A Radical Redistribution of Capital

Torie L. Weiston-Serdan

Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, California, USA

Abstract

The study of capital in all of its forms has provided key insights into the system of education: its structure, its inequities, its values and its contributions. While the research is a key component to understanding educational opportunity and inequity, it does not advance from research to application. There is a general consensus that the existing system replicates and perpetuates unequal distribution of capital; what practitioners do not understand is how to reform the system so that it replicates and perpetuates an equal distribution of capital. The intent of this analysis, in direct response to the research, is to propose a radical shift or redistribution in capital beginning with the educational system and through a dynamic and collective consciousness in order to address the inequities. The paper consists of three parts: the first, a discussion of the concept of capital and how it is currently distributed through education and perpetuates an unequal distribution of capital within society; the second, a discussion of the need for collective consciousness, introduction of a subversive curriculum and teaching of grassroots activism in order to create change; and the third, a discussion of what the new system would look like should that change take place. This revolution of educational process includes the discussion of changing education from an "accumulation model" to a "cultivation model", thereby creating a space in which cultural and social capital that exists within "undervalued" communities is acknowledged and fostered rather than opposed or assumed deficient.

A Radical Redistribution of Capital

The study of capital in all of its forms has provided key insights into the system of education: its structure, its inequities, its values and its contributions. While the research is a key component to understanding educational opportunity and inequity, it does not advance from research to application. There is a general consensus that the existing system replicates and perpetuates unequal distribution of capital. Theorists like Bourdieu (1973) recognize this unequal distribution:

> An educational system which puts into practice an implicit pedagogic action requiring initial familiarity with the dominant culture, and which proceeds by imperceptible familiarization, offers information and training which can be received and acquired only by subjects endowed with the system of predisposition that is the condition for the success of the transmission and of the inculcation of the culture. (p. 80)

What practitioners do not understand is how to reform the system so that it replicates and perpetuates an equal distribution of capital. Concepts remain inert and useless without application. Though a clear understanding of what the problems are is important, that understanding has no significance without action. In order for these concepts to have true meaning, the issues must be identified and then changed. By exploring the research and responding to it, this paper seeks to make the connection between research and application by proposing a radical shift in the distribution of capital, as it currently exists, beginning with the educational system and through a collective consciousness. The paper will consist of three parts: the first, a discussion of the concept of capital and how it is currently distributed through education and perpetuates an unequal distribution of capital within society; the second, a discussion of the need for a collective consciousness, subversive curriculum and the teaching of grassroots activism in order to create change, this includes the discussion of the need for those whose capital is assumed deficient in the current system and the majority; to collectively understand their disadvantage, oppose the thought that they must gain access to that capital and actively oppose and change the system of capital distribution as it exists now, and the third, a discussion of what the new system would look like should that change take place. This includes the discussion of changing education from an accumulation model to a cultivation model,

creating a space in which the cultural and social capital that exists within "undervalued" communities is acknowledged and fostered rather than opposed or assumed deficient.

Part I: Capital Theory and Educational Inequality

Capital, by definition, is accumulation: accumulation of culture, social relationships, money, labor, access, and most importantly, power. As defined by Bourdieu (1986):

> Capital is accumulated labor (in its materialized form or its "incorporated" embodied form) which, when appropriated on a private, ie., exclusive, basis by agents or groups of agents, enables them to appropriate social energy in the form of reified or living labor…Capital, which, in its objectified forms, takes time to accumulate and which, as a potential capacity to produce profits and to reproduce itself in identical or expanded form, contains a tendency to persist in its being, is a force inscribed on the objectivity of things so that everything is not equally possible or impossible. (p. 241)

While the focus of research has been on social and cultural capital, capital in all of its forms represents one idea: accumulated wealth. Whether accumulated possessions are intellectual, social or cultural, capital in any form results in wealth and advantage. According to Bourdieu (1986), cultural capital is the "accumulation" of education, the social form of a group, material items that exhibit or represent this wealth and educational credentials, labels or titles that further exhibit this wealth. While Bourdieu's ideas of capital encompass a distinctly social definition, both Weber and Marx see capital as almost exclusively economic. Though both Marx and Weber allow for variations of capital, for them the form is a purely economic one and either directly or indirectly results in wealth. The ideas, however, are not necessarily competing ones, as the social and cultural capital that Bourdieu discusses does in fact reinforce class and monetary wealth. With the accumulation of the cultural capital that Bourdieu refers to comes the reward of economic wealth.

The way that Bourdieu relates this to education is to say that the "accumulation" of all aspects of cultural capital puts some at an advantage over others and that the institution of education only recognizes the accepted form of cultural capital, which, consequently, isolates some or elevates some over others. Bourdieu (1986) suggests:

> A theoretical hypothesis which made it possible to explain the unequal achievement of children originating from the different social classes by relating academic success, ie., the

> specific profits which children from the different classes and class fraction can obtain in the academic market, to the distribution of cultural capital between the classes and the class fractions. (p. 243)

In addition, his concept of habitus, a "set of ideas about how the world operates, what is to be valued, what one's own place in society is, and which actions are correct and proper," informs the way in which individuals within society and within the school system operate (De Marrais and Le Compte, 2000, p. 208). Though students go into the educational system with values that were initially instilled in them by their familial surroundings those ideas are either negated or reinforced while in the education system. "Marx made explicit the relationship between social class and economic power and demonstrated how it creates a hierarchy of classes within a society… stating that the educational system provides a legitimizing function for capitalist systems" (De Marrais and Le Compte, 2000, p. 203).

While Marx's discussion of capital and its connections to education were limited, Weber wrote more extensively on the topic. "He was especially interested in the curriculum and the types of students recruited to different kinds of schools. He felt that each society created educational systems uniquely suited to indigenous systems of power and authority. These systems were used to select and train leaders of the society" (De Marrais and Le Compte, 2000, p.205). Like the subjects in the *Preps at Play and in the Power Structure* (Cookson et al, 1987), cultural capital goes hand in hand with social capital and produces an elite class of "the haves." This process is systematically maintained within education. As a result, capital because of its relationship to "accumulation," belongs to and is kept with those who are at the top of the class structure of any society, and education is the key proponent of this distribution. Weber (1978) describes it as:

> The main importance of a privileged property class lies (i) in its monopolization of the purchase of highly priced, or high cost, consumer good; (ii) in its monopolistic situation and opportunity to plan monopolistic policies as a seller; (iii) in its monopolization of chances for capital accumulation by saving, and hence of possibilities for the investment of wealth in the form of loan-capital and so for control of the leading entrepreneurial positions; (v) in certain privileges of status which depend on education, to the extent that such education costs money. (p. 57-58).

Another aspect of the capital that children entering into the public education system bring with them is connected to parental class, parental education and parental involvement. Again, reiterating the idea that all capital is inextricably linked with economic capital, the above issues dictate student success within the education system. Parents who are upper and middle class are more likely to have an education, understand the importance of obtaining education and as a result be more involved in their students' education. "The interventions by upper-middle-class parents appear to yield significant educational advantages, particularly for low achievers, social class provides parents with social resources which they 'invest' to yield social profits" (Lareau, 2000, p. 10). These elements help to guarantee the success of the student and cultivate a sense of entitlement that will carry with it a drive for educational and financial success. Lareau's (2003) idea of concerted cultivation, a process in which parents ensure that their children participate in activities and discussions that will cultivate success, is relevant to this idea.

> These standards include the importance of talking with children, developing their educational interests, and playing an active role in their schooling…Because these guidelines are so generally accepted, and because they focus on a set of practices concerning how parents should raise their children, they form a dominant set of cultural repertoires about how children should be raised (Lareau, 2003, p. 4).

This way of raising children is reinforced in the school system. When students do not come from families or homes where this concerted cultivation takes place, both they and their parents are considered deficient, and that student has a harder time navigating the system. Working class families, though not for lack of care and concern or hope for success, may not participate in these kinds of activities. "Although parental involvement is positively linked to school success, many parents are not as involved in schooling as teachers would like. The lack of involvement spoken of is not random: social class has a powerful influence on parent involvement patterns" (Lareau, 2000, p. 3). In essence, parents are a form of capital for some students. If their parents have access, then they in turn have access; if their parents have money they not only reap the benefits of that money but of the time and resources that that money provides. If their parents have education, they see examples of what education gives access to and are, additionally, exposed to that education through concerted cultivation, another form of capital that creates advantage of one over the other. According to Furomoto and Montano (2006):

> Schools are sites of social struggle and serve as reproducers of the social relations in dominant society. Schools, as microcosms of larger society, tend to mirror relations of power and oppression. In schools populated by working class children of color aspects of institutional oppression are evident on several fronts including: school curricula emphasizing pacification and oppression rather than a curriculum for empowerment; educational policies that eliminate the use of native languages and that tend to marginalize nonwhite racial and ethnic cultures; lack of parent, student and teacher voice in curriculum decisions; an excessive emphasis on student testing versus teaching for understanding; and the increasing gap between education provided for privileged students and that provided to poor and working class students of color.
> Within schools that serve predominantly poor and working class students of color, the oppression of students and teachers is also extended to parents. Parents are systematically shut out of meaningful participation in their children's education. Working class parents are welcomed in schools insofar as they do not question the power relations or the nature of the oppression that pervades schooling. School personnel often disregard the parents' "funds of knowledge" and devalue parents' efforts to improve the quality of their children's education. The struggle against the oppression in schools has both moral and structural dimensions. (p. 3)

The research, in its summation, establishes that the system of capital, as it currently exists, is static, unjust and largely perpetuated by the school system. Education, as a significant part of the state apparatus, distributes capital based on existing capital. Those who go into the system with capital leave the system with even more accumulated capital. The system places emphasis on dominant culture and does not allow for alternatives or even acknowledge other types of social and cultural capital. According to De Marrais and Le Compte (2000):

> Education has been the key to upward mobility. It takes place in two stages. First, one must acquire at least some of the characteristics of the upper class, most important of which is a level of education that will provide competence in higher-status jobs and give a luster to social and intellectual interaction. Second, one must learn the language patterns, social graces, and habits of behavior of the class to which one aspires. (p. 9)

As a result, the majority of our students are outside of the accepted norm. Education has the power to shape and change members of a society. It can give or limit access to money and power. Education dictates what types of jobs one can get and how much money one can make. Education determines the overall success of a society both politically and economically. Education in this country is at the present moment, doing exactly what it is has been

manufactured to do: reinforce the existing capitalistic hierarchy. If one refers back to the ideas of Marx and Weber and their connections between education and its reflection on society, education is meant to systematically maintain the class system that exists. According to Purpel and Shapiro (1995, p. 99): "the "new sociology" made problematic the strict separation and superiority accorded to school knowledge as opposed to the knowledge that kids brought into school from their home and communities. It made clear that the kinds of knowledge and experience valued, or devalued, in the classroom had a crucial bearing on the kinds of students most likely to be successful in school." Capitalism thrives on labor, more so than innovation. Capitalism is fed, in one way, by the assurance that there will always be a labor base and a consumer base. Through education students are taught to accumulate the goods, ideas, culture, social relationships and ultimately, the wealth of the dominant culture. With all of the power that education has been proven to have, the next challenge then, becomes the ways in which that power can be used to redistribute capital through a collective consciousness of the majority.

Part II Collective Consciousness:

After having examined the problems with the current system of capital and the way in which it is distributed within society, one must consider why, those at the bottom rungs of our society especially, have allowed the distribution of capital to continue in this way, even buying into a system that would force them into trading in their own capital for the capital of the dominant culture. Cultural Reproduction theory believes that this complicity comes as a result of repression: "within the context of education Bourdieu conceptualizes all pedagogic practice as, at one level, a style of inculcation that perpetuates a more general social tendency towards repression-a symbolic violence. Repression, for Bourdieu, becomes a 'natural' mode of human adaptation within a culture that is pervasively oppressive. All forms of socialization and enculturation are seen to contribute to this alienation adaptation" (Jenkins, ed., 1993, p. 11). Those within the system are so entrenched that they are unable to identify much less rebel against a systematic suppression.

Not only is education considered the great equalizer; it is often used as a tool of maintenance for this complicity. Once one attains the power and prestige gained through education, he inevitably ends up participating in the unequal distribution of capital on one level or another. McLaren (1997) refers to this:

> When teachers, in their acceptance of the role of technicians, fail to challenge the ways in which educational curricula correspond to the demands of industry or the means by which schooling reproduces existing class, race, and gender relations in our society, they run the risk of transmitting to subalternized student populations the message that their subordinate roles in the social order are justified and inviolable. (p. 2)

The idea that schools and the agents within can help students to navigate a biased system in order to become successful and in turn help others is a prevalent one. "Teachers and guidance counselors do far more than teach and organize class schedules. In fact, they are often key participants in the social networks of low-status children and adolescents, and play a determining role in either reproducing or interfering with the reproduction of class, racial and gendered inequality" (Stanton-Salazar, 2001, p. 161). The first problem with this system is the need to gain access to the dominant culture. The second problem is that by virtue of the system, one must give up and even at times oppose the very nature of philanthropy. Philanthropy, or helping and giving, in order to promote the well-being of mankind is distinctly opposed to a system that naturally stratifies and creates a need for this help. The capitalist system does little to reward the uplift of the lower classes. Social capital theory reinforces this in its suggestion that the exchange of social favors can only be made within groups that acknowledge and relate to one another as being able to cash in on these favors. "Two elements are critical to this form of social capital: the level of trustworthiness of the social environment, which means the obligations, will be repaid and the actual extent of obligations held" (Perez, 2008). Without this, the initial exchange is meaningless. The general acceptance, reinforced by educational proponents that education will aid in the ascent from lower to upper classes must be combated through a collective consciousness of the opposite.

Collective consciousness, a phrase coined by French socialist Emile Durkheim in 1893, refers to a set of shared beliefs and moral attitudes within a society: "by adopting the viewpoint of the collective consciousness, which is 'the true microcosm,' and thereby perceiving 'the unity of things,' since it is in the civilization of an era-the totality made of its religion, science, language and morality etc. that is realized the perfectly complete system of human representations at any given moment in time" (Durkheim, 1982, p. 10-11). Durkheim has also noted that the collective consciousness needed to be destroyed on some level in order for labor, and in turn, capital to be divided. "The real reason for the development of repressive measures is

therefore that at that time the evolution of the collective consciousness was both widespread and strong, whilst the division of labor had not yet taken place" (Durkheim, 1997, p. 99).

This statement suggests that "repressive" measures were meant to divide and conquer. Before these measures were instituted there was strength in collective consciousness. Collective consciousness, so easily dissuaded by the innate structure of capitalist competition, is necessary. The educational agents that Stanton and Salazar (2001) refer to as individuals who can help or hurt the social reproduction process must be agents of change rather than agents of adaptation. Once a collective consciousness is attained the actions of the current system will be unacceptable and immediately challenged. "Any action that was perceived as an infringement of the collective consciousness the shared mental and moral orientation of societies was conceived as a crime and sanctioned accordingly. In modern societies, on the other hand, in which individuality, and hence the violation of individual rights is central, restitutory rather than penal sanctions predominate" (Durkheim, 1997, p. xvii). There must be a strong connection, within the whole group, rather than the individualized "every man for himself" attitude. From development of unity there must be an understanding of the oppressive nature of the system. Capitalistic education is fundamentally opposed to this collectivist attitude focusing instead on a very individualistic and competitive one. "Schools in the United States tend to reflect the values of the dominant culture, which has its roots in Western Europe. They are highly individualistic, with the goal of teaching children to become independent and to strive for individual success" (Rothstein-Fisch et al., 2008, p. 11).

Connected to the concept of collective consciousness is Paulo Freire's idea of critical consciousness (1970). Critical consciousness, developed through a critical pedagogue's education of a student, has to do with an awareness of the world and its inequities, which directly results in freedom of the mind and then a struggle for freedom from oppression. Collective and critical consciousnesses go hand in hand. "Critical theorists argue that the moral freedom of an individual is really only an illusion within a capitalist economic order. The freedom of real individuals can only be understood within the context of an interdependent society" (Furomoto and Montano, 2006, p. 3). Freire believes that it is a critical pedagogue's responsibility to engage the student in activities that will result in this type of consciousness so that he may begin a process for action (1970). Without the critical consciousness piece the students and system will remain static and continue adapting to the dominant culture. According to Weffert (2001), "The awakening of critical consciousness leads the way to the expression of social discontents

precisely because these discontents are real components of an oppressive situation" (as cited in Freire, 2001, p. 36). Furumoto and Montano (2006), conducting research on a group called Mothers United for Justice, observed the following: "increasing critical consciousness can be facilitated through structured social interactions and collective processes that actively confront social oppression. Collective social action, reflection, and critical analysis were embedded in the women leaders' work practices and social interactions as they participated in a humanizing and democratizing movement" (p. 2).

Educators will gain this collective and critical consciousness in three significant ways: committing to a subversive curriculum, one that is explicitly focused on the flaws of and alternatives to the system, teaching thinking; making a concerted effort to engage in critical and higher level thought and questioning of the material while making strong connections to society, and teaching grassroots activism or how to organize in a central way that is focused on the unity and power of the "average" man . "When contemporary progressive educators all around the nation challenged the way institutionalized systems of domination (race, sex, nationalist imperialism) have, since the origin of public education, used schooling to reinforce dominator values, a pedagogical revolution began in college classrooms (hooks, 2003, p. 1).

Subversive Curriculum

Committing to a subversive curriculum, which is a complicated task, is about a very purposeful teaching of an anti curriculum or curriculum that highlights the flaws and issues with traditional curriculum, makes connections to the current state of the world students live in, and encourages students to act on this knowledge. The educational curriculum, as it currently exists, serves to reinforce the stratification within society, "the political space that education occupies today continues to de-emphasize the struggle for teacher and student empowerment; furthermore, it generally serves to reproduce the technocratic, corporate, and capitalist ideologies that characterize dominant societies" (McLaren, 1997, p. 1). The anti curriculum seeks to reveal and challenge that. For example, when teaching Aldous Huxley's *A Brave New World*, a teacher may focus on the futuristic ideals set forth in the novel, address general themes and create writing responses that ask students to summarize and analyze specific elements. The subversive or anti curriculum for this novel would first seek to engage every student by making explicit connections to how the novel can be directly applied to contemporary society or the here and

now, and second, ask students to not only identify but create projects that oppose those fundamentals that are identified as being issues in their own society. The subversive or anti curriculum uses the novel as a vehicle for critical discussion of the surrounding world. If the students recognize that the drug soma, used in the novel, is there to cloud the minds of the people so that they will freely accept and participate in the expected behavior of the state, the students will be able to connect that to their own form of soma which empowers them to act out the removal of that limitation. Paulo Friere (1974) calls this process "educating as the practice of freedom."

The standard curriculum gives preference to western dominant culture, excluding many other viewpoints. As a result, students get a very biased education focusing on limited ideas that, for the most part, exclude a great number of them. They do not see themselves or anything connected to them in the curriculum and there is a perpetual disconnect as a result. The students disengage from what is happening in the classroom and do not see a need for collectivism based on this model. For example, history and english courses consistently highlight a Western European perspective of history, often leaving out alternative perspectives and significant ethnic achievements.

> Textbook authors are struggling with this issue, trying to move beyond colonialized history and Eurocentric language… the whole approach is to portray whites discovering non-whites rather than a mutual multicultural encounter. Indeed, they are so Eurocentric that they don't even notice they left out 'the people of Africa and Asia' from their sentence of people who had yet to 'discover' America (Loewen, 2007, p. 65).

Teachers who wish to make change must teach alternatives to this thinking, so that students have access to a wider breadth of information. Also, alternatives to what is currently taught will contribute to the collective and critical consciousness that Durkheim (1893) and Friere (1970) require to make change. The current system offers students only what is needed for them to be participants in the current system; any material outside of that prescribed curriculum will cause upheaval which is why it is often suppressed.

Teaching Thinking

Teaching thinking is also essential to collective consciousness. Schools are full of memorization and the regurgitation of information, "they typically narrow the band of issues for students--and teachers---to study, demand short and simple answers to questions, and present complexity as previously categorized historical eras, mathematical algorithms, scientific formulas, or pre-established genres and classes" (Brooks, 1999, p. 5-6). Critical thinking and exploration are innately discouraged. Teachers must give students the tools to think so that they are able to judge, weigh, and evaluate on their own. The suppression of and attack on thought within the education system is a major contributing factor to the lack of success and the reinforcement of the current system. A culture of thinking must become prevalent in the classroom in order to encourage and reinforce thinking skills. For example, there are different levels of questioning used for the acquisition of information. Many schools utilize the Blooms Taxonomy levels of questioning to take students from lower memory and comprehension levels of thinking to higher analysis and judging levels of thinking. A thinking classroom stays, as much as is possible on the highest levels of Bloom's Taxonomy forcing students to adjust to a culture in which they analyze, weigh, judge and question the material being presented to them. According to Tishman et al., Ritchart, and Project Zero (2007), "a culture of thinking comes from social practices that create thinking dispositions. Thinking dispositions are inclinations and habits of mind that benefit productive thinking and are teachable over time across diverse thinking situations" (as cited in Salmon, 2007, p. 458).

When teaching Henry David Thoreau's *Civil Disobedience,* a teacher may ask students what the essay was about and why it is important. The teacher who chooses to cultivate thinking in their classroom will ask those questions but will also have the class discuss, act out or create an artistic or abstract piece in which they apply the crux of this essay to a contemporary issue directly affecting them or their society. Teaching thinking is a way of giving students a place in which to construct their own meaning; "educators must invite students to experience the world's richness empower them to ask their own questions and seek their own answers, and challenge them to understand the world's complexities" (Brooks, 1999).

Grassroots Activism

Finally, a concerted effort to teach students grassroots activism further aids them in the goal to begin the redistribution of capital. The historic background of major grassroots movements such as the American Revolution, the Women's Rights Movement, and the Delano Grape Strike are viable examples of activism. Students should be required to create their own movements around issues of significance to them, preparing and training them to be active members of democracy. Mimi Orner in her article, "*Teaching for the Moment: Intervention Projects as Situated Pedagogy*" (1996, p.72-73), explains: "I teach, I ask students to think about their own local contexts—work, home, school, friends—and to think about how they might intervene in one or more of these contexts in order to interrupt business as usual and generate alternative understandings and engagements with issues and events." A teacher covering the American Revolution might give students all of the historical background, show them documentary films covering the causes and important people and expose them to all of the significant pieces of literature written during that time. A teacher, who wishes to teach grassroots activism, will expose students to all of those elements as well but will add a very careful look at how the colonists organized, what empowered them and how that can be replicated by the students in the classroom. This teacher may even link a student cause to the American Revolution and use the historical example to give students a starting point. bell hooks (1999) reflects on this further, even including Freire's idea of consciousness:

> Early on, it was Freire's insistence that education could be the practice of freedom that encouraged me to create strategies for what he called "conscientization" in the classroom. Translating that term to critical awareness and engagement, I entered the classroom with the conviction that it was crucial for me and every other student to be an active participant, not a passive consumer. (p. 14)

If the power elite can understand the significance of close relationships and the power of networking then they also understand the ways in which to undermine these relationships for those at the bottom. Only in going back to a grassroots movement of social support and interaction will schools be able to create more opportunities for students who are disadvantaged.

Teaching a subversive curriculum, critical thinking and grassroots activism will empower students and create a collective consciousness. Engaging in a curriculum that is stimulating

encourages awareness and participation rather than passive and mindless interaction. These tools create a shift in the balance of power within the educational system. Once students have been given the tools that they need to be able to recognize themselves as a part of a larger society, to be able to consider, question and challenge concepts, and to be able to organize themselves and campaigns that will create change, they will engage in change making. Weber (1978) suggests that:

> It is easiest to promote collective action by a whole class (a) against those whose interests are directly opposed (for example workers against entrepreneurs, not against the shareholders, even though they really draw unearned income, similarly, peasants do not act against land-lords); (b) only in cases, typically, where the class situation is similar in the mass; (c) where it is technically possible to achieve unity of action easily, especially in a community of workers gathered together in a particular locality, such as a factory; (d) only where the class is led towards clearly visible goals, which are usually imposed or interpreted by persons who are not members of the class (that is by intellectuals). (p. 59-60)

The system as a whole is directly opposed to the interests of those who are considered capital-less. The majority of students share that title and students are gathered in the same locality daily, but they do not understand their situation because schools refuse to teach them and, consequently, they are missing the critical aspect of intellectual leaders to make "clearly visible goals". Pupel and Shapiro (1995) propose that:

> It was the classroom that made intelligent and capable human beings into apparently incapable students. The content of our curriculum, notions about what it is worthwhile to teach in school and the way in which we view intelligence--all of these create school systems that produce and maintain the form of injustice that increasingly blight the social order. (p. 99)

Through subversive curriculum, teaching thinking, teaching grassroots activism and the ultimate collective consciousness, students will be empowered to initiate a radical shift in education from the existing accumulation model to a new cultivation model.

Part III Accumulation VS. Cultivation:

Bourdieu fails to apply cultural capital to anything outside of economic and social class. Though the general theory may be applied to class, culture is not limited to class status. If we look at culture outside of the term "accumulation" in the cultural sense, and apply it instead to the term "cultivation" in the cultural sense, it will include people in cultures beyond the dominant one: those that are at the bottom rung of the social class, for example. Accumulation involves little more than the collection of items. Accumulation assumes that there is a deficit and that the collection of items is imperative. Cultivation, by contrast, is the growth or nurturing of what currently exists. Cultivation recognizes that something is already possessed and looks to build upon that. The education system is one in which students, who know nothing or at the most very little, enter into schools to accumulate or collect the intellectual, academic and social resources and network connections that they need in order to leave school prepared for capitalistic society.

The average student is meant to collect. In the cultivation model, when students enter into schools, it is recognized that they already have a wealth of intellect, academic and social resources and network connections. Because the school is aware of the capital that each student possesses, the educational process changes from one in which the student accumulates to one in which the school cultivates or grows what already exists within each student. The simple change in terminology takes us from a collector or take-based attitude to an attitude in which the fostering of what exists; knowledge, culture, and resources take priority. From this perspective educators can look at their students more neutrally and respectfully. Each of them comes with their own form of capital or cultural, social and intellectual wealth. This capital can also be rewarded in terms of economic capital if it is respected and cultivated, because schools would recognize what students have as valuable instead of forcing them to shed what they have and adjust to a new way of being, then showing students how to use and build what they have, empowering them to create their own economic capital.

The disconnection comes from our differing definitions of what capital is and which capital is most acceptable or important. When students come to an educational institution with a "deficit," that deficit will affect that student and their performance in that institution. Because the effect is usually a negative one, the effect typically reinforces the prevailing idea of capital and provides less opportunity for that student.

> Deficit thinking dominates current educational policy and practice. Unfortunately, when opposed, it is replaced with another form of deficit thinking. A democratic education requires changes in curriculum, participation, rights and understandings of equality. When a comprehensive democratic education is attempted, there is evidence that alleged deficits disappear. The fundamental issue is not whether deficits can be overcome with equal encouragement, but whether, when we pledge allegiance to 'freedom and justice for all', we mean it. (Pearl, 1997, p. 239)

Many people outside of the middle and upper classes, particularly those of ethnic cultures, possess cultural and social capital according to the dominant culture. They understand the wealth of their own cultures; they understand the stories of their own cultures, the songs of their cultures, and the art of their cultures. Many students have connections to some type of art, some type of music, and some type of literature. The issue is that the concepts of culture that are learned in school are not connected to and place no value upon the cultural wealth experienced in students' homes. These students are forced to accumulate or collect the ideas of what the dominant culture considers "art" rather than have the opportunity to cultivate what already exists in their culture. The redistribution of capital begins to take place when the model shifts from accumulation to cultivation. It begins to shift because individuals are no longer seen as deficient or capital-less. The shift begins because there is no longer a gap in capital possession. When every person enters the system with something valuable and is treated as such, the capital that people already possess is recognized, no one comes through the door needing to collect, everyone comes in the door needing growth.

The concept of social capital, as Coleman (1994) expresses it, has to do with social relationships and the complex way in which those relationships benefit the "actors" within them. According to Coleman (1994) this set of relationship "resources" that come from family and community organization are significant not only to a child's "cognitive or social development" but to their success in school and work. Coleman believes that a well-established social capital in school communities and in the families of students attending those schools is essential to educational opportunity and student success. He did note, however, that this social capital is not necessarily linked with money or affluence. Understanding how educational opportunity is linked to social capital is especially important, not so that the "deficit" in the capital of students can be identified but so that connections to the people within their social networks can be made

and that new and strong social networks within the educational system can be established. Social capital must be dealt with in the way that cultural capital would be dealt with.

The richness that each student brings onto school campuses and into classrooms must be acknowledged and respected. Parents, family members and community members of all students have to be looked upon and treated as if they are essential to the survival and success of the student. Rather than isolating those who don't fit the image of dominant culture, every social resource must be seen as a viable and thriving part of a student's social network. Jackie Joyner Kersee, in an interview with Henry Louis Gates, when talking about her experiences growing up in inner city Detroit, speaks very proudly about the drug dealers and gangsters in her neighborhood who encouraged her daily to stay in school and keep running. She said they always told her that she would make it out and be someone one day (Gates, n.d., 2008).

Only after accepting the richness of the existing connections can the additional resources that schools can provide be made. Most students believe that they must give up their connections to family and friends in order to be successful; and this idea has been confirmed in many cases. For example, Joe Vega in the Groton school documentary experienced a disconnection from her ethnic, inner city culture; she was no longer fully accepted by family and friends. This cannot continue to be an issue if education is to progress. Though many suggest that learning the art of code switching is the key to overcoming this issue, code switching reinforces the idea that one's culture is not acceptable and must therefore be traded, even if only at times, for the dominant culture. A former police officer for the Glendora Police Department revealed in an interview that she was part of a department that included community based policing. This involved walking "the beat," rather than driving it, and making personal connections with the residents in her jurisdiction. This policy was a result of her chief's belief that people must be met where they are. He wanted the police officers to bridge that gap between "us" and "them." The same work must be done in schools. Schools can no longer afford to keep students and their family members in one circle while existing in a completely different one. The students not only need the resources that schools have to offer them, but we need the resources that our students have to offer us.

It is true that one can have social capital without money and without affluence. If social capital is a major factor in educational success and opportunity, then it is for lack of connection to the community that most of our schools have failed. Money and other factors do contribute and make things easier, but they are not the end-all. This piece is essential for the redistribution

of capital as well. Social networks are an essential part of survival in a capitalistic society. Recognizing the power of each individual's social network makes it unnecessary for individuals to have to exclude certain people who are apart of their networks in order to gain others who might be more important or have more capital. There is as much richness of capital in having a connection with someone who owns a business as there is in knowing someone who may not own a business but who is solely invested in seeing other individuals become successful. When this is recognized there is no difference between each individual who comes through the door; each has rich social networks that can be built upon and added to, and capital is, consequently, redistributed because no one's social networks are more valued than another's.

A cultivation model focuses on what already exists in each student, building on and connecting that to the information we must give to him or her. Acknowledging students' strengths, their own cultural and social capital, and making their capital the focus, rather than asking them to displace it, is key to the cultivation model. The diversity in our classrooms serves two very important purposes: the first, an education of difference and understanding of various cultures and, the second, an education of sameness, in which students begin to identify the similarities of their cultures and their humanness. A cultivation model validates each student and validates the fact that they have something to offer. A cultivation model does not assume that each student enters the system of education an empty vessel into which we may pour our mighty ideals. A cultivation model invites the students to share their own ideals. A cultivation model presents information and encourages thinking about the information in a critical fashion. There is one very significant example of cultivation type teaching: constructivism. Constructivist teaching focuses on a student-centered classroom in which students build their own meaning of the concepts presented. According to Page and Marlowe (2005)

> The main proposition of constructivism is that learning means constructing, creating, inventing, and developing our own knowledge. Others can give us information, we can find information in books, and we can get information from the media, but as important as information is---and it is extremely important---receiving it, getting it, and hearing it does not necessarily equal learning. Learning in constructivist terms is: the process and the result of questioning, interpreting, and analyzing information; using this information and thinking process to develop, build and alter or meaning and understanding of concepts and ideas; and integrating current experiences with our past experiences and what we already know about a given subject. (p. 7)

Schools should be using not just student based but student-designed curriculum. Students should have significant choices about what they do in the classroom. They should design and create their own lessons and projects in coordination with a teacher. In this way students internalize objectives, purposes and strategies needed to become educated citizens and become owners of their own educational experiences. This kind of education recognizes every student's capital and builds upon that. It does not assume that some students come with more than others or that some students need more than others; this kind of education understands that every student brings something with them and builds on that something. In this way a shift in the way that capital is recognized results in capital being more equally distributed.

The radical redistribution of capital via the education system is a requirement for the reorganization of our current system. Education feeds all parts of the state apparatus and is crucial for any movement. The way that capital is identified needs to change so that capital can be redistributed. Though "radical" implies revolution, its meaning as it relates to this paper is connected to extreme change. The goal is not to displace any one group but to provide access to all groups and to change what education is giving access to. The goal is to undo the training of adjustment to an internally flawed system and to empower students so that the system itself becomes a system of equity and empowerment for all groups. The ultimate redistribution of capital means changing the meaning of capital itself, from an accumulation of wealth to a cultivation of unity and education.

References

Bourdieu, P. (1974). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In R. Brown (Ed.), *Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change* (pp. 71-112). London, Tavistock.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-258). Westport: Greenwood International.

Brooks, J. G. (1999). *In search of understanding the case for constructivist classrooms*. Alexandria, Va: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Coleman, J. S. (1994). *Foundations of social theory* (2nd ed.). Harvard UP.

Cookson, P. W., & Persell, C. H. (1987). *Preparing for power: america's elite boarding schools*. New York: Basic Books.

DeMarrais, K. B., & LeCompte, M. D. (2000). *The way schools work: a sociological analysis of education*. Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education, Limited.

Durkheim, E. (1982). *Rules of sociological method* (Macmillan Press, Trans.). New York: Free Press.

Durkheim, E., & Coser, L. A. (1997). *The division of labor in society*. New York: Free Press.

Freire, P. (1976). *Education, the practice of freedom*. London: Writers and Readers Cooperative.

Freire, P. (2001). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London: Burns & Oates.

Freire, P. (2005). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Continuum International Group, Limited.

Furumoto, R., & Montano, T. (2006). Critical consciousness and humanization: madres unidas para la justicia. *Paulo Freire Institue Online Journal*, *1*(1), 1-6.

Gates, H. L. (Writer). (n.d.). *African american lives 2* [Television broadcast]. In *African American Lives 2*. PBS.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching community a pedagogy of hope*. New York: Routledge.

Introduction. (1982). In E. Durkheim (Author), *Rules of sociological method* (pp. 1-24). New York: Free Press.

Jenkins, C. (Ed.). (1993). *Cultural reproduction*. London: Routledge.

Lareau, A. (2000). *Home advantage : social class and parental intervention in Elementary Education*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, Incorporated.

Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhood - class, race, and family life*. New York: University of California Press.

Loewen, J. W. (2007). *Lies my teacher told me: everything your American history textbook got wrong*. New York: Touchstone.

Marx, K. (1987). *Capital: the process of capital production*. Boston: International Company, Incorporated.

McLaren, P. (1998). *Life in schools an introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. New York: Longman..

Orner, M. (1996). Teaching for the moment: intervention projects as situated pedagogy. *Theory into Practice*, *35*(2), 72-78. Retrieved April 17, 2009, from JSTOR.

Page, M. L., & Marlowe, B. A. (2005). *Creating and sustaining the constructivist classroom*. New York: Corwin P.

Pearl, A. (1997). *Evolution of deficit thinking educational thought and practice* (pp. 211-241) (R. R. Valencia, Ed.). London: Falmer Press.

Perez Dr., W. (2008, October). *Social capital theory I*. Lecture presented at Education 426 in Claremont Graduate University, Claremont.

Peter, M. (1998). *Life in schools an introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. New York: Longman.

Purpel, D. E., & Shapiro, S. (1995). *Beyond liberation and excellence: reconstructing the public discourse on education* (H. A. Giroux & P. Freire, Eds.). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Rothstein-Fisch, C., & Trumbull, E. (2008). *Managing diverse classrooms how to build on students' cultural strengths*. Alexandria: ASCD.

Salmon, A. K. (2007). Promoting a culture of thinking in the young child. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *35*(5), 457-461.

Serdan Dr., G. (2008, October 23). [Personal interview].

Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (2001). *Manufacturing hope and despair: the school and kin support networks of U.S.-Mexican youth (Sociology of Education Series, No. 9)*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Weber, M. (1978). *Weber selections in translation* (W. G. Runciman, Ed.; E. Matthews, Trans.). Cambridge University Press.

Writer's Details: Torie Weiston-Serdan is a graduate student of Educational Studies at Claremont Graduate University, Claremont, California, USA and a high school English teacher in Rancho Cucamonga. California, USA

Correspondence: tweiston@gmail.com