

Class, Culture and Reproduction: Re-reading Bourdieu

Md. Siddiqur Rahman*

Abstract

This paper discusses three conceptual models of social reproduction with focus on education. From a radical perspective, Giroux (1983) identified three kinds of models in relation to school and reproduction such as; economic- reproductive model, hegemonic -state reproductive model and culture- reproductive model. Along with other two models, culture- reproductive model pioneered by Bourdieu, has been re-examined in details. Bourdieu's notion of 'cultural capital' and 'habitus' has been explained as a mechanism to understand how these work in the critical interactions among class, culture and reproduction. This paper also presents the subsequent criticism of Bourdieu's culture-reproductive model in reference to some contemporary works. Finally, this paper also argues the significance of Bourdieu's work in many contemporary researches on class, culture and reproduction in recent globalization process.

1. Introduction

From a critical stance, Keesing (1997) has argued that the analysis of causes and forces of inequality do not sufficiently address how cultural dimensions help to maintain and reproduce the control of power and domination in society. In this light, this article re-examines Bourdieu's model of class reproduction through the education system in French society. The relationship among culture, class and reproduction has become more critical in the context of recent globalization process. In this article, I first present three conceptual models of reproduction with a focus on education. Secondly, I present the subsequent criticisms of Bourdieu's cultural reproductive model in reference to some contemporary works. Thirdly, I also extend this criticism in the light of recent globalization process.

* Assistant Professor, Department of Anthropology, Jahangirnagar University, Dhaka.

2. Approaching Education: Liberal Vs Radical

The early theories of education address the psychological, philosophical and social foundations of education. Early liberalism in education advocated the improvement of the quality of life of people through education. In liberal theories, the goals of education generally signify the improvement of six faculties of human being. These faculties are: the intellectual faculties of perception, memory, imagination and reasoning together with the faculty of feeling and faculty of will (Wynne, 1965: 9), hence, the theories of formal disciplines attempt to reach the proper balance of different subject matters that proportionately balance those different faculties. Some liberalists also focus on the improvement of special groups through education; however they have been criticized for being conservative in nature since it helps to maintain certain status quo in society (Wynne, 1965: 80). The new liberalism in education argues that the theories that justify the transmission of fixed ideas and beliefs to the young in school, do not effectively contribute to the gradual improvement of the quality of human experience. Rather, they argue for the continuous improvement of all people everywhere and the reconstruction of the ideas and beliefs in school practice. In the contemporary globalized world, the educational practices of each country has recognized the importance of education for all and there is a growing tendency for standard school practices such as ensuring a national curriculum, at least to the level of secondary level of education.

The social, philosophical and psychological foundations of contemporary educational practices in many ways seem problematic to contemporary radical educators. They argue against liberal theorists and historians who claimed that public education offered the possibility of individual development, social mobility, and economic and political power to the disadvantaged. In contrast, radical educators argued that schools reproduced the dominant ideology, forms of knowledge and the distribution of skills needed to reproduce the social division of labor (Giroux, 1983: 257). For them, to understand how school operates in society one needs to see schools in relation to the economy and the state (Giroux, 1983: 258). Radical educators did not blame individual students for their failure; rather they blamed dominant social practices.

Instead of viewing schools as politically innocent, they argued that schools played a central role in the dynamics of inequality in the society. From a reproduction perspective, radical educators saw schools as reproductive in three senses: 1. "School provided different classes and social groups with the knowledge and skill they needed to occupy their respective places in a labor force stratified by class, race and gender. 2. Schools were seen as reproductive as cultural sense, functioning in part to distribute and legitimate forms of knowledge, values, language and modes of style that constitute the dominant culture and its interests. 3. Schools were viewed as part of state apparatus that produced and legitimated the economic and ideological imperatives that underlie the state's political power" (Giroux 1983: 258). These three senses are the root of the later discussions of reproductive models of schooling.

2.1 Economic-Reproductive Model

Giroux (1983) identified three kinds of models in relation to school and reproduction. The economic-reproductive model explained how schools function to mediate and legitimate the dominant and subordinate relations of the capitalist economy. He argued that schools not only provide the social division of labor in line with class, gender and race; it also reproduces the wider class structure of the society. The connection between school and workplace is mediated through the hidden curriculum. In the classroom social relations, the hidden curriculum provides specific messages that legitimize the views of capitalist workplaces of values, authority and social rules. The hidden curriculum gives ideological and material weight of high and low status of knowledge, of social organizations, of personal interaction. Even though the curriculum is visible through its forms and contents, its underlying messages and associated ideology that support capitalist economy are not as visible as in capitalist workplaces. Curriculum works behind the back of the teachers and students to continue the existing mode of domination in capitalist society. Althusser (1971), Apple (1983), Bowels and Gints (1981), and Giroux (1983) all argued the capitalist economic needs were mediated through the hidden curriculum in schools.

Althusser (1971, cited in Giroux 1983: 263) argued that school as a social site reproduced the forms of skills, labor rules and relations of

production. However, he emphasized the hidden process of socialization in school through a system of ideology. He identified two kinds of meanings. Firstly, ideology has a material existence, which is visible in the forms of school architecture, use of office spaces, classrooms, recreational areas, etc. His argument is similar to arguments made by Bowels and Gints (1983). They also argued that there was a political nature to the use of space, time and social process in schools. Secondly, ideology through the concrete practices in schools structured "unconscious and imaginary relations... to their real condition of existence (Althusser 1971, cited in Giroux 1983: 264)."

The economic – reproductive model tells us about the significant relationship between school and workplace, and how it reproduces the division of labor and helps to maintain the structural inequality in the society through its hidden curriculum. It did not pay sufficient attention to the notion of culture, resistance and mediation in concrete classroom practices and failed to understand the complex relationship between schools and other important social sites such as workplace and family. School did not necessarily always reproduce the dominant capitalistic ideology. To some extent it has been mediated and challenged by students in schools.

2.2 Hegemonic-State Reproductive Model

Many educational theorists have argued that reproductive functions of education cannot be explained without examining the intervening role of the state in the reproductive process. In contrast to the economic-reproductive model, this model argued that capital could not be the only key mechanism through which capitalist domination prevails in society. Rather, how political factors through the state's intervening policies serve and reproduce the structural domination in the society is the central concern of this model. In a similar way, Gledhill (2000) argued that global politics is linked, to a certain extent, determines the political horizons of many developing countries of contemporary world. He urges researchers to capture the dynamic nature of interaction of political factors at both global and local levels and to understand the significant role of the state through its policies to maintain this process of global interaction, domination of power, and inequality. Hence, in a globalizing context, the interplay of economic and political factors at

both global and local levels and the state's role in this process is important to understanding its role in the reproduction of class through school.

Although many reproductive theorists agree that the state plays a role in the reproductive process, there are significant disagreements about how it works in school to reproduce the dominant ruling class. In order to understand the critical process of this engagement, we need to explore, first, the relationship of state with capitalism and then how these relations manifest themselves in schools. Orthodox Marxism views the state as a repressive tool for the dominant class. However, according to Gramsci (1971) the state is divided into two different societies: political and civil society. Within the framework the dominant class through its exercise of hegemony continues to reproduce dominant social relations. Hegemony is the central concept in Gramsci's notions of how the state's power is linked to the production of knowledge for political needs. For him, political society includes the administrative and legal apparatus through which the state expresses repression or 'legitimizes' actions to ensure capitalistic production. Civil society includes all the public and private institutions that simultaneously appropriate the meanings, ideas, symbols and ideologies of the ruling class as well. Additionally, it shapes and limits oppositional discourse and practice. He argues that state is an ongoing site of struggle between various groups, e.g., class, race, and gender, as well as the dominant class. The state also can limit or channel the schools for its response to the dominant society.

State relations with the school are profoundly important to understanding how state intervention in capitalist society is guided by the logic of capital. Hence, states directly control the curriculum and classroom social relations, which is assumed to produce 'better' students for market needs. From a political sociology perspective, Arno, Torres, Franz and Morse (1996) examine how recent structural adjustment policies affect the governance, financing, and provision of education in Latin American countries. The case studies of some countries suggest that historical forces, institutional contradictions, national and international contexts shape the possibility of educational and social change. They argue that the role of the state is conditioned

capitalism needs to be examined to understand the equality of educational opportunity and outcomes.

2.3 Culture-Reproductive Model

The cultural reproductive model attempts to explain how schools help to reproduce the capitalist class in the society. Bourdieu (1977) argued that domination in the capitalist society like France has always been mediated through schools. He linked schools with culture, class and domination. He explained that schools do not simply mirror the dominant society. Interestingly, without realizing the oppression, the oppressed groups themselves participate in the critical process of their own subjugation. In a similar way, Althusser explained this process of subjugation by his theory of ideology and how it related to hegemonic state power in school practices. Bourdieu made several important arguments to support his thesis of the cultural reproduction model. Firstly, he argued that school enjoys the relative autonomy from other powerful economic and political institutions. It acts as a symbolic institution that does not directly impose docility and the domination, but indirectly, reproduces the dominant power relations through the production and distribution of the dominant culture and silently tells us what it means to be educated in the society. Influenced by Althusser's notion of ideology in school practices, Bourdieu argues that this process is objective and scientific. Accordingly, he developed his theory of "symbolic violence."

In his second argument, Bourdieu identified the mechanism of cultural reproduction in school with the notion of 'cultural capital.' He defined culture as the cultural arbitrary of the individuals; thus, every group in the society has a different cultural arbitrary. The cultural arbitraries of different groups have different symbolic value within the society. For him, cultural capital concerns linguistic and communicative skills that an individual gains through his life trajectory. In a class-based society, the class position of an individual determines the amount and value of her/ his cultural capital. For him, the cultural arbitrary of the dominant class has more symbolic value than others and can become the cultural capital in the society. However, schools, despite their relatively autonomous positions always appropriate and provide more value to the culture of the dominant class. Thus, the students of the dominated

social classes systematically have a lower chance for school success. This appreciation and internalization of the cultural arbitrary of the dominant class in the school does not happen innocently. Bourdieu linked power and culture and argued that the hegemonic curriculum in schools plays a role in distributing and legitimizing certain knowledge as high and low status. The knowledge of the dominant social class is considered as high standard knowledge in the practice of school. Hence, the school legitimizes the knowledge of the ruling class as superior and higher than the knowledge of the working class and thus confirms their privileged position in the school. In a similar manner, recent theories of curriculum (Goodson 1992) have paid attention to the 'higher/ lower orderings' of the curriculum and have critically examined how patterns of prioritizing academic forms systemically privilege certain social groups. Apple (1982) explored the connection between schooling and economic, cultural and political power. More specifically, he addressed present-day policies and practices in the organization of teaching and curriculum. He argued that the control over teaching and curriculum cannot be simply explained by the class situation. Rather, we need to look the issues of race and gender to understand the dynamics of control. In analyzing the relationships between class, gender, and teaching he argued that the control of curriculum and teaching would not be fully understand unless we understand who is doing the teaching. By providing a historical account of the relationship between class, gender and teaching he tried to understand the present forms of these relationships. He addressed how certain knowledge, usually the knowledge of the dominant groups, is legitimized by teachers in the classrooms. He also explored the political economy of national proposals in education restructuring, which reinforces this process of control. Like Bourdieu, Apple also related schooling to state power and examined how it worked to reproduce class through a hegemonic curriculum. However, unlike Bourdieu, he emphasized the issues of race and gender in classroom situations. In a similar vein, Robinson and Garnier (1985) argued that Bourdieu's reproduction theory tended to ignore gender differences in class production. Their empirical study in France suggested that women were less likely, than men, to inherit the business from their father. Thus, the strategies that perpetuate class privilege for men do not work as well for women.

Apple (1982) also explored the connection between culture, economy and the state in the production of official knowledge. He raised

questions such as, the ideological and economic reasons behind the production of texts. He sees texts as the construction of a certain group in the society who provide educators and the general people about what should be taught and what a teacher's jobs look like.

Apple's critical analysis mainly derived from his view of cultural products as "things" which have a circuit of production, circulation and consumption. These 'things' even though not always physical are made up of certain relations among a specific group of people with varied power. Thus, he views text as a product of a certain moment in history and its complex relations within the culture, economy and the state.

He also addressed how power operates in the society and how the relation of domination and subordination are reproduced and challenged through the existing political, economic and cultural forms of interactions. The dual relations of education and economy, culture and education, and class and gender always possess tensions and contradictions. These tensions and contradictions are elaborated upon by authors like Giroux (1983) and MacLeod (1995) through their empirical investigations. Providing examples from various studies in the US, Europe, and Australia, they give us important insights on the struggle, conflict and resistance in the process of domination in schools (Giroux, 1983:259).

Thirdly, Bourdieu's notion of "habitus" is central in understanding the critical relationship between theory and practice and how it works in the process of reproduction. Bourdieu identified two kinds of history to examine the relationship between human action and structure. These are: objectified history (habitat), which has accumulated over time in the things, books, machines and theories and embodied history (habitus), a set of internalized competencies and structured needs, an internalized style of knowing the world grounded in the body itself. Thus, habitus is a total matrix of viewing, acting and internalizing of certain actions, perceptions and situations which ultimately is the product of both socialization and embodied history itself. However, Nash (1990, cited in Grenfell and James 1998: 17) argued that as a theory of socialization, habitus often seems to "exclude ideas like 'self', 'choice' and 'action', by virtue of its emphasis on practices arising from the group's relations to culture." In a similar way, Jenkins (1992)

objected to Bourdieu's notion of the subordination of an individual's calculated and rational actions to generative schemes of the habitus. He also argued that there is difficulty in using the term disposition within the general concept of habitus, since sometimes this term implies conscious action and sometimes it appears as unconscious action. However, Bourdieu's notion of habitus can be useful to understanding social praxis as a research epistemology, as well as the manifestations of social distinction and differentiation. According to Bourdieu, individual knowledge and actions have objective value, which is subjectively perceived in human activity. For example, the knowledge and actions of a CEO in board meetings of his company have objective value to his board members; however, the meaning and the value of his actions in the meeting are subjectively perceived by the board members and inform them about underlying social distinction and differentiation. Thus, habitus becomes a powerful concept of explaining the theory of practice within the domain of practical activity of each individual. In a class-based society, there are various dominant and subordinate groups of individuals with varied habitus.

In this light, it is important to ask how habitus is linked with the concept of cultural capital. Bourdieu used the word capital to describe the social products of the fields and system of relations through which individuals carry out social intercourse (Grenfell and James, 1998: 18). For Bourdieu, social products such as thought, actions, objects, or any product of human activity have two aspects: material and ideational. Thus, "capital can be seen as a material base to an ideational reading of social action" (Bourdieu, 1980: 2-3, cited in Grenfell and James 1998). In a class-based society, social actions are valued differentially. Thus, the social actions of individuals of different classes with different habitus have different capital within the society. In Bourdieu's scheme, there are three kinds of capital: economic, social, and cultural. Economic capital is convertible into the material form of wealth. Social capital is the complex sphere of social contacts of an individual. Cultural capital is the product of education. However, each individual does not enter education with equal amounts of capital. Each individual with his or her family connections and cultural up-bringing has distinctive cultural attributes in the process of habitus formation.

However, the habitus of upper and middle class children make them better players in the game of education to accumulate further capital.

Bourdieu argued that habitat or objectified history and habitus always have a dialectic relationship. He explained how school as habitat played an active role in the process of domination. School poses certain ideologies in contrast to the ideologies of different habitus, however, in the process of domination two sets of values and ideologies always interplay and constitute both structure and agency. He also argued that individuals of various social groups in the school not only learned the dominant values and ideologies through socialization but also learned what happens in the physical domain of individual activity through body, sense and emotions.

3. Criticism of Bourdieu's theoretical framework

Many scholars who tried to incorporate Bourdieu's theoretical model in different social and cultural settings have challenged many of his propositions. Firstly, Giroux (1983) argued that Bourdieu's notion of domination and power was mechanistic and that he placed too much emphasis on the function of human agency through self-reflexivity. He argued that there is sufficient room to look for the elements of resistance and conflict in the correspondence of two different formalistic historical structures: the historical structure of the disposition and the historical structure embodied in institutions like school. Secondly, authors like Gorder (1980) and Apple (1982) also criticized the way Bourdieu viewed working-class culture as homogenous, and people by then merely copy or accept dominant cultural capital. Rather Giroux (1983) and Gorder (1980) argued that working class students might significantly contribute to contradictory school practice that could alter dominant symbolic practices. Giroux also argued that more theoretical detail is needed to uncover how domination and resistance happens in the complex interface of class, gender and race.

Thirdly, Giroux argued that Bourdieu did not pay sufficient attention to the complex relations between school and working-class families and neighborhood. He argued that school simply does not silence the cultural capital of working-class families and neighborhoods. There might exist potential power struggle and conflict in the school. This

point has been further elaborated by the work of Sieber (1981) in an elementary school in New York city. Other scholars also have explored the relation between schools and other social sites.

Fourthly, Giroux (1983) argued that in Bourdieu's theoretical model the link between domination and materiality of economic forces has not been well addressed. He challenged Bourdieu's idea about the participation of the working-class students in their own subjugation and their subsequent failure in school. He rather argued that domination does not happen only in the sphere of ideology through symbolic violence. In many concrete instances of higher educational institutions, the working-class students are constrained and burdened by immediate economic conditions. Hence, they are forced to take short-term career choices and, their behaviors, ideas, failures and choices are grounded in material conditions.

Contemporary empirical studies that tested the applicability of Bourdieu's theoretical model in different national contexts present varied findings. For example, Konrad and Szelenyi's (1996: 797) study in Hungary shows the dynamic of cultural capital in state socialism. Their formulation of a new class theory suggests that intellectuals were on 'the road to class power.' In Hungary, their study focused on the conversion of cultural capital into personal earnings. They defined cultural capital in two forms: education and habitus. By measuring different variables of habitus and education, they argued that both education and habitus were expected to contribute to improving the individual's position. In measuring education, they considered formal educational credentials, proficiency in foreign languages, and the number of books the respondent owned. In measuring habitus they included the number of hours in reading books, the number of times respondents went to the theater, attended classical music concerts and the number of trips taken abroad. However, their results showed the effects of education were more direct and stronger than habitus. The certification of education through formal education was the strongest factor in determining the individual's income.

4. Class and Culture-Reproductive Model

Theories on class are significant in understanding class relations to culture and reproduction. Classical Marxism suggests that in a capitalist society there are two kinds of class- the capitalist class who owns the means of production (the bourgeoisie) and the proletariat who can only sell their labor power in market. In contrast, Weber drew attention to other forms of stratification in the society notably status and ethnic stratification (Edgell, 1993: 11). Weber distinguished class from status. For Weber, a person's class position consisted of causal factors influencing the individual's 'life chances' in a market economy (DiMaggio and Mohar, 1985). On the other hand, status was the individual's participation in a human group and the culture of that group. Status thus relied on the "style of life" that is expected from all those who wish to belong in a collectivity bound together by a shared status culture. From neo-Marxist and neo- Weberian perspectives, Wright and Perrone (1977) identified four categories of class on the basis of the concept of control. These are: 1) "Capitalists who own the means of production and control labor power. 2) Managers who do not own the means of production but control labor power on behalf of the owners. 3) Petty- bourgeoisie, self-employed people who own the means of production but do not purchase the labor. 4) Workers who neither own the means of production nor have the control of labor. "Thompson (1982: 9) viewed class not a category or a structure or a thing rather a historical phenomenon derived from the historical process of a particular society. For him, classes were based on the differences in legitimate power. Thus, an individual became a member of a class by playing a social role relevant, from the point of view of authority (Thompson 1982: 11). He viewed each individual and his social class as a struggle between different ways of life within the society. Like Thompson, Bourdieu (1977) defined class in relation to power and more importantly state power, and how it legitimized the dominant class-culture through pedagogic actions in historical sequences in France. Bourdieu's work on education in France provided a historical sequence of state interventions in education and looked at how historical events reflected the relationship between contemporary theory and practice. However, Gartmen (1991) argued that Bourdieu's ahistorical structuralism failed to grasp the historical changes produced in culture

by capitalism. He also argued that culture can only be conceptualized as historically grounded human praxis, an intervention of class struggle that may reproduce or revolutionize existing class structures (Gartmen, 1991: 445).

Thus, the applicability of Bourdieu's cultural reproductive model depends on the conceptual and analytical framework of class and research aims. For example, DiMaggio and Mohr (1985) explored the connections between cultural capital, educational achievement, and marital selections. In their study, they used the Weberian distinction between class and status. They considered status-culture as cultural capital in their analysis of data. They argued that there was a significant effect of cultural capital on educational attainment, college attendance, college completion, graduate attendance, and marital selection for both men and women. Similarly, Katsillis and Robinson (1990) demonstrated their fundamental points, based on a study of high school students in Greece. Firstly, the effect of education on reproduction of class positions depends on the definition of class. Defining class by ownership and authority relations in the workplace yielded different results than when class was defined by occupational prestige or status score. Secondly, Differences were found in the effects of particular mechanisms underlying educational reproduction in different countries. This resulted from the extent to which they were stratified into curricular tracks. Thirdly, the role of education in social reproduction and the effects of the mechanisms underlying educational reproduction varied by gender.

Their study assessed the role of 'cultural capital' as a mechanism of social reproduction. They viewed 'cultural capital' as one of the intervening processes in social reproduction. For them, the major mechanisms by which socio-economic status was transformed into educational achievement were through ability and effort. The reproduction that occurs does so mainly through differential ability and the effort of students from different socioeconomic backgrounds. They argued that the theories, which see school as an achievement process, do not recognize that this process can also be a mechanism of social reproduction. On the other hand, theories that saw schools as a site of social reproduction did not recognize that it could also be a process of

achievement. They argued that the reproduction and achievement processes go hand to hand and these two processes are not mutually exclusive. The achievement process itself can become the mechanism of reproduction. Even though the analysis of the achievement process is focused on academic success, this process played a significant role in other outcomes such as occupation, income, and status. If achievement depends either on the family backgrounds or individual ability and effort and can reproduce differential attainment the achievement can be a mechanism of reproductions.

Robinson and Garnier (1985) argued that Bourdieu's reproduction theory has over emphasized the education system as a mechanism of reproducing elite class in France. Rather they argued that education serves as a vehicle of class mobility rather than reproducing class inequality. The defined class in four categories identified by Wright and Perrone (1977). Their large-scale survey of French men and women indicated that education played only a small role in reproducing the ownership of means of production and control over labor power. Although Bourdieu's reproduction model generally ignores the gender differences, their study suggested that reproduction works better for men than for women. Parents have different reproduction strategies for their sons than, for their daughters. They argued that there is a possibility of the direct reproduction of class at workplaces such as for managerial and supervisor levels in the forms of hiring and promotion. Hence, they argued for detailed observation of child rearing and ethnography of hiring and promotion decisions. These ethnographies can potentially tell us about how different cultural traits and interpersonal communication skills have been rewarded in the work places.

Lee and Brinton (1996) explored the relation between elite education and social capital in the context of contemporary Korea. They explore to what extent the "prestige" effect of elite universities was mediated through human and social capital. They concluded that South Korean students encountered a tremendous amount of competition to enter into a prestigious university. By using various measures of university prestige, graduate's human capital, and social background and graduate's institutional and private social capital, they argued that human capital and university prestige highly correlated. Graduates whose fathers went

to university were more likely to go to a prestigious university. There was no significant co-relation between the family socio-economic status of the graduates and their educational attainment. Students from the top or second ranked universities were more likely to use institutional social capital (help of the placement office, professors, friends and alumni) than private social capital such as family connections for their first jobs.

Robbins (1993) argued that all researchers should explore their own responses to Bourdieuf's effort to understand higher education in French society. The conceptual framework, which Bourdieu used, can be useful and contradictory within different national contexts of higher education. Robbins argued that many of the concepts of Bourdieu's analytical framework were applicable to present-day conditions of higher education. In explaining his own institution in the United Kingdom, he identified the tendency of the educational curriculum to fulfill certain commitments through various forms of rational pedagogy, mainly derived from the need of the market. Thus, he argued that the field of employment was appropriating the field of education.

Robbins went into the details of the relationship between market and higher education and raised several issues discussed by Bourdieu. The notion of "experience" and "experiential learning" in higher education diminished the autonomy and collective cognition of higher education. Similarly, the process of self-assessment and peer assessment in school also encouraged cultural self-endorsement, since students are socially homogeneous and do not have other experiences by which to judge each other's experience.

The issue of "distance learning" in higher education is also a further confirmation of the irrelevance of traditional face-to-face institutional learning and ethos. In this process of learning students do not have any sense of institutional belonging. Bourdieu ascertained the issues of quality auditing in higher education by the state as a constant control of the content of higher education as an effort to neutralize the possibility that students might ask for the knowledge in school, which potentially can challenge and question the dominant direction of the society where they belong.

5. Globalization and Culture-Reproductive Model

Recent globalization processes pose challenges to rethinking anthropological approaches to education. Although globalization has become faster in recent decades, it has its roots in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth century European world economy. Globalization as a complex process entails political, economic and cultural terrain with its predominant link with the West. The definition of globalization depends what aspect of globalization is in question. However, Appaduari (1991) described this complex process of globalization in terms of five dimensions: ethnoscares (tourists, immigrants, refugees), mediascares (real and fictional landscapes mediated through the media), technospaces (configurations of technology), finance-scares (financial flows from other lands), and finally ideoscares (the ideas of democracy, rights, welfare, freedom spreading over the world). He argued that each aspect of globalization has different rhythms and distribution in specific time and space. There are also significant contradictions in each aspect of globalization too. Since two key factors, knowledge and innovation, are the base in contemporary globalization process, globalization should have profound effects on education and culture. Recently, along with other accommodation, education has been subjected to restructuring by national policies with the pressing demand of global economy. Similarly, in this globalized context, culture also become less homogenous and bounded entity. As Appadurai (1991: 44) argued "culture becomes less what Pierre Bourdieu would have called a habitus (a tacit realm of reproducible practices and dispositions) and more an arena for conscious choice, justifications, and representation". Thus, in the context of globalization, the other non-home sites such as international media and its associated ideology and how these contribute in the formation of 'cultural capital' of an individual is of importance in an aim of how it works in class reproduction. In a Similar way, Robbins (1993) argues that we need to analyze the trajectories of learners and how learning influences the inherited 'habitus' and how educational institutions privilege one sort of learning over another. He asserted the need for an assessment of the function of information an individual gets from the media, the attitude one gets from certain religious affiliation or skills obtained from the workplace, all of which enhance the life-chances for certain individuals. Robbins argues that this

kind of exploration may be a fantasy to many of us; however, in the end it raises the important questions of value and the competition between values.

6. Conclusion

This article is an attempt to understand the social inequality and control of power and domination in society from a cultural dimension. More specifically, this article critically focused on three reproductive models in relation to schooling. Along with other reproductive models, the culture- reproductive model, championed by Bourdieu provides us the theoretical insights to grasp the critical interactions among class, culture and reproduction. Although many of his theoretical arguments have been criticized by some contemporary works, however, Bourdieu's work can be re-examined in different social settings. As a source of inspiration, Bourdieu's work can still be of significant for many contemporary researches on class, culture and reproduction in a new globalized context.

Acknowledgement

A substantial part of this paper was submitted to fulfill the comprehensive examination requirement of the Ph.D program in Anthropology at American University, Washington D.C, in December 2002. As a Ph.D candidate, I am grateful to all the committee members- professors Dolores Koenig, Bill Leap and Geoffrey Burkhart for their support and inspiration. I am especially thankful to my supervisor Professor Dolores for her thoughtful comments and suggestions on this paper.

Bibliography

Apple, Michel

1978 *Ideology and Curriculum*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

1982 *Educations and Power*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

1989 (1986) *Teachers and The Texts. A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations*. New York: Routledge.

1982 *Reproduction and Contradiction in Education. An Introduction*. In, *Cultural and Economic Reproduction in Education*. Michel Apple, ed., Pp. 1-32. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Appadurai, Arjun

1990 Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Public Culture* 2 (2): 1-11, 15-24.

1991 'Global Ethnospace: Notes and quires for a transnational anthropology.' In *Recapturing Anthropology*. Richard G. Fox, ed. Pp. 191-210. Santa Fe: School for American Research.

1996 "Global Flows". In *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. MN: U of Minnesota P, Pp.27- 85.

Bourdieu, Pierre

1977 *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Passeron Jean-Claude

1990 *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage Publications.

Bollnow, Friedrich Otto

1987 *Crisis of New Beginning: Contributions to a Pedagogical Anthropology*.

Borocz, J., and C. Southworth

1996 Decomposing the intellectuals' class power; conversion of cultural capital to Income, Hungary 1986. *Social Forces* 74 (3): 797-822.

Brinton C. Marcy and Lee, Sunhwa

1996 *Elite Education and Social Capital: The Case of South Korea*. *Sociology of Education* 69 (3): 177-192.

Clignet Remi & Foster Philip

1966 *The Fortunate Few: A Study of Secondary Schools and Students in the Ivory Coast*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Calhaun, Craig

1990 Putting the sociologists in the sociology of Culture: The self-reflexive scholarship of Pierre Bourdieu and Raymond Williams. *Contemporary Sociology* 19 (4): 500- 505.

Calhan, Craig, LiPuma, Edward and Postone Moishe 1993 *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Edgell, Stephen

1993 *Class: Key Ideas*. London: Routledge Publications.

Giroux, A. Henry

1991 *Border crossing: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. New York: Routledge Publication.

1983 "Theories of Reproduction and Resistance in the new sociology of education: a critical analysis", *Harvard Educational Review* 53 (3), 257-293.

Giroux & Myrsiades

2001 *Beyond the Corporate University: Culture and the Pedagogy in the New Millennium*. ed., Introduction and Part-I. Pp 1- 57. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Goodson, F. Ivor

1990 *Curriculum Forum: Notes Toward a Theory of Curriculum*. *Sociology of Education* 65 (1): 66- 75.

Gorder, L. Karen

1990 *Undersatnding School Knowledge: A critical appraisal of Basil Bernstein and Pierre Bourdieu*. *Educational Theory*, 30 (4): 335-346.

Grenfell, Michael and James, David

1997 *Acts of Practical theory: Bourdieu and education*. London: Falmer Press.

Gramsci, Antonio

(1971) *Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers.

Gledhill, John

Power and its Disguise; Anthropological Perspective on Politics. Herndon, VA: Pluto Press.

Harvey, David

The Condition of Post Modernity: An enquiry into the origin of Cultural Change. Cambridge: Blackwell.

Kearney, M.

The Local and The Global: The Anthropology of Globalization and Trans nationalism. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 547-565.

Lamaison, P.

1986 *From rules to strategies: An interview with the Pierre Bourdieu*. *Cultural Anthropology* 1(1): 110-120.

Lareau, Annette

- 1990 Social Class Difference in Family- School Relationships: The Importance of Cultural Capital. *Sociology of Education* 60 (2): 73-85.

Macleod, Jay

- 1994 *Ain't No Makin' It: Aspiration and Attainment in a Low-Income neighborhood*. Boulder, Co: Westview Press.

McDonough, M. Patricia.

- 1991 Buying and Selling Higher Education: The Social Construction of College Applicant. *Journal of Higher Education* 65 (4): 427-446.

Robinson, Richard and Katsillis, John

- 1990 Cultural Capital, Student Achievement, and Educational Reproduction: The Case Of Greece. *American Sociological Review* 55(2): 270-279.

Robinson V. Robert and Maurice A. Garnier.

- 1983 Class Reproduction among Men and Women in France: Reproduction Theory on Its Home Ground. *American Journal of Sociology* 91(2): 250- 280.

Rosenlund, Lennart

- 1996 'Cultural changes in a Norwegian urban community; Applying Pierre Bourdieu's approach and analytical framework'. *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology* 33 (2): 211-35.

Rado, Emil R.

- 1974 The Relevance of Education for Employment. In *Education, Society and Development: New perspectives from Kenya*. David Court and Durham P. Ghai, eds. Pp-29-46. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.

Spindler, D. George

- 1972 *Education and Cultural Process Toward an Anthropology of Education*. ed., New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sewell Jr., and William H.

- 1990 'A theory of Structure; duality, agency and transformation'. *American Journal of Sociology* 98 (1): 1-29.

Sorenson, B. Aage

- 2000 Toward a Sounder Basis for Class Analysis. *American Journal of Sociology* 105 (6): 1523-1558.

Thompson, E. P.

1982 *The Making of the English Working Class*. New York: Vintage Books.

Thomas, Elwyn

2000 *Building Cultural Bridges between Society and School*. In *Culture and Schooling: Building Bridges Between Research, Praxis and Professionalism*. P.P -199-240, New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Wynne, P. John

1963 *Theories of Education: An Introduction to the Foundations of Education*. New York: Harper and Row Publisher.

Westby, G. Dorothy

1963 *Social Perspective on Education*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Williams, Raymond

1977 "Keywords: culture". In *Marxism and Literature*. ed., London: Oxford University Press.

Wacquant, Loic J.D.

1996 'Reading Bourdieu's "Capital"'. *International Journal of Contemporary* 33 (2): 151-169.

