

Chapter 2

School, Society, and Culture

PA [Pedagogic Action] is, objectively, symbolic violence first insofar as the power relations between the groups or classes making up a social formation are the basis of the arbitrary power which is the precondition for the establishment of a relation of pedagogic communication

(Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990, p. 6)

School, society, and culture, paired to each other or viewed jointly, have occupied a central role in educational sociology discourse and research in the last century. The theoretical perspectives on the relations between and among schools ranged from a position advocating the deschooling of society to a position which considered formal schooling as a necessity for social cohesion and acculturation. This chapter covers an overview of the theoretical underpinnings and implications of the major theoretical issues on the complex relations of school, society, and culture, ones that appeared in scholarly discourse in the last century. The chapter compares the different theoretical perspectives on formal schooling, their implications for the value of formal schooling in the real world, and their implications for the modes by which students are acculturated.

2.1 Perspectives on Formal Schooling

In the last century, many perspectives on the nature and value of formal schooling in relation to the student, school, and culture have been proposed and debated. This section presents and compares the theoretical underpinnings of the major perspectives on formal schooling, focusing on the following perspectives: critical reproduction (Marx), emancipatory (Freire), social mobility (Weber), socialization (Durkheim), deschooling (Illich), personalized learning, and cultural reproduction (Bourdieu).

2.1.1 *Formal Schooling from the Critical Perspective*

The critical reproduction perspective views formal schooling as a means of legitimizing and hence perpetuating pre-existing class privilege. This perspective argues that ruling classes created and maintained a schooling system that systematically favors students with privileged backgrounds by giving them class-neutral educational certifications, and prevents working and lower class children from achieving these certifications in comparable measure (Bowles & Gintis, 1976). Its name of “critical reproduction” came from the fact that it critiqued all the school systems because they tended to reproduce the existing power structure in which the class that has the means of material production at its disposal has concurrent control over the means of knowledge production and transmission.

Based on the Marxist idea that the production and transmission of knowledge serve the interests of those in power, the ruling class (originally the bourgeois) is the one that controls the means of material production and consequently its ideas become the ruling ideas. The school as the social institution charged with the role of transmitting knowledge by necessity serves the ideas of the ruling class, and hence it reproduces and maintains a school system that is designed to serve the dominance of the ruling class at the expense of those ruled. Thus, the school, from this perspective, cannot promote social equalities.

2.1.2 *Formal Schooling from an Emancipatory Perspective*

Freire’s emancipatory education (Freire, 1970/2013) adopts a Marxist critical stance but differs from critical reproduction theory in its strong belief that the school is capable of overcoming oppression through the human agency of both students and teachers. Students have the capability of being active in remaking themselves and their society through the construct of *praxis*, which involves the two simultaneous processes of reflection and action. Freire believes that emancipatory education should not be neutral. According to him, for education to serve the struggles for humanity and liberation from oppression, it should always be linked to broader social movements. To achieve the goal of emancipating students through developing their abilities to read and write their world, Freire advocates the adoption of *problem-posing pedagogies* as an alternative to what he calls *banking education* (2013). Banking education can be illustrated by a banking analogy, as an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor, and similarly to a bank account, the scope of action of the student is limited to receiving, filing, and storing the deposits. The banking concept of education negates education and knowledge as processes of inquiry and considers knowledge as a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider ignorant; it is in this way that banking education projects the ideology of oppression. In contrast, *problem-posing pedagogies*, by abandoning the dichotomy

between teacher and student, render the educator as constantly re-forming reflections, and the students become critical co-investigators in dialogue with the teacher rather than docile receivers of information.

2.1.3 *Formal Schooling from the Social Mobility Perspective*

The social mobility perspective views formal education as an effective mechanism of social mobility because of its ability to move people from all social classes up and down social hierarchies. Stevens (2008) observes that:

... empirical findings have been remarkably consistent: formal schooling does indeed have independent effects on individual life chances; at the same time, parents tend to use formal education as a primary means of handing privilege down to their children.” (p. 100).

Thus, the reproduction thesis that privilege is passed down from parents to children goes hand in hand with the social mobility perspective that formal schooling has an independent effect on the individual’s chances in life.

The social mobility perspective owes its origin to Max Weber’s theory of the development of modern societies from the viewpoint of rationalization. Weber maintains that the historical development of rationalized society in the Occident resulted from modern capitalistic development and the political and legal institutions that grew simultaneously (Samier, 2002). According to Weber (2002), modern capitalism involved the rational organization of free labor, the systematic pursuit of profit, and a “modern economic ethos” or “spirit” embodied in the “Protestant ethic.” Weber (2002) believes that rationalization implies a systematizing of one’s actions (usually to accord with religious values) to express an increased rigor and method and a taming of the *status naturae* (spontaneous aspects of human nature that are not tamed, channeled, sublimated, or organized). Among the distinctive factors Weber identifies as relevant to this historical development are an emphasis on “a rational, systematic, and specialized pursuit of science and its ‘technical utilization’ by economic interests, accompanied by rationalized law and administration” (Samier, 2002).

According to Stevens (2008), Weber’s rationalization theory stipulates that:

... as societies modernize, inequalities of family, caste, and tribe gradually give way to hierarchies predicated on individual achievement. In modern times, individuals accumulate status as they move through the elaborate bureaucracies that characterize industrial societies: large corporations, centralized governments, big religious organizations, and schools. (p. 99)

Max Weber’s conception of the world differs from the Marxist conception in that it stipulates that economic relations do not solely define social hierarchy, but also that political and status systems have independent effects on the character of inequality. “Weber held that formal education is an important mechanism of status aggrandizement, economic organization, and political legitimation in complex societies ...” (Stevens, 2008, p. 99). On the other hand, Weber’s economic rationalization

of education as an economic enterprise implies that education should be subjected to rational economic values and treated as capital, and it is susceptible to exchange theory and calculation by cost–benefit analysis.

2.1.4 Formal Schooling from the Socialization Perspective

Socialization refers to a group learning process in order to allow the members to develop into competent group members. From a socialization perspective, one of the main functions of formal schooling is to build social cohesion by educating young people in abstract knowledge that knits groups together in order to foster reverence for formal authority and to generate emotional allegiance to the nation (Durkheim, 1977).

The socialization perspective was elaborated by Durkheim. For him, industrialization and urbanization weakened traditional forms of group cohesion—the family, the village, and the church—and if modern societies are to maintain their cohesion by strengthening the allegiance of their members, they need to devise new instruments for producing solidarity. This for Durkheim is the job of formal secular schooling.

Durkheim’s conception of schooling as a universalizing glue holding modern societies together often appeared reactionary. In the last part of the previous century, and in a period of intense social tensions, socialization was seen by many as a “hidden curriculum” which had the doubtful aim of entitling the privileged students while dampening the aspirations of socioeconomically disadvantaged students.

2.1.5 Formal Schooling from the Deschooling Perspective

Illich’s book entitled *Deschooling Society* (1971), written at the peak of the expansion of modern educational institutions, provides more of a radical critique of schools than a perspective informed by a theoretical foundation. Still, I am including deschooling under perspectives for two reasons: first, because this deschooling viewpoint has inspired variants within the deschooling discourses that are still relevant in our days, and, second, because deschooling focuses, more than any other perspective, almost exclusively on the relationship between school and society.

In his controversial book referred to above, Illich calls for the disestablishment of schools through a “law forbidding discrimination in hiring, voting, or admission to centers of learning based on previous attendance at some curriculum” (p. 11). He maintains that:

Equal educational opportunity is, indeed, both a desirable and a feasible goal, but to equate this with obligator; ‘schooling’ is to confuse salvation with the Church. School has become the world religion of a modernized proletariat, and makes futile promises of salvation to the poor of the technological age. The nation-state has adopted it, drafting all citizens into a graded curriculum leading to sequential diplomas not unlike the initiation rituals and

hierarchical promotions of former times. The modern state has assumed the duty of enforcing the judgment of its educators through well-meant truant officers and job requirements, much as did the Spanish kings who enforced the judgments of their theologians through the conquistadors and the Inquisition (pp. 10–11).

Illich (1971) challenges the assumption made by the school system that most learning resulted from teaching, and he argues that most people acquire most of their knowledge outside school. The existence of obligatory schools divided social reality into two realms: “education became unworldly and the world became non-educational” (p. 24).

As an alternative to formal mandatory schooling, Illich suggests four learning webs (networks) which enable students to gain access to any educational resource which may help them to define and achieve their own goals:

1. Reference Services to Educational Objects—which facilitate access to things or processes used for formal learning.
2. Skill Exchanges which permit persons to list their skills, as models for others who want to learn these skills, and the addresses at which they can be found.
3. Peer Matching—a communications network which permits persons to describe the learning activity in which they wish to engage, in the hope of finding a partner for the inquiry.
4. Reference Services to Educators-at-Large—who can be listed in a directory giving the self-descriptions of professionals, paraprofessionals, and freelancers, along with conditions of access to their services.

Two observations are in order here. First, these learning webs, which seemed far-fetched possibilities in 1971, have become actualities through the information communication technology as embodied by the Internet. Second, the availability of these sophisticated learning webs has affected the existence of formal schooling very little.

2.1.6 Formal Schooling from the Personalized Perspective

Personalized learning is a contested term which holds different meanings for different people. Two different personalized discourses have appeared in the UK towards the end of the twentieth century and in the USA in the last decade. In the UK, the discourse on personalized learning was a part of a policy debate on the personalization of public services. The term personalized learning was introduced in a paper by Leadbeater (2004) from a think tank, Demos, promoting the idea that individuals be allowed to interpret the goals and value of their education. Pykett (2009) identifies two interpretations of personalization of learning:

For some proponents of personalization, the idea denotes a modern notion of educational choice, flexibility, parental control and independence from the state. For other, ‘progressive’ educators, commonly regarded to be from a more left political tradition, it denotes an education which values personal differences, learner control and democratic schools, and is opposed to rigid national testing (p. 378–379).

Pykett maintains that one root of the personalization of learning in the UK can be traced to the revival of the ideas of the early proponents of deschooling, particularly John Holt, by a think tank of UK scholars known as Personalized Education Now (PEN). A book by the founder of the group, Roland Meighan (1995), entitled *John Holt: Personalised Education and the Reconstruction of Schooling*, defines the main principles of the movement. Analyzing the literature produced by this movement, Pykett (2009) concludes that the alternative to mass state schooling offered by such authors is characterized by five main tenets:

- First, more meaningful autonomy and choice between different types of schools, and learner-managed choice in terms of what, how, where, and when children should learn.
- Second, home-schooling, and the increased involvement of parents and families in making decisions about how their children learn.
- Third, support of work-based and skill-focused learning.
- Fourth, education whose purpose should be to produce flexible people.
- Thus, schools, for them, are part of the technocratic, authoritarian, bureaucratic state which denies children and families the right to flexibility, choice, home-schooling, authentic, self-directed learning and freedom.

Pykett (2009) identifies a conceptual alliance between deschoolers and conservatives, congregating around the ideas of:

... the autonomy of natural, personalized learners, an emancipatory role for education, the freedom of schools from state bureaucracy, and opportunities for parental control and family involvement to promote authentic learning outside the school (p. 384).

A second type of personalized learning which provides individualized learning through e-learning systems has become a major trend in the last decade, particularly in the USA. This type of personalized learning is based on the idea of individualizing learning and making it more adaptive by providing individual students with adaptive learning environments that are tailored to individual characteristics and needs. However, the early proponents of personalized learning in the UK made a conceptual distinction between individualizing and personalizing learning. Leadbeater (2004) views individualization as a shallow level of personalization: First, individualization provides a user-friendly service and the freedom of navigating through the service, whereas personalization goes beyond individualization to enable the learner to become a co-designer and co-producer of learning. Second, individualization regards the learner as an individual, while personalization views the learner as self-organizer of one's own learning as he/she operates within a collective activity of others. Personalized learning allows individual interpretations of the goals and value of education, whereas individualized learning allows individual paths for predetermined goals and values of education.

2.1.7 *Formal Schooling from the Cultural Reproduction Perspective*

In his book *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990), Bourdieu sets the basis of his theory on the role of education in culture and hence in society. One of his main theses is that the reproduction of culture through pedagogic action (education in the broadest sense, including parental and institutional education) plays a major role in the reproduction of the whole social system. In an educational system, such as formal schooling, the process of cultural reproduction takes place through the exchange value of *cultural capital* students bring to the educational process for *institutionalized cultural capital* that can be ultimately exchanged for economic capital and hence power. Bourdieu (2011) identifies three forms of capital (economic, social, and cultural) which can be exchanged and converted to each other. He also identifies three states of cultural capital (embodied, objectified, and institutionalized) and defines the institutionalized cultural capital as "... academic qualifications, a certificate of cultural competence which confers on its holder a conventional, constant, legally guaranteed value with respect to culture" (p. 86).

How does an educational system reproduce the power structure in the society? Bourdieu maintains that the educational field is a system of structured relations in which power is determined by the relative cultural "capital" accorded to positions or individuals who occupy these positions in the field. Students of the dominant class come to the education process with a greater cultural capital because their families possess greater social and/or economic capital. In the school system, such cultural capital can be exchanged for institutional cultural capital, which can later be exchanged for economic or social capital. Thus, the power relationships in the society are reproduced through the school system, which exchanges the superior capital of the dominant group for a superior institutionalized cultural capital that can be later translated to other forms of capital. A particular kind of cultural capital that plays a critical role in formal schooling is the linguistic capital. According to Bourdieu's analysis, students of the dominant groups, because of their cultural experiences, possess much more linguistic capital than those of the dominated. Consequently, the linguistic capital possessed by students of dominant groups position them at an advantage in obtaining educational capital such as admission to university.

In Bourdieu and Passeron (1990), Bourdieu equates education with "inculcation" and views pedagogical action as an arbitrary power which imposes meanings. The following three foundational premises appear in the first few pages of the book:

... every power which manages to impose meanings and to impose them as legitimate by concealing the power relations which are the basis of its force, adds its own specifically symbolic force to those power relations (p. 4).

All pedagogic actions (PA) are, objectively, symbolic violence in so far as it is the imposition of a cultural arbitrary by an arbitrary power (p. 5).

PA is, objectively, symbolic violence first insofar as the power relations between the groups or classes making up a social formation are the basis of the arbitrary power which is

the precondition for the establishment of a relation of pedagogic communication, i.e. for the imposition and inculcation of a cultural arbitrary by an arbitrary mode of imposition and inculcation (education) (p. 6).

The first two premises imply that all pedagogic actions (teaching) undertaken by educational institutions, such as schools, inflict “symbolic violence” on the dominated, to the extent that they exclude them from access to educational capital by imposing (inculcating) cultural arbitrary meanings as legitimate while concealing the power relations which are the basis of their force. The third premise implies that imposition and inculcation of a cultural arbitrary by an arbitrary mode of imposition and inculcation (education) is a reflection of the power relations between the groups or classes making up a social formation (society).

2.2 Use Value of Schooling

“Use value” refers to the value of school educational capital to the individual and the society at large in terms of its degree of usefulness in meeting individual and social needs. Niss (1981) identifies examples of individual and societal needs. Examples of individual needs include comprehending the physical and social worlds, participating actively and critically in the cultural process, and developing personally at the intellectual, emotional, and experiential levels. Societal needs include social and economic development, political and administrative government of society, cultural activity, and values and ideology.

The different perspectives on formal schooling that were introduced in Sect. 2.1 of this chapter either claim or imply different conceptions of the nature and extent of the use value of formal schooling. I shall discuss their perspectives on the use value of formal schooling under two categories: the reproduction model and the developmental model.

The reproduction model includes the perspectives of economic reproduction of education (Marx), cultural reproduction of education (Bourdieu), and deschooling (Illich). All three perspectives assign low use value to formal schooling for the society as a whole since they postulate that formal schooling reproduces the economic or cultural stratification that exists in the society and thus has little value in advancing economic and social development. At the individual level, beyond technical knowledge, formal education offers little benefit from formal schooling because the latter offers little opportunity for increasing the economic, social, or cultural capital of students coming from the economically or culturally dominated groups in the society. To support this view, Williams (2012) writes:

Having searched through many Bourdieu texts, I have yet to find more than a few almost trivial references to the ‘use’ of education or knowledge for society and production per se, though there are occasional references to the ‘no doubt’ technical value of education to ‘competence’ and the efficiency of production (pp. 67–68).

Deschooling pushed the reproduction argument to its logical conclusion in the extreme: If formal schooling has little use value for the individual and society, then

why not call for the de-establishment of formal schooling. It must be noted however that the argument of deschoolers was based not only on the reproduction argument but also on the natural right of the individual to choose on how, when, and what to learn.

The developmental model includes the perspectives of social mobility (Weber), socialization (Durkheim), personalized learning (Leadbeater), and emancipatory education (Freire). These perspectives share the belief that formal schooling has, to varying degrees, some use value in developing individuals and/or society. The social mobility perspective stipulates that individuals accumulate status as they move through elaborate bureaucracies such as school, and this acquired status has economic and social value to the individual; it also has value for the society as a whole since it eventually contributes to the human resources needed for social and economic development. The socialization perspective implies a high use value of formal schooling to the society as a whole since its main aim is the development of social cohesion, a necessary prerequisite for the existence and development of a society. The personalized learning perspective assigns a high use value to the individual rather than the society since, at its deepest level, it calls for providing students with the choice of their own learning in terms of what, how, where, and when they should learn. The emancipatory perspective allocates high use value to formal schooling for both the individual and society since it stipulates that students should be active in remaking themselves and their society through *praxis*, which involves the two simultaneous processes of reflection and action.

2.3 Pedagogic Modes of Acculturation

Various school perspectives differ, not only in terms of the functional relationship between formal schooling and culture, but also in the *process* by which students are acculturated, i.e., acquire and appropriate their own culture. A review of the literature reveals three main modes of acculturation: transmission, participation, and inculcation. *Transmission* refers to a process of acculturation by which those who know more transmit knowledge and values to those who know less. According to Brunner (1986), this mode of acculturation rests on the presupposition that the learners “were not only underequipped with knowledge about the world, which needed to be imparted to them, but were also ‘lacking’ in values” (p. 124). The pedagogy of transmission views teaching mainly as deficit-filling. The *participation* mode of acculturation, however, emphasizes the negotiation and sharing of meaning within significant social interaction. Brunner (1986) emphasizes the importance of negotiating and sharing in school education because it is a “... joint culture creating as an object of schooling and as an appropriate step en route to becoming a member of the adult society in which one lives out one’s life” (p. 127). This participation mode of acculturation rests on the assumption that learners are capable of constructing and negotiating their meanings. In contrast, the *inculcation* mode of acculturation refers to a pedagogy which includes a certain degree of “imposing” knowledge

and values on students. The inculcation mode of acculturation does not assume that imposition is a favorable way of imparting knowledge and values, but rather it interprets the imposition of ideas and values as a result of existing power relations in the society.

The social mobility and socialization perspectives of formal schooling seem to lean towards the transmission pedagogic mode. From Weber's perspective, education should be subjected to rational economic values, treated as capital, and be susceptible to exchange theory and calculation by cost-benefit analysis. According to Stevens (2008) schooling, from Weber's perspective, "actually entailed-namely, the formalization and transmission of such fundamentally cultural phenomena as language, mathematics, art, and literature-became a static quantity akin to money" (p. 102). The socialization perspective seems to adopt the pedagogic mode of transmission since the ultimate goal of formal schooling from this perspective is to transmit the knowledge and values that promote social solidarity and cohesion.

The emancipatory and the personalized learning perspectives of formal schooling tend to promote the participation pedagogic mode of acculturation. Freire, the leading proponent of emancipatory education, advocated problem-posing pedagogy, an essentially participatory pedagogy as an alternative to the banking pedagogy, which is essentially the transmission mode of acculturation (Freire, 1970/2013). Similarly, the personalized learning perspective of formal schooling is based on the idea that individual interpretations of the goals and value of education should be allowed and that learners are the self-organizers of their own learning as they operate within the collective activity of others.

The perspectives of economic reproduction of education (Marx), the cultural reproduction of education (Bourdieu), and deschooling (Illich) share the viewpoint that the current school systems tend to use inculcation as the pedagogic mode because, by their nature, schools try to impose the ideas of the dominant class. From a Marxist point of view, the school as the social institution charged with the role of imparting knowledge cannot escape imposing (inculcating) the ideas of the dominant class. Bourdieu uses inculcation as equivalent to education and goes further to say that current schools use arbitrary modes of imposition and inculcation (education to impose the ideas of the dominant classes). Thus, one motivation for the call of deschooling society was that these schools have a "hidden curriculum" which serves the interests of the dominant class and is imposed on students from dominated classes.

2.4 My Narrative About School, Culture, and Society

My narrative about school includes my own reflections first on my experiences in the school I attended as a student and second on the many schools I came to know in Arab countries in the course of my work as an educator and consultant. I did all my pre-university education school at my hometown in South Lebanon. The town residents may be described according to the standards of the 1950s as mainly

middle class, including merchants, landowners, and professionals, with a minority of a working class of soldiers, artisans, and workers. My father was an artisan/small-time contractor, and as such my family was a working class family. My mother had a high school diploma from an American missionary school and a working knowledge of English, and was considered to be an educated individual according to the standards of the time. My family, especially my mother, had high educational expectations for the children, particularly for me, the only male child in the family. My town was known to be the educational hub of the district. Its many schools were all tuition based and affiliated with Christian missionary organizations, and they attracted many students of diverse socioeconomic and religious backgrounds from neighboring villages and towns. In the late 1940s, my school was established by a group of Lebanese notables living in the West, and as such was the first non-sectarian, nonprofit school, with no religious affiliation whatsoever.

As I became more conscious of my socioeconomic status, I started to develop a sense of empowerment. I can trace that sense to a resilient motivation to excel, as the only way up the socioeconomic ladder for me and for my family. In hindsight, I realize that the two factors that may have counterbalanced any inequities that may have arisen because of my socioeconomic status were the personal capital I brought to school (my distinguished ability for academic achievement) and my home capital (attitudes and values). I am inclined now to interpret these factors in terms of Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990) that I brought to school from my own home environment, particularly my mother's education, her pedagogic practices, and her high expectations for me.

Which of the school perspectives described earlier would characterize my school? I believe that the dominant perspective of my school was that of social mobility. The school was perceived as a gateway to an education in one of the universities in Beirut. Both parents and students saw the school's curriculum, particularly its emphasis on the English language, its coeducation policy, and its reputation for emphasizing moral secular values as opportunities to move upward academically and hence economically and socially. To some extent, the school embodied the socialization perspective since it projected itself as a national institution as contrasted with a religious institution. This nationalism reflected itself in the name of the school, which included the word "national," and its program, which encouraged national cohesion as well as creativity and critical thinking. It is rather difficult, from my own perspective today, to interpret the school's pedagogy in terms of Bourdieu's cultural reproduction theory. Personally, I would be hesitant to describe the approach and content of my school's pedagogy as being that of the socially dominant group in the town. For example, I would not interpret my own motivation to achieve as a reaction to symbolic violence inflicted by the pedagogy of the dominant group (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990), but rather to a number of interacting factors which included cultural capital from home environment, personal characteristics, school and teacher attributes, and possibly a reaction to perceived symbolic violence.

During my career and in the course of my involvement in curriculum development projects in Saudi Arabia, Sudan, and Lebanon, I came to be exposed to different

schools with different missions. In the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the emphasis of the state-funded and state-managed schools is mostly on cultural reproduction within Islam and, to a lesser degree, on socialization and on social mobility. The cultural reproduction of the Saudi schools reflects itself in the commitment to and inculcation of the values and practices of Islam. The Arabic language is viewed as part of Islamic studies since it is the language in which the holy Quran was revealed. The Saudi curriculum is not limited to Islamic studies but includes all other school subjects, particularly mathematics and sciences, which are valued for their perceived cultural neutrality and for their academic and technical skills. The socialization function of the Saudi schools reflects itself in promoting loyalty to the state and monarchy and in providing state-of-the-art educational facilities for all schools. The social mobility function of the Saudi schools reflects itself in the growing need for human resources in the expanding state bureaucracies and industrialization projects of the country.

In Sudan, the emphasis of the state-funded and state-managed schools is mostly focused on social mobility and socialization within local cultural traditions. The social mobility function reflects itself in the growing needs of the socioeconomic development of the country, particularly its vast agrarian resources. Because Sudan is a multiethnic, multi-religious country, cultural reproduction on ethnic and religious grounds was not perceived, at that time, as necessary or viable. On the other hand, socialization reflects itself in the dedication to local cultural traditions to promote cohesion and solidarity at the local level. One experiment in socialization was undertaken in the 1930s in Sudan by Griffiths, one of her HMI inspectors of education who decided to establish an institution of education, with minimal facilities, to prepare teachers for rural areas, calling it Bakht-Al-Rida. (I visited this institution many times in the course of the project.) The recruited student teachers were required to live on campus and lead a combined life of work and education in a minimalist environment. This experiment that was initially intended to socialize rural education in Sudan ended up as an institution to prepare educational leadership for the country and as model of teacher education in Eastern Africa.

The school situation in Lebanon is far more complex, diverse, and unusual. The historical accumulation of events, the last of which was the independence of the country from the French mandate in 1943, resulted in a complex system of formal schooling: the state-funded and state-controlled public schools, which constitute currently about 40 % of the system, and tuition-based private schools which constitute 60 % of the system. The private sector, in turn, includes a variety of schools: religiously affiliated schools and privately owned and managed schools.

The emphasis in both public and private schools in Lebanon is on social mobility and socialization. The social mobility function of all schools in Lebanon is evident. Social mobility through education has been a major motivation for parents and students because education is conceived as a gateway to opportunities in the service sector, which is the backbone of the country, particularly since Lebanon has few of the natural resources needed for industrialization.

On the other hand, the socialization function in Lebanon seems to serve conflicting purposes. The public schools and the secular private schools strive to serve

socialization for the purposes of national and social cohesion; however, the religious schools tend to promote, implicitly or explicitly, different and sometimes conflicting socialization purposes. These schools claim to promote national unity but serve socialization for their own religious values. The commitment to religious values in schools varies from an explicit inculcation of a specific religion to an implicit commitment to a certain religious ethos. The diversity of the socialization purposes in Lebanese schools has been a major obstacle in the way of the educational system's ability to contribute meaningfully and significantly to the much-needed national and social cohesion.

References

- Bourdieu, P. (2011). The forms of capital (1986). In I. Szeman & T. Kaposky (Eds.), *Cultural theory: An anthology* (pp. 81–91). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brunner, J. S. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1977). *Evolution of educational thought: Lectures on the formation and development of secondary education in France*. Translated by Peter Collins. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Freire, P. (1970/2013). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling society*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Leadbeater, C. (2004). *Personalisation through participation*. London: Demos.
- Niss, M. (1981). Goals as a reflection of the needs of society. In R. Morris (Ed.), *Studies in mathematics education* (Vol. 2, pp. 1–21). Paris: UNESCO.
- Meighan, R. (1995). *John Holt: Personalised Education and the Reconstruction of Education*. Drake International Services.
- Pykett, J. (2009). Personalization and de-schooling: Uncommon trajectories in contemporary education policy. *Critical Social Policy*, 29(3), 374–397.
- Samier, E. (2002). Weber on education and its administration prospects for leadership in a rationalized world. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 30(1), 27–45.
- Stevens, M. L. (2008). Culture and education. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 619(1), 97–113.
- Weber, M. (2002). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Williams, J. (2012). Use and exchange value in mathematics education: contemporary CHAT meets Bourdieu's sociology. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 80, 57–72.

Learning and Teaching Real World Problem Solving in
School Mathematics

A Multiple-Perspective Framework for Crossing the
Boundary

Jurdak, M.

2016, XX, 199 p. 24 illus., 4 illus. in color., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-319-08203-5