of practice –

[31] Interaction Note IA30.
[32] Interaction Note IA107.
[33] Interaction Notes IA15, IA21, IA23, and IA27.
[34] Interaction Note IA11.
[35] Interaction Notes IA54 and IA37.
[36] Interaction Note IA189.

i.e. Zikris versus Namazis. This had given way since around the 1980s to the view that Zikris and Muslims were distinct faith groups. Many Muslims considered that the Zikris did not recite the *kalima* properly, and therefore, any animals slaughtered by Zikris were forbidden to Muslims. Muslims did admit to eating with the Zikris, however, and sharing utensils.

While the food taboo was a visible marker of religious difference, it is interesting to note how social relations were maintained around it. In the rural Sanghar village, for example, it was reported that Muslims did attend Bheel wedding feasts, as Bheels employed Muslim chefs to procure and prepare the food, which was then served to Bheel and Muslim guests sitting along separate lines. Zikris of Mekran too reported employing Muslim butchers and cooks in order to ensure Muslim participation in their wedding functions. There had also been prominent attempts at breaking the food taboo on the part of local political leaders in Mekran.

Food taboos were conspicuous markers of religious difference because in many other ways the everyday social interaction between people of various faiths was unremarkable. A fundamental aspect of social interaction – marriage relations – was governed by kinship group endogamy in any case. The fact that people married within extended families or kinship groups meant that the absence of marriage relations with people of other faiths was not out of the ordinary. The only case in the fieldwork where this had become a major issue was the relationship between the Zikris and Muslims in Mekran. It was reported that up to the 1980s marriages between the groups had been common, but these had stopped after missionary activity on the part of orthodox Muslims.[37]

There were a few cases in the fieldwork where the religious minorities felt physically threatened by their majority community neighbours on grounds of religious difference. The small Punjabi Christian enclave in the urban Peshawar field site was a one such case.[38] The Christians faced frequent intimidation, and there had been a number of cases of violent crimes against Christian men and women who had to walk past Muslim-owned houses and fields in order to access public transport facilities. Another conspicuous case was that of the Lachhi Hindus in Quetta who experienced similar feelings of vulnerability. They reported of physical attacks on Hindu festivities and forced occupation of their cremation graveyard.[39] Females, especially young girls, had been allegedly subject to sexual molestation when they traveled to get drinking water from Muslim populated areas. The Lacchis also complained of attempts by surrounding Muslim communities to resist and disparage developmental work in Hindu areas.

Much of the discrimination faced by religious minority groups such as the Bheels, Kolhis, Bagris, and Jandavaras in Sindh, the Christians in Punjab and NWFP, and the Lachhis in Quetta, was in part based on caste-based hierarchies. These groups were regarded as being of "low" status by the mainstream communities, and the fact that they happened not to be Muslims simply added to the social distance from them. The Bheels and Kolhis of the rural Sanghar site, for example, faced food taboos vis-à-vis Muslims, but also claimed to exercise food taboos with each other. Both Bheel and

[37] Interaction Note IA189.
[38] Interaction Note IA54.
[39] Interaction Note IA160.

Kolhi respondents insisted separately that their respective status was higher than the other, and that they would not eat with the other. Moreover, the relationship between the Bheels and Kolhis of rural Sanghar, and the Bagris and Jandavaras of urban Shahdadpur with the "higher" caste Hindu Vanya community of urban Shahdadpur was marked with social distance. While some Bheels expressed the view that their social status had declined after 1947 and that prior to that they used to get respect from their Vanya landlords, others complained bitterly about discrimination at the hands of the "higher" caste Hindus.[40] There had been some attempts at bringing the various Hindu groups together but these were limited to one-time coalitions for electoral purposes.

Class was an important intermediary in the way in which religious discrimination played itself out. Mainstream Muslim respondents in a Faisalabad school were of the view that while they would not eat with other Christians, they could eat with their Christian colleague because he was "clean" and did not consume foods forbidden to Muslims. The word "Chuhra" was a common term of abuse used against Christians. In the urban setting this term was equated not only with people of a particular faith but also with the supposedly contaminating sanitary work that many Christians were employed in. Religion was overridden by social class in rural Sindh too where there were no reports of Muslims refusing food or eating utensils that had been used by Vanya Hindus, who were generally well-off and considered to be of high status. In fact, it was the Muslims who complained of being discriminated against by the Vanya Hindus in food taboos.

Religious marginalisation was not merely an issue with respect to non-Muslims and allegedly heretical sects. In the fieldwork village in Faisalabad there had been violent conflict some five years prior to the fieldwork along sectarian lines between Shias and members of the Ahle-Hadees Sunni sect.[41] This conflict which was resolved after mediation, was actually between some leading Shia families and their counterparts among the Ahle-Hadees. The marginalised groups in the village were not the main protagonists and simply lined up behind their own patrons. The two main *nai* (barber) families in the village, for example, were associated with and protected by their patrons among Shia Syeds and Rajput1 Ahle-Hadees respectively.

Another reference to religion with respect to social marginalisation was the tendency among the dominant groups to judge the religious practices of marginalised groups. This, interestingly, was a common pattern across the sites and regions. Respondents among the "pure Baloch" in Mekran asserted, for example, that the Darzada and the Ghulam were not properly practicing Muslims. Similar observations were made with respect to the "lower castes" in the Peshawar field sites, and Muslim Shaikh brick kiln workers in Islamabad sites and Changar community in the Faisalabad site.[42] The issue of being "proper Muslims" turned out to be an important one in the perceived role of education in these communities.

2.4 Ethnicity and race

[40] Interaction Note IA19.
[41] Interaction Note IA134.
[42] Interaction Notes IA97 and IA115.

This study was not expected to probe social marginalisation along the lines of ethnicity – primarily because it was felt at the outset that such forms of marginalisation were not likely to be encountered at the local level. In fact, ethnicity and race turned out to be important dimensions of marginalisation in a number of fieldwork sites. Ethnicity is often defined with respect to cultural patterns and practices with language a core marker of identity. In many countries race and ethnicity are coterminous, as ethnic minorities also happen to be racially distinct from the mainstream. In fact, race is a difficult concept to operationalise empirically and racial differences are talked about crudely with reference to a person's physical appearance. To the extent that narratives (or myths) of racial origin play a role in the construction of social hierarchy these narrative and myths become useful sources of insight.

It was mentioned above that many of the marginalised groups in Sindh – Bheels, Kolhis, Bagris, Jandavaras – are distinguished from the mainstream and from one another by language, dialect and cultural patterns. The fact that these groups "stand out" is only partly ascribable to their faith, and partly to their distinctive ethnicities. Respondents in other fieldwork sites also referred to cultural and linguistic differences between groups. The Pashtun1 in urban Peshawar, for example, noted that while nominally the same, the Pashto spoken by migrants from a tribal area was virtually a distinctive language.[43] Similarly, residents of the canal colony villages in central Punjab, and indeed in urban Faisalabad, referred to Punjabi and Jaangli as being distinct languages.[44] The extent to which any particular spoken dialect or accent qualifies as a distinct language is a matter for linguists. What is interesting and important is that linguistic and cultural differences were common ways for groups to mark themselves out from others, sometimes in a hierarchical manner.

Race, as in racial origin, was a recurrent theme, understandably in Mekran, where a large proportion of the population was of supposedly African origins. The traditionally dominant group promoted the idea of a "pure Baloch" compared with Darzadas who were seen as part Baloch-part African origin, and Ghulams who were of pure African descent. There was a strong counter-current among the Darzadas that asserted Balochi ethnicity on non-racial and linguistic grounds. Racial origin myths were found in the Baloch-dominated areas of southern Punjab where the claim of Baloch ancestry was seen as a mark of higher status than *kammi*s or even camel-herding Juts.[45] In southern Punjab the Baloch origin story was linked up with whether or not a group originated in the mountains and spoke the Balochi language.

Myths of racial origin were powerful sources of marginalisation in the Peshawar fieldwork sites.[46] The dominant groups preferred to see society as being divided between pure Pashtuns and others. The pure Pashtuns were supposed to be descendents of particular individuals who had conquered the territory at some time in history and established their hegemony. According to these origin myths, only those who owned hereditary land for generations and could prove their lineage were "pure" Pashtuns. There were many claimants to the mythical pure lineage. The Khans did not accept the claim of any other group, while others asserted that the Khans were

[43] Interaction Note IA55.
[44] Interaction Note IA129.
[45] Interaction Note IA148.
[46] Interaction Notes IA45, IA53, and IA68.

simply the chiefs of the tribe and that other members of the tribe or *quom* were equally "pure". It was common practice in the area for all Pashto-speaking parents to register their children in school as belonging to the "Afghan" *quom*. In order to avoid confusion with actual citizens of Afghanistan who resided in the area, the latter were labeled as "Afghan mohajir".

2.5 Patriarchy and status

Patriarchy – or the systematic domination of women and children by men – is an unremarkable feature of many societies including Pakistan. It was taken as a given in this study that gender was a cross-cutting dimension of marginalisation. The fieldwork revealed, however, a more specific relationship between patriarchy and marginalisation. The hierarchy between groups was quite often premised on perceptions, practices and maintained norms about the way in which families and groups regulated the lives, mobility, work, and decision-making on the part of "their" women. The discourse of dominant and marginalised groups regarding their social structure was punctuated with issues of definition of honour and morality, women's work and female mobility.

The issue of honour was tied strongly with the concept of morality and modesty. Repeatedly, females of socially marginalized groups were criticized as being immoral or licentious. Women from an upwardly mobile Bheel family in Sindh, criticized Kolhi women for wearing inappropriately covered or "inviting" clothing.[47] In Karachi, Muslims believed that female Bagri domestic workers and beggars were immoral and involved in sex work. The reason for this perception was their late work hours and "fashionable" dressing.[48] "Immoral" or licentious behavior was seen to be at its extreme in the decision of a woman to marry in a group considered to be unmarriageable by social norm.[49] The severity of the punishment in such a case was the reflection of a group's honour. In Gwadar, for example, Muslims percieved Zikris as lacking honour because they had not reacted strongly to cases of Zikri women marrying Muslim men.[50] Similarly, Bagris in Karachi were also seen to be dishonorable by the Muslims because Bagri men did not react severely when Bagri women married Muslim men.[51]

To avoid such acts of "dishonour" and mantain their "honourable" position in the society, dominant groups discouraged any influx of ideas contrary to traditional norms. The world, beyond places considered as "safe" or "upholding traditional values", was seen as "bad" or "corrupt", an exposure to which could make women act in immoral ways. Dominant groups like the Syeds, Jats and Rajput1 in Punjab translated these concerns into female mobility and *purdah* restrictions.

The concept of honour also impacted the economic activities women of a particular group were involved in. Dominant groups moreover perceived women working on other people's lands and houses as a dishonourable economic activity. Groups, whose

[47] Interaction Note IA12.
[48] Interaction Note IA1.
[49] For more discussion on marriage patterns, refer to Section 2.1.
[50] Interaction Note IA193.
[51] Interaction Note IA2.

women were actively participating in such jobs, were seen as groups at a lower social position, with little honour or respect to lose.

For marginalised groups, however, the concept of honour varied from group to group. Castes whose women worked on the fields, like Bheels and Kolhis in rural sites of Sindh or hamsayas in FR1, insisted that their women worked solely on the land and not inside the landowner's house.[52] For them, working on the field was not a breach of honour but working inside the house was. Certain castes, like the Ansaris in PR1 were involved in domestic work but only for the reputed Syed families of the village.[53] They considered their women to be respected and secure in these households and thus did not consider this as dishonourable. In groups, which led an unsettled lifestyle such as Bagris and Jandavars in Shahdadpur and Changars in Faisalabad, honour dictated that their women work in the public space, as beggars or rag-pickers, an activity seen by dominant castes or even other marginalised groups as a low status activity. These groups however believed that working in the public space was more honorable than women entering the private space of another.[54]

In fewer instances, upwardly mobile groups expressed their concerns about the honour of the dominant groups in the area. The Afridis in FU1, for example, considered Pashtun1 to be lacking honour because their women went to the market with their hands and feet exposed. On the other hand, Pashtun1 considered Afridis to be following tribal traditions they had left a long time ago and expressed contempt for the *kisabgars* on the basis of the perceived licentious behaviour of the latter's women.[55]

2.6 Salient implications of marginalisation

The discussion thus far has been focused on the analysis of various forms of social marginalisation and the documentation of socially marginalised groups. The emphasis has been on social aspects of inequality, discrimination and disadvantage. Some of the implications of social marginalisation on the economic opportunities and civil and political rights of the marginalised groups in the fieldwork sites are briefly described here. The description here makes only passing reference to access to education. This is dealt with in greater detail in Section 3. The purpose here is to highlight salient aspects of marginalisation in "adult" life in order to see more clearly whether or to what extent the educational system deals with these issues.

Bonded labour

There were a number of marginalised groups across survey sites that currently lived in, or had recently experienced, conditions that could be described as "bonded labour". Many of these were indebted to their employers, were constrained from seeking alternative employment, faced restrictions of mobility and personal autonomy, and had suffered verbal abuse and physical violence at the hands of their employer or their agents. There were yet others about whom it was suspected that

[52] For an example of this, see IA26.
[53] Interaction Note IA131.
[54] Refer to interactions with members of the Changar caste in PU2.
[55] Interaction Note IA45.

they faced conditions of dependence and bondage, but it had not been possible to confirm these suspicions to any reasonable degree.

It was noted above that the Bheels in the rural Sindh site worked mostly as landless sharecroppers for absentee and local Muslim landlords.[56] In terms of economic resources the position of the Bheels was not very different from many of the Muslim landless sharecroppers. The landlords in the area enjoyed some level of monopoly power over tenants, and the economic relationship between landlords and tenants was often marked with threats of eviction. There were some tenants in the area, however, whose position was considerably worse than that of the other tenants. While it was common, for example, for some landlords to demand unpaid work from their tenants in getting fodder for cattle, or helping in house construction or repair, some tenants faced extra burdens of work. These were also tenants whose movements were restricted, and who faced physical violence. These tenants, therefore, suffered conditions of bondage within the tenancy contract.

All of such bonded sharecroppers in the survey site were Bheels. Muslim tenants who happened to be poor and vulnerable to landlords did not, nevertheless, face the forms of abuse that these bonded Bheel sharecroppers experienced. It was not all Bheel tenants, however, who were in such dire conditions, even though landlord credit was the norm for all tenants. The Marghat Bheels of Sammat1 landlords were particularly vulnerable to bonded labour. Other Bheels were more autonomous and prosperous. One middle-aged man had actually been beaten on the day of the survey because the landlord was unhappy with the quality of fodder he had gathered for the livestock. Bheel tenants in the area were of the view that the particularly bad conditions faced by the Marghats were quite largely due to the unchecked political power enjoyed by their landlord. But the fact remained that Bheel tenants faced greater coercion than the Muslim tenants of the same landlord. The idea that bondage was at least partly a result of overwhelming landlord power (because the landlord had strong political connections) was also expressed by freed Kolhi bonded labourers interviewed in Hyderabad.

Muslim Shaikh brick kiln workers in Islamabad provided another example of bonded labour in the fieldwork.[57] Muslim Shaikhs and *Kharkar* Pashtuns living and working at the same brickkiln were both indebted but Muslim Shaikh families faced severe coercion compared to the Pashtuns. Muslim Shaikh brick kiln workers in Islamabad had come to the present brick kiln after their new employer had paid substantial amounts of cash to their former employer. The Muslim Shaikh workers referred to these transactions as "being bought and sold". The employer would, obviously, justify the cash payments as repayments of workers' debts to their former employer. There was no comparable example of bonded labour transactions with respect to the Pashtun *kharkar* workers. There were also bonded brick kiln workers among the Christians of the fieldwork village in Faisalabad. Their conditions were somewhat better than those of their Muslim Shaikh counterparts in Islamabad. This was, in part, due to their residence in the village away from the brick kiln and the easier access they enjoyed to their social networks. The Islamabad Muslim Shaikhs, by contrast, were migrants in the area from faraway districts.

[56] Interaction Notes IA24 and IA25.
[57] Interaction Notes IA91-IA102.

A third conspicuous group of bonded labourers were the Joya/Muslim Shaikh farm servants (*naukar*s) of Araeen landlords in the fieldwork village in Toba Tek Singh.[58] The position of these workers and their families was arguably the most precarious among all of those observed during the course of the fieldwork. Children as young as ten years of age had become servants for loans of as little as 8,000 rupees. It was expected that they would serve their masters for an indefinite period. There were many instances of sons taking on loans first contracted by their fathers. These individuals received nominal wages between 700 and 1500 rupees per month. They received their meals from the employer's kitchen, and also got new clothes and shoes once a year. These farm servants or *naukar*s were at the beck and call of their employers at all hours. It was considered normal for the employers to closely monitor and restrict their movements, and to administer beatings if the *naukar* fell out of line. The employers were not large landlords. In fact there were no large holdings in the village. A landowner with just 10 acres could quite easily have at least one servant. The Joya/Muslim Shaikhs of the village were among the poorest, with few assets, and no land. There were other groups too that were in this position. There were, in fact, even some Araeen household that did not own any land or assets. Virtually of the *naukar*s, however, were from the Muslim Shaikh families.

The social power enjoyed by the employers or landlords over their workers or sharecroppers was a key factor in the continuation of bonded labour despite national laws banning it. Cases of escape, recapture and negotiation were documented during the course of the fieldwork. The employers/landlords of bonded labourers in these various locations operated with the confidence that workers' were socially disadvantaged and politically weak, and therefore could be subjected to illegal coercive means.

Verbal abuse

While bonded labour was one extreme manifestation of social marginalisation, verbal and physical abuse were more common conditions associated with marginalisation in the fieldwork sites. In the Peshawar site, for example, Khans and other "pure Pashtuns" felt that they could abuse the "lower castes" quite openly at will.[59] Verbal abuse of marginalised groups such as the *kammi*s, Christians and the Muslim Shaikhs was quite the norm in both urban and rural fieldwork sites in central Punjab.[60] In fact the very caste names used by the dominant groups to refer to and call out the marginalised groups were considered to be terms of abuse.

While derogatory name-calling was common, there was also resistance against it. Many of the "low" caste groups in the Punjab village had acquired new surnames that created some distance between them and their traditional occupations. The weavers or *paoli*s in the Faisalabad fieldwork site like to call themselves Ansaris. The Muslim Shaikhs in the Toba Tek Singh village, who were referred as "*mussali"* by the dominant caste, would introduce themselves as Joya. Their relatives in a neighbouring village called themselves Wattoo. In Sindh, by contrast, the Bheels, Kolhis or Bagris did not feel any shame in using their own caste names. In fact there

[58] Interaction Notes IA137 and IA138.
[59] Interaction Note IA85.
[60] For example of this see, Interaction Notes IA137 and IA138.

was some pride in these identities, despite the marginalised status. In Mekran there was an interesting tension between those who tried to conceal their Darzada origins behind an all-encompassing Baloch identity, and some who considered "Darzada" a badge of pride.[61]

Vulnerability to sexual exploitation

One of the most severe manifestations of social marginalisation was reflected in the incidence of a marginalized group's vulnerability to sexual exploitation and abuse. Members of the marginalised Changar community discussed alleged sexual crimes committed by members of the dominant Jat1 caste against females of the Changar community. One of the cases was of a young girl who was allegedly raped and detained against her will by an influential Jat1 for two years. Another alleged case of harassment, again by the Jat1 caste, was against a Muslim Sheikh primary school teacher who was repeatedly threatened and coerced to enter into sexual relations with an influential Jat1.[62] Lacchi in Quetta also expressed similar feelings of insecurity and vulnerability and reported alleged cases of harassment of their women by the dominant groups. They said that Lacchi women were verbally abused and physically molested when they traveled further away from the locality for everyday chores.[63] Bagris in Karachi also reported that their women, especially young girls, were harassed on the streets and in workplaces.[64]

A woman of the isolated Christian enclave in Peshawar, had also been allegedly subjected to an extreme case of sexual violence. A Christian woman was allegedly abducted, taken to the fields and gang-raped by Pashtun men. The Christian community, which seemed to have had internalized a sense of being in a weaker social position, did not enter into any sort of legal or illegal confrontation with the dominant group and kept the case discreet.[65]

There were mixed reports about sexual exploitation of bonded labourers in rural Sindh. The freed bonded labourers of the Kolhi caste interviewed in Hyderabad claimed that sexual abuse of families in bondage was rampant in parts of Sindh. It was claimed that both landowners and their managers were involved in the sexual exploitation of women of bonded families.[66] This was different from what was expressed by Marghat Bheel bonded labourers working for a powerful Sammat1 landlord. While they reported the verbal abuse of women, they denied any cases of sexual exploitation.[67]

Labour market segmentation

Segmentation refers to the situation where market players of specific types are clustered into transactions of particular types. Social marginalisation is often associated with the systematic inclusion or exclusion of workers from various social

[61] Interaction Note IA178.
[62] Interaction Note IA103.
[63] Interaction Note IA160.
[64] Interaction Note IA1.
[65] Interaction Notes IA54 and IA55.
[66] Interaction Note IA37.
[67] Interaction Notes IA25 and IA26

backgrounds into specific jobs and activities. Labour market segmentation therefore creates the possibility for the reinforcement and reproduction of social marginalisation even in conditions of economic growth and change.

The historical division of labour found in the rural fieldwork sites in NWFP and Punjab was socially regulated system of labour market segmentation. A barber's son, for example, could only be employed as a barber. He not only acquired the skills necessary for the job, he was also unlikely to find other employment prospects. Even with the breakdown of the traditional rural economic arrangements, however, there were several examples of labour market segmentation in the fieldwork sites.

The Christians in the NWFP and Punjab fieldwork sites were clustered around jobs in the sanitary services.[68] For these workers upward mobility was often associated with similar jobs in somewhat higher paid environments such as modern offices and health facilities. Christian youth in urban Faisalabad referred to the traditional "sweeper" and "gutter-cleaning" jobs of their parents derogatorily as "gang work".[69] Many of these youths nevertheless found themselves in similar jobs in somewhat higher-end environments. They found that jobs in the sanitary sector were the only ones that were readily available to them, and were left aside by their Muslim counterparts. The Changars of Faisalabad represented another case of labour market segmentation. Despite living in an area with a large number of power looms employing hundreds of workers, the Changars preferred to continue with their traditional occupation of rag-picking, scrap trade and small-scale vending.[70] In this instance the supply side appeared to be the main factor in labour market segmentation.

Labour market segmentation of less traditional and severe forms was found in other sites and with respect to other groups. The fact that jobs in non-traditional sectors were rationed by personal reference (*sifarish*) meant that first entrants and their social networks enjoyed strategic advantages. The same was true of employment opportunities for migrant workers in large cities or abroad. One enterprising individual from among the Baloch5 in the village PR3 of Dera Ghazi Khan, for example, had managed to get a job in a private sector construction firm.[71] He had then enabled dozens of other men from his own extended family and *vasti* to get jobs in that firm. People in other surrounding *vasti*s who were more remote relatives had also gained some openings in the same company, but the people of the *qasai vasti* in PR3 who had no kinship ties with the Baloch5 did not have a single job there.

A common complaint on the part of marginalised groups was their limited access to formal sector jobs and higher education opportunities. The *kisabgar* in the urban Peshawar site argued, for example, that although they had no problems in gaining entry into schools, admissions into good quality higher educational institutions in the city were still controlled by the Khans.[72] While public sector jobs were less dependent on individual *sifarish* compared with jobs in the private sector, political connections and bribes were considered essential entry requirements. To the extent

[68] Interaction Notes IA54 and IA110.
[69] Interaction Note IA111.
[70] Interaction Notes IA108, IA113 and IA114.
[71] Interaction Notes IA139, IA140 and IA141.
[72] Interaction Note IA53.

that the socially marginalised groups were disadvantaged in these areas, they felt excluded from such jobs.

There were also important breakthroughs. It was widely reported that past recruitment policies were less dependent on political connections and bribes, and these had opened the door of formal jobs for many of the marginalised groups in the fieldwork in all provinces. In some cases political connections had proven to be sources of entry for previously marginalised groups. Similarly employment opportunities for unskilled workers in the Gulf region were cited as important sources of social mobility in NWFP and Mekran (Balochistan). The case of Mekran was particularly interesting, where recruitment of Darzadas and the "pure Baloch" on a non-discriminatory basis by the Oman Army was widely regarded as a great social leveler.[73]

Property rights and legal protection

The socially marginalized groups faced disadvantages in other markets too. It was reported that the way in which a low caste (*kisabgar*) buyer ensured the security of a land transaction was by involving a Pashtun1 friend or acquaintance to witness and stand surety for the purchase.[74] Land in FU1 was understood as the realm of the Pashtun1 while the Kisabgar, refugee migrant from Afghanistan, and Christians were vulnerable to contractual default. In the same community the Christians reported having paid money several times for the same strip of land to Pashtun1 individuals who owned the area providing them access to the main road.

Marginalised caste groups sought the protection from landowning mainstream dominating caste groups in order to avoid abuse at the hands of the police. A *nai* in the fieldwork village in Faisalabad found himself falsely implicated in a case of cattle theft. The case was manipulated by a local landlord whose *seyp* the *nai* had stopped doing some time before. Eventually he had to refer to his other *seyp* patrons to rescue himself from the police case.[75] In PU2, a Jat1 strongman was alleged to have raped and murdered a young Changar woman after having held her captive for two years. The activities of the alleged murderer were contained only after the Changars managed to get the support of other local dominant groups. [76]

It was a common perception in BR2 that a Ghulam would not dare to raise his hand against a "pure Baloch" even if provoked because the police would always side with the "pure Baloch".[77] In the fieldwork site in Dera Ghazi Khan the Baloch5 were terrified of Baloch3, who were thought to be behind a string of thefts and burglaries in the area.[78] In Islamabad, young Muslim Shaikh brick kiln workers being frequently harassed and detained, then released on the payment of bribes by the local police even as they went about routine activities. The felt targeted due to their physical

[73] Interaction Note IA176.
[74] Interaction Note IA45.
[75] Interaction Note IA129.
[76] Interaction Note IA103 and IA106.
[77] Interaction Note IA176.
[78] Interaction Note IA140.

appearance that betrayed their "Mussali" identity.[79] Similar accounts were narrated by Sarmastanis and Bagris in Quetta.

[79] Interaction Note IA96.

3. Schooling and Marginalisation

3.1 School availability

Some public schooling facility was available, at least nominally, in most of the fieldwork sites. A summary picture of school availability has been sketched in the community profiles provided in Section 1. There were functioning government schools for boys and girls, at least till the primary level, in the fieldwork sites in rural Peshawar, rural and urban central Punjab, and larger of the Mekran settlements. There were also boys' schools in the rural Sindh and the urban Peshawar sites, and in the fieldwork sites in southern Punjab, and the smaller settlements in Mekran. It might be argued with some justification that remoteness is a critical dimension of marginalisation, and this dimension could not be properly gauged in the present study. Access to government schooling facilities, therefore, might be less prevalent than is suggested by the fieldwork sample sites.

This qualification notwithstanding, it is remarkable that many segments of the target population remained beyond the reach of government schooling facilities even in the less remote areas. Perhaps the most astonishing cases were to be found in the urban areas, where it was expected that mainstream and marginalised groups alike will have physical access to schooling facilities.[80]

The fieldwork site in urban Peshawar comprised an established settlement and its extensions into surrounding farmland. While there were functioning government schools for boys and girls in the main settlement, the peri-urban extensions which account for three sizeable and spread out segments did not have any government schools for girls. There was a boys' primary school in this area and apart from the case of two daughters of a local school teacher who had studied here till class 3, no girls had ever been enrolled.[81] There was a strong sense among teachers in the government boys' school that the area was socially conservative and that mixed gender schooling was not possible. Some girls in the area went to a small NGO-run non-profit school located in a private house. A for-profit private school had opened three years ago and admitted both boys and girls.[82]

Some of the rural fieldwork sites (central Punjab, the larger settlements in Mekran, and the Peshawar rural site to some degree) had high population densities. Most, if not all, of the population of these administrative areas resided in sizeable concentrated settlements. These settlements were relatively well-served with government schooling facilities. In the rural Peshawar site, however, one large segment of the population lived at a distance of over 2 km from the main settlement, and did not have a government school.[83] While the main village in the rural Sindh fieldwork site (SR1) was relatively concentrated and had two government schools, one each for boys and girls, the girls' school had been non-functional many years.[84] The other Sindh *goths*, and southern Punjab *vasti*s were scattered settlements with small populations. These smaller settlements either had single-teacher primary schools or no schools at all.

[80] Interaction Notes IA1, IA2, IA5, IA95, IA98, IA170 and IA171.
[81] Interaction Note IA44.
[82] This is discussed further below.
[83] Interaction Notes IA87-IA91.
[84] Interaction Note IA6.

There were also small villages, clusters and hamlets in the rural Mekran fieldwork sites that could not justify the presence of more than one government primary school. In these areas, unlike the urban site in Peshawar, the single government schools did admit boys as well as girls.[85]

School placement could be interpreted as an issue of social marginalisation in some of these cases. The cluster of households in the rural Peshawar site that did not have easy access to a government school (due to distance) happened to be the one where *hamsaya*s and former *hamsaya*s of the Khans lived. In the rural Sindh fieldwork site a Bheel village with 60 households did not have a school whereas Muslim *goths* of similar size did have schools.[86]

The nominal presence of a government was no guarantee, of course, of the provision of schooling services. The case of the non-functioning girls' school in the rural Sanghar (Sindh) fieldwork site has been noted above. Another example was the fieldwork village in Dera Ghazi Khan in southern Punjab (PR3) where the only government school for the entire administrative village had remained closed for 5 years. In a village in Kech there was a girls' government school whose only visible mark was a signboard planted by the roadside.[87] There was no building or any other physical manifestation of this school, though local respondents were of the view that two teachers did draw salaries on account of the school.

There were stories of political bias, some though not all of it rooted in social marginalisation, behind these nominally existent schools. The situation in the rural site in Dera Ghazi Khan (PR3) had two layers of social marginalisation at play. The weak social and political position of the Baloch5 compared with the local *sardar*s (of the Baloch3 group) meant that the former were unable to lobby effectively for school improvement. They were frightened of complaining too loudly because the local administration was controlled by their stronger patrons. The Baloch5 in turn were more powerful than the *qasai vasti* of PR3. They were engaged in a conflict with the latter over control of land. The *qasai* complained that their children were regularly harassed on the way to schools, by the Baloch5 who had blocked their path through the fields on several occasions. It was reported that only those children whose fathers or older brothers could take out the time to accompany them through the fields to the main road, were able to go to school at all.[88] While education was not an issue in the power play between the Baloch3 and the Baloch5, or between the Baloch5 and the people of *qasai vasti*, it was certainly a victim.

School quality varied greatly between the fieldwork sites, not only in terms of physical infrastructure, but also with regard to the effort and dedication of the teachers. The extreme cases of neglect, of course, were the non-functional schools noted above. There were a number of other less extreme cases too. In fact, complaints about school quality were the norm across fieldwork sites in urban and rural areas. In the main settlement in the rural Sindh fieldwork site (SR1), the regular teachers were reported to have sub-contracted their work to a local youth.[89] The

[85] Interaction Note IA189.
[86] Interaction Note IA19.
[87] Interaction Note IA172.
[88] Interaction Note IA141.
[89] Interaction Note IA15.

school was held in one cramped room with a single teacher looking after all six grades (from *katchi* till class 5) simultaneously. In a village in SR1, the only teacher was a local farmer and storekeeper with irregular school attendance. The school remained shut when he did not turn up.[90]

In the Peshawar and central Punjab fieldwork sites the schools were larger with greater numbers of teachers on staff. The same was true of the bigger villages in Kech (Mekran, Balochistan). The absence of one or two teachers, therefore, did not lead to a complete breakdown. School infrastructure was also better in the larger schools, with proper classrooms, verandahs, boundary walls, drinking water supply, and courtyards. While these schools were better in terms of teacher attendance and infrastructure than their counterparts in the smaller villages and settlements, most of them compared poorly with local fee-charging private schools.[91]

The boys' school, serving the mostly Christian fieldwork site in urban Faisalabad, was a particular case in point.[92] The catchment area of the school consisted of three large localities, two of them mostly Christian and one mostly Muslim. Christian pupils made up around half of the student body. The nearest government schooling facility was at a distance of over 3 km away and the school was surrounded by densely populated low-income residential areas. All rooms in the school building save one had broken floors. This was clearly due to the use of inappropriate building materials and bad workmanship. There was no furniture in the school for pupils and only a few chairs for the staff. The floors were reduced to dusty rubble on which pupils needed to sit for classes to take place. There were no toilet facilities for the pupils, who were forced to use a narrow lane between classrooms and the school boundary wall as an open latrine. The school had a reputation among government teachers of being a "hardship" posting. The teachers were of the view that other government schools in the area had far better conditions. The fact that this school was located in the midst of a socially marginalised community with little influence or political power, was cited as a reason for the particularly bad conditions found there.

The presence of a functioning and accessible government school was found to have been sufficient incentive for people in a number of marginalised groups to send their children to school. This was easier to ensure in settled communities – despite the types of lapses and constraints noted above. For physically marginalised groups who did not reside in permanent settlements, or whose livelihood strategies required residence away from main population centres, there were no specific public facilities for schooling.[93]

For communities where the physical presence of a public schooling facility was not a problem, the interaction between the socially marginalised groups and the schooling system could be characterized under four types of relationships: (a) active discouragement; (b) passive discouragement; (c) passive encouragement; and (d) active encouragement.

[90] Interaction Note IA24.
[91] Further discussion of private schools is provided below.
[92] Interaction Note IA112.
[93] This issue is discussed in more detail in Section 3.3 below.

Active discouragement means that the school environment was specifically hostile to children from particularly social backgrounds. Passive discouragement refers to those aspects of the school environment that were discouraging for all children, and perhaps disproportionately for children from socially marginalised groups, but the latter were not specifically singled out for discrimination. Measures and features of the schooling system that generally encouraged children from all backgrounds to participate in education, and by implication encouraged children from socially marginalised groups are defined here as passive encouragement. Active encouragement refers to those actions and interventions that might specifically target children from socially marginalised groups.

3.2 Active discouragement

There were relatively few instances, in the fieldwork sites, of open active discouragement of pupils from socially marginalised groups in government schools. This was remarkable given the range of processes of social marginalisation found in these sites and extent of inequality in social relations, economic opportunities and legal protection.

There were few clear-cut cases where children from a socially marginalised group had been outright barred from a government school. This had happened with the Christian enclave in the urban Peshawar fieldwork site.[94] It was clearly stated by teachers that their school was not for Christian children. This assertion was softened up with the view that the Christians had their own system of education and they preferred not to go to government schools.[95] Interviews in the Christian community revealed, however that there was overt and explicit hostility to their children on the part of other children and also the teachers. After many efforts and *sifarish* one boy from the Christian enclave managed to gain admission into the local government school. He had to be withdrawn by the time he reached Class 4 due to incessant harassment, name-calling and discrimination on the part of other pupils and the teachers. Many of the children of this community were in school in other parts of the city. Their parents had to make special efforts, and bear higher costs, to ensure the education of their children.

Government schools across fieldwork sites had different policies with respect to children of foreign nationals. In Quetta the children of Afghan refugees were not admitted.[96] In Peshawar, however, the very school that had *de facto* barred Pakistan Christian citizens, had instructions from the education department to admit children of Afghan refugee families.[97] Besides these cases, there were a few complaints of difficulty in obtaining admissions into government girls' schools in urban areas of Punjab. Urban schools were generally oversubscribed compared with rural schools, and it is possible that teachers exercised some form of rationing to hold numbers down to manageable levels.[98]

[94] Interaction Note IA54.
[95] Interaction Note IA44.
[96] Interaction Notes IA151 and IA163.
[97] Interaction Notes IA44 and IA48.
[98] This was also seen in rural Peshwar, as documented in Interaction Note IA70. Rimla, 8, daughter of a Kisab mother and Awan father, was repeatedly refused admission in the government primary girls school. The reason given for refusal was that she was too young to be admitted in the KG class.

In general, however, schools were relatively equal and open spaces for children of all groups compared with society at large. It is possible, of course, that parents were not always aware of discriminatory behaviour towards their children. It is also possible that parents who aspired for a better and more equal life for their children earnestly believed (or hoped) the school to be a respectable route of upward mobility. Elements of both these forms of reporting bias were found to be at play. Interviews with children suggested that they did not reveal all that happened at school for the fear of punishment at home, or that of withdrawal from school.[99] When confronted with actual instances of discriminatory behaviour with their children on the part of a teacher, some parents were found willing to rationalize such acts as the teacher's prerogative.[100]

The fieldwork probed several possible forms of discrimination in the school environment – reflecting the findings of marginalisation and discrimination in "adult" life. Was there name-calling on the basis of derogatory caste names? Were children from certain backgrounds more likely to get beaten by teachers than others? Were children called upon to do chores and errands for the teachers, and were these demands made more from children from marginalised groups? These questions were addressed to parents, children and key informants. Teacher attitudes with respect to the schooling of socially marginalised groups were also investigated.

Harsh language was common in boys' government schools in the fieldwork sites. Complaints about abusive language were fewer – notable exceptions were the fieldwork sites in rural Peshawar and in Toba Tek Singh respectively, where it was reported that teachers often used abusive language towards pupils.[101] To a question about caste-based verbal abuse, Muslim Shaikh respondents in the Toba Tek Singh village felt that the dominant caste (Araeen) schoolmasters behaved in the school much like they behaved in their *baithak*s, implying the frequent use of derogatory names for people of marginalised groups. The complaint about abusive language in the Peshawar school, however, was about the generally uncouth behaviour of teachers, and not about discriminatory language against any particular group.

In other fieldwork sites, there were no reports of name-calling and verbal abuse of children of marginalised groups. A Bagri family in Shahdadpur mentioned that their children had dropped out of secondary school because they feared taunts from fellow pupils about "being dirty and smelly".[102] This was mentioned, however, with regard to the inability of this family to afford new and clean clothes for the children, and not explicitly as a caste-based insult.

Although corporal punishment was officially banned in government schools its occurrence was commonplace in boys' schools. A slap with an open hand was not regarded as a "real beating" -- which was a term used for wielding a stick.[103] Teachers in private schools were generally at pains to say that they did not beat children, but some of them also admitted that light slapping was acceptable and

[99] Interaction Note IA189.
[100] Interaction Note IA132.
[101] Interaction Notea IA75 and IA137.
[102] Interaction Note IA31.
[103] Interaction Note IA48.

necessary.[104] There were several cases in the fieldwork of children having dropped out of school because of beatings.[105] There were few complaints, however, of selective beatings of children from marginalised groups. Children who were seen as impetuous and troublesome or those who made slow progress in learning were frequent targets.

There were many reports of teachers getting children to do chores for them. It was common for teachers in government schools to get the pupils to clean the school.[106] Children were also asked to make tea, bring tea or food from home, and run other errands.[107] One young man from a *hamsaya* family in Peshawar reported that he and other children from "weak" families were routinely put to work on a teacher's farm.[108] Another schoolboy from a *hamsaya* household in the same village said that teachers only ask children whom they thought would agree to work. This child himself denied doing such work, though his older brother admitted that he did run errands for one particular teacher.[109]

A "low" caste Baddu family in the Faisalabad survey village found that their daughter was frequently taken by the local school teacher to her home to wash dishes and to do other housework. This was discovered by chance as the child had never complained to her parents about this practice. The adults in the Baddu family carried out similar work for the landowning families – the women would clean and wash dishes, and the men and women were called upon by the dominant group to look after guests at the time of weddings or funerals. Another child from the same family had dropped out of school because he could not follow the lessons. While in school, he was frequently asked by the teachers to clean their bicycles and to do other odd jobs.[110]

When asked directly about the perceptions of pupils from different social backgrounds, teachers in the fieldwork sites generally held the view that a child's performance at school depended on *shauq* (motivation), individual talent, hard work and support at home. When pressed to rank pupils of difference kinship groups in their own class by intelligence (*hoshiyari*) and motivation (*shauq*) most teachers again referred to individual and family characteristics rather than group traits. Some comments on social groups were offered. In the urban Peshawar fieldwork site it was reported that Afghan refugee Kuchi families (who were considered being of low status) had become very enthusiastic about schooling because they felt that once educated their children could return to Afghanistan and get government jobs.[111] Their interest levels were ranked above those of the dominant Pashtun1 group, who were considered to have been late starters in education.

In the rural Sindh village, the teachers who were themselves Talpur1 ranked children from their own kinship group and Bheel children as being among the best pupils, while putting down children from Baloch2 families as being non-performers due to

[104] Interaction Note IA79.
[105] See for example, Interaction Notes IA129 and IA41.
[106] See for example, Interaction Notes IA78.
[107] Interaction Note IA132.
[108] Interaction Notes IA76 and IA78.
[109] Interaction Note IA72.
[110] Interaction Note IA132.
[111] Interaction Note IA50.

the "rustic" attitudes of their parents.[112] In terms of social hierarchy the Baloch2, mostly poor landless sharecroppers, were clearly "higher" than the Bheels. The reason given for the more attentive behaviour of Bheel children, however, confirmed the marginalised status of the group. It was stated that Bheels being a minority were scared of punishment and were, therefore, keener to ensure that they followed lessons properly.[113] In the fieldwork village in Faisalabad where caste hierarchy was strongly present, the teachers (themselves from landowning castes) volunteered instances of children from *kammi* backgrounds who had done very well at school.

There were also counter opinions, particularly among women teachers. Perhaps they were more candid than their male counterparts. It is also possible that, given the lag between male and female schooling, women teachers were more exclusively drawn from the dominant groups. In rural Faisalabad, women teachers from the Syed and Jat castes, commented that children from Rajput1 backgrounds were uncouth and completed primary schooling with much difficulty[114]. In rural Kech, teachers perceived children from the Ghulam caste to have lesser comprehension than Baloch students. This so-called dense behaviour was seen as one of the reasons why children from the Ghulam caste dropped out from schools.[115]

While instances of discrimination and marginalisation within schools were encountered, and some villages and schools appeared to be less equal than others, the school was genuinely seen by teachers and people from various communities as a more open and less hierarchical space than society in general. When asked if Bheel pupils were asked to sit separately from Muslim ones in his school, a teacher in the rural Sanghar fieldwork site replied that social norms were different from school norms.[116]

A similar view was expressed by respondents from marginalised and dominant groups alike across the fieldwork sites. The Muslim Shaikh respondents in Toba Tek Singh who had complained that the Araeen schoolmasters behaved in school like they were in their *baithak*s were also aware of the fact that the school environment needed to be different from what prevailed in society at large.[117] Case studies of individuals from marginalised groups who had been to school many decades ago also confirmed that the school was regarded as a more neutral space. A Marghat Bheel bonded sharecropper who felt little compunction in complaining about the brutal attitude of his landlord, nevertheless insisted that in the local government school where a member of the landlord's family taught his child was treated at par with other children.[118] This did not mean that the teacher did his job properly. In fact there were complaints that he did not turn up regularly and often sent schoolchildren to do chores for him. The Marghat Bheel parent was of the view, however, that his child did not

[112] Interaction Note IA16.
[113] It was striking that a similar observation had been made by Kolhi adult cotton-pickers who had been asked about their relations with their Muslim employers. They had volunteered that the Muslim landlord/employers knew that Kolhi labourers did not shirk or steal because the Kolhis were more fearful of punishment than their Mulsim counterparts. Interaction Note IA21.
[114] Interaction Note IA123.
[115] Interaction Note IA185.
[116] Interaction Note IA16.
[117] Interaction Notes IA137 and IA138.
[118] Interaction Note IA24.

face any additional problems because of his identity. Such testimonies were found across the country, and are significant pointers to the way forward.

One reason that was offered by some respondents, particularly in the Peshawar sites, about the relatively equal and non-hierarchical culture of the school was the exit of the real dominant group from the scene.[119] The Khans, who were at the top of the social hierarchy no longer sent their children to the local government school – nor were they much in evidence as teachers. If the Khans had been present, it was argued that there might have been more overt discrimination against the marginalised groups. In the central Punjab villages where, by contrast, the traditional dominant castes were still very much involved in the government schools, there were more complaints of discriminatory behaviour. The gradual induction of teachers from various marginalised groups was another possible reason for the less exclusionary environment of the school.[120]

There was one important respect in which the government school reinforced and perpetuated caste-based social marginalisation in regions where traditional caste hierarchy was a source of social inequality. School admissions forms demanded to know the caste of a child, and this was then recorded into the admissions register. In the Peshawar and Punjab fieldwork sites caste identity was seen as a barrier to upward mobility by many groups. The *kisbagars* in Peshawar and the various *kammi* and menial service castes in Punjab often took on surnames that disguised their traditional occupations. The school register, however, remained a durable record of these identities. According to one respondent in Peshawar, no matter how high a person rose in life he was brought down to earth by the school record.[121] Teachers took it upon themselves to record a child's caste name in line with the traditional calling of the family, rather than according to the wishes of the parents.[122] In some regions such as rural Sindh where caste identity was not, inherently, a marker of low status the recording of caste names was not problematic. In Mekran, schools generally recorded a pupil's *zaat* as Baloch regardless of whether she was from a "pure Baloch", Darzada or Ghulam family.[123]

3.3 Passive discouragement

Poor quality of schooling

The generally poor quality of the schooling system acted as a source of passive discouragement for entire communities including the socially marginalised segments of those communities. Despite the poor quality of schools – some of which was documented above – parents and children across the fieldwork sites expressed a strong desire for education. There were only two groups – a Faqeer extended family in Faislabad and Jandavaras in Shahdadpur – where respondents were unequivocal in their alienation from formal schooling.[124]

[119] Interaction Note IA71.
[120] This issue is discussed in more detail further below.
[121] Interaction Note IA64.
[122] Interaction Notes IA61 and IA138.
[123] Interaction Note IA177.
[124] Interaction Notes IA136 , IA29 and IA30.

The experience of schooling, however, was often a disappointment for parents and children alike. Many cases of drop-outs were documented across the fieldwork sites where a pupil had become disenchanted with the school and refused to go any further because she or he had not learnt anything useful even after years of remaining in school. There were children in the fieldwork sites who had attended school up to Class 4 or 5 without ever learning to read properly.[125] Archaic teaching methods consisting of endless repetition and rote learning required great conformity from the children at the outset. There were few chances of retaining or arousing the interest of a child if she or he was put off in the early stages. Children from poorer and socially marginalised groups were at a particular disadvantage if their parents did not have the time, resources, or prior knowledge to persuade or coerce them into continuing with the motions of schooling.

Language

In all of the fieldwork sites in NWPF, Punjab and Balochistan, much of the classroom time at the primary level was taken up in teaching children to recognize Urdu words and to read them. Comprehension, according to most teachers across the country, was a distant prospect by Class 4 or 5. Since most children came from families that spoke languages other than Urdu, they attempted to learn a new language at the same time as learning to read and write. The common practice in these schools was the "translation method". The teacher would recite a text in Urdu and then explain its meaning to the children in Punjabi, Pashto, Balochi, Seraiki or whichever happened to be the native language of the area.[126]

Sindhi was the medium of instruction in the schools in the rural site in Sanghar. Since Sindhi was also the *lingua franca* in the area it was expected that children would not face the double task of learning to read and write in a strange language. For the Bheel children, however, Sindhi was a second language. Their spoken language at home was Marwari. Adult male respondents – Bheels as well as non-Bheels – were of the view that the Bheel children were fluent in Sindhi even before they went to school. Probing revealed that a Talpur1 teacher whose own language was Sindhi did use Marwari to put the Bheel children at ease in the early phases of schooling. The teacher claimed to know some Marwari through longstanding social interaction with the Bheel community. Bheel parents also indicated that a teacher from their own community might have been advantageous since he or she might have spoken to the children in their own language.[127]

There was no simple solution to the language paradox. School teachers across the provinces were of the view that local language teaching was going to be even tougher on the children. Some of the teachers were candid enough to admit that they themselves would have a problem with texts in the local languages, since they had only ever learnt to read and write in Urdu.[128] An added problem – and one that was revealed when attempts were made to teach in local languages – was that there were wide variations in dialects leading to confusion among teachers and pupils alike.[129]

[125] See for example, Interaction Notes IA15.
[126] Interaction Notes IA50, IA126, IA148 and IA176.
[127] Interaction Notes IA6, IA15 and IA19.
[128] Interaction Notes IA112, IA126, IA148 and IA176.
[129] This view was expressed by teachers in NWFP, Punjab and Balochistan. Interaction Note IA.

The adoption of local languages would require standardization, which may again create a gap between the language spoken by children at home and that used in the school.

There was a genuine issue at stake, however, that local language teaching might place children at a disadvantage if they had to switch to Urdu at higher levels of schooling. The introduction of English as a taught language in many schools added one more layer of complication to an already confused picture. In schools where English teaching was being attempted, it was reported that the teachers translated English texts first into Urdu and then into local languages.[130]

The language issue merely highlighted the fact that schooling continued to be seen in instrumental terms. It was necessary to go through primary school in order to get secondary education, and a secondary schooling was essential to gain a public qualification (matriculation), which in turn was a minimal condition for a job. The idea that a child who had finished Class 5 might have learnt something useful by then which was of some intrinsic value appeared to be virtually non-existent. This outlook also worked as a dampener for school participation for boys as well as girls. A boy from a poor and socially marginalised family who felt that he did not have a chance to get regular job saw little point in completing the primary cycle. There were many such cases documented in the fieldwork sites. There were also cases of girls whose parents did not send them to primary school because there was no middle or secondary school nearby. Primary schooling in itself was often seen as a waste of time.

Religious instruction and symbols

The role of curriculum and ideology came up tangentially in the course of the fieldwork. Teachers, children and adult respondents in areas of religious heterogeneity were asked about the effect of religious instruction and religious messages in other subjects. The Muslim teachers in Faisalabad held the view that the Christian children did not mind Islamic religious lessons and messages in the curriculum. They believed that the Christian children were better than their Muslim counterparts in reciting Islamic lessons.[131] In the rural Sanghar site too the Muslim teachers felt that the Bheels were not inhibited by Islamic lessons or symbols in school. One teacher who claimed to be an expert on the Bheels went as far as to say that the Bheels of his village were not really Hindus at all, and that they recited the *kalima* and other Islamic prayers without hesitation.[132]

In Mekran Muslim teachers who were convinced that Zikris were heretical non-Muslims reported that Zikri children had no hesitation in reading Islamic lessons extolling *namaz* (prayer) and *roza* (fasting) or reciting the *kalima* – all matters that were considered antithetical to the Zikri faith. The teachers felt that the pupils simply recited these lessons without believing in them, and that they held fast to their own

[130] Interaction Note IA50.
[131] Interaction Note IA112.
[132] This view might have been an exaggeration, given the explicitly non-Islamic icons and deities displayed prominently in Bheel homes in the village. What was true, however, was that there was a sense in which Bheels and Muslims of the village shared religious practice – they were both *mureed* (disciples) of the same mystics and shrines. Interaction Notes IA15 and IA17.

beliefs.[133] This was confirmed by Zirki schoolchildren who argued that they "read what they were told to read, but did what they were supposed to do". These children, however, did not tell the parents about Islamic lessons in school, in case this led to them being withdrawn from school.[134]

Like language the question of religious instruction and symbols in schools was a complicated matter. There were numerous Muslim respondents among socially marginalised groups who thought that the most important benefit of schooling, particularly for girls, was that their children would "learn about religion (*deen*)", "learn to recognize *kufr* (denial) and *shirk* (polytheism)", and "come to know about Islamic personalities".[135] There were many such responses in the fieldwork sites in Peshawar, but also elsewhere in the country. Interestingly, these parents had chosen to send their children to regular schools rather than religious schools or *madaris*. In socially conservative environments where women were not expected to acquire paid jobs, it was perhaps important to impute moral and religious reasons for girls' schooling.[136]

The talk, on the part of Muslim teachers, of non-Muslim pupils taking part in Islamic lessons was a good-intentioned and benign way of working around potentially conflictual religious difference. But the fact remained that if Islamic lessons were important to induce Muslim parents to send their children to school, the absence of Hindu, Christian or Zikri lessons might have dampened the enthusiasm of these particular groups for schooling.

Schooling relevance and the "lottery" effect

In some ways the poor quality of schooling, archaic teaching methods, problems of language instruction and the negotiation around religious ideology and symbols were inter-connected issues. Implicit in all of this was the damaging idea that whatever happened at school was of only superficial relevance to the lives of the people who were schooled. The fact that the primary level of schooling was so widely regarded as simply instrumental to stepping onwards to secondary schooling was a devaluation of the learning possibilities in the first five or six years of school life. Children spend many years simply trying to learn a new language, and that too, reportedly, with very limited success. The point of religious lessons and symbols, likewise, was simply the ability to remember, recite and repeat.

For the poor and the socially marginalised families, public schooling was like a lottery. A child who was able to find the aptitude to learn something in this environment, or one who happened to maintain some level of motivation and enthusiasm (having *shauq*), could progress through primary onto secondary school. The cases of people from socially marginalised backgrounds who had succeeded were mostly stories of children who got an extra helping hand (from a relative, a patron or teacher) and those who showed aptitude.[137] Conversely, those who dropped out were often the ones who could not cope and did not gain anything. It was quite rational for

[133] Interaction Note IA186.
[134] Interaction Note IA189.
[135] Interaction Note IA62.
[136] Interaction Note IA184.
[137] See case studies in Section 4.

families from socially marginalised groups to invest in children who appeared to be doing well in school, and to allow the others to find their own way into work life.

There was a strong perception among marginalised groups that they faced a serious disadvantage in accessing formal sector jobs, which in effect mean public sector employment. A key motivation for educating boys used to be the possibility of a government job. It was widely understood that there were far fewer such jobs available, and that these were rationed by bribes and *sifarish* – both being scarce resources for most marginalised groups. Political connections, however, could play a role in overcoming some obstacles to government jobs. One opinion that was widely heard across fieldwork sites was that the failure of an educated youth to land a government job acted as a dampener on demand for schooling in his peer group.[138]

The current situation was perhaps more challenging compared to the experience of upwardly mobile socially marginalised groups in the past. Jobs in the public sector – civil and military – appeared to be more readily available on qualifications and merit some two decades ago. The changing nature of the labour market was being factored into people's expectations. Many expressed the view that education was valuable because it would enable a person to understand accounts (*hisab-kitab*), do his own business (*karobar*), and not be fooled in the market.

Livelihood strategies, constraints, and mobility

The concept of a school "fixed" in a settled village or urban quarter was, in some ways, a "mainstream" and "mainstreaming" idea. Many of the socially marginalised groups documented in this study were people who needed to be away from their homes for extended periods, those who did not have "fixed" homes, or those who were perceived to be temporary residents even if they had stayed in a particular location for many years. Perceptions were sometimes based on the past, traditional, or expected behaviour of these groups.

There was a difference in the schooling options available to brick kiln workers who lived in their own villages and those who worked as migrant labourers. In principle both were vulnerable to bonded and child labour. The Christians in the Faisalabad fieldwork site, however, did at least have the opportunity of sending their children to the local school if they tried.[139] The Muslim Shaikh migrant counterparts in Islamabad, however, lived at brick kilns and were more prone to get their children to work.[140]

Some livelihood strategies were difficult to square up with existing practices in the formal schooling system. Cotton was the most important cash crop over much of middle and upper Sindh, and southern Punjab. Its harvesting was not a one-time activity but a process that could take up to four months starting around September and ending around December. The school year in both these provinces began in August. In the fieldwork sites in Sindh cotton harvesting was an important source of income for the poor, and particularly some of the socially marginalised. It was an activity

[138] See for example, Interaction Notes IA131 and IA110.
[139] Interaction Note IA96 and IA127.
[140] Two Muslim Shaikh *jamadar*s (foremen) at the fieldwork site in Islamabad had started sending their children to a newly established private school nearby.

carried out mostly by women and children of a village. Very young children would be left at home while children of school-going ages generally accompanied their mothers into the fields. Socially marginalised groups such as the Kolhis, Marecha, and Bagris in the fieldwork communities often traveled long distances away from home to do this work.[141] In these cotton-growing areas the school calender itself was a form of "passive discouragement" for children of the poor, and particularly the socially marginalised.

Other groups such as the Usta, Changar, Jandavaras and Faqeers also regularly commuted long distances from home in order to make their livelihoods. Their children either accompanied them in their work, or remained behind to take care of younger siblings. In some cases, such as the Jandavaras of Shahdapur or the Faqeers of Faisalabad, who relied on begging, children were the front-end "workers".[142] It was inconceivable for these groups to send their children to school without giving up their main sources of livelihood.

The idea of a fixed school also militated against the sense of mobility that many of these groups felt. Even though they had lived in one place for many years there was, nevertheless, fluidity in their lifestyles. What mattered, therefore, was not how long someone had stayed in a place, but how long they expected they would stay there. The Kolhis of SR1 were clearly of the view that they could move on short notice. The same was felt by the Jandavaras and some of the Bagris of Shahdadpur. The Faqeers actually did move every few weeks and traveled long distances over the course of a year.[143]

For some transhumant and peripatetic groups – admittedly those who faced less social discrimination than the Faqeers or the Bagris – schooling was becoming a focal point for getting settled. A Pashtun family from Loralai that migrated every year to Rajanpur and worked in the timber trade had started sending its children to school some years ago. They timed their annual trips to Loralai during the summer holidays and returned to Rajanpur soon after the start of the school year in August. Their traditional migration pattern had been premised on longer summer stays in their home area. These transhumants lived in make-shift houses on someone else's land, but their children were going to obtain school-leaving certificates from this region and not their actual homes.[144]

In the same area a group of camel-herding Jut families had begun to abandon their semi-nomadic lifestyle and moved to the plains from the hills along the Punjab-Balochistan border.[145] They had acquired some land for homesteads and farming and sold off many camels in return. Their move towards a fixed life was partly motivated by a long-running tribal conflict in the hills resulting in restricted mobility in their traditional grazing areas. Children from these families had now started going to school because this was the first time that they had decided to settle down in a place close to schooling facilities. These two cases of transition merely highlighted the

[141] Interaction Notes IA21, IA22, IA23 and IA31.
[142] See for example, Interaction Notes IA30 and IA136.
[143] Interaction Note IA136.
[144] Interaction Notes IA46 and IA47.
[145] Interaction Note IA148.

point that people who remained transhumant (due to economic necessity or lifestyle choice) had open attitudes to schooling but lacked facilities to meet their needs.

3.4 Passive encouragement

There were a number of measures and features of the schooling system in the fieldwork sites that were designed to induce greater school participation. Pupils were entitled to fee exemptions and free textbooks in most places. In some of the fieldwork sites there were also schemes for cash and kind stipends for girl pupils with good attendance records. The placement of a school where none existed before could also be considered an inducement to greater school participation. These measures to encourage schooling were not specifically aimed at any particular target population or group. But they were expected to have a salutary effect on the socially marginalised groups. These measures were primarily aimed at tackling the problem of the "purchasing power" – i.e. the unwillingness or inability of parents to send their children to school due to low incomes. There was also propaganda value to these initiatives – by creating greater public awareness about schooling they were expected to induce greater demand for schooling even at given levels of income by altering attitudes and preferences.

These measure for "passive encouragement" were found to be effective in all fieldwork sites. Many families that who had started sending their children, particularly their girls, to school for the first time cited a range of these factors – that a school had become available where there was none, there were free textbooks, there were other cash or kind incentives. Perhaps the positive "propaganda" value of such inducements had been underestimated. In many of the fieldwork sites there were noticeable increases in demand for schooling that appeared to be directed to fee-charging private schools – as opposed to government schools where there were fee exemptions and free textbooks. Such private schools were present in all urban sites, but also in the rural fieldwork sites in Peshawar and central Punjab.[146]

There were no reports of discrimination between pupils in the distribution of textbooks. In the fieldwork sites in Peshawar, Punjab and Sindh it was reported that all primary school children received books free of charge. Teachers in Balochistan complained about not receiving adequate numbers of books. They claimed to have distributed these evenly between the pupils – if one child received an Urdu reader the other got the arithmetic workbook. In the rural Sanghar site some Bheel parents complained that while their children had received the textbooks like all other children, a few satchels that had been provided by a donor organization were given to Talpur1 children only.[147]

Parents and community key informants in Punjab did complain about abuse of cash and kind inducements that had been offered in girls' schools. The Baloch5 said, for example, that teachers in the government girls' school in the nearby town – which was the closest girls' school to the village – routinely demanded bribes from the girls

[146] Teachers in the boys' school in rural Faisalabad (Interaction Note IA126) believed that fee exemptions and free textbooks had led to a return of pupils from private to government schools. In this case the inducements were not increasing overall school participation but simply switching participation from one type of school to another.
[147] Interaction Note IA24.

in return for giving over *ghee* (cooking oil) cans that had been provided as attendance incentives.[148] Girls in secondary classes were entitled to cash inducements (payable by cheque). There were charges of irregularity in this regard also. The teachers allegedly threatened to reduce a girl's attendance record, or even to expel her from school, if her parents did not sent food items such as eggs or chickens. There had been a case recently of a child having been removed from the school after her father had gone to the school to protest about this behaviour.

3.5 Active encouragement

Universal enrollment efforts and role of teachers

Some of the measures for improving enrollments were not based on increasing parental demand for schooling, but on attaining universal education within the locality. Teachers were asked by the education department to prepare lists of all children born in particular years, and to follow up on children who had come of school-going age in any given school-year. Birth registers were maintained at least in the fieldwork site in rural Peshawar, though it was not clear if there were follow-up visits to households to ensure that a child who attained the school-going age was actually enrolled.[149] Teachers felt over-burdened by these demands of the educational authorities, which they saw as extra work on top of other activities such as assisting with elections, polio campaigns, and population censuses.

The complaints of teachers notwithstanding, the idea of setting and operationalising universal schooling targets in school catchment areas was a sound one for ensuring the participation of the socially marginalised groups among others. It was important to pay attention to teachers' perceptions if any universal enrollment scheme were to succeed. In fact teachers were required even as a normal part of their duties to motivate enrollment and to follow-up on dropouts. The actual record in the fieldwork sites was mixed. There were many groups with low or non-existent school participation rates where no teacher or other education official had ever visited.[150] In some cases these groups appeared to be temporary residents and were not regarded as *bona fide* members of the "school community". Universal enrollments measures would have missed these groups even if they had been in operation.

For drop-outs there were cases both of teacher effort and neglect. A Bagri family in Shahdadpur that had been the first in its community to send its children to school was forced to withdraw these children due to an adverse economic shock. They reported several home visits on the part of the teacher to persuade the parents to send their children.[151] There were several cases of teachers going out of their way to bear expenses of able but poor pupils from socially marginalised groups in order to help them pursue their studies.[152] Conversely many of those interviewed who had dropped out had never had any follow-up action on the part of the school or teachers. The key difference appeared to be in the academic promise of a pupil. Some of the teachers

[148] Interaction Note IA139.
[149] This effort had been carried out as part of a Universal Primary Education (UPE) programme. Interaction Note IA62.
[150] Interaction Note IA21.
[151] Interaction Note IA31.
[152] See, for example, Interaction Note IA197.

who intervened actively to ensure the continued participation of promising pupils appeared to have gained genuine satisfaction – perhaps motivated by feelings of charity – at having invested time, effort and even resources into a "good cause". Such feelings could not be summoned up, obviously, for "lost cause" children who had failed to make progress. It was these very children who perhaps required the greatest amount of encouragement and support.

Teachers from socially marginalised groups

The induction of teachers from marginalised groups was another measure of active encouragement – even if this was not part of any conscious policy. Teachers from marginalised group could reduce the social distance between the school and the target community. Given the prevalence of the "translation method" in teaching, such teachers might be able to communicate with children of their own groups more effectively than outsiders. They may also provide role models for aspiring youth and focal points for group leadership.

Schools administrations in fieldwork sites had different policies towards local hiring of teachers. In Sindh and Balochistan local teachers appeared to be the norm, while in Punjab there was a bias against the hiring of local teachers. The situation was more mixed in the NWFP fieldwork sites. Locals, of course, need not have been from the socially marginalised groups. In the rural Sindh sites, for example, all of the teachers were from locally dominant groups. There were cases in neighbouring villages, however, of teachers from marginalised (or formerly marginalised groups) who had played in important role, historically, in the uplift of their respective communities.[153]

In the fieldwork sites in urban Faisalabad there were mixed experiences with teachers from the target community. A school serving the mostly Christian locality, which had mostly Muslim teachers, did have a Christian teacher who acted as a bridge between the school and the local Christian community.[154] He was not from the area himself, and had tried not to get posted to this school, which was known for its dilapidated conditions. Before his posting there had been another Christian teacher serving in the school. There appeared to be an unstated policy on the part of the administration to ensure the presence of at least one Christian member of staff. The Christian teacher was, indeed, and important resource for the local Christian community in the school. The experience of the Changars with a teacher from their group, however, was not altogether a positive one. He was known to be particularly strict and administered frequent beatings.[155]

In the Mekran region of Balochistan there were many teachers from among the Darzadas. The headmaster of a surveyed school was a Darzada, and many other Darzadas were in teaching positions in the schools inspected.[156] In the school BR1, for example, there were 5 Darzada teachers on a staff of fifteen.[157] The situation represented a radical change from around twenty years before, when the first ever

[153] Interaction Note IA28.
[154] Interaction Note IA112.
[155] See Interaction Note IA119 for the case of a drop-out Changar boy due to being beaten by the teacher.
[156] Interaction Note IA198.
[157] Interaction Note IA175.

Darzada teacher was appointed there. It was thought that the entry of Darzadas into the profession had been facilitated by electoral politics – since the Darzadas had many votes, candidates canvassing votes were obliged to offer them government jobs.

3.6 Case studies of specific interventions

The findings discussed above have been interpreted as measures for the "active encouragement" of marginalised groups. It is not clear, however, if they had been self-consciously designed with this purpose in mind. There were some specific interventions on the part of non-governmental or non-profit organizations documented during the course of the fieldwork that were specifically designed to deal with particular sources of marginalisation and/or specific marginalised groups.

School for domestic servants and other marginalised groups in Lahore[158]

The welfare organization, established in 2002 by a female social worker, currently runs eight schools in areas within and close to Lahore. Seven of these schools are coeducation and one is for girls only. The basic idea behind the organization is, that sending children to work at an early age is child abuse by the children's parents. This makes children vulnerable to physical, verbal and sexual abuse which is seen as a cause of many growing up to be "thieves, vagabonds and prostitutes". Thus, the organization aims to impart a mix of religious, contemporary and vocational education to children from the marginalised group of what it defines as "ignorant, illiterate and underprivileged rural class". The founder further defines this target population as composing of those rural to urban migrants who are involved in marginalised economic activities like domestic work and beggary.

The chain of schools started in July 2002 with a small informal school in its founder's porch. The students were a few children of domestic servants who worked in her neighbourhood. The student body slowly grew as children from other families also started coming to this free school inspired by the children studying in the school. The organization gained exposure for its work in the print media, and grew with the help of local philanthropists. As the number of schools increased, the school's initial target population also expanded from solely children of domestic workers to children of beggars etc. Currently close to 1500 children study in the eight schools including the socially marginalised *kammi* castes and Christians.

The curriculum followed by the schools is a modified version of that followed in government schools. The curriculum has been modified in three main ways. Firstly, it has been condensed to reduce the time it takes for children to complete each education level. For example, the syllabus for the primary level has been condensed from being taught over five years in government schools to three in the organization's schools. Secondly, the curriculum includes teaching vocational skills, which the organization considers as a prerequisite for better paying occupations with a higher social acceptability than beggary or domestic work. This includes teaching gardening, mending electronic items and computers, and sewing etc. The third modification has been the incorporation of Islamic symbolism in the syllabus, as discussed below.

[158] Interaction Note IA149.

Since the vision of the school is to improve the socio-economic position of the children, the organization's perception of their background has been instrumental in deciding the emphasis of the education. Prior to being inducted in the school, children are seen as having no social etiquette and low morality. The school administration and teachers complained that when children were inducted they often used foul language, had little understanding of cleanliness and hygiene, and almost no knowledge of Islam. Since morality is seen by the organization to be stemming from Islam, the curriculum pays special attention to imparting basic Islamic education to all. The first word that is taught in the schools is Allah and the memorization of ninety-nine names of Allah is included in the primary syllabus.

The school's environment, including the teacher's attitudes and syllabus taught, openly and intentionally, imparts a feeling of repulsion in the children towards the occupation of their parents. The aim of the school, which is to make more civilized, upwardly mobile, religious citizens out of the children naturally demands a shunning of the perceived irreligious, uncivilized and backward culture they have left behind at home. This has resulted in many of the children feeling ashamed of their backgrounds. Many do not reveal their parents profession and aspire to be involved in more "respected" occupations like teaching. Many have assented to changing their traditional names to more acceptable Muslim sounding names to show their civilized identity. The founder expressed her satisfaction on the improvement in children's behaviour and vocalized her desire to civilize the children's parents through the children.

An incident of religious discrimination within the student body was observed at the school. There were food taboos in sharing food and drink with a Christian child and the attitude of students towards the child was derogatory. The influence of the school or teachers in this cannot be ascertained.

Conflict-displaced group in Quetta[159]

The fieldwork site BU1 in Quetta was a settlement of conflict-displaced families belonging to the Marri tribe. The Marris had arrived in Quetta in 1992 after over a decade of exile in Afghanistan. The community remained in a state of tension vis-à-vis state authorities and with whom their relations were marked by mutual suspicion and mistrust. There was one government girls' middle school close to the Marri settlement, and no boys' school in or near the area. The schooling gap had been filled by a non-governmental organization – the Bonded Labour Liberation Front (BLLF) – that ran two schools, one each for girls and boys, in the area.[160]

The boys' school in the Marri community was visited during the fieldwork. The school was established in 1993 to target working children in the low income and conflict-displaced Marri community. Till 1995, the school had poor infrastructure with no building with classes being held in tents. The teachers then pooled their private funds and constructed four *katcha* rooms. Since then, the situation has improved. The school had been upgraded from primary to middle, and had four cemented and four *katcha* rooms. There were close to a hundred pupils and six

[159] Interaction Note IA68.
[160] There was also a BLLF-run school in the Lachhi-majority fieldwork site in Quetta.

teachers. BLLF paid the salaries of teachers and the pupils contributed towards expenses like water pots and stationary. The school had no financial support from any other non-governmental or governmental organization.

All teachers in the school belonged to the conflict displaced Marri community - two of them had themselves completed their own primary schooling from the BLLF school. School timings were from 2 pm to 6 pm to accommodate the work timings of the children. Many of the children worked in the mornings, or in the evenings after school. Some worked as vegetable vendors and others in the wholesale fruit and vegetable market as labourers.

Changar community school in urban Faisalabad[161]

In the fieldwork site inhabited by the Changar community in urban Faisalabad there was a "community" school that was meant specifically for children of Changar families. Changars, it might be recalled, were mostly involved in the rag trade and children's work as rag-pickers and scavengers was a crucial contributor to family livelihoods. The community school was called the Al-Shams School, possibly in deference to the saint Shah Shams Tabrez whom the Changars revered. Some members of the community who regarded "Changar" to be a derogatory title, preferred to call themselves Shamsi.

The school was located inside the Changar *mohalla*, and its timings, from 1.30 pm till 5.30 pm, were specifically meant to suit the needs of the community. It was housed in rented premises, and had been in a different building until two years ago. The founder and manager of the school was a man called Khalid, who lived in another locality of Faisalabad, and had a public sector job. He was thought to be a Changar/Shamsi himself, and had set up some eight schools in different parts of the city to cater for the needs of Changars and other similarly marginalized groups. Khalid subsidized the running of these schools, paid the rent and the teachers' salaries. Pupils were asked to pay a nominal monthly fee of 10-15 rupees. Two of these eight schools were reported to be non-functional. It was not clear whether Khalid had access to other benefactors who supported his schooling ventures.

The inspected school had also seen better days. It was closed on the first day of the field visit. Local respondents reported that it had been shut for eight days in a row. When the school did finally open and was inspected, there were around 40 pupils, boys as well as girls, all Changar, being taught by two female teachers. There was no furniture or facility for drinking water. The teachers were from the surrounding non-Changar localities and, in fact, had strong negative prejudices about the Changars and their children. When the school had first started in 2001 it has employed a local Changar youth Tariq who had completed high school. Tariq had been a dedicated teacher and at that time the school reportedly had over 100 pupils.

Charity school in Peshawar rural site[162]

[161] Interaction Note IA115.
[162] Interaction Note IA90.

The settlement of FR2 was within the administrative area of the survey site FR1 in rural Peshawar. This cluster of around 30 households was connected by 2 km of dirt track with the main settlement where the government schooling facilities were located. The people living in FR2 were either existing or former *hamsayas* of the Khans, and mostly worked as tenant farmers. The former *hamsaya*s had bought small plots of land to build their own houses. The distance from the main settlement meant, however, that the children of these socially marginalized (and some upwardly mobile) families were at a disadvantage with respect to schooling. FR2 was at the far end of the FR1 administrative area and had its own access to the main Charsadda Road via a link road. Besides FR2 there were other *hamsaya* and former *hamsaya* clusters in the vicinity, whose children faced a similar schooling disadvantage.

A Peshawar-based physician (Dr Laiq) who owned some agricultural land in the area had started up a charitable school in this area in 2003. He was not from the area himself, but maintained a house there, which he visited every weekend. The physician had received help from other philanthropic individuals in setting up the school. The school was housed in a specially constructed building on Dr Laiq's land. The building was well-designed and included a courtyard and a play area. Classrooms were equipped with good furniture and the school had the look and feel of a high quality private fee-charging school. In fact, there was no charge at the school. Textbooks, other teaching materials and school uniforms were provided free of charge to the children. The enrolment had reached a total of 120 children, with 80 girls and 40 boys. The teachers were well-qualified – all of them being at least graduates compared with matric and inter-pass teachers in local private schools. Their salaries were over three times as high as their local private school counterparts.

The school had revolutionized the schooling conditions in the surrounding *hamsaya* and former *hamsaya* villages. Children studying here were among the first few individuals in their extended families to have ever gone to school. There was even the case of a family that had moved to the area specifically to take advantage of the schooling opportunity that had become available. Given the good reputation that the school had begun to enjoy there was high demand for places in it. These were rationed on the basis of residential proximity to the school – a rationing system that happened to favour the marginalized groups in the area.

3.6 Lessons from private schools[163]

Fee-charging private schools were found in a majority of the fieldwork sites. They were present not only urban areas but across rural fieldwork areas in NWFP and Punjab. These schools belied the common perception that private schooling was the preserve of the urban elites. The urban areas visited as a part of this study were mostly low-income localities. Although private schools were clearly out of the reach of the poorest, there was evidence of families from marginalised groups making special efforts and sacrifices in order to send their children to these schools. In the fieldwork site in rural Faisalabad, for example, poor Baddu parents had decided to invest in the schooling of their son in the local private school, even as the daughters with sent to the government school. Similar cases were found in other sites.

[163] This section is based on Interaction Notes IA1, IA50, IA79, IA97, IA124, IA125, IA137, IA139 and IA147.

Private schools were to be found in settlements with relatively high concentrations of population. It was not profitable for entrepreneurs to open schools in places where sufficient numbers of fee-paying pupils could not be found. A recent statistical study of the private schooling sector in Pakistan has revealed that low-cost schools tend to emerge in locations where there are educated young women who are willing to take up teaching jobs.[164] That study also found a prevalence of low-cost private schools in rural areas of NWPF and Punjab, but not Sindh and Balochistan.

The observations in the qualitative fieldwork for present study were broadly in line with the findings of the statistical study cited above. There was at least one fee-charging private school in the field sites in urban and rural Peshawar, urban and rural Faisalabad, rural Toba Tek Singh, Dera Ghazi Khan and Rajanpur. It was also found, moreover, that privatization had crept into the local government schools in the rural site in Sindh. In one school regular government staff had appointed a local youth to take classes on their behalf, while in another school children paid fees to a local teacher to take classes in the government school that had been abandoned by the regular teacher. There were fee-paying Bheel children, among others, who had enrolled in this latter school.

Fee-charging private schools were considered to be of a generally higher standard than their government counterparts. This opinion appeared to be shared by dominant and marginalised groups alike. Government school teachers were, of course, of a different opinion everywhere. They argued that the private schools were based on the "gimmick" of English language teaching, that the staff were untrained and poorly paid, and that they were run purely for a profit-making motive. These allegations were found to have been substantiated to a great degree.

Schools did generally market themselves as English-medium, even though their instruction of English was limited to the rote learning of the alphabet and word-recognition. Teachers in private schools admitted that they taught English in a way similar to how Urdu was taught in local schools – i.e. using the "translation method". In effect, what the children actually learnt was Urdu, with some smatterings of English words and phrases. It was also true that the teachers were mostly young women who had done their Matriculation or Intermediate, and took up teaching posts simply to bide the time before they got married. Their monthly salaries ranged between 1,000 and 1,500 rupees, compared with government school salaries of over 5,000 rupees. There was a high turnover rate among the teaching staff. It was also true that the schools were run for a profit motive. They charged monthly fees in the range of 100 to 200 rupees, and were clearly out of the reach of the poorest households.

Perceptions of school quality were motivated, however, by a number of tangible and some intangible factors. Unlike government schools in NWFP and Punjab the private schools provided furniture for the children. They did not use the traditional *takhti* method of "setting the hand" and this gave the impression of a modern learning environment. They insisted on the wearing of school uniforms and maintained some

[164] Tahir Andrabi, Jishnu Das and Asim Ijaz Khwaja (2006), "A Dime a Day – The Possibilities and Limits of Private Schooling in Pakistan", World Bank Working Paper, Washington DC.

control over the personal hygiene of the pupils.[165] Efforts were made to ensure some level of cleanliness and order in the school's physical environment. School head teachers were also usually the owners and founders and they kept a right reign on the regular attendance and activities of their teachers.

From the point of view of socially marginalised groups, the fee-charging private schools were perceived to be much friendlier places than their government counterparts. The most common reply to questions about hierarchical attitudes was that "those who are interested in your money are not interested in those other things". Since the parents paid fees, there was no question of teachers demanding children to do chores and errands. These schools generally employed caretakers and peons for these purposes. Physical violence was also actively discouraged, and there were no complaints of verbal abuse.

An important innovation of the fee-charging private schools was the introduction of mixed gender schooling (co-education) in their respective areas. In the fieldwork sites in Peshawar, for example, it was commonly asserted that girls could not be sent to mixed schools. This turned out to a major handicap in places where a girls' school was not available within walking distance. The opening of mixed gender private schools had shown that the problem, perhaps, was not so much with parental attitudes as it was with the school environment.

Privatisation, though widely present, was an emerging trend. The first fee-charging schools in the Peshawar sites had appeared only since around 2003. In the central Punjab villages they had been around a little longer. In the rural Sindh site too the *de facto* privatization of the government school had been a relatively recent occurrence, dating back to around five years.

[165] One school even required uniforms for the teachers.

4. Transition and Continuity

This section presents selected case studies of individuals and families in the survey sites that represented change of some type. In some, the family was the first in its group – a pioneer of sorts -- to have gained exposure of formal schooling. Others deal with individuals who were the first in their families to have gone to school. In areas where there were strong opinions against female mobility and schooling special attention was paid to pioneering girls and women.

4.1 Upwardly mobile individuals and groups

Alisher Talpur1, rural Sanghar, Sindh[166]

Alisher Talpur1 belonged to a poor sub-clan of the Talpur *quom*. Historical accounts indicate that this particular sub-clan was expelled by the main ruling Talpur families for alleged misdemeanours. They have clung on to the Talpur identity, or perhaps invented it, in order to acquire status. Until the 1970s these Talpur1 were all landless and marginalized. They had no voice in local politics, and lived under the domination of various local and absentee landlords. Their village, despite being the most populous one in the area did not get a government school until 1988. Alisher started school in a neighbouring village of a dominant Baloch group in 1979. At that time 7 boys from his village, all belonging to his Talpur1 sub-clan, starting going to school together. All were, in fact, from one extended family. Before that there was only one Talpur1 from this village who had ever been to school. This man (Hussain) who was Alisher's uncle, had finished Class 5 some twelve years prior to Alisher and his cohort's entry into school. Alisher's elder brother who was a staunch disciple of a *peer* (spritual leader) in Hala (a market town), and a supporter of the political party in the 1970s managed to get a government sector job in a city, and then moved to Hala. Hussain (who had studied up to Class 5) took keen interested in Alisher and his cohort. After they finished primary school he arranged for all the boys to be taken to Hala and had them admitted in a high school there. They boys were able to go because Alisher's brother was already resident there. Alisher and his cousins finished high school together and were the first ones in their entire community to have done so. Their schooling experiences were closely connected to the rise of their family and sub-clan from the margins to the mainstream – a transition in which political entrepreneurship played a key role.

Waheed Baloch5, rural Dera Ghazi Khan, Punjab[167]

The Baloch5 were a relatively weak tribe among claiming Baloch ethnicity, who lived under the overall political and social domination of the powerful Baloch3 group. They had been landless tenants of this group. There were eight distinct *vasti*s with over two hundred households in all. Over time the Baloch5 had acquired ownership rights over their homestead lands, and some had also bought agricultural land. A government school was established in their area in 1988 but it had been non-functional for many years. The first male to have completed high school in this community was Waheed who was now over 50 years old. He had done his BA and

[166] Interaction Note IA16.
[167] Interaction Note IA139.

worked at the officer level in a private sector construction firm. Waheed was considered an educational pioneer among the Baloch5 and the first girl to have completed high school was also from his family. The only other graduates among the Baloch5 were Waheed's sister's sons whom he had mentored. Waheed's father died when he was very young. The Baloch5 are disciples of a local Syed *peer* who as an act of charity and support took Waheed under his care. Waheed moved to the Syed's house in town and was sent to school there. He managed, with the help of his mentor, to get through school and gain a degree. He was also considered to be a special disciple of the *peer*. He had become a local leader whose help was sought by the Baloch5 for resolving disputes, dealing with the authorities, and deciding on voting strategies.

Discussion

Alisher and Waheed present comparable cases of transitional groups where education played a role. Alihser's Talpur1 sub-clan and the Waheed's Baloch5 had been social underdogs who were politically dominated by other local groups. Both groups had improved their position in social and economic terms. They had also acquired some level of political autonomy. In both cases key individuals or sets of individuals were mentored by powerful religious figures – in Alisher's case it was the connection with the Hala *peer*, while for Waheed the Syed patron was an important source of support. The transitional individuals had further helped in the rise of their extended families and kinship groups in turn. Support with schooling had gone alongside other factors of empowerment – access to formal sector jobs, economic uplift, and critically, political enfranchisement.

4.2 The school and job lottery

Ismail and Khadim, unrelated men of *nai* (barber) caste, rural Faisalabad, Punjab[168]

Ismail's family of had migrated to this village from Amristar (Indian Punjab) with a dominant Rajput family as *seypi nai*s (barbers) at the time of independence. Ismail's father Deen (born 1945) was the first person in the family and among the local *nai* families to have been educated. He studied up to Class 8 (middle school) and then started work in his traditional family occupation. There were a few boys from *kammi* families in school even then, and there was no overt discrimination. He also opened a small grocery shop to supplement his income. The *seyp* relationship with the Rajput patrons was maintained, though some customers also paid in cash. Ismail (aged 43) who was the eldest brother was sent to school as were the younger brothers. There was no discrimination in school against boys of "low" castes. According to Ismail the teacher's attitudes set the tone for these things, and that a local Syed school master was a kind and noble person who did not harbour such feelings. While at school, and soon after finishing, Ismail did do *seyp* work for the Rajputs for a little while. But he felt repulsion (*nafrat*) for such work and was determined to find a way out of it.

He completed high school with good grades and appeared for entry into the armed services at a local recruitment centre. Ismail's school record was good and he easily

[168] Interaction Notes IA129 and IA134.

passed the physical examination (he was of a good height) so he was recruited without any *sifarish*. His literacy and numeracy were recognized quickly and found himself in a clerical section where he managed to develop good connections. Ismail was instrumental in helping his younger brothers in getting recruited into the armed servcies. Ismail had retired from service and returned to the village while the other brothers were still serving in various places. The family still did *seyp* for the Rajputs despite the note of resentment expressed by Ismail. Ismail's father Deen did the regular *seyp* of shaving the Rajput men, and at least one brother would come back to cook food and help out at weddings of a few special patrons among the Rajputs. The women of the family also went to Rajput homes during such functions to help out.

Khadim aged 45 was also a *seypi* barber (*nai*) in the village who has recently acquired some land on tenancy. Like Ismail, he felt that a *seypi* was in a position of subservience, though he had also been protected and supported by his Syed patrons. Khadim's family had migrated from the Hoshiyarpur area of Indian Punjab at the time of independence with their Syed patrons. Khadim went to school for a few days but then dropped out after he was beaten badly by a teacher for some other child's mischief. He never went back to school. After that two of his brothers did go to school and studied up to Class 9 and 10 respectively. Khadim's own son was sent to school but then dropped out after a few years because was not learning anything. Khadim felt that with education a person would be able to do his own business (*karobar*), would be able to leave *seyp*, and would learn about *deen* (religion) and *dunya* (the world). Although Khadim had mentioned Ismail's family as being part of the same *biraderi*, and was eager to associated himself with that family's success in gaining education and jobs, Ismail was adamant that they no relations or even social interaction.

Ansari (weaver) household, rural Faisalabad[169]

The family was originally from Gurdaspur in Indian Punjab, and migrated to this village at the time of partition due to partition related violence. In the last ten years, the family changed professions from its traditional work of cloth making to selling vegetables in the village. The head of the household, father of 9 children, was educated till Class 7. His wife was completely uneducated. The change in profession was undertaken due to several reasons. Firstly, the handmade cloth made by *julahas* was costly than the cheaper ready made cloth which had come in the market. Secondly, the new generation did not like their hereditary work and wanted to do something more profitable. They worked on looms in Faisalabad for a while but left the job as there was no one to look after their homes in the village. Thirdly, there was no place in the house to install looms. One of the sons, Ahmed, who completed matric and PTC, worked at a cloth store. He studied in the government school in the village and was sent by his father and grandfather, who had high expectations from him. The teachers in school also encouraged him. He stopped studying after matriculation because of economic hardship. The household was very disappointed that he could not get a government job even though he had completed Matriculation and had obtained a certificate in primary school teaching (PTC). It was said that he did not get the job, as he was not able to pay bribe.

[169] Interaction Note IA131.

Bashir Afridi, urban Peshawar, NWFP[170]

Bashir migrated one year ago with his family from a tribal agency because of warfare in the area between two rival religious sects. They moved here because there were already a number Afridi families from their area settled here, some of whom were their relatives. The Afridi migrants were looked down upon a rustic and uncouth by the locally dominant Pashtun tribe. His father Nasir had studied up to Class 7 in the village of origin, and had migrated to the Gulf to work and support his family. Nasir was very keen that at least some of his sons get educated. After displacement from the tribal area the family was only able to send Bashir to school. His brothers were working as labourers or as apprentices in workshops. Bashir did his primary schooling at the local government school, but moved to a private school in Class 6. He was currently in Class 9 in a fee-charging school, and was the only Afridi boy in the school. There was disagreement in the family about Bashir's schooling. His father supported Bashir while the mother felt that it would be better for him to take care of the family's livestock and to start earning like his brothers. Bashir, however, was committed to staying in school and aspired to become a doctor. He was staunchly opposed to the idea of his sisters going to school on grounds of tribal traditions.

Discussion

These were cases where individuals had been able to take advantage of available government schooling facilities in order to attempt a transition into education, and contribute to a transition of their families and communities from the margin into the mainstream. The *kammi*s in the Faisalabad village had gained a foothold through the government school. The contrast between the positions of the two *nai* families was instructive. Both felt that their traditional work, particularly under *seyp* arrangements was demeaning. Ismail had been able to make a transition out of that work while Khadim was still a *seypi*. The school might have encouraged Ismail, but his success resulted mostly from his own specific individual circumstances. The school had been unable to ensure that Khadim and his family remained engaged with the schooling system.

The fate of the Ansari family showed that persistence with schooling was not necessarily a guarantee of economic uplift. The Ansari youth was unable to get government employment and for his family the educational investment appeared to have ended in disappointment. It was striking that even Ismail's family that appeared to have been the most successful in having made a transition – i.e. struck "lucky" twice, in terms of schooling and in gaining public sector jobs – had not shaken off the "*nai*" and *seypi* status in village society. The lesson for an aspirant Bashir Afridi was a mixed one. His father had already made an economic transition (through migration to the Gulf) before the schooling transition. It was possible, however, that Bashir's mother's career advice would have turned to be sounder and more realistic than his father's hopes for change.

4.3 Out of bondage?

[170] Interaction Note IA51.

Amar and Mohan Bheel, rural Sanghar, Sindh[171]

Amar's extended family (including the family of his brother) was the first one among the Bheels of SR1 to have educated their children. All children had finished primary school and the first person among the local Bheels to have completed high school was Amar's nephew. Amar was around 50 years old, and worked as a *hari* (sharecropper) and *kamdar* (supervisor) for Iqbal, one of the largest landlords in the village. He claimed to have close ties with Iqbal. Recently when Amar got his daughter married he arranged a reception at the local *autaq* (male reception area) maintained by his landlord. His brother, cousins and nephews all worked for Iqbal and had done so for many years. The nephew who had completed high school worked as a tractor driver for the landlord. Amar himself had been to school for a couple of years. There was no local school then and he had to walk some six miles to get to the nearest school. He dropped out and started working. Amar had acquired a position of leadership among the local Bheels due to his diligent and loyal service to Iqbal. This was recognized by the fact that he had been elevated as a *kamdar* (supervisor) of local tenants. It was important to entertain guests from various Bheel sub-clans at particular events, and Amar's ability to do so (perhaps due to his connection with Iqbal) had enabled him to play the role of a leader among local Bheels. He had further added to his credential by making pilgrimage to holy places in India, and was now known as "Haji".

Mohan was a Bheel tenant of Hassan, who was known to be a particularly exacting and cruel landlord. Mohan was over 50 years old and had never gone to school. His eight-year old son was the first child among the Bheels of SR2 to ever go to school. Mohan had worked for Hassan for many years and was regarded as a head of the dozen or so Bheel families who resided in SR2. Members of these families were in conditions of severe bondage to Hassan. They were obliged to do unpaid work, and were beaten on a regular basis in order to extract work or as punishment for minor lapses. They were not allowed to go to the market without getting Hassan's permission. Some of them had seen even harsher conditions – such as nightly lock-ups, separate quarters for men and women, and labour camp conditions -- in more remote villages in the district. Mohan's position had become somewhat more autonomous, however, and he had recently taken on a tenancy with a new landlord Zafar in addition to working for Hassan. Zafar had got to know him because some of Hassan's land that Mohan farmed was adjacent to Zafar's area. Zafar had offered a tenancy to Mohan and the fact that Zafar was also from a locally powerful clan meant that Hassan could not directly oppose or challenge this contract. Mohan cited Hassan's excesses as the primary reason for making a bid for autonomy. He had also begun to argue that the village homestead land was officially sanctioned as government property and not Hassan's private property as the latter had claimed. One of Mohan's first actions after asserting some independence from Hassan was to enrol his son into school.

In both cases of Bheel "pioneers" schooling did not lead but was led by other changes. In the case of Amar it was service within the system with a "good" landlord that had allowed upward social mobility for the family. For Mohan it was strategic defiance of

[171] Interaction Notes IA19 and IA24.

the existing "bad" landlord that seemed to be the critical factor. It was not clear how these stories would turn out. Amar's nephew who had completed high school was still working for the same landlord. It was too soon to predict the outcome of Mohan's recent and fragile attempt at gaining autonomy.

Ghafoor Darzada, rural Kech, Balochistan[172]

Ghafoor was a 40-year old Darzada man who worked as a driver for Javed. Ghafoor's family included his wife and their three daughters and five sons. The oldest child was a daughter called Saima aged 16, while the youngest was a four-year old boy called Lal. Ghafoor had been to school up to Class 4 and could barely write his name. His father had been a soldier in Oman where he had died. Ghafoor left school and became a house servant (*bachak*) for a "pure Baloch" family then. He was not aware if the mother had ever received a pension for his father. Ghafoor's wife had never been to school and she and the oldest daughter worked as a domestic servants for various "pure Baloch" families – including Ghafoor's employer Javed and his close relatives. The women were paid in kind and not cash. None of the daughters had ever been to school. The eldest son Yusaf had studied till Class 9 and then dropped out. He worked in Javed's house as a *bachak*. The two middle sons (aged twelve and ten years respectively) had never been to school and the older one worked as a *bachak* for Javed's relatives. One son Saleh (aged 9) was in school in Class 4. The two boys who worked as *bachak*s stayed at their employer's homes. They ate their meals there and got a new pair of clothes every year. They were paid monthly salaries of 200 rupees. Ghafoor had tried his hand at casual labour, but had ended up working for Javed. There was a close dependence on Javed and his family – who were the traditional chiefs of the village. The oldest son Yusaf was sent to school by his employers. Ghafoor claimed that Javed had encouraged Yusaf to study. When he finished primary he was sent to the nearest high school some 3 km away. He went there with Javed's sons who also studied there. But while Javed's sons finished high school and went on to college in the city, Yusaf dropped out in Class 9. Ghafoor thought that Yusaf had lost interest in schooling, and Javed also did not help any further. Yusaf now worked for Javed full-time. Ghafoor claimed that his economic conditions had deteriorated in the interim and he was unable to send his middle sons to school because of that. Now Saleh (aged 9) was in school and Ghafoor hoped that the younger children would also be educated. He thought that the younger sons might study up till matric.

Abbas Joya Muslim Shaikh, rural Toba Tek Singh, Punjab[173]

Abbas was a 65-year old Muslim Shaikh (Joya) man who had lived in the village since the age of thirteen. He worked as a casual labourer, and owned his house in a segment of the village that had been set aside for plots for the landless poor (5-marla scheme). His mother had migrated here from Jhang with her children upon re-marriage following the death of her first husband. Abbas's step-father was a debt-bonded *naukar* of Majid, a local Araeen landowner. When the step-father died the debt was taken on by Abbas's older brother, who had started working for Majid. Abbas's brother was able to pay off the debt and quit Majid's employ. Unlike other

[172] Interaction Note IA181.
[173] Interaction Note IA138.

Joya/Muslim Shaikh families in the village Abbas's family had managed to remain free of debt and carried on working as casual labourers. Abbas managed to send his three children to the local government schools. His eldest son Pervez completed high school, his daughter was in Class 9, and the youngest son was in primary school. The teachers in the local school are from Araeen landowning families. When his son was admitted Abbas insisted that his caste should be recorded as Joya and not "*Mussali*", but he came to know that it was recorded as "Joya Mussali". Some teachers were prejudiced against the Joya children. Once when Pervez had been absent from school for a few days his name was removed from the register. It was not easy to get him re-admitted. There was a Muslim Shaikh in a neighbouring village who, due to connections in a political party, had gained some influence. Abbas approached this man for help and the teachers relented and re-admitted the child. Abbas reported that after completing high school his son went to live on the *dera* (farm-house) of Aslam Araeen. Aslam had befriended Pervez and had even paid for the latter's wedding expenses. Abbas was of the view that Pervez was not a *naukar* of Aslam but a friend but this could be verified independently, though it was found that Pervez served and looked after guests at the *dera*.

Discussion

The entry into schooling of the cases of bonded (or suspected bonded) families was an indication of the possibilities of change. Schooling, however, was not a driver of change in any of the cases. The Bheels in rural Sanghar had negotiated some space within their existing labour arrangements. Abbas Joya's transition had come about also through gaining autonomy from the economic arrangement first. His connection with a Muslim Shaikh political activist was a source of support. Ghafoor Darzada's position was peculiar, in that his son managed to get some schooling with the help of the employer. It was striking, however, that in three very disparate cases – Amar Bheel's in Sindh, Abbas Joya's in central Punjab, and Ghafoor Darzada's in Mekran (Balochistan) – the individuals who represented an educational transition appeared to be in relations of dependence vis-à-vis the dominant group patrons. Amar's nephew who had done his matriculation worked for his very landlord, Abbas's educated son had become a client of another Araeen landlord, and Ghafoor's educated boy was still working as a *bachak.*

4.4 Pioneers of female schooling

Bhatiyara household in urban Peshawar, NWFP[174]

Salim, age 45, took pride in his job of spraying water on streets as the hereditary occupation of *Bhatiyaras*. He was a government employee in the community corporation. His elder son Rauf, age 14, worked as an apprentice in a furniture workshop for 300 rupees a month. Rauf had studied till Class 6 in the local government school but had dropped out due to financial hardship. He was not too inclined on studying further and the family also realized the difficulties in getting a job. The eldest girl of the household, Simra age 12, did housework while her younger sisters, Nadia and Fauzia aged 10 and 8 respectively, went to a home-based NGO-supported school and were in the pre-school class. They took the initiative of wanting

[174] Interaction Note IA58.

to go to school because they saw other *Bhatiyara* girls and boys going from the neighbourhood. Their father had discouraged them because he felt that he would not be able to afford their books etc. later, but when he found out that these things were being provided in school, he agreed. No one from the community or family opposed this. The family expressed the view that once the girls were educated they would know how to look after themselves, and may be able to get jobs. It was also felt that if they were educated they will face fewer restrictions and will be more independent. The idea of educated girls taking up jobs was a rare one in this area, and it is possible that the "low" status *kisabgar* families like the *Bhatiyaras* were less constrained compared with the "higher" status Pashtuns by the rigid patriarchal codes.

Pashtun1 household in urban Peshawar, NWFP[175]

This case study of a family from the dominant Pashtun1 group was chosen to highlight the incidence of change with regards to female education in the field sites. In an area where very few girls were being sent to school, the highly educated girls of this household were an interesting aberration. All five girls of this household were educated. One of the male siblings, educated till class 8, was a driver in Kuwait and the other, an M.Comm by qualification a senior official in the government office. Father (Karim) worked as a contractor (*thekedar*) in construction and owned two trucks. Currently due to weak eyesight he has retired. He had worked in Lahore for some years. The girls' mother and all of her sisters were uneducated.

Karim was keen to get all his children, both girls and boys to study. The eldest girl, Rubab aged 25, was an MA in political science from Peshawar University. Lubna aged 21 and FA, was a teacher in a private school in Hayatabad Peshawar. Below her Hajra aged 19 was in the third year in a college in the city. The youngest two, Salma (aged 17) and Aasiya (aged 15) were studying in Classes 10 and 8 respectively in a government high school some 3 km away.

The sisters described other people in the village as being uncouth. Regarding harassment there were conflicting opinions. One girl said that boys from the area did harass girls who went outside the home to study. Her sister said that they did not face any sort of harassment in their own locality because "people were scared of their family". There was some initial resistance to education for girls from the father's side of the family, but this slowly declined. Now the person who initially opposed education was sending his own daughter to a private school. The concept of *purdah* has also declined in the family.

The girls had asked their father for permission to take up jobs on the premise that if he did not oppose their getting educated, he ought not to oppose them working. Rubab (aged 25) was not yet engaged. When a family came with a proposal, they assumed that the girl was uneducated. When they realized that she had an MA, they left thinking that she will be too independent, will do a job, go out of the house, not wear a *burqa*, not work in the house and not adapt to the lifestyle of their household. In some cases, Rubab has refused proposals because the prospective match was not as educated as she was.

[175] Interaction Note IA60.

Zareena, *makhloot* (mixed caste), rural Peshawar, NWFP[176]

Zareena is from an economically sound *makhloot* family. Her father owns a shop and also 80 marlas of land. She is 17 years old and has studied up to Class 10. She did not finish matriculation because she failed two papers and did not attempt them again, because she was not going to study any further in any case. Zareena got her primary schooling in the local government school. For middle school she went to a neighbouring village some 2 km away, while the high school was even further away at the Union Council headquarters. Zareena's elder sister Shabana (aged 18) had to drop out in Class 7 due to opposition on the part of her mother's brother. He was of the view that there was no need to educate girls beyond a point, because they were not going to be allowed to work at any rate. It is not clear if this opposition was due to the distance to the middle school, because Shabana now studies the Holy Quran in a village also some 2 km away. The two younger sisters aged 16 and 10 years are in Classes 4 and 3 respectively. The family does not have a television set at home because they feel that it might have a negative influence on the girls. They felt that people made fun of girls who worked and of their families. Girls, therefore, could be educated to a point where they could be helpful at home - have a basic understanding of things, write letters etc. – but not beyond. Because of this reason, girls were withdrawn from school around Class 7 or 8. Another concern was that if girls studied too much, they might get "morally corrupted".

***Mochi* household, rural Peshawar, NWFP**[177]

This was an upwardly mobile *mochi* family, who had bought land for their large house from the Khans 20 years ago. They reported that the Khans' attitude towards them had become more respectful over time. There were 11 siblings - 7 girls and 4 boys. Two of the four boys had studied and had worked in large urban centres. Five of elder sisters did not study, their ages ranging from 36 to 23. One sister, aged 27, and another, aged 22, went to school. The former completed primary and the dropped out when she started receiving marriage proposals. The younger one studied till class 6 and then dropped out to look after her ailing mother. In response to the question of why the older sisters had not studied but the younger ones had, they said that there had been a change in people's attitudes over time. Previously people used to talk about girls who used to go to school but now many girls went to school and no one talks anymore. The government has also facilitated the people by providing free books to the students. They felt that it was important for girls to study since they could work as lady doctors, nurses or teachers, and would create a better home environment. Another important reason cited was the ability to read religious texts.

Saima, caste Ansari, rural Faisalabad[178]

Saima the eldest daughter of the family, aged 17, was uneducated and stayed at home. A younger daughter, Surayya aged 14, was studying in Class 7 in the private school

[176] Interaction Note IA73.
[177] Interaction Note IA80.
[178] Interaction Note IA131.

nearby. She was the first girl in her family to study. The private school was reportedly chosen over the government school because the government school in the village was upto the primary level only. The nearest government middle school for girls was too far off and to get there she would have had to walk for a long distance alone, and boys might tease her if she went out of the locality. The reason why she studied was because of her own interest, and because her parents and elder uneducated sister thought that she might become cultured through schooling. The younger siblings of primary school going age, 3 boys and 1 girl all went to the private school. Another reason provided for preferring the private school was the poor quality of education in the government school and the indifferent attitude of teachers.

Farzana, Raees/Darzada/mixed, Lady Health Worker, rural Kech, Balochistan[179]

Farzana was 25 years old and married with one young child. She worked as a LHW (Lady Health Worker) with government health department. Her husband also worked as a government employee in the local police station. Farzana was born in Karachi and migrated to the village after getting married. He father died when she was young and her elder brother supported the family.

Her father was of the Raees caste and mother from the Darzada caste. Her husband was also of mixed lineage with his father a Raees and mother Darzada. Farzana's father-in-law was a government employee in road construction. Farzana does not acknowledge her Darzada background and introduces herself as a Raees. Other people of the community however refer to her as Darzada.

Farzana's three elder sisters were uneducated and two elder sisters completed primary. She was the first in her family to complete Matriculation. When her mother and brother decided that the elder sisters should study, there was much opposition from her father's side of the family. This opposition diluted later when his children insisted that they wanted to go to school. The main reason why her elder sisters could not study beyond primary was because of monetary reasons. At that time her elder brother was the only earning member of the family. Farzana's three brothers are educated. The eldest left studying after his father's death in class 6, but the younger two completed FA and Matric.

Farzana studied till Class 7 in a government school and then shifted to a nearby private school for further schooling. After matriculation, she started training as an LHW and then got married some months after her training ended.

Farzana can be seen as someone who has brought the idea of education to her marital home in the village. The girls in the family were inspired by her and went to the school to study. They were disappointed by the poor quality of education, Baloch-Darzada discrimination, and the indifferent attitudes and irregular attendance of teachers. Since the boys' school was better, some girls tried to go and study there, but were withdrawn because of societal pressure.

[179] Interaction Note IA178.

Discussion

The cases discussed in this section demonstrate a transition in societal attitudes towards female education. Different households, including the *mochi* household and the *makhloot* family in rural Peshawar, talked about the increased societal acceptance of girls acquiring basic education. Families saw basic education as beneficial within the home, and a tool, which could potentially help a woman fulfill her societal role.

It is instructive to note that these cases of women schooling pioneers come from families who have successfully made an economic transition. The cases are either of dominant groups, like the Pashtun1 household, or of upwardly mobile families from traditionally marginalized groups. The *bhatiara* household had the household head in a government job, the Darzada family in rural Kech had achieved upward mobility through urban migration, the Ansari household had changed its occupation from traditional hereditary work to more profitable vegetable vending, and the *mochi* household had improved its economic conditions by incorporating modern ideas and designs into its traditional work.

Female education was mostly a result of individual initiative and subsequent family support. This can be seen clearly in the case of the *bhatiara* and Ansari households. A similar observation can also be made about women's work from the Pashtun1 case and Farzana's case. It is interesting to note that several "low caste" families mentioned increased job opportunities as a motive for female education. This can be related to lower female mobility restrictions and a different perception of honour of these socially marginalized groups compared with the dominant group counterparts.[180]

There seemed to be an ambiguous relationship between education and marriage prospects. Higher qualifications were clearly posing problems in the marriage of educated Pashtun1 women, and only one woman, Farzana, mentioned in this section was married. The *makhloot* household also said that education beyond a secondary or middle was detrimental to the marriage prospects of girls, because highly educated women were seen to be too "independent" or "immoral". Increased incidence of reduced marriage prospects for educated girls might have a negative impact on the will of families to send their daughters to school.

4.5 Changing lifestyles

Fida, urban Karachi, Sindh[181]

The family migrated some 8 year ago from lower Punjab because of land disputes within the kinship group. They claim to be of Baloch origins, and are the only family of that group in a cluster of around 50 households that is otherwise populated by socially marginalized groups such as Kutanay, *nai*s and other *kammi* and dependent castes from rural south Punjab. The other migrants were from the same area of southern Punjab as Fida's family but there did not appear to be close relations between them. Fida was a rag trade contractor and his wife Zahida worked as a domestic servant in middle class homes nearby. She had been inspired by the lifestyle

[180] For more discussion, please refer to Section 2.5.
[181] Interaction Note IA3.

of her employers and the fact that their children went to private schools. Zahida wanted to see her child to be as clean and alert as the children of her employers – unlike other children in her own locality. She felt that these other children only did rag-picking and low status activities such as begging and petty-vending by the roadside, and was eager to avoid this fate for her own son Asif. The boy was in school and had reached Class 4. Zahida's employer provided support sometimes in the form of school uniforms, and meals for the child during the day. The school was close to Zahida's workplace and Asif usually went out with his mother early in the morning and returned with her in the evening. No other child from this cluster of 50 families was in school. There were several similar clusters nearby, however, where children went to school with their domestic worker mothers, much along the lines of Asif and Zahida.

Tariq, caste Changar/Dogar, urban Faisalabad, Punjab[182]

Tariq aged 30 was the first person in the Changar community in his locality to have pursued schooling seriously. He was of the opinion that "Changar" was a derogatory word and that the real caste name of his community was "Dogar". His family faced taunts on the part of relatives about sending him to school, but Tariq's mother was very keen on him continuing. Tariq completed 10 classes from a government technical high school. The family and Tariq himself had hoped that he would qualify and get a job as a school teacher. In the event he was forced to discontinue his education because he got married young, and also needed to take over his father's work (in the rag and recycling trade) when the latter became ill. Tariq did get a chance to teach at a local community school set up specially for the Changar/Dogar community. He thought this was a highlight of his life and felt pride in the fact that many children from his kinship group who had passed Classes 4 and 5 had been his pupils.

Tariq, being the most educated person, had emerged as a local leader of the community. There was an ongoing conflict with the local Jat landlords of the area who were trying to evict the Changars/Dogars in order to occupy their land. Tariq had been identified by the other side as a key leader, and had received threats to his life. He had moved out of the area because of these threats, and also to pursue his work in the rag and recycling trade elsewhere. This had ended his involvement in the local community school.

Sonal Bagri, urban Quetta, Balochistan[183]

Sonal Bagri's (aged 29) family had two homes, one in Quetta and the other in the Jhatpat region bordering Sindh. They lived in Quetta during the summer (March to October) and in Jhatpat the rest of the time. In Quetta they sold balloons, did other petty vending and begged for alms on the roadside. In Jhatpat they did harvest labour. Sonal was the first person in his family to finish primary school. Two young teachers had come from the city to their winter village in Jhatpat and set up a two-room community school for the Bagris and other marginalized Hindu families. They spend some time motivating the parents to send the children to this school, which was free

[182] Interaction Note IA118.
[183] Interaction Note IA159.

of charge and provided textbooks and other materials. Sonal studied in that school up to Class 5. Then the people of the area came to know that the teachers were secretly trying to convert the Bagris and other Hindu families to Christianity. Sonal's family and other Hindus of the area got together and withdrew their children from the school. Currently no children from the community go to school in Quetta or Jhatpat.

Ghani and Nazeer, semi-nomadic Baloch, rural Kech, Balochistan[184]

There were two comparable cases in different fieldwork sites in rural Kech, of semi-nomadic Zikri Baloch families that had recently set up home in established settlements. Ghani was a 40-year old man who used to live and work in the hills with his family. He had come down from the hills some seven years ago, and settled in a village where he already had some relatives. Nazeer was a 25-year old whose family had also moved down from the hills to a settled village some six to seven years before. They had come in a group of four families and were provided land by a local owner, and set up homes. In the hills Ghani and Nazeer did similar kind of work. They had goat-herds and other livestock such as camels. They collected firewood from the hills, and also gathered *peesh* (a small palm tree that grows in the wild) to make ropes. The wood and ropes were sold in the markets. The reasons for coming down from the hills were similar. Persistent drought had depleted grazing land and trees. Both Ghani and Nazeer were now sending their children to their respective local government schools. These children were the first in their families to go to school because previously a school had not been available within walking distance. Ghani worked now as a casual labourer, while Nazeer worked for a tractor operator. The reduction in their herds had meant that child labour was a less important factor in the livelihood strategies of these families than it had been in the past.

Jaleel, caste Lorhi, Gwadar, Balochistan[185]

The Lorhis, also known as "Shahzada" were among the lowest social strata in the area. They were minstrels, whose traditional occupations included begging, playing music and making musical instruments. The dominant groups had traditionally looked down upon the Lorhis as people of lax social mores. There were eight Lorhi households in the locality, and some of them were involved in begging and musical pursuits. Jaleel did his matriculation from the local government high school. Teachers showed an interest in his ability to play musical instruments and to sing, and this made Jaleel stand out among the pupils. While in school, he became involved in political activity and became a district level leader of a political organisation. Despite the fact that he was from a "low" caste members of his political organization from dominating castes had to work under him. Jaleel had got married young, and had to travel long distances to perform at musical programmes. That and his political activities had forced him to pause his educational career. Jaleel felt committed, however, to return to higher education, when his circumstances allowed.

Discussion

[184] Interaction Notes IA173 and IA188.
[185] Interaction Note IA193.

All of the cases here were those where the educational transition was somehow linked to a change in lifestyle. The term "lifestyle" is not used in the sense of a fashion. As discussed in Section 2 above, many of the marginalized "lifestyles" were direct outcomes livelihood strategies, or of strategies for coping with oppression and domination. The change of lifestyle was also closely associated with actual, perceived and/or feared cultural change and loss of identity. Schooling was playing a major role in the change in lifestyle, even though it was not always the trigger.

The Zikri Baloch semi-nomads had descended from the hills and were becoming part of settled village life in Mekran. They had no prior hostility to schooling and started sending their children to school as soon as the opportunity presented itself. It is possible, however, that exposure to mainstream education would pose challenges to their religious identity in the future. The case of Sonal Bagri's family was particularly stark in this regard. The first engagement with schooling had failed precisely because of the feared loss of religious identity. For Fida's family in urban Karachi, however, a change of cultural identity was a motivating factor in sending their child to school. Jaleel Lorhi's educational transition appeared to have been connected to a broader social change in his region, where a previously marginalized group had become valued due to their repository of traditional Balochi/Mekrani music – something that was regarded as a lever for the assertion of a wider Baloch identity. Tariq Changar/Dogar was self-conscious about using schooling as a way of changing perceptions about his community's identity. His schooling, however, had placed him in a personally vulnerable position vis-à-vis a dominant group.

5. Conclusion

This report has provided a detailed thematic account of the findings of a qualitative survey across Pakistan. Social marginalisation, as defined in the terms of reference of this study, was found to be a powerful framework for analysis, and tool for the identification of major gaps in the delivery and take-up of educational services, and the achievement of national educational goals. Many diverse processes of social marginalisation were identified, and these require a range of policy responses, only a subset of which related primarily to the educational sector. The broader policy question relates, of course, to creating conditions of equal citizenship in place of the existing social divisions and hierarchies.

Educational interventions do, nevertheless, have a crucial role to play in addressing social marginalisation. The survey findings have shown, conversely, that an understanding of social marginalisation is critical to the reform of educational systems for marginalized and mainstream groups alike. It was a persistent finding of the fieldwork that the formal schooling system, despite its many problems, provided a more open and equalizing domain than society at large. This finding is both encouraging and challenging. It is encouraging because it shows that the educational system can be a powerful tool of social change. It is challenging because it points to the many gaps and failures that will need to be addressed to effect that change.

The documentation and analysis of social marginalisation and marginalized groups is neither comprehensive nor definitive. Many processes of marginalisation and marginalized groups remained unrepresented in this study. There may also be disagreements about the interpretation and analysis presented in this study about societal processes. This work, however, ought to be taken as a point of departure rather than a port of arrival. It is manifest that much more work needs to be done, discussions to be had, and agreements reached before fundamental changes in policy might be made.

Indigenous forms of education were not conspicuous in the fieldwork communities. Religious instruction was prevalent but this was also an “outside” interventions rather than indigenous to the marginalized groups. There were knowledge systems based on traditional occupations, and practical skills, but these had also shown signs of fluidity and evolution. A proper consideration of indigenous forms of education – one of the research questions posed at the outset of this study – requires attention to societal attitudes to cultural change. Many individuals and families among the marginalized groups are eager to escape the low status that becomes associated with them simply because of their traditional activities and knowledge systems. Others, however, are interested in maintaining their identities while also engaging with formal education, and the modern economy and society. Still others fear engagement with modern processes of change as threats to their identities.

The quality of the formal schooling system comes up as a key constraint – both as an active and as a passive source of discouragement to socially marginalized groups. Some issues such as matters relating to school procedures, calendars, and facilities can be addressed in the short to medium term. On other matters genuinely complicated issues have been thrown up. Language and the method teaching, for example, does not provide any easy or trivial solutions. Similarly, the matter of

religion, ideology and cultural change is complex. There are fragile balances to be reached between the goal of cultural change and the protection of identity.

Annex 1: Research Instruments

Three types of research instruments will be used in the qualitative fieldwork. There are (a) community profiles; (b) school case studies; and (c) family and individual case studies. It is estimated that at least one community profile and school case studies, and between 2 to 4 family and individual case studies will be generated in each of the eight field sites. These research instruments will be used to prepare a field report that will address the questions outlined above for each of the eight sites and for all sites as a whole. Fieldwork protocols for the three types of research instruments are provided below.

A Checklist for community profile

1.Locality:

- Union council, Tehsil, district.
- Total number Households,
- Total population,
- Total votes,
- Name and caste of elected representative of locality

2. Name of nearest primary school (Government/private/NGO),

- Distance from locality?
- Details of groups not sending their children to school. Who are they? Why?

3. Classification of households, according to

- caste,
- religion,
- sect,
- household occupation (domestic work, begging, scavenging etc)

4. Number of highly educated households? Their caste(s)?

- Number of non-educated house households? Their caste(s)?

5. Which caste/tribe/group is the oldest in locality? Who are the migrants or newcomers in locality?

6. How many languages are spoken in the locality? What are the various languages spoken in the household? Which languages are mainly used in the local market or in public places?

7. What are marriage traditions in the locality? Which caste/ ethnic groups intermarry?

8. What are the details of basic amenities in locality? Which localitys and groups have access or availability of services? Why? Which don't? Why not?

9. What are main disputes in the locality? Are they along tribal, caste, ethnic or religious lines?

10. Details of poor widow-headed households.

11. have any households been involved in litigation?

12. Which groups of the locality are involved in immoral activities (including theft and other crimes)?

Checklist of marginalised community

1. Total number of Households
2. Total population
3. Total votes
4. Name and caste of elected representative of locality

5. Brief history of the group including migration history.

6. Do they live on their own land or on someone else's? Details.

7. Names of nearest primary government, private and NGO schools and their distances from the village centre?

8. Details of groups not sending their children to school? Who are they? Why don't they send their children to school? Do they send their children to the *madrassah*?

9. Number of landholding households? Distribution of households by occupation? Tenants, land labour, migrant worker, casual labour, those employed with government or do private jobs etc.

10. How they think about other ethnic, caste or religious groups? Which groups support or disturb them? What are the intra-inter community networks?

11. What are marriage trends?

12. Which households do not send their children to school? Why?

13. Who are the teachers? What is the attitude of teachers?

14. What are the advantages and disadvantages of Education?

15. Number of boys and girls who have completed primary? Secondary? Matriculate?

16. Role of law enforcement agencies and extortionist groups?

17. Any struggle against landowner, police and victimizing groups? Details

18. Details of violence against working women and school-going girls?

B School case study

School's location

- Average distance from the village/settlement
- Status of pathway/road to the school

Infrastructure

- School building: Katch/*pucca*
- Boundary wall
- Number of rooms (admin + class rooms)
- Facilities: electricity, potable water, latrine, play ground

Classification

- Primary/Middle/Secondary
- Girls/Boys/Co-ed

Students

- Class-wise gender- and identity-segregated data
- Who are the "good" students?
- Dropout and pass out ratio
- Primary to secondary transition
- Major comprehension and learning issues
- Do the students find school enjoyable?
- How do they rate the teaching and learning environment in the school?
- Why are they studying in the school? (Link to future/ambition.)
- About non-school going children in the community

Teachers

- Identity
- Educational qualification
- Work experience
- Is the teacher from the same village?
- What were (are) the religious/cultural/linguistic barriers that the teacher faced (is facing)?
- Worldview (pluralism and marginalisation)
    - Who are the "good" students?
    - How do the "marginalised" students perform?
    - How does the teacher ensure participation of all students in the classroom?
    - Do students from all groups play/interact/cooperate with each other?
    - How to increase enrolment rate and decrease dropout rate of children belonging to the marginalised groups?
- Issues in teaching and class room management especially re marginalised children

Head Teacher

- School's role in universal primary schooling
- …and the response: Who extends support, and what are the issues?

School Management Committee (PTA/SMC)

- Existence (formed in which year?)
- Active/inactive
- SMC Members' profile
- Working and effectiveness

C Family and individual case studies

Structure of household [roster]

- How many people are there within the household?
- What are their ages?
- What are their professions? (Earning members and dependents)
- What is your Caste/tribal affiliation?
- What is your religious affiliation?
- What language do you speak at home? What other languages do members of the household know/speak?
- How many have ID cards?

Occupation

- Since when has the head of the hh been practicing his present profession?
- Has he/she done anything before this?
- How many generations have been practicing the same profession? If none, then what were they doing?
- Has anyone done anything different from your profession in your family?
- Was he/she successful monetarily?
- Was there an impact of the changed profession on his/her social status?
- Was there an impact of the changed profession on the family's social status?
- What was the response on change of profession from within your family?
- What was the response on change of profession from outside your family but within your kin/group?
- What was the response on change of profession from outside your kin/group?
- Can you easily change your occupation? If no, what are the obstacles?
- Has anyone from your family ever been in government employment (including military services)? Who? How?
- Do you think there are special obstacles to your family/members of your group in gaining government employment? Details

Economic situation of household (to be examined in conjunction with the community profile)

- What was the status of the house? *katcha*/*pucca*/both?

- How far was the house from the centre of the village or (where villages are sparsely spread) from main places within the area?
- Do you own the land on which house your house is built?
- Do you own land? How much?
- Do you own livestock? How many?
- Do you own any machinery/equipment? If yes, what machinery?
- Are you on any sort of financial assistance from state or otherwise?
- Are you indebted? By who? How much money? Why did you borrow money? What is the mechanism of repayment?

Status within community

- Since when have you been living in this community?
- Where were you living before coming here? When did you move and why?
- Is any member of your hh part of any decision making body of the community?
- Do you vote? Who decides who you vote?
- Within which group/tribe/caste do you marry? Who don't you marry?
- Do women from your family visit homes of other castes/tribes/groups in the locality? If not why not? If so on what occasions?
- Has this changed over time? How do view this change?
- Do women/girls from your family work in houses/on farms of other families?
- Has there been any change in this over time? What change? Why?
- Do women/girls from your family feel safe going out to different parts of the locality? Which parts are safe, which are unsafe? Why?

Patron-client relationships

- Who do you go for resolution of minor disputes? Why? What is their relationship to you?
- Who do you go for resolution of major disputes? Why? What is their relationship to you?
- Who do you borrow money from? His status? What is their relationship to you?
- Who owns resources within community? E.g. wells, land etc

Access to resources (to be examined in conjunction with the community profile)

- Do you have access to drinking water? How (well, borrowing water, buying water, some "open' source, others)?
- Do you have access to electricity?
- Do you have access to gas?
- Do you have access to paved roads?

Education

- Within your hh, how many people are educated?
- Are they literate?

- Have they completed primary? Secondary? College? More?
- Where have they studied?
- Has or is anyone form your household going to the local state school? If not, why not?
- Is anyone from the household in the School Management Committee or other school organization? If no, why not?
- Do you feel that the local government school is accessible to your children? If not then why not? (aim is to distinguish group-specific issues from general issues: former such as language, attitude of teachers, attitude of other students; latter such as distance, cost, school quality)
- Has this changed over time? For the better or worse? Why?
- Has or is anyone form your household going to any other schools in your area? *Madrassah*/private/ngo? If not, why not? If so, why?
- For children of your family/group which school (government or private; govt or *madrassah*; govt or NGO) is better? Why?
- Has there been any change in enrollment from your group over time? Why?
- Who was the first male in your family to ever go to school? _____ (name)
- Who was the first female in your family to ever go to school? _____(name)

Case study of first male

- Individual profile: age, level of education, current occupation, whether married or not
- Which school did he go to? Why?
- Who made the decision for him to go? Why?
- Did anyone from outside encourage him? Who? Why? (teacher, relative, family friend, employer?)
- What types of difficulties did he face? (travel, cost, social hostility from within group, from outside, attitude of teachers, attitude of other students, difficulty of language, religious differences with others)
- Did he drop out? If so, at what level and why?
- What was his expectation from schooling? (good job, respect in community, access to other opportunities and facilities)
- To what extent were there expectations met? How? And if not, why not?

Case study of first female

- Individual profile: age, level of education, current occupation, whether married or not.
- Which school did she go to? Why?
- Who made the decision for her to go? Why?
- Did anyone from outside encourage her? Who? Why? (teacher, relative, family friend, employer)
- What types of difficulties did she face? (travel, cost, social hostility from within family, within group, from outside, attitude of teachers, attitude of other students, difficulty of language, religious differences with others)
- Did she drop out? If so, at what level and why?

- What was her expectation from schooling? (good job, respect in community, access to other opportunities and facilities)
- To what extent were there expectations met? How? And if not, why not?
- Did going to school affect in any way her marriage prospects? How?

Case study of household with no person who has attended school

- Do you have any close relatives (first cousins) who have attended school? Give details. Where are they, what made them start going to school, when, what are they doing now?
- Why has nobody from your family ever gone to school?