Three Approaches to Educational Stratification and their Implications in the Anthropology of Education*

Park, Jeehwan[*]

    This paper aims to review the English-published literature which is engaged in exploring the ways in which schooling may function to reproduce the existing social inequality. In so doing, this paper critically examines three main approaches－correspondence, resistance, and cultural capital－to educational differentiation and then refers to empirical studies concerning the academic achievement gap between African and European American students and the differential development of higher education in the United States. As such this paper suggests that neither structural nor cultural approach is good enough to understand the effect of schooling on social reproduction if we draw on only one or the other. Instead, it proposes that educational anthropologists should be able to analyze the mechanisms through which class identities as well as the social gap in educational achievement and attainment are created.

    〈Key concepts〉: bell curve, correspondence, resistance, cultural capital, acting white, cooling out

---

* Assistant Professor, Chonbuk National University

1. Bell Curve Debate and Educational Stratification

The debate on individual intelligence has had important implications for the function of educational system as a social reproductive mechanism. The debate can be characterized as one of nature versus nurture. In fact, cultural anthropologists have refused to reduce the cultural to the biological since anthropology was first established as an academic discipline(Marks 2005). Nevertheless, some of social scientists in the nature camp still either reject or assign marginal importance to the effects of the social environment on individual cognitive abilities(Gottfredson 1997).

Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray are also part of those who rekindled the controversy on IQ and its genetic connectedness in the 1990s. The fundamental premise of their book, *The Bell Curve* is that intelligence and its proxy IQ are determined primarily by genes and that economic and social success are determined mostly by IQ(Herrnstein and Murray 1994). Although Herrnstein and Murray are cautious about explaining the genetic relatedness of IQ, they actually maintain that the social inequality by the difference of IQ is inevitable.

Moreover, Herrnstein and Murray reveal racial and ethnic bias when they explain the effect of demographical change on the distribution of intelligence in the United States. They expect that IQ may drop by a point or two per generation in the country because of the racial constitution of IQ distribution and the constant immigration from non-European countries. According to them, black women are likely to be in the category of IQs of 90 and below three times more than white women. They also mention that about 57 percent of legal immigrants in the 1980s came

from ethnic groups whose IQs are significantly below the white average. As a result, people with lower IQs come to congregate in racial and ethnic minorities, whereby they cannot help performing less in school and eventually falling below the poverty line. In Herrnstein and Murray's logic, therefore, racial and ethnic inequality in the United States is the function of biological determination.

However, the gap in academic achievement and social mobility among classes and races cannot be reduced to the product of intelligence and its genetic connectedness. For example, some researchers have found the unfair operation of tracking for and its negative effects on minority children. The track placement of students tends to be determined by their social locations such as class and race, not simply by their academic achievement(Lucas 1999; Oakes 2005). Furthermore, a track placement in elementary school continues to affect a track allocation in secondary school and further an entry level in college or university(Ogbu 2003). Then, tracking may work to prepare students for different destination. In other words, unlike a suggestion from Herrnstein and Murray, academic and eventually social divisions depend upon not the biological but the social.

Then, the Bell Curve debate suggests that cultural anthropologists interested in schooling should grope for some ways to elucidate the reproductive working of educational system. In the following, therefore, rather than covering the whole field of educational anthropology, which is well documented by other researchers(Ogbu 1996; Spindler 1997; Levinson, Borman, Eisenhart, and Foster 2000; Eisenhart 2001; Yon 2003; Collins 2009; Levinson and Pollock 2016), this paper seeks to review the English-published literature which is explicitly engaged in exploring the ways in which schooling functions to reproduce the existing social

inequality.

In so doing, this paper aims to critically examine three main approaches to educational differentiation: structural Marxism, cultural Marxism, and cultural capital theory. By reviewing advantages and limitations of these three approaches, it attempts to demonstrate that educational anthropologists should understand the working of school as a legitimating and perpetuating apparatus of social divisions rather than reducing educational differentiation to the function of either economic conditions or cultural norms.

Then, this paper refers to two empirical studies concerning the academic achievement gap between African and European Americans and the differential development of higher education in the United States. The reason this paper covers these two cases is that the concept of 'acting white' for the racial division of academic achievement and that of 'cooling out' for screening students in advanced studies may elucidate the ways in which cultural anthropologists further develop the three approaches to educational stratification.

Based on the above theoretical and empirical engagement with the literature of educational stratification, this paper finally suggests that an ethnography of education should explore school as one of the "specific institutional mechanisms that are most responsible for the differential distribution of the cultural forms that generate, organize, and legitimate class practices, that allow and obscure individual understanding and movement through the process"(Slater 2010: 142). In other words, this paper mentions that educational stratification is eventually concerned with the formation of habitus as well as the social differentiation in academic achievement.

2. Three Theoretical Frameworks on Educational Stratification

One of several transformations in the modern era is the gradual expansion of mass public schooling, which is supposed to contribute to a fair distribution of social benefit relative to individuals' educational achievement regardless of their class origins. Still, the modern educational system has hardly accomplished such a meritocratic ideal. On the contrary, it has served to reproduce social inequalities in certain 'legitimate' ways. Thus, this section would examine the ways in which three main approaches to the relationship between education and social stratification ─structural Marxism, cultural Marxism, and cultural capital theory─ elaborate on the differentiating and legitimating function of schooling.

1) Structural Marxism

The typical literature of structural Marxist approach to education is *Schooling in Capitalist America*(Bowles and Gintis 1976). In the magnum opus, Bowles and Gintis offer a compelling argument for the origins, structure, and function of educational system in the United States. According to the authors, capitalism begets an educational system whose primary function is to sustain capitalism. The educational system plays an important role to prepare people for a class-stratified division of labor and to make them accept such sorting and placement. That is to say, it reproduces and legitimates the social distinctions in the capitalist society.

The structural Marxist approach which Bowles and Gintis present is often summarized as a theory on the correspondence between society and

economy. This hypothesis has been explored by qualitative and quantitative research since the 1980s. It spawned a whole new generation of work on the political economy of education and the origins and effects of 'hidden curriculum'(Anyon 1981; Wilcox 1982), whereas it, like other Marxist theories, was often criticized for its economic determinism(Olneck and Bills 1980; Hickox 1982; Oakes 1982; Giroux 1983; Apple 1988).

For instance, Hickox provides the counterargument to a nearly direct correspondence between student positions in schools and their positions in the occupational structure: "There is no necessary fit between any specific form of educational organization or pedagogy and the needs of advanced capitalism"(Hickox 1982: 576-577). In practice, comprehensive secondary schools in the United States provide little specialized or technical education that would substantiate the Marxist position. Thus, it is no wonder that little evidence of direct correspondence exists in the American schools.

Despite a bitter criticism on the naive economic determinism of correspondence theory, however, Bowles and Gintis did not reduce the development of public schooling in the country to its economic condition. They simply noted "a correspondence between the social relationships which govern personal interaction in the work place and the social relationships of the educational system"(Bowles and Gintis 1976: 12). To put it another way, their point is not that school prepares students for specific jobs by teaching technical skills to them. Instead, it "tailors the self-concepts, aspirations, and social class identifications of individuals to the requirements of the social division of labor"(130). Hence, it is unfair to criticize that "the correspondence principle" is a mechanistic economic determinism(131). It properly concerns the role

which schools play in making people believe as if socially produced differences are naturally given.

The correspondence between school and workplace has been often confirmed through the literature on 'hidden curriculum' in formal education(Wilcox 1982; Ogbu 1996; Oakes 2005). In the investigation of five elementary schools distinguished by social class setting in two school districts in New Jersey, for instance, Anyon(1981) also finds the differences in school knowledge and norms transmitted by the schools.[1]

According to Anyon, what constitutes school knowledge in the working-class school is "fragmented facts isolated from context and connection to each other or to wider bodies of meaning, or to the activity or biography of students"; and "knowledge of practical rule-governed behaviors-procedures by which the students carry out tasks that are largely mechanical"(12). By contrast, in the middle-class school, school knowledge is "a possession": it is learned that "information, facts, and dates can be accumulated and exchanged for good grades and college or a job"(17). Meanwhile, the "knowledge in the affluent professional school is not only conceptual but is open to discovery, construction, and meaning making"(23). Finally, a dominant type of school knowledge in the executive elite school is the necessity of academic and intellectual preparation for being the best for "top-quality performance" rather than critical thinking(29).

Hence Anyon claims that students in each school distinguished by

---

1) Anyon divides these five elementary schools into four groups by the family background of students, i.e. their father's job and family's annual income: working-class (unskilled or semiskilled workers; below $12,000), middle-class (highly-skilled, well-paid blue-collar and white collar workers; $13,000~$25,000), affluent professional (medical doctors, television or advertising executives, interior designers and so forth; $40,000~$80,000) and executive elite school (vice presidents or more advanced corporate executives; over $100,000).

social classes are socialized for different cognitive abilities and ultimately different occupational positions through the differential operation of curriculum. In other words, the literature on 'hidden curriculum' documents the correspondence between the behavioral requirements of workplace such as dominance or subordinacy, and those of classroom like self-direction or conformity.

Therefore, it should be noted that the correspondence theory points out the selective affinity of cognitive skills and orientations between workplace and school rather than the perfect match between a specific knowledge learned in school and a particular skill demanded in workplace. As such, the theory may take into account the seemingly legitimate ways in which school may function to reproduce social structure.

2) Cultural Marxism

There is little doubt that school functions to reproduce the unequal social structure in capitalist societies as Bowles and Gintis claim. Still, the social structure which school supports is not automatically reproduced without human agency. While structural Marxists emphasize the working of school as a social institution which places students into a particular social position, cultural Marxists focus on the practices through which the structure is reproduced. For instance, how and why some working class students willingly take dead-end jobs is comprehensible only when attention is paid to a relative autonomy of cultural process among the youth.

In *Learning to Labor*, Paul Willis(1981) explores the very paradoxical process. According to Willis, non-conformist working class kids whom

he called lads are well aware of the limitation of meritocracy and of the alienation of labor in the capitalist society. The lads know that in the society every labor is not so much different since it is generally deskilled, and then that a high school diploma or other mediocre certificates will not make a big difference in their future career. Thus, instead of valuing any formal schooling, they take pride in recognizing the 'truth' of life earlier than other students.

Willis(1981: 119) maintains that such "penetration" to the limitation of meritocracy and their self-pride are based on working class culture, which the lads share with their fathers who have been manual workers on the shop floor. However, their penetration cannot help being limited. While the class culture provides them with the recognition of contradictions in the ideology of meritocracy, it privileges manual labor over office work by identifying them with masculinity and femininity respectively. Furthermore, even though they share manual labor with racial groups of immigrants, they regard the latter's work as just dirty, i.e. not good enough to be genuinely masculine. As a result, the articulation of sexism, anti-mentalism, and racism in the working class culture reduces the lads' penetration to a misrecognition of capitalist system. As such, Willis describes a paradoxical combination of social agents' resistance with their subordination, i.e. reproduction through resistance.

However, so-called resistance theorists including Willis have been often criticized that they lack a tight definition of what they mean by the term of resistance(Hargreaves 1982; Davies 1995; Brown 1996). Many resistance researchers tend to designate as resistance "almost anything ranging from drinking and fighting with teachers to less conspicuous phenomena such as boredom, indifference, laziness, and quiet behaviors"(Davies 1995: 22).

According to these critics, the resistance scholars just attempt to find out any evidence for resistance, in its broad sense, against the capitalist system, thereby losing sight of conflict, competition or complicity among students and overemphasizing the creativity of their misbehaviors.

This limitation of resistance study may be partly corrected by elaborating the concept and type of student resistance. Cammarota(2004: 56) notes "education researchers recognize that some types of student achievement—particularly that of marginalized students of color—can be read as a single marker for both conformism and resistance," i.e. "conformist resistance"(Fordham 1996; Miron and Lauria 1998; Valenzuela 1999; Solorzano and Delgado Bernal 2001; Yosso 2002). Also others find the difference in strategies of which boys and girls make use in order to resist schools, thereby making up for the problem that Willis focuses only on the lads and their way of resistance(Ohrn 1993; Cammarota 2004).

Nevertheless, the more fundamental problem of Willis' analysis is that he fails to make a balance between the cultural and the structural. His explanation of class reproduction often leans to the former too much. That is why he looks as if he blames the victims since the lads themselves opt for manual jobs. This problem derives from the fact that he thinks the effect which institutions such as schools make on cultural reproduction may be "unintended"(Willis 1981: 176). Then he limits their role to a passive background against the counter-school culture without focusing on "specific institutional school practices that were ideologically repressive"(Foley 2010: 190).

To put it different way, his theoretical priority of the cultural level over the structural tends to overemphasize the role the counter-school culture plays in reproducing its agents as manual laborers and relatively

underestimate the part the institutional structure plays in preventing them from fully recognizing capitalist ideologies. Even if school is not the evil institution which intends to inculcate the ideologies, it is still necessary to attend to its institutional effects as well as students' active agency in dealing with social reproduction processes.

To consider the above structural and cultural Marxist approaches together, therefore, we can see a difference between the two: Bowles and Gintis do not pay enough heed to the impact on educational stratification of cultural differences that students from different classes may bring to schools, whereas Willis tends to underestimate the function of schools to structure students for certain careers and attitudes. Instead, both institutions and agents should be taken into consideration at the same time since social structure is produced and reproduced by actors who are a part of and constrained by the structure.

3) Cultural Capital Theory

Such consideration of structure and agency in educational stratification is taken by Bourdieu and Passeron(1990) in *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. They analyze the relation between "the school system conceived as an institution for the reproduction of legitimate culture" and "the social classes characterized by unequal distances from academic culture and different dispositions to recognize and acquire it"(101). School is "a huge classificatory machine," which helps to "impose the legitimate exclusions and inclusions which form the basis of the social order"(x). Still, school can play such differential role to the extent that "the socially conditioned dispositions the agents (transmitters or receivers) owe to their

class origin and class membership" correspond to what it values(203). That is to say, the school can reproduce class structure in a meritocratic manner only when cultural capital students bring into it matches with what the school privileges.

Due to this selective affinity between educational system and social class, therefore, school serves "to ensure the transmission of cultural capital across generations and stamp pre-existing difference in inherited cultural capital with a meritocratic seal of academic consecration by virtue of the special symbolic potency of the *title*, credential"(ix-x; italics in original). It functions as an apparatus to lead people to misrecognize the pre-existing cultural difference as the essential gap in ability, whereby people find themselves accepting their social positions without question. Therefore, a study on school as "a huge classificatory machine" makes it possible both to examine how the institution justifies class differentiations and to analyze how social actors such as teachers, parents, and students cope with it relative to their cultural capital which is a product of their social positions.

The concept of cultural capital has been fairly accepted in the literature on education and class reproduction(DiMaggio 1982; DiMaggio and Mohr 1985; Peterson and Simkus 1992; Kalmijin and Kraaykamp 1996; Aschaffenburg and Maas 1997; Lareau and Horvat 1999; Roscigno and Ainsworth-Darnell 1999; De Graff, De Graff, and Kraaykamp 2000). However, pointing out "this acceptance often proceeds without a due scrutiny of the related empirical research," Kingston(2001: 2, 89) concludes that (1) "defined in terms of exclusionary class-related practices and dispositions, cultural capital does not substantially account for the relationship between social privilege and academic success" in the United States and (2) "too many conceptually distinct variables have come to

be placed under the big umbrella of cultural capital, creating a distorted sense of what accounts for academic success".

Firstly, Kingston's second criticism is proper in that many statistical studies have just focused on how cultural capital should be measured. Considering that what Bourdieu means by the concept is a cultural capability which has been embodied through a long period of rearing and education, it is problematic to judge the possession of cultural capital only by measuring, for instance, the frequency to go to museum and music concert. Rather than simply trying to find out the relation between cultural practices and educational success, we should first understand how and what kind of cultural capital is formed and inherited in a particular class if we wish to correctly use Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital.

However, Kinston's first criticism does not draw on any substantial evidence: It simply rests on a kind of folk belief that American do believe success depends on individuals' talents and efforts and that "class is not a central category of cultural discourse in America" unlike race, ethnicity and gender(Ortner 1991: 169). And yet, this attribution of failure to individuals may obscure "a displacement of class strain and friction into other arenas of life" such as race, ethnicity and gender in the United States(171). Furthermore, the recent literature shows that by capturing subtle class differences in linguistic command and ways of parental involvement with schooling, it is possible to apply the concept of cultural capital and find out a particular class culture in the country(Heath 1983; Useem 1992; Lareau 2000, 2003).

Above all, given that teaching and learning in school are basically conducted through linguistic communication, it is little wonder that the class difference of language use at home offers differential advantages to children and eventually influences their academic achievement. For

instance, Heath(1982: 105) documents how different types of questions are "in proportion to other types of utterances across three different situations," i.e. "a working class community of black residents (Trackton), the classrooms attended by children of this community in 1970~1975, and the homes of teachers from these classrooms, in a moderate-size city of the Southeastern United States". Particularly, she looks at the "different uses of questions and the assumptions made by the questioners about the functions of questions," thereby providing "an indication of the interrogatives teachers use with their own preschoolers at home, questions Trackton adults ask their preschool children, and the conflict and congruence between these discrepant approaches to questioning as they evolve in classrooms"(105, 109). Even though she does not directly address social class issue, she seems to clarify the effect of linguistic cultural capital on education in the country given the social class distance between the parents and the teachers.

Lareau(2003) more generally analyzes how the different norms and ways of child raising, which middle class and working class parents prefer respectively, privileges the former's children over the latter's in school. On the one hand, the middle class parents value "concerted cultivation" in child rearing, which "entails an emphasis on children's structured activities, language development and reasoning in the home, and active intervention in schooling"(2, 32). On the other hand, the working class parents appreciate "the accomplishment of natural growth," which describes "a form of child rearing in which children hang out and play, often with relatives, are given clear directives from parents with limited negation, and are granted more autonomy to manage their own affairs in institutions outside of the home"(3, 32). As a result, kids from middle class families are likely to perform better than those from working class

families in school not only because they have higher linguistic skill but also because they get more accustomed to negotiating with adults with authority by participating in the structured activities.

Taken together, these ethnographic studies reveal that even in the United States where no class-specific culture appears to exist, the class differences of educational practices may contribute to social inequality. Particularly, as some research shows, the cultural continuity/similarity between middle class family and school implies that the idea of cultural capital may be applied to the understanding of American educational practices in the very similar way that Bourdieu analyzes French ones: By valuing a specific way of language use and behavioral mode with which students from middle class families are accustomed, school transforms relative differences in the cultural practices among social classes into absolute and even inborn gaps, thereby naturalizing class inequality. Then, the following sections will address the ways in which these theoretical discussions can be applied to some empirical studies of race and higher education.

3. Race: A debate on 'acting white'

The academic achievement gap between African American and European American students has been a controversial issue since the educational problem is directly related to the larger debate of racial discrimination in the United States(Jencks and Phillips 1998; Fryer and Levitt 2002). However, research on African American students' attitudes toward school and academic achievement, which is intended to explain the gap, has often presented contradictory findings.

Of educational anthropologists interested in the issue, Fordham and Ogbu(1986) and Fordham(1988) provide a reasonable explanation about why African American students have performed less than European American students in school by paying attention to the former's cultural characteristic, i.e. oppositional culture. Not only do social and economic inequalities, to which African American students are subject, but also their oppositional culture, which is a historical product of the involuntary immigration of their ancestors(Ogbu 1987), systematically discourages them from being committed to schooling.

Fordham and Ogbu(1986: 176) explain this disengagement from formal education among African American students in terms of a kind of psychological threat from their peer group, i.e. "the burden of 'acting white'".[2] If some African American students study hard, they are very likely to be criticized of 'acting white' from their peers because studying is defined as the White culture contrasted with the Black culture among African Americans at large as well as the students. Thus, the psychological burden of 'acting white' forces some Black students, who want to become a part of mainstream society, to opt to develop a race-neutral persona or to disaffiliate them from the oppositional Black culture.

However, it is not certain to some extent that the practice of 'acting white' is prevalent among African American students across every grade level. For instance, Tyson(2002) contends that younger black students

---

2) The effect of peer culture on schooling and eventually students' social status is also confirmed in the analysis of why college women who supposedly have the means to go up the social ladder come to be resigned to getting married without accomplishing their aspiration toward professional career(Holland and Eisenhart 1990). According to Holland and Eisenhart, college women are surrounded by a peer culture in which women's prestige and associated attractiveness depend on the attention they get from men. Thus, when they come to have a difficulty in dealing with academic problems, they try to increase their potential as marriage partner rather than making efforts to study more.

in elementary school begin the school oriented towards achievement and engaged with the schooling process. As such, she criticizes Ogbu for overgeneralizing his findings, which were based mostly on high school students, to black students at all grade levels. Furthermore, in their quantitative study of high school sophomores Ainsworth-Darnell and Downey(1998) even find that blacks report more pro-school attitudes than whites. In contrast to Ogbu, they also mention that high-achieving blacks are especially well-liked among their peers.

In addition, African American youngsters are not clearly divided into "cultural mainstreamers" and "noncompliant believers"(Carter 2005: 18). Instead, Carter mentions that as "cultural straddlers" they can demonstrate knowledge and facility with "White" styles and at the same time with the styles they share with their Black peers(18). By contrast, it seems that Fordham and Ogbu do not pay enough heed to the diversity among African American students and of their cultures.

Therefore, Ogbu and Fordham's cultural account of the academic underachievement of Black students relative to White students seems problematic in that it tends to simplify African American cultures. While they point out that we should focus on diversities among all minority students, they themselves appear to be blind to differences among African American students. If there is 'the' African culture which is oppositional in every aspect, however, it is hard to explain how some Black middle class families can apply themselves to meritocracy(Lareau 2003: ch. 8).

This limitation in Fordham and Ogbu's accounts may derive from their insufficient attention to social class.3) In fact, 'acting white' is a class

---

3) This problem may result from the fact that they conducted fieldwork in one inner-city school. In his later publication, *Black American Students in and Affluent Suburb*, Ogbu(2003) addresses middle-class African American students and their parents' educational practices, too. However, as its subtitle, "a study of academic disengagement" implies, even among

practice which is coded through racial terms, because all white students do not necessarily study hard, and yet only middle class white students try to perform well in school. In other words, 'acting white' may reflect "a middle-class version of white"(Bettie 2003: 84). Given that they often come from middle class families, even African American teachers do not understand the oppositional Black student culture, and then underestimate their Black student's competence(Carter 2005: 24). Hence the point may be not race but class: We may pay attention to the effect of class cultures as well as that of racial cultures in order to understand African American students' poor performance in school.

Finally, the concept of 'acting white' may run the risk of suggesting that the cultural practice to undervalue education among African Americans may lead to the academic achievement gap, and eventually to the social disparity, between Blacks and Whites. This problem of blaming the victim for their fate, which is also found in the study on the culture of poverty(Goode 2002), may result from the fact that Fordham and Ogbu pay less attention to the working of school through which African American students may withdraw from schooling than the peer pressure against 'acting white.' Just as it is imperative to understand the mechanisms to perpetuate the harrowing conditions among the poor, so is it to examine those of making African American children disengaged from school such as teachers' low expectation of their academic performance(Ferguson 2003).

---

the middle-class African American students does he find that the phenomenon of 'acting white' still operates and that they do not value education as a legitimate channel to go up the social ladder. Rather they believe that good performance in sports may offer the best chance to overcome any racial barrier in opportunity structure. More seriously, their middle-class parents not only attend very few school meeting but also think that it is the responsibility of teachers and schools to make their children learn and perform successfully.

4. Higher Education: The Distinction between Community College and University in the U.S.

Only a few anthropologists conduct research on higher education. However, this does not mean that the ethnographic study of higher education has nothing to do with educational anthropology and anthropological theory in general(Shumar 2004). Some researchers have sought to relate their data on higher education to theoretical issues such as gender stratification(Montgomery 2004). For instance, Holland and Eisenhart(1990) analyze why women college students are underrepresented in math and science in terms of a patriarchic culture in American colleges.

In recent years, some anthropologists have also contributed to the expanding scholarship of globalization by studying how universities and their members such as students, part-time lecturers, professors and administrators respond to and interpret the transformations of educational environments caused by the neoliberal capitalism(Shumar 1997; Church 1999; Stevenson 1999; Canaan 2002). Thus, it seems that the anthropology of higher education has enough potential to extend the substantive and theoretical ranges of educational anthropology.

Nevertheless, given that the subfield is still small, it is imperative that educational anthropologists interested in higher education refer to other scholarships of community colleges and universities. In this vein, it is still valuable to see Clark(1960) who addresses a psychological rationalization in community college, i.e. the 'cooling out' process by which he means to decrease educational aspiration and desire for social mobility, and then its students come to be resigned to their failure.

In spite of focusing on the psychological process, Clark avoids reducing

it to an individual psychology by documenting the procedures in which community colleges discourages their students from advancing to senior colleges: pre-entrance testing, counseling interview, orientation catering to vocational education, grading, and probation. Thus, the concept of 'cooling out' may be useful in grasping some institutional procedures within schools by which students are made to gradually recognize and even internalize their "proper classification and placement" in the educational and social ladder(575).

However, a less satisfactory aspect in Clark's accounts is that he describes as if the 'cooling out' process is relatively smooth. Although he notes that several layers of discouraging procedures are needed in order to make over-aspiring students disoriented from going to university, he does not mention anything about students' resistance against being tracked into vocational courses. Yet it is important to address the very fact that during the vocationalization of community college, African American students have tended to oppose their placement into vocational tracks(Dougherty 2001: 206).

In *The Contradictory College*, Dougherty(2001: 8) presents his plausible theory of "the relative autonomy of the state," which demonstrates the significant role of government officials in both the founding of two-year community colleges and their transition to vocational curriculum. Dougherty explains that the self-interest has motivated goals of local, state, and national government officials to promote community colleges for relieving demands for higher education. Through community colleges, private foundations and officials of existent universities would protect the status of academia, and government officials would earn access to administrative and teaching jobs in higher education, and achieve the appearance of a striving economy.

Through his these findings, Dougherty rejects the Marxist instrumentalist critique of community colleges as directly serving capitalist interests by feeding trained mid-level workers into firms. His concept of "power of constraint" displays the mediating role of government officials(36). The relationship between business and community colleges is complex and laden with ideology or government officials' belief in the equality of opportunity and serving the needs of the economy, even when they wish to maintain their elected positions.

Still, Dougherty sometimes appears to overpraise the role governmental officials have played for the making of community college. For example, he marginalizes the role of private foundations for the vocationalization of community college since they affected the process only after the 1960s. By the same reasoning, however, it can be said that the role federal governmental officials and lawmakers have played must not be overemphasized because it was not until the 1960s that they made direct interventions in community college issues: Most of important laws which concerned the issues became effective at that time. Thus, it seems that he unfairly gives more merits to federal governmental officials than they would be deserved to get.

Nevertheless, Dougherty's emphasis of the role that public officials play in the distinction of higher education is generally true. We can also see the ways in which, like other public officials, the top leaders at the upper hand of higher education, i.e. university, have attempted to keep its high status through admission practices.

In *The Chosen*, Karabel(2005) describes how admission practices in the Big three universities such as Harvard, Yale and Princeton changed since the 1920s. According to him, these top universities sought to maintain their existing privileged status by selectively accepting

applicants according to their ethnicity, gender and race. For instance, the Big three universities introduced the character of applicants as one of selection criteria, thereby excluding Jewish students who academically performed better than Anglo-Saxon counterparts. In addition, they decided to accept women and African American applicants not because they came to embrace the principle of equal education but because they wanted to incorporate best-achieving male students into their campuses or avoid racial conflicts prevalent in the 1960s.

Therefore, Karabel(2005: 8) concludes, "In charting the transformation of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton over the course of the twentieth century, it becomes clear that change in admissions policy has come about primarily through their attempt to preserve and, when possible, to enhance their position in a highly stratified system of higher education".

In sum, the above studies suggest plenty of channels through which educational anthropologists can explore educational stratification in higher education. Particularly, if the differentiation in higher education is ethnographically studied, they may see a similar process which they have found in tracking in elementary and secondary education(Lucas 1999; Oakes 2005): It can be said that advanced class is to general or vocational class in the secondary education what university is to community college in the tertiary education. On this point, an ethnography of higher education may also contribute to documenting the processes through which educational stratification takes place within and without universities/community colleges.

5. School as "a Huge Classificatory Machine"

This review on the literature of educational stratification suggests that school is "a huge classificatory machine" through which social divisions are created and justified(Bourdieu and Passeron 1990: x). For instance, the concept of hidden curriculum from structural Marxist approach informs that schooling socializes middle-class and working-class children into different abilities and attitudes. The criticism of cultural Marxist approach also reminds us of focusing on not only what cultural norms students bring into school but also how school shapes their (mis)recognition of capitalist society. Furthermore, cultural capital approach demonstrates the ways in which school transforms the cultural differentiations of classes into their natural difference in abilities.

Meanwhile, research on the distinction in higher education as well as the literature on the racial gap in academic achievement informs us of the importance of understanding the process through which students are made to disassociate from working hard in school. We find that the low school performance among African American students can be understood by examining not only their burden of 'acting white' but also certain educational practices which make them think of working hard in school as the White culture. The concept of 'cooling out' also demonstrates how curriculum in community colleges functions to discourage them from pursuing advanced education.

Thus, all these literatures mention that educational stratification is more than an academic performance gap among races or classes. Instead, schooling is intertwined with an acquisition of "habitus as a system of dispositions to be and to do"(Bourdieu 2000: 150). In his analysis of

education system in France, Bourdieu develops this idea: "Even the negative dispositions and predispositions leading to self-elimination, such as, for example, self-depreciations, devalorization of the School and its sanctions or resigned expectation of failure or exclusion may be understood as unconscious anticipation of the sanctions the School objectively has in store for the dominated classes"(Bourdieu and Passeron 1990: 204-205). Since such dispositions come from past and current experiences of objective sanctions in school, "agents may explicitly state plans and strategies [for their own future], but these practices are the product of habitus and not rational calculation"(Reed-Donahay 2005: 109). As such, school may help to form habitus by which working class children or racial minority students may accept their precarious positions with little reluctance.

Then, what an ethnographer of schooling should do is to explore the mechanisms through which students are not only divided relative to their academic achievement but also come to get an implicit sense of where they (will) stand in society. In so doing, (s)he may examine the ways in which assessment and tracking affect students' aspirations, self-identities, and eventually attitudes toward society. For instance, in an ethnographic analysis of grading and ability grouping in a Japanese junior high school, Park(2014) mentions that these sorting apparatuses may help lower class children not to aspire to go up the social ladder via schooling. In this way, an ethnography of school can explore how pedagogical practices may not only affect students' academic achievement but also shape their dispositions.

In sum, this review demonstrates that neither structural nor cultural approach to educational stratification is good enough to understand the effect of schooling on social reproduction. Instead, this paper suggests

that educational anthropologists should describe the mechanisms through which class identities as well as the social gap in educational achievement and attainment are created.

References

Ainsworth-Darnell, James W. and Douglas B. Downey
    1998 "Assessing the Oppositional Culture Explanation for Racial/Ethnic Differences in School Performance," *American Sociological Review* 63(4): 536-553.

Anyon, Jean
    1981 "Social Class and School Knowledge," *Curriculum Inquiry* 11(1): 3-42.

Apple, Michael W.
    1988 "Standing on the Shoulders of Bowles and Gintis: Class Formation and Capitalist Schools," *History of Education Quarterly* 28(2): 231-241.

Aschaffenburg, Karen and Ineke Mass
    1997 "Cultural and Educational Careers: The Dynamics of Social Reproduction," *American Sociological Review* 62(4): 573-587.

Bettie, Julie
    2003 *Women Without Class,* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre
    2000 *Pascalian Meditations*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron
    1990 *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture*, London: Sage Publication.

Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis
    1976 *Schooling in Capitalist America*, New York: Basic Books.

Brown, Michael F.

    1996   "On Resisting Resistance," *American Anthropologist* 98(4): 729-735.

Canaan, Joyce E.

    2002   "Theorizing Pedagogic Practices in the Contexts of Marketization and of September 11, 2001, and Its Aftermath," *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 33(3): 368-382.

Cammarota, Julio

    2004   "The Gendered and Racialized Pathways of Latina and Latino Youth: Different Struggles, Different Resistances in the Urban Context," *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 35(1): 53-74.

Carter, Prudence L.

    2005   "Black's Cultural Capital and the Conflicts of Schooling," in *Keepin' It Real: School Success beyond Black and White,* New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-30.

Church, Jonathan T.

    1999   "Laboring in the Dream Factory, Part II," *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 12(3): 251-262.

Clark, Burton R.

    1960   "The 'Cooling-Out' Function in Higher Education," *The American Journal of Sociology* 65(6): 569-576.

Collins, James.

    2009   "Social Reproduction in Classrooms and Schools," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 38: 33-48.

Davies, Scott

    1995   "Leaps of Faith: Shifting Currents in Critical Sociology of Education," *American Journal of Sociology* 100(6): 1448-1478.

De Graaf, Nan Dirk, Paul M. De Graff, and Gerbert Kraaykamp

    2000   "Parental Cultural Capital and Educational Attainment in the Netherlands: A Refinement of the Cultural Capital Perspective," *Sociology of Education* 73(2): 92-111.

DiMaggio, Paul

    1982   "Cultural Capital and School Success: The Impact of Status Culture Participation on the Grade of U.S. High School Students," *American Sociological Review* 47(2): 189-201.

DiMaggio, Paul and John Mohr

　1985 "Cultural Capital, Educational Attainment, and Marital Selection," *American Journal of Sociology* 90(6): 1231-1261.

Dougherty, Kevin J.

　2001 *The Contradictory College: The Conflicting Origins, Impacts, and Futures of the Community College,* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Eisenhart, Margaret

　2001 "Educational Ethnography Past, Present, and Future: Ideas to Think With," *Educational Researcher* 30(8): 16-27.

Ferguson, Ronald F.

　2003 "Teachers' Perceptions and Expectations and the Black-White Test Score Gap," *Urban Education* 38(4): 460-507.

Foley, Douglas E.

　2010 *Learning Capitalist Culture,* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Fordham, Signithia

　1988 "Racelessness as a Factor in Black Student School Success: Pragmatic Strategy or Pyrrhic Victory?," *Harvard Educational Review* 58(1): 54-84.

　1996 *Blacked out: Dilemmas of Race, Identity, and Success at Capital High,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fordham, Signithia and John Ogbu

　1986 "Black Students' School Success: Coping With the Burden of 'Acting White'," *Urban Review* 18(3): 176-206.

Fryer, Roland G. and Steven D. Levitt

　2002 *Understanding the Black-White Test Score Gap in the First Two Years of School*, Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Giroux, Henry

　1983 "Theories of Reproduction and Resistance in the New Sociology of Education: A Critical Analysis," *Harvard Educational Review* 53: 257-293.

Goode, Judith

　2002 "How Urban Ethnography Counters Myths About the Poor," in George Gmelch and Walter P. Zenner, eds., *Urban life: Readings in the Anthropology of the City*, pp. 185-201.

Gottfredson, Linda S.

    1997   "Why g Matters: The Complexity of Everyday Life," *Intelligence* 24: 79-132.

Hargreaves, Andy

    1982   "Resistance and Relative Autonomy Theories: Problems of Distortion and Incoherence in Recent Marxist Analysis of Education," *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 3(2): 107-126.

Heath, Shirley Brice

    1982   "Questioning at Home and at School: A Comparative Study," in George Spindler, ed., *Doing the Ethnography of Schooling: Educational Anthropology in Action*, Austin: Holt Rinehart & Winston, pp. 102-131.

    1983   *Ways with Words: Language, Life and Work in Communities and Classrooms*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Herrnstein, Richard J. and Charles Murray

    1994   *The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in American Life*, New York: The Free Press.

Hickox, Mike

    1982   "The Marxist Sociology of Education: A Critique," *British Journal of Sociology* 33(4): 563-578.

Holland, Dorothy C. and Margaret A. Eisenhart

    1990   *Educated in Romance: Women Achievement and College Culture*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Jencks, Christopher and Meredith Phillips(eds.)

    1998   *The Black-White Test Score Gap*, Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Kalmijin, Matthijs and Gerbert Kraaykamp

    1996   "Race, Cultural Capital, and Schooling: An Analysis of Trends in the United States," *Sociology of Education* 69(1): 22-34.

Karabel, Jerome

    2005   *The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton*, Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Kingston, Paul W.

    2001   "The Unfulfilled Promise of Cultural Capital Theory," *Sociology of Education* 74(Extra Issue): 88-99.

Lareau, Annette
  2000 *Home Advantage*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
  2003 *Unequal Childhoods*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lareau, Annette and Erin McNamara Horvat
  1999 "Moments of Social Inclusion and Exclusion: Race, Class, and Cultural Capital in Family-School Relationships," *Sociology of Education* 72(1): 37-53.

Levinson, Bradley A., Kathyrn M. Borman, Margaret Eisenhart, Michèle Foster, Amy E. Fox, and Margaret Sutton(eds.)
  2000 *Schooling the Symbolic Animal: Social and Cultural Dimensions of Education*, New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, INC.

Levinson, Bradley A. and Mica Pollock(eds.)
  2016 *A Companion to the Anthropology of Education*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Lucas, Samuel R.
  1999 *Tracking Inequality: Stratification and Mobility in American High Schools*, New York and London: Teachers College Press.

Marks, Jonathan
  2005 "Anthropology and the Bell Curve," in Catherine Besteman and Hugh Gusterson, eds., *Why America's Top Pundits Are Wrong: Anthropologists Talk Back*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 206-227.

Miron, Louis F. and Mickey Lauria
  1998 "Student Voice as Agency: Resistance and Accommodation in Inner-City Schools," *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 29(2): 189-213.

Montgomery, Laura M.
  2004 "'It's Just What I Like': Explaining Persistent Patterns of Gender Stratification in the Life Choices of College Students," *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 17(6): 785-802.

Oakes, Jeannie
  1982 "Classroom Social Relationships: Exploring the Bowles and Gintis Hypothesis," *Sociology of Education* 55(4): 197-212.
  2005 *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

Ogbu, John

 1987 "Variability in Minority School Performance: A Problem in Search of an Explanation," *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 18(4): 312-334.

 1996 "Educational Anthropology," in David Levinson and Melvin Ember, eds., *Encyclopedia of Cultural Anthropology*, New York: Henry Holt and Company, pp. 371-377.

 2003 *Black American Students in an Affluent Suburb: A Study of Academic Disengagement*, Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishing.

Ohrn, Elizabeth

 1993 "Gender, Influence and Resistance in School," *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 14: 147-158.

Olneck, Michael R. and David B. Bills

 1980 "What Makes Sammy Run? An Empirical Assessment of the Bowles-Gintis Correspondence Theory," *American Journal of Education* 89(1): 27-61.

Ortner, Sherry B.

 1991 "Reading America: Preliminary Notes on Class and Culture," in Richard G. Fox, ed., *Recapturing Anthropology: Working in the Present,* Santa Fe, New Mexico: School of American Research Press, pp. 163-189.

Park, Jeehwan

 2014 "Hierarchical Socialisation in a Japanese Junior High School: The Formation of a Sense of One's Place," *Social Science Japan Journal* 17(2): 189-205.

Peterson, Paul and Albert Simkus

 1992 "How Musical Tastes Mark Occupational Status Groups," in Michelle Lamont and Marcel Founier, eds., *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 152-186.

Reed-Danahay, Deborah

 2005 *Locating Bourdieu*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Roscigno, Vincent and James Ainsworth-Darnell

 1999 "Race, Cultural Capital, and Educational Resources: Persistent Inequalities and Achievement Returns," *Sociology of Education* 72(3): 158-178.

Shumar, Wesley

 1997 *College for Sale: A Critique of the Commodification of Higher Education,*

London: Falmer Press.

2004 "Making Strangers at Home: Anthropologists Studying Higher Education," *The Journal of Higher Education* 75(1): 23-41.

Slater, David H.
2010 "The 'New Working Class' of Urban Japan: Socialization and Contradiction from Middle School to the Labor Market," in Hiroshi Ishida and David H. Slater, eds., S*ocial Class in Contemporary Japan: Structures, Sorting and Strategies*, London: Routledge, pp. 137-169.

Solorzano, Daniel G. and Dolores Delgado Bernal
2001 "Examining Transformational Resistance Through a Critical Race and LatCrit Theory Framework: Chicana and Chicano Students in an Urban Context," *Urban Education* 36(3): 308-342.

Spindler, George Dearborn(ed.)
1997 *Education and Cultural Process: Anthropological Approaches*, Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.

Stevenson, Mark A.
1999 "Flexible Education and the Discipline of the Market," *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 12(3): 311-323.

Tyson, Karolyn
2002 "Weighing In: Elementary-Age Students and the Debate on Attitudes toward School Among Black Students," *Social Forces* 80(4): 1157-1189.

Useem, Elizabeth
1992 "Middle Schools and Math Groups: Parents' Involvement in Children's Placement," *Sociology of Education* 65(4): 263-279.

Valenzuela, Angela
1999 *Subtractive Schooling*, Albany: SUNY Press.

Wilcox, Kathleen
1982 "Differential Socialization in the Classroom: Implications for Equal Opportunity," in George D. Spindler, ed., *Doing the Ethnography of Schooling*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 268-309.

Willis, Paul
1981 *Learning to Labor*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Yon, Daniel A.
2003 "Highlights and Overview of the History of Educational Ethnography,"

Annual Review of Anthropology 32: 411-429.

Yosso, Tara
    2002   "Critical Race Media Literacy: Challenging Deficit Discourse about Chicanas/os," *Journal of Popular Film and Television* 30(1): 52-63.

<주요개념>: 벨커브, 조응이론, 저항이론, 문화자본론, 백인처럼 행동하기, 교육열망의 냉각

교육인류학에서 교육에 의한 계층화에 관한 세 가지 접근과 그 의미

박지환*

이 논문에서는 학교교육이 어떤 식으로 사회불평등을 재생산하는가에 관한 영미권의 연구를 검토하고 있다. 이를 위해, 이 논문은 우선 교육을 통한 계층화에 대한 세 가지 주된 접근방식(조응이론, 저항이론, 문화자본론)을 비판적으로 검토한다. 또한 이런 세 가지 접근법의 의미를 경험적인 연구의 맥락에서 고찰하고자, 미국의 인종 간 학력격차에 관한 연구와 고등교육의 서열화에 대한 연구를 검토한다. 이로써 이 논문은 구조적 접근이나 문화적 접근 어느 하나만으로는 학교교육이 사회적재생산에 미치는 영향을 충분히 파악할 수 없다는 점을 보여준다. 대신, 이 논문에서는 교육인류학이 특정한 시공간에서의 민족지적 연구를 통해, 집단 간 학력 차이를 초래하며 나아가 사회적 위치에 대한 감각을 형성시키는 교육적 메커니즘을 파악해야 한다고 주장한다.

* 전북대 고고문화인류학과 조교수