
Reproduction of society through education

Darko Štrajn

Introduction

Since Bourdieu's and Passeron's seminal text the *Reproduction* was first published more than forty years ago,¹ one would think that the text can no longer be such a matter of concern for us today. However, we shall demonstrate that the relevance of the text, on the contrary, is even greater than at the time when it was published. As we know, the time when it was published was an age of heightened social innovation, when the structure of the symbolic universe became somewhat more transparent – also due to such unique insights as the one contained in the *Reproduction*. Passeron pointed out in his chapter in a posthumous volume on Bourdieu that neither Bourdieu nor he anticipated the impact their work would have in the 1960's and 1970's. (Passeron, 2003: 71) As they implied in their book: "It is (...) necessary to construct the system of relations between the educational system and the other sub-systems, specifying those relations by reference to the structure of class relations, in order to perceive that the relative autonomy of the educational system is always the counterpart of a dependence hidden to a greater or lesser extent by the practices and ideology authorized by that autonomy." (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990: 197) The authors demonstrate elsewhere in the text that the dependence of educational system on social class relations or "their structure" determines the whole

1 The French original edition *La Reproduction, éléments pour une théorie du système d'enseignement*, was published by Les éditions de minuit in Paris in 1970. The work on which the book was supported by Bourdieu's collaborators at the *Centre de sociologie européenne de l'École pratique des hautes études*. The book signalled not only a new approach to the topic of education but a breakthrough in sociology too, since Bourdieu and his colleagues applied structuralised epistemology to the field of sociology. In Bourdieu's terms, the sociology of the time started to develop upon the paradigm of "reflexivity."

discursive field, where the “pedagogic agency” is playing its role. Margaret Archer and her very important work in the domain of sociology of education confirms in slightly different terms the main propositions from *Reproduction*, as she wrote about “subordination,” which determines the position of educational (or schooling) institutions and, for instance, the state. (Archer, 1984: 23) This actually means that the autonomy of institutions, teachers and other agents in education is ultimately quite limited. Some twenty years after the first edition of the book, Bourdieu reiterated the main insight of the book in the very clear articulation in the Preface to the 1990 edition of *Reproduction*, under the title Academic Order and Social Order:

Reproduction sought to propose a model of the social mediations and processes which tend, behind the backs of the agents engaged in the school system – teachers, students and their parents – and often against their will, to ensure the transmission of cultural capital across generations and to stamp pre-existing differences in inherited cultural capital with a meritocratic seal of academic consecration by virtue of the special symbolic potency of the title (credential). Functioning in the manner of a huge classificatory machine, which inscribes changes within the purview of the structure, the school helps to make and to impose the legitimate exclusions and inclusions, which form the basis of the social order. (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990: IX–X)

One problem with the functioning of an educational system in this regard is a matter of much dispute. It is far more important how a school system functions than how its role in a society is declared, although a critical reading of the official language, which underpins an educational system, can define inner relations between exclamations on the side of social political system and education. These constitutive inner relations are ultimately objectified as an order of domination, which is legitimized in a framework of “economic necessities,” incorporated in the complex institutional system. This is further characterized by a continuous process of (linguistic) naturalisation within the operation of ideology. On the other hand, the notion of social reproduction could be taken as a term, which describes pedagogic activity in some “neutral” terms, but Bourdieu and Passeron decidedly demonstrated that such “neutrality” is ultimately impossible. Of course, we cannot present here the whole complex argument and epistemologically challenging analysis, which transcends the boundaries of, say, just sociology of education. Those who know Bourdieu’s work would probably agree that this book, as much it is a theory of a role of education in a society, also represents a “phase” of authors’ developing a reflexive social theory. As it is, one cannot imagine such a big and consistent social theory, which was formulated ten

years later in Bourdieu's fundamental book *Le Sense pratique*,² without the "phase," in which Bourdieu had researched the functioning of educational system, as well as without his initial anthropological research in his native Béarn, in the Pyrenees and his research of the Kabyle culture in the Algerian Atlas mountain range. Therefore, the notion of reproduction in the context of reflexive sociology cannot be simply a critical concept. Moreover, it should be understood as a core concept for a theory of education in the late industrial society. Bourdieu's and Passeron's work should still be remembered due to its paradigmatic and theoretical importance, transcending the limits of the time when it was been published. The discursive field, formed by an educational system interacting with other systems within a society, is structured by reproductive projections and schemes containing incorporating agencies, which "need" the educational system.

Class and reproduction

After a period of a quite widely spread belief that theories of social class (and the ensuing conflict and/or struggle) had to cede their places in the intellectual universe to theories of cultural differences and identities, such as ethnicity, "race" and gender, the outbreak of so-called financial crisis in 2008 brought back a renewed relevance of concepts such as class and economic exploitation.³ What was expressed as opposition between the politics of redistribution against the politics of recognition is now transforming into a new yet not entirely clear synthesis between concepts, which are, nevertheless, confronted with the realities of the globalized world, where the end of neoliberalism seems imminent. As Michael A. Peters noted recently: "Contemporary social theory, including economics, in the form of identity studies seek the constitution and manufacture of consciousness and subjectivity in more nuanced ways emphasizing cultural processes of formation within larger shifts concerning globalization, the 'knowledge economy,' and the mobility of peoples across national boundaries and frontiers." (Peters, 2011: 194) Considering such observations new, readings of Bourdieu's and Passeron's book reveal its anticipatory dimensions due to Bourdieu's philosophical, anthropological and linguistic background, all of which are inscribed in his reflexive sociology. "In cultural matters the manner of acquiring perpetuates itself in what is acquired, in the form of a certain manner of using the acquirement, the mode of acquisition itself expressing the objective rela-

2 The English translation appeared another ten years later (in 1990) under the title *The Logic of Practice*, published by Polity Press, Cambridge.

3 Just before the outbreak of the financial crisis a very exemplary collection of texts on the topic of "redistribution versus recognition," written through years of discussion, was published. Cf. Olson, 2008.

tions between the social characteristics of the acquirer and the social quality of what is acquired.” (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990: 116) At the time, when *Reproduction* was written, the very term knowledge economy (and/or society) had not yet been in use; however, the book had already anticipated this by describing the social space, in which the educational institutions already did the job, which stakeholders (another term from neoliberal imagining of society) expected from it. Of course, this means that a corresponding “subjectivation” is produced within the operating of discourses that run the system of production and reproduction of knowledge, not separately from the reproduction of entire society. What authors call “pedagogic agency” (PA) inscribes the activity of education and inculcation on levels of curriculum into broader cultural schemes. Therefore, they – much in advance of a range of theories in the scope of cultural studies – recognized the decisive power of the symbolic order, incorporating education as a space, where both culture and economy interlace and make possible a multitude of specific accumulations and flows of cultural capital to forms such as social, economic, political and last but not least financial capital. The dilemma between “redistribution and recognition” therefore clearly represents a constitutive binary structure, which determines the field of functioning of the Pedagogic agency.

The symbolic strength of a pedagogic agency is defined by its weight in the structure of the power relations and symbolic relations (the latter always expressing the former) between the agencies exerting an action of symbolic violence. This structure in turn expresses the power relations between the groups or classes making up the social formation in question. It is through the mediation of this effect of domination by the dominant PA that the different PAs carried on within the different groups or classes objectively and indirectly collaborate in the dominance of the dominant classes (e.g. the inculcation by the dominated PAs of knowledges or styles whose value on the economic or symbolic market is deemed by the dominant PA). (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990: 7–8)

Reproduction isn't entirely just theoretical, conceptual reflexive and critical, as it also takes into account a number of empirical instances, which prove the point. One of the most basic demonstrations uses some significant actual data on trends of educational opportunities by social class between 1961 – 62 and 1965 – 66. (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990: cf. 90–104) The analysis of the main features of these trends is further on elaborated and very much nuanced in showing how a (social) cultural capital, acquired values, etc. decide the social structure of higher education students. For the purpose here, it will be enough simply to recall the authors' point on the fact that social class holds a strong correlation with educational opportunities. The period between 1961-62 and 1965-66 was a period of growth in higher educa-

tion. This growth was at the time “often interpreted as a democratization of admissions.” It was visible from the data and their diagrammatic representation that the “structure of the distribution of educational opportunities relative to social class did indeed shift upwards, but it remained virtually unchanged in shape.”

We can remember that 1960’s were a time when the expression “explosion of education” had begun to circulate. Of course, that “explosion” was still limited to numbers not exceeding 20 to 30 per cent of the number of enrolments in higher education in most developed countries (these nowadays include a number of Asian countries beside Europe and USA) in recent years. In order to understand whether this high enrolment (well above 50% of each generation) still verifies the notion of reproduction as it has been elaborated by Bourdieu and Passeron or not, we should take into account more nuanced and “subtle” aspects of their analysis, mentioned above, which makes visible a correlation between social class and students’ choice of a discipline. In a late neoliberal social structure, undoubtedly some indicators may vary but highly probably divisions and gaps, regarding investments of inherited social capital, as they are structured in a relation to labour market, still tend to determine educational choices and opportunities. A steady tendency, along with the demise of the welfare state, to impose and increase student fees for their studies does the trick of limiting educational opportunities and reducing freedom of choice of higher education curriculum. The dreams of total democratisation of access to knowledge within academic institutions seem almost forgotten but there are encouraging signs that the actual struggle against the monopoly of knowledge ensues outside the institutional framework of the academic world, as there are increasing movements for freedom of the Internet.

Let’s return to our authors’ presentation of the functioning of the huge classificatory mechanism of reproduction. In fact, in their time, the increased enrolment of 18-20 year olds in the latter period of their analysis “was distributed among the different social classes in proportions roughly equal to those defining the previous distribution of opportunities.”

To explain and understand the changes in the distribution of competences and attitudes, it is sufficient to observe that, for example, the sons of industrialists, who, in 1961-62 had a 52.8 per cent chance of faculty enrolment, had a 74 per cent chance in 1965-66, so that for this category, which proportionally is even more strongly represented in the *classes préparatoires* and the *grandes écoles* than in the faculties, the likelihood of higher education is around 80 per cent. If the principles derived from analysis of the synchronic relations are applied to this process, it can be seen that as this category advances towards quasi-total enrolment, it tends to acquire all the charac-

teristics, in particular the competences and attitudes, associated with the academic under-selection of a category. (Bourdieu, Passeron, 1990: 91–93)

Of course, *Reproduction* takes for granted that education is crucial for operating economy and social institutions, however Bourdieu and Passeron clearly point out the component which defines a society through putting its members in the “classificatory machine,” this component is education.

Education for all in cognitive capitalism

Most of the national education systems are declared as being open to everyone but they effectively result in segregation, usually on the basis of a pupil’s social (class) origin. This is even truer when we think about the growing business of international “educational market.” Undoubtedly, policy-makers and researchers of education are caught in crossfire of controversies that cannot be easily solved. “Thus it may be that an educational system is more capable of concealing its social function of legitimating class differences behind its technical function of producing qualifications, the less able it is to ignore the incompressible demands of the labour market.” (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990: 164) Due to these demands, which in the times of global capitalism, which has “defeated communism,” have become only more ubiquitous and pressing, the public (state) instances, which must take care of the proper adaptation of the school system to the market demands, work on never-ending reforms and new system improvements. In many cases, of course, a political change, caused by usually democratic elections, results in many interventions in the school system and, depending on a current “fashion,” puts a stress on the content of the curriculum or on “improving the quality” of education or on changing some rules of the game like, for instance, teachers’ working hours. Some of such changes could well be reasonable and justified in various contexts such as, for instance, the context of new scientific trends or new developments of “pedagogical agency.” Almost continuous “reforms” nowadays expose schools to ever-new adaptations. The Slovenian school system went through many transformations, originating from its position in the political system after big social changes and from its relation to the labour market and to the changing ambitions of different social groups in the wider society. These types of changes were also supported by some modernisation regarding the need to educate pupils according to a development of scientific interdisciplinary. “The principle of interdisciplinary linking and the attainment of a higher degree of associating disciplinary knowledge is one of the most important aspects of modernisation of the Slovenian school and of the development of curriculum in 9-year elementary school.” (Sardoč, 2004: 55)

One of the more recent trends in developing and reforming school systems in order to adapt them to their operation within patterns of reproduc-

tion, actually instigates a rhetoric of “education for all,” but of course, this is at the same time a camouflage for the work of selecting, discriminating, sorting, classifying, etc. of pupils in order to direct them in the most desirable directions from the point of view of the dominant class.⁴ Naturally, these processes don’t always run exactly as one could expect. High enrolment of students in the social sciences and humanities, parallel to the increasing export of manufacturing to the third world and development of supply-side economy are now, after the outbreak of the crisis, less desirable and at the same time the administrators and policy-makers are very busy shortening the duration of studies. In France, Bourdieu’s native country, in 2004 the conservative government of Jacques Chirac began a reform “for the success of all pupils.” In the official paper the commission, led by Claude Thélot, gives a declaration very much in accordance with the trend of education for all:

A school of success is a good school for students, even and especially for the most unable of them, since all of them must necessarily enter into professional life. The school must apply to individuals and offer them as much as possible diversity and flexibility, once the common culture is acquired. A mass school should not be at risk to be a school of exclusion or a school of uniformity. The school should, while ensuring mastery of the basics (socle), provide learning paths as diverse as apprenticeship and encourage the diversity of excellence. It needs, therefore, *control mechanisms of orientations and definition of sectors* (italics by D. Š.). It must also allow all students, not just the ‘good’ ones, to enter the learning process throughout their life. The report therefore gives particular attention to the issue of diversification of paths, the terms of the relationship between general education and vocational training and between professional training and continuing education. (Thélot, 2004: 33)

In any critical analysis, based on the notions of *Reproduction*, one cannot help but notice the classificatory agency within the logic of any projection of aims of school reform. To really come to grips with such work of governing institutions and their experts – of course not without “good” intentions – one should take into account a theory of “cognitive capitalism,” which could be viewed as a conceptual elaboration, that follows from Bourdieu’s and Passeron’s “classical” reproduction theory. According to the main lines of this thinking, we have to deal with the kind of economy in which the “traditional frontiers” between spheres of reproduction and production are dis-

4 In this respect, I am more or less just suggesting a hypothesis, which would require a lot of research. However, in the now established system of research, which is governed by the same kind of instances as the education itself, such critical research could have problems getting funded. This is also an aspect of difference between the academic autonomy at the time when *Reproduction* has been written and this time of neoliberal capitalism.

appearing and, therefore, also the exploitation of labour power moves also to the time when labour force is considered to enjoy leisure time.

On the other hand, capital's attempt to maintain the permanence of the law of value founded on direct labour-time, despite its crisis, leads to the unemployment and the devalorisation of labour-power. The result of this is the current paradox of poverty within abundance in an economy in which the power and diffusion of knowledge contrasts with a logic of accumulation; and where the frontiers between rent and profit fade, while the new relations of ownership of knowledge obstruct the progress of knowledge through the creation of an artificial scarcity of resources. (Vercellone, 2007: 34)

At this instance we can say that the notion of reproduction marks the field of possible new elaborations in circumstances of new developments within the system of globalized capitalism, which, by destroying the pillars of welfare state – even more so after the outbreak of the so-called financial crisis – strengthens class domination, albeit in a new form.

Conclusion or the case of Shakespeare on film

In the final paragraphs of this paper, a hint is given on the participation of mass culture in the reproduction of patterns of domination. Although such products as feature films are open to interpretation, they can be read as symptoms, which sometimes by virtue of bringing up a certain topic mark an instance of widespread perceptions of reality. Audiences in the epoch of cognitive capitalism are – to say the least – quite perceptive, which is a ground for rather sophisticated artistic products within the cultural sphere of social reproduction. Of course films, as in our illustrative case, as any artistic endeavour represent not only pure aesthetic products, but also an intervention within the symbolic universe, a statement about social reality. As such, any film can be viewed as a representation of some standpoint on an issue or on an aspect of public interest and it can speak to a viewer identifying or counter-identifying with some current trends in dominant perceptions and persuasions, always contextualised by some ideological instance. The film by Ronald Emerich, *Anonymous*,⁵ which had its world premiere at the end of October 2011, tackles an issue which is continuously present in the Western culture at least from 1875 onwards, when James Wilmot questioned Shakespeare's authorship of the plays and poems and attributed it to Francis Bacon. This topic is intellectually challenging, and it, therefore, attracted doz-

5 Some parts of these paragraphs are adapted from my column in the Slovenian bi-weekly for professionals in the educational field. Cf.: Štrajn, Darko. V kakšno šolo je hodil Shakespeare? [What kind of school did Shakespeare attend?]. *Šolski razgledi*, 4th November 2011, year 62, No 17, 3.

ens of very different scholars; last but not least, it caught interest also among members of the wider public, who are less proficient in matters of literature, history, politics and theatre. In the worst case such public would have at least heard of Romeo and Juliet, if not then the frustrated Danish prince Hamlet. An intriguing question around which all these many levels of often very passionate discussions take place, is about whether William Shakespeare was indeed the author of plays and sonnets, which are attributed to him by literary and general history or not? The academic knowledge about the issue, however, is quite firm: “The evidence I continued to uncover (...) made it hard to imagine how anyone before the 1840s could argue that Shakespeare didn’t write the plays.” (Shapiro. 2010: 10). In spite of this, very recently a number of literary speculations in a crime novel style were launched about a presumed problem of Shakespeare’s authorship. Actually, there might be the occasional cultural wave of interest in Shakespeare, which is usually triggered by some contemporary reason or cause. One can just recall the Shakespeare mania at the end of the last century due to the John Madden film *Shakespeare in Love* (1998), which had restored hope amongst the general public that the younger generation, supposedly exposed to the cynicism and shallowness of contemporary media, actually is interested in real ecstatic love. On the other hand, in terms of these educating films, it provoked little didactic movement; simply it acted for the passing of great cultural values of the past to the young people of today in attractive and intelligent ways. To many public intellectuals, who, particularly in Britain, complained that the youth were mostly interested in which football teams this Shakespeare played for, the film had infused some new hope for the possibility to develop a higher level of mass culture. As for the actual reasons for the interest in Shakespeare the current crisis, which is not only economic but also a crisis of social institutions, gives more than enough reasons for a rethinking of this paradigmatic part of Western history and culture.

The film *Anonymous* has already caused some controversies that indicate the class and educational dimensions of Shakespeare’s authorship question. In a final analysis, the movie is a conservative intervention in the field of endless debate about the authorship of Shakespeare’s plays and poetry. Judging from the director’s oeuvre, Roland Emmerich intended to make us scared, especially with such spectacles as *Independence Day* (1996), *The Day After Tomorrow* (2004) or *2012* (2009). However, if you think that *Anonymous* is just another spectacular production aimed at mass audiences, you would be quite wrong. This is an accomplished film, which combines in its narrative a number of historic facts and imagines a somewhat complex plot in which the “real author” of Shakespeare’s plays and poems tries to intervene in the power struggles at the end of Queen Elizabeth’s reign. Therefore,

we have no need to deal with a visualisation of history, relying on stereotypes and clichés, although the whole construction around Shakespeare's non-authorship is a little bit far-fetched. However, in our view it is interesting, what comes to the surface and this is a rather *conservative ideological viewpoint, according to which the subtlety and excellence can only be available to those, who are born in the proper or noble social and educational environment*. The character of Shakespeare (played by Rafe Spall) is quite a caricature, shown as an almost illiterate brute, who seizes the opportunity to gain artistic glory by posing as the writer of the Earl of Oxford Edward de Vere's plays and poems. The meaning of this emphatic presentation of a Shakespeare's persona is further confirmed in a special trailer, in which Emmerich gives ten reasons for the doubt about Shakespeare's authorship. He especially put emphasis on the fact that Shakespeare was the son of an illiterate glover and an itinerant actor. "Surely such an ordinary man could not have written these masterpieces," wrote film critic Roger Ebert in *Chicago Sun-Times* on 26th October 2011, confirming the film's main idea. The film is actually based on the hypothesis that born in such an environment and educated in the local primary school William could not have reached a level of literacy, which would have made him capable of dazzling literary achievement. Moreover, the alleged author did not live among the aristocracy and a question is raised on how it could be possible for him to subtly process thoughts and emotions of rulers, who are the protagonists of his plays? According to the film story, this was much better suited to Edward de Vere, 17th Earl of Oxford, who actually had a role in the events in Elizabethan England at the end of the sixteenth century.

In *Newsweek*, Simon Schama recapitulates the findings of James Shapiro, suggesting that the movie is based on fake history and manipulated concepts:

The Earl of Oxford was learned and, by reports, witty. But publicity-materials for *Anonymous* say that Shakespeare by comparison went to a mere 'village school' and so could hardly have compared with the cultural richness imbibed by Oxford. The hell he couldn't! Stratford was no "village," and the "grammar school," which means elementary education in America, was in fact a cradle of serious classical learning in Elizabethan England. By the time he was 13 or so, Shakespeare would have read (in Latin) works by Terence, Plautus, Virgil, Erasmus, Cicero, and probably Plutarch and Livy too. One of the great stories of the age was what such schooling did for boys of humble birth. (Simon Schama, *Newsweek*: October 17, 2011)

Leaving aside other such reasons to doubt the Shakespeare's authorship, primarily the educational aspect of the matter, gives us a perspective in which we can perceive the movie as a historical metaphor of the divided world at the time of big crisis, caused by the neoliberal form of capitalism.

References

- Archer, M. (1984). *Social Origins of Educational Systems*. London, Beverly Hills, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Bourdieu, P., Passeron, J.-C. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. Worcester: Sage Publications.
- Olson, K. (ed.) (2008). *Adding Insult to Injury: Nancy Fraser Debates her Critics*. London and Brooklyn, N.Y.: Verso.
- Passeron, J.-C. (2003). Mort d'un ami, disparation d'un penseur. In: Encrevé, Pierre et Lagrave, Rose-Marie (ed.) *Travailler avec Bourdieu*, Paris: Flammarion, 17–90.
- Peters, M. A. (2011). *Neoliberalism and After? Education, Social Policy, and the Crisis of Western Capitalism*. New York, Bern etc.: Peter Lang.
- Sardoč, M. (2004). Medpredmetno povezovanje vzgojno-izobraževalnega procesa v 9-letni osnovni šoli [Intercurricular Connecting of the Educational process in 9-year Elementary School], *Šolsko polje*, vol. XV, N° 5/6, 2004, 53–70.
- Schama, S. The Shakespeare Shakedown, *Newsweek*: October 17, 2011.
- Shapiro, J. (2010). *Contested Will, Who Wrote Shakespeare?* London: Faber & Faber.
- Thélot, C. (présidée par...) (2004): *Pour la réussite de tous les élèves. Rapport de la Commission du débat national sur l'avenir de l'École*. Paris: La documentation Française.
- Vercellone, C. (2007). From Formal Subsumption to General Intellect: Elements for a Marxist Reading of the Thesis of Cognitive Capitalism. *Historical Materialism* 15 (2007), 13–36.

ers on the other. In the third part, the investigations are based on the findings of the (modern) theory of affects. The author argues for the importance of body, affectivity, and of teacher for school and education. The conclusion entails a short outline and recommendation of the personalist pedagogy.

Key words: body, bodily relations (between teachers and students), identity, self-consciousness, recognition, communication, emotions, affects, upbringing, education, pedagogy

Bojan Žalec

Afekti in čustva v vzgoji in izobraževanju

Članek ima tri dele. V prvem delu avtor zagovarja pomen telesa in telesnih odnosov. Na tej osnovi zagovarja pomen živih telesnih odnosov med učencem in učiteljem. Uspešno poučevanje na daljavo ni mogoče. V drugem delu se avtor ukvarja s problemi sodobne mladine in učencev. Zagovarja pomen samozavesti, identitete, priznanja in potrditve za uspeh in dobro življenje mladih. Njihova identiteta se gradi skozi njihove odnose z njihovimi starši in učitelji (pomembnimi drugimi). Avtor opozarja na dejstvo naraščajoče čustvene nepismenosti evropske mladine in na nujnost čustvene vzgoje, v kateri imajo starši in učitelji ključno vlogo. Žal pa je takšna vzgoja prepogosto skoraj povsem odsotna, kar vodi v ravnodušnost, apatijo, nasilna dejanja in druge negativne pojave pri naši mladini. Ključni dejavnik v razvoju takšnih pojavov je slaba ali prazna komunikacija med otroki ali študenti na eni strani in odraslimi, starši ali učitelji na drugi. V tretjem delu raziskovanje temelji na dognanjih (sodobne) teorije afektov. Avtor zagovarja pomen telesa, afektivnosti in učitelja za šolo in izobraževanje. Članek zaključuje s kratkim orisom in priporočilom personalistične pedagogike.

Ključne besede: telo, telesni odnosi (med učiteljem in učencem), identiteta, samozaupanje, priznanje, komunikacija, čustva, afekti, vzgoja, izobraževanje, pedagogika.

Darko Štrajn

Reproduction of society through education

Whenever we mention the very term "reproduction" in the context of education, we cannot avoid the seminal work of Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron, simply entitled *Reproduction*. As implied in their book, it is necessary to construct a system of relations between the educational system and the other sub-systems. A relative autonomy of the educational system is always »the counterpart of a dependence hidden to a greater or lesser extent by the practices and ideology authorized by that autonomy«. The problem of the functioning of an educational system in this regard is a matter of much

dispute. It is far more important how a school system functions than how its role in a society is declared. Most of the national education systems are declared as being open to everyone, but they effectively result in segregation, usually on the basis of a pupil's social class. Policy-makers and researchers of education are caught in the crossfire of controversies that cannot be easily solved. Bourdieu's and Passeron's work should still be remembered due to its paradigmatic and theoretical importance, transcending the limits of the time when it was published. The discursive field, formed by educational system interacting with other systems within a society, is structured by reproductive projections and schemes, which contain incorporating agencies. Social expectations from education in the lower social strata are hindered by many dominant views concerning pupil's social origin. In the era of late neo-liberal domination, there are symptoms, which expose counter tendencies against a definition of education as a "big social equaliser" and as an instrument of social upward mobility. A recent film, *Anonymous* (2011) by Ronald Emerich, which is built on the myth of Shakespeare's non-authorship, is a case in point.

Key words: education, society, school, ideology, power, research, Shakespeare

Darko Štrajn

Reprodukcija družbe z vzgojo in izobraževanjem

Kadarkoli omenimo sam izraz „reprodukcija“ v okviru izobraževanja, se ne moremo izogniti vplivnemu delu Pierre Bourdieuja in Jean-Clauda Passerona, preprosto naslovljenega *Reproduction*. Kot pravita v svoji knjigi, je treba zgraditi sistem odnosov med izobraževalnim sistemom in drugimi pod sistemi. Relativna avtonomija izobraževalnega sistema je vedno »proti-postavka odvisnosti bolj ali manj prikrite s prakso in ideologijo, ki ju avtorizira omenjena avtonomija«. Problem delovanja izobraževalnega sistema je v tem pogledu precej sporen. Veliko bolj je pomembno, kako šolski sistem deluje, kot to, kako je deklarirana njegova vloga v družbi. Večina nacionalnih izobraževalnih sistemov naj bi bilo odprtih za vsakogar, vendar v njih dejansko deluje segregacija, običajno na podlagi učenčeve pripadnosti družbenemu razredu. Oblikovalci politik in raziskovalci izobraževanja so ujeti v navzkrižnem ognju polemik, ki jih ni mogoče enostavno rešiti. Bourdieujevo in Passeronovo delo je treba še pomniti zaradi njegovega paradigmatskega in teoretskega pomena, ki presega meje časa, ko je knjiga bila objavljena. Diskurzivno polje, ki ga oblikuje izobraževalni sistem v interakciji z drugimi sistemi znotraj družbe, je strukturirano z reproduktivnimi projekcijami in shemami, ki vsebujejo utelešene agense. Družbena pričakovanja od izobraževanja v nižjih družbenih slojih ovirajo številna prevladujoča mnenja o socialnem izvoru učencev. V času pozne neoliberalne nadvlade najde-

mo simptome, ki označujejo nasprotno težnjo opredelitvi izobraževanja kot »velikega družbenega izenačevalnika« in kot instrumenta socialne mobilnosti navzgor. Nedavni film, *Anonymous* (2011) Ronalda Emericha, ki je zgrajen na mitu Shakespearjevega ne-avtorstva, je tak primer.

Ključne besede: izobraževanje, družba, šola, ideologija, moč, raziskave, Shakespeare

Valerija Vendramin

Why feminist epistemology matters in education and educational research

The starting point of this contribution is feminist epistemology and above all its influential concept of situated knowledge (as developed above all by D. Haraway in science). Their importance for the field of education is investigated as well as the presentation of certain fundamental postulates highlighting above all the socially embedded knowing subject whilst paying attention to the practice of feminist objectivity. Furthermore, the hidden curriculum, which can be taken to be an epistemological topic, is brought to the forefront, on the basis of which, the range of the approach taking into consideration situated knowledge is illustrated. By focusing on the category of gender (but not excluding other social axes of domination) a common sense approach is taken, which prevents an insight into the specificity of context and self-reflection on how we reached understanding, what the "tacit" cultural premises are and which domination relations help define our views in education.

Key words: gender, curriculum, feminist epistemology, situated knowledges

Valerija Vendramin

Zakaj je feministična epistemologija pomembna za vzgojo in izobraževanje ter njuno raziskovanje

Izhodiščna točka mojega prispevka je feministična epistemologija in predvsem njen vplivni koncept umeščenih vednosti (kot ga je v znanosti razvila predvsem D. Haraway). Izpostavim poskušam njuno relevantnost za polje vzgoje in izobraževanja. Dotaknem se nekaterih temeljnih izhodišč, predvsem družbene umeščenosti spoznavajočega subjekta, in opozorim na prakso t. i. feministične objektivnosti. V nadaljevanju postavim v ospredje prikriti kurikulum, ki ga berem kot epistemološko temo, s katero ilustriram domet pristopa, ki upošteva t. i. politiko umeščenih vednosti. Ob kategoriji spola (ob čemer ne izključujem drugih družbenih osi dominacije) se poskušam spopasti z zdravim razumom, ki onemogoča uvid v specifičnosti konteksta in