

Social Reproduction in Theory and Practice

Social Reproduction in Theory and Practice

Edited by

Shahzad Farid

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



Social Reproduction in Theory and Practice

Edited by Shahzad Farid

This book first published 2024

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2024 by Shahzad Farid and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-6879-2

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-6879-2

TO THE CHILDREN OF DERS-E-NAAZARI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	x
Chapter One.....	1
Introduction	
Shahzad Farid	
The Ariel View and Advancement.....	1
The Undersupply.....	5
The Matrix: General.....	7
The Matrix: Bourdieusian Exclusivity	9
The Question, The Answer	13
 Part I: Social Reproduction: The Theory	
Chapter Two	18
Capital I and II	
Shahzad Farid	
Capital I: Marx and Bourdieu	18
Capital II: Coleman, Bourdieu and Putnam	26
Chapter Three	38
Capital III: Pierre Bourdieu	
Shahzad Farid	
Isomorphism of circuits: M-C-M' and C-E-C'	39
Conversion of Capital	47
Chapter Four.....	49
Habitus	
Shahzad Farid	
Internal and External Structure	49
Habitus: Empirical Extension	56
Embodied form or habitus?.....	58

Chapter Five	62
Social Class: Marx, Bourdieu, and Weber	
Shahzad Farid	
Social Class Typology	70
Chapter Six	73
Social Class Reproduction	
Shahzad Farid	
Field, Power and Homology of Social Structure.....	75
Chapter Seven.....	82
Social Class Reproduction: Education and Family	
Shahzad Farid	
Education and Social Reproduction.....	82
Field of Education.....	85
The Strategies of Social Reproduction: Education and Family	89

Part II: Social Reproduction: The Practice

Chapter Eight.....	98
Marriage and Reproduction of Social Hierarchies	
Shahzad Farid, Saif Ur Rehman Saif Abbasi and Sajjad Hussain	
Reproduction and Marriage	100
Reproduction and Modes of Homogamy	102
Data and Methods	104
Results.....	107
Discussion and Conclusion	120
Chapter Nine.....	125
Reproduction of Linguistic Competence	
Shahzad Farid, Muhammad Ilyas Mahmood, Zahid Bilal	
and Sajjad Hussain	
Methodology.....	127
Results.....	129
Discussion.....	133
Conclusion	134

Chapter Ten	135
Modelling Bourdieusian Social Reproduction Theory	
Shahzad Farid, Saif Ur Rehman Saif Abbasi and Qaiser Khalid Mahmood	
Modelling Social Reproduction Theory.....	137
Methods	143
Measurement.....	144
Cultural Capital.....	144
Economic capital.....	145
Social Capital	146
Construction of composite variables.....	147
Appraisal of The Triptych Model	151
Discussion.....	165
Conclusion	169
Appendix	170
References	171
Contributors.....	216

PREFACE

We discussed the circulation of social events while I was driving a motorbike; Baba Jan said, using the analogy of a bush roller chain that operates the whole bike, “Without compromising its position, the bush roller chain drives the bike.” I thought society works in the same way: It reproduces itself. At that time, I was a first-year student of Bachelor of Arts. On another occasion, when struggling to roll up my scattered thoughts as a Ph.D. candidate, I decided to write about Multiple Myeloma or WASH. He smiled and told one of my fellows, “he would shelve these ideas,” and I did without knowing his prophecy.

One day, I was reading some published papers and came across the idea of cultural capital. I submitted the proposal to the Board of Studies (BOS) for approval. Here, I was severely crushed by the members of the BOS. One of the members said,

“Which book of theory have you read?”

“I’m working on Bourdieu. I have read his books”. I spoke.

“I mean the secondary text like George Ritzer,” he replied.

“Why would I prefer Ritzer over Bourdieu?” I astonishingly replied, and he frowned.

Enduring my tenacious defense, another member titled me “*the Stubborn Marx*.” The more challenging time was given by the Board of Advance Studies and Research, where the members rejected my idea and formed a committee to review and refine it, which cordially did the opposite: I was insulted with joy. Meanwhile, I was teaching at Sargodha University, and my professor called me to appear before the committee again, and I renounced participating. Luckily, on that day, the committee approved my idea of modeling social reproduction in my absence. This book is not the result of that approval but that rejection that encouraged me to redefine my model, and the concept of undergraduate social circulation transmigrated into doctoral social reproduction.

I am thankful to Mamu Jan (and his undecided smile), Majid Raza (and his bike), Muhammad Luqman (and his drawing room), Sajjad Hussain (and his guesthouse), Farooq Ahmed (and his flat), Muhammad Ikram (and his hostel room), Prof. Dr. Sayed Amir Sohail (and his credit card) and Dr. Hammad Rasool (and his mobile phone), Saeed Ahmad (and his Panah Gah). They were always there to support me with their enthusiastic

volunteerism. I would also like to mention that Dr. Sajjad Hussain has been my companion on several journeys from Multan to Islamabad. We used to look at the fatigue on each other's faces, whispering when this supposedly endless research journey would end.

I also thank my little prince, Turab Hussain, and his yet-to-be-born younger brother, Muhammad Hassnain, for being imprisoned in her mother's belly until I completed this book. I would not have completed this task if they had been born a bit before.

Lastly, I bow down to the kindness, financial support, and elevated ideas of BABA JAN, who left no stone unturned to make a Slumdog a doctor. I will never forget the nights we spent discussing world history, universal mysticism, world politics, international literature, and my personal problems, which were, in fact, public problems. He has been listening to me even when I presented Inanna as the hero in the epic of Gilgamesh and Enkidu; praised Sasi as The Man and Majnu as a usual coward; proved universal mysticism as a golden lie; and admired John Elia's poetry more than philosophy, especially of Plato's and Iqbal's. He is such a homie that sheltered my wandering verbosity. He always looked at me as if I was some kind of genius to him, which I believe I am not and used to say, "I wish, within a blink of an eye, you would be a doctor." This book would not have been completed without his unconditional love, consistent encouragement, and constant support.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

SHAHZAD FARID

The Ariel View and Advancement

Class reproduction is a social process in which society replicates its social stratification (Toren 2004) by strategizing its social attributes, i.e., accumulated capitals of family in a field, e.g., education, that reproduces the social positions of its agents across generations in a stratified society (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990a; Apple 2012). For example, agents from a dominant class perpetuate their class or relative social position in the social space. This perpetuation is conditioned by successful educational consecration (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990a). The relationship between successful education and the perpetuation of social class is a gist of social reproduction theory.

Althusser, Bourdieu, Bernstein, Bowles, and Gintis developed the theories of social class reproduction. Although Karl Marx modeled social reproduction, his work was primarily concerned with economic (capital) reproduction in capitalism. He asserted, "...even a child knows that if a social formation did not reproduce the conditions of production while producing, it would not last a year" (1955, 209). Signifying the process of class reproduction, he also claimed,

"every social process of production is, at the same time, a process of reproduction...no society can reproduce unless it constantly reconverts a part of its products into means of production...Capitalist production, therefore, under its aspect of a continuous connected process, of a process of reproduction, produces not only commodities, not only surplus value, but it also produces and reproduces the capitalist relation; on the one side the capitalist, on the other the wage laborer" (Marx 1887, 395-401).

The reproduction of capitalist relations and wage laborers represents class reproduction in his writings. However, Marx and Engels should have

given more attention to education as a strategy for social reproduction (Morrow and Torres 1995, 11). Althusser (2014) extended the Marxist class analysis to social institutions, including education in social reproduction theory, and introduced a comprehensive systematic elaboration of reproduction in relation to production in capitalism. He advanced the church supremacy thesis in the educational domain by arguing that the modern education system replaced church supremacy in mature capitalism. Therefore, he believed that the dominant ideological state apparatus was the scholastic apparatus (144). Moreover, being consistent with the revolutionary spirit of Marxism while incorporating his philosophical and theoretical assertions of reproduction of social formations in the domain, he asserted that social reproduction could only be destroyed if the labor class takes state power in their hands (Althusser 2014).

However, these theories were confined conceptually and geographically. Morrow and Torres (1995, 6) signified the geographical confinement of empirical studies of social reproduction. Gewirtz and Cribb (2003) claimed emerging context specification of the theory. Further, Bowles and Gintis's (2011) theory of social class reproduction is contextually restricted to the American educational system. It examined the latent functions of unequal pedagogic practices and curricula. Such an unequal schooling system has a "hidden curriculum" and pedagogic practices of the elite class to inculcate "the class taste" among students who, in turn, reproduce the system of inequality. Althusser's theory, like Marx's, is conceptually confined to economic reproduction but varied in factors of reproductions, e.g., ideological state apparatuses. However, Bourdieu's theory is contextually limited to the French educational system, and Bernstein's reproduction model is vitally concerned with social class, codes, and education. He claimed that educational institution allocates social classes to its students by producing and reproducing certain practices and dispositions (Bernstein 1977, 185).

Although the theory is contextually confined, it has been improved conceptually, such as in the emergence of new forms of capital. Marx studied traditional modes of class reproduction, and Bourdieu criticized these modes. He argued that the dominant class adopted a new reproduction strategy, contrary to the conventional strategy of inheritance, which values the education system as a critical element in the reproduction process (cited in Robinson and Garnier 1985). The curriculum, pedagogic practices, educational meritocracy, etc., favor economically privileged students only and offer advantages to the students who have already accumulated cultural capital ("the cultural goods transmitted by the different family PAs" (pedagogic actions), Bourdieu and Passeron 1990a,

30, parenthesis added). It reveals the biases in the educational system. Therefore, he claimed that educational meritocracy is bourgeoisies' meritocracy (Bourdieu 1984) because the educational system does not discourage an unequal social class system; on the contrary, it reinforces and reproduces it (Bourdieu and Boltanski 1978; Bourdieu and Passeron 1990a).

It is essential to state that these theories of social class reproduction are demarcated as the culturalists' and economists' theories concerning social class analysis. The analysis of social class and its reproduction or inequality from a culturalist perspective focuses on the "culture of class" (Crompton 2006). However, the economic theories of social class reproduction emphasize material resources. The concept of class in these dimensions is also described distinctively. The culturalist conception revolves around behavior patterns, the use of language, the consumption of cultural goods, and lifestyle. Weber and Bourdieu are significant figures in this class analysis. On the contrary, the economic perspective weighs material resources and associated institutional influences, as Althusser emphasized ideological state apparatuses.

However, the concept of social class still needs to be clarified because its conceptualization either constructs boundaries to form a group of people with similar economic resources or attempts to break these boundaries through multidimensionality by encompassing material and non-material resources as well as status and culture. In Marx's writings, social class is based on material resources, social relations of production, and exploitation (Marx 1987; Wright 2005, 30). Weber (1946) focused on market relations and life chances (Parkin 2002, 93). Others believed it is a mixture of cultural and economic resources, e.g., Bourdieusian social class analysis (Bourdieu 1984; 1996). Further, the American tradition of social class analysis is individualistic, and the French analyze the concept structurally and politically (Sayer 2005, 72).

To organize these multiple class conceptions, Wright (1979, 2002, 2004, 2005) arranged these ideas by "relations and gradations." In the relations domain, social class is further defined in relations of production (e.g., Marx's class) and market relations (e.g., Weber's class). Many sociologists used relations of production for social class analysis, such as Dahrendroff, who examined class in this sphere through authority relations (e.g., superordinate and subordinate); Mills, who used technical division of labor (e.g., white and blue color) and some Marxists such as Lenin who believed exploitation was the heart of class analysis in relations of production. Sayer introduced a dichotomous division as an abstract and concrete conception of social class. The abstract is not synonymous with

vague and shows a one-sided or selective inclination (2005, 72). The Marxist class is abstract in this dichotomy because it emphasizes specific economic aspects. On the contrary, the Bourdieusian class is concrete because it is multifaceted and incorporates material and non-material assets.

The conceptual and methodological terrain of empirical studies refined the Marxist and Weberian class and class analysis concepts. For example, Wright's (1979, 2004) and Wright and Perrone's (1977) works operationalized the concept through means of production and labor power. The social class schema of Goldthorpe (1974, 1980, 1992) used Weberian stratification with the labor market. Such operationalizations of social class, on the one hand, systematized the unorganized work of the theorists and, on the other hand, signified the conceptual foundations of the construct.

The neo-Marxist and Weberian perspectives also made some new developments that acknowledged and emphasized the imperative role of family and marriage in social class analysis apart from the structural and market-oriented analysis. Wright (2005) describes that family connects individuals with class relations other than material resources. Further, marriage also determines one's class location (18). Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992, 233) tagged family as "the unit of class 'fate'" because it involves economic decisions and strategic actions within the class structure. Similarly, Mills (1956, 31), like Weber, argued that the connubial relations within the power elite contribute to strengthening the closure and monopoly over resources, which Bourdieu signified by asserting that "the monopoly, when recognized, is converted into a nobility" (1996, 79). Althusser also maintained the family's prominence in the social reproduction legacy by acknowledging the shift from the church-family dyad to the school-family dyad as the dominant ideological apparatus (2014, 144).

Another significant advancement in social reproduction is the emphasis of empirical studies on marriage and its types, such as educational and occupational homogamy—marrying or the tendency to marry within similar educational (Mare 2016) and occupational groups. Scholars assented that homogamy is a central concept in understanding and analyzing social reproduction (Van Boven 2012) because, as Wright described, it contributes to defining the relative position of individuals within a social structure by providing profitable returns (Becker 1973, 1974; Bourdieu 1990b, 1996). The profitable returns through marriage, on the one hand, accrue family resources (Blossfeld 2009, 515) and, on the other hand, provide better life chances for the next generations (Hwang, Saenz, and Aguirre 1995). In other words, a family's cultural and economic resources determine the

next generations' resources (Bourdieu 1984, 1996). Therefore, the perpetuation of resources through homogamy sustains the family's social position across generations.

However, marriage is not the only strategy to reproduce a family's social class position or location. Bourdieu (1984, 1996) argued that agents use alternative strategies to sustain their social positions when a former strategy becomes unsuccessful. In capitalist societies, education (and the education system itself) is a vital strategy for reproducing social class and labor power. On account of the education system as a mediating device of social reproduction, both culturalist and economic theorists have a consensus. Althusser (2014, 52) claimed that school not only reproduces labor power with a required qualification in the labor market, but it also reproduces the dominant ideology and practices of the ideology that is the ideological subjection to the ideology. Bernstein labeled education as a class-allocatory device (1977, 185), and Bowles and Gintis (2011, 5) named it an arena of social struggle. Bourdieu (1984, 1996) and his associate (1990a) introduced a comprehensive theory of social reproduction that integrated family, education, resources (monetary and non-monetary), and social class. This theory argues that education facilitates children with high-brow cultural and economic resources. These resources ensure their educational success because the educational system favors and reproduces such resources through its students. Therefore, these students are destined for higher social and economic positions in the labor market.

In a nutshell, the theories of class reproduction reveal how family, education, and resources are interrelated to facilitate agents with high socioeconomic and cultural assets to reproduce the structure of inequality (Giroux 1983; Mills 2008) and how the integration of these apparatuses with resources corresponds to the structure of exploitation.

The Undersupply

However, scholars criticized the social reproduction theory despite its comprehensive discourse, integrative framework, and rigorous methodological and empirical analysis. Broadly, Giroux (1983) and Thapan (1988) contended the theory by arguing that it prioritized structure and neglected human agency in its analysis of the reproduction of inequality. Sullivan (2003) labeled habitus (a system of dispositions, Bourdieu 1977a, 72) and cultural capital as vague and ambiguous. Cole (1998) pointed out that Bowles and Gintis neglected race. Moreover, several other significant studies (e.g., Farkas 1996; Roscigno and Ainsworth-Darnell 1999; Tzanakis

2011; Goshgarian 2013) also found weaknesses in the reproduction theory (Gewirtz and Gribb 2003).

Despite the criticism, the theory was widely studied, appreciated, and empirically evaluated. Kaufman and Gabler (2004), Dumais and Ward (2010), and Gaddis (2013) evaluated the theory in the United States of America. Willekens and Lievens (2014) in Belgium, Lewicka (2005) in Poland, Hatlevik, Guðmundsdottir, and Loi (2015) in Norway, Sullivan (2003) in Britain, Riaz (2009) in Pakistan, and Tramonte and Willms (2010) evaluated the theory across the countries recognized by The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

In empirical studies, Bourdieu's theory of reproduction gained much attention due to its multidimensional approach, structure-agency integration, and new forms of capital that surpass other social reproduction theories, albeit with complexity. Most of the empirical studies on this theory focused on selected propositional relationships of variables. For example, the relationship between family structure and academic success (e.g., Pearson 2009; Roosa et al. 2012), capital and academic success (e.g., Rosenbaum and Rochford 2008; Szybka 2010), family structure and social reproduction (Douglas 1997; Crompton 2006), and capitals and social reproduction (Zutter 2001; Smart, Hutchings, Maylor, Mendick, and Menter 2009) was extensively appraised. However, Bourdieu proposed the mediating role of habitus and cultural capital in social reproduction theory, which has rarely been focused on.

Nevertheless, some researchers took this initiative, such as Gaddis (2013) and Palardy (2015) studied habitus as a mediator of reproduction. Sullivan (2003) assessed the mediation of cultural capital between the cultural capital of parents and the education of students. Cheng (2015) applied cultural capital theory in the media field and explored that "media use" mediates between network diversity and cultural knowledge. However, in Pakistan, Riaz (2009) selected neither habitus nor cultural capital as a mediator of class reproduction. Other studies on reproduction in the country selected qualitative research design. Ullah (2016) used Bourdieu's theory to explore the reproduction of gender hierarchies. Malik (2012) found the reproduction of social hierarchies through educational institutes. Such studies indicated that the mediating role of habitus and cultural capital in the country is yet to be explored.

Theorists acknowledged that education and family are vital concepts of reproduction theory. However, social reproduction revolves around the unequal distribution of resources and class differentiation; therefore, social class, capital, family, and education are a matrix of relationships in reproduction theory.

The Matrix: General

Bourdieu (1984, 1996) and Bourdieu and Passeron (1990a) argued that children from advantaged families are highly likely to accomplish educational success due to their elite socialization in highly admired families in educational institutes. Children from disadvantaged family backgrounds cannot acquire and accumulate elite behavioral patterns in their early socialization due to their disadvantaged family background. Such patterns of behavior and aspirations are ingrained in habitus. Therefore, the habitus of children from advantaged and disadvantaged family backgrounds is differentiated by their objective behavior.

Habitus is defined as ingrained and durable dispositions. Moreover, it directs agents' actions and mediates between structure and agent. It is structuring structure, structured structure, and feel for the game. Bourdieu revealed its relationship with behavior by stating, "The habitus is this kind of practical sense for what is to be done in a given situation" (1998, 25). Thus, it relates previous experiences with the given situation to act. Cumulatively, habitus is a system of

"durable, transposable dispositions structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles of the generation and structuring of practices and representations which can be objectively "regulated" and "regular" without in any way being the product of obedience to rules" (Bourdieu 1977a, 72).

Bourdieu and Passeron (1990a) asserted that education differentiates status and forms symbolic hierarchies. He clarified such differences by stating an example of two individuals working in the same organization, having the same job and competence but different social classes due to educational disparities and different habitus (Bourdieu 1984). Family inculcates such grammatical codes of behavior, which signify symbolic differences among actors in each field. Thus, dominant (i.e., the class with relatively higher economic, cultural, and social capital) and dominated class (i.e., the social class with relatively lower economic, cultural, and social capital) have dominant and dominated habitus, that is to say, that the disparity of high and low aspirations.

As it deals with educational outcomes, it takes into account the retention of students in educational institutions. Lehmann (2007) found that most students from lower socioeconomic families leave their universities because they do not "feel university." Similarly, Thomas (2002) used habitus to explore students' retention in a university. He found

that students retain their higher education by adapting to the university environment.

Apart from *habitus*, evidence showed that family with high socioeconomic status invests in the education of their children (Duncan and Magnuson, 2003), which ultimately increases their chances of upward mobility (Amato 2005) and accumulation of resources (McLanahan and Percheski 2008). Moreover, Biblarz and Raftery (1999) and Sandefur and Wells (1999) explored that children from intact families are likelier to pursue higher education. Lillard and Gerner (1999) found that students from intact families attained sustainable education and higher academic success at higher education. On the contrary, evidence showed that single-parent families could not effectively support children's education (McLanahan and Percheski 2008). Thus, family is one of the potential factors of titivating or depleting the academic performance of children (Astone and McLanahan 1991; Biblarz and Gottainer 2000; Björklund, Ginther, and Sundström 2007; Francesconi, Jenkins, and Siedler 2010) as well as the reproduction of social position of the family (Bourdieu 1984, 1996).

McLanahan and Percheski (2008) introduced a model of family structure and reproduction of inequality mediated by parental resources, i.e., parental capital and parenting style. They argued that family structure, i.e., intact and non-intact, highly correlates with children's educational outcomes. The single-mother family decreases the mother's income due to childbearing responsibilities that produce poor parental resources for children. Inadequate parental resources negatively affect caring motherhood and fatherhood in monetary and non-monetary forms. This effect is further negatively associated with children's educational outcomes. Thus, it decreases the likelihood of children's higher-level employment. Conclusively, they asserted that family structure reproduces inequality.

Although McLanahan and Percheski (2008) related family structure to the reproduction of inequality, they neglected culturalists' accounts of social reproduction. Family structure is not inclined to reproduce only one aspect, such as cultural reproduction; it encompasses multiple factors, e.g., economic and symbolic reproduction. Therefore, almost all factors a family comprises are required to be reproduced. Otherwise, the concept of the family would be distorted or renewed. Crompton (2006) discussed this mechanism in his study on "class and family," in which reproduction in relation to family is accounted for by two dimensions, i.e., culture and economy. While discussing these dimensions, Crompton (2006) clarified that although both dimensions of reproduction are different, they assented to the prime role of the family in social reproduction. Although cultural

and economic approaches deal with social reproduction separately, a combined holistic view affirms that family pertains to the reproduction of its socio-cultural and economic aspects.

Evidence from Pakistan on the relationship between family and education is also consistent with previous studies, especially the intervention of family in the educational choices of children as well as in the academic performance of students. In the country, several studies focused on the family and educational outcomes of children (Khatoon 2008; Chohan and Khan 2010; Suleman, Aslam, Hussain, and Shakir 2012; Bilal, Tariq, Aleem, Shabbir, and Parveen 2013; Waqas, Fatima, Sohail, Saleem, and Khan 2013; Chaudhry, Khaliq, Agha, and Hassan 2015). However, fewer studies (e.g., Khan 2014; Khurshid 2014) selected higher education to evaluate this relationship. These studies also neglected the social reproduction thesis and focused on the determinants of positive educational outcomes. Despite such neglect, studies affirmed the interaction between family and children's education. Specifically, the intact family system has more potential than the non-intact family system to reproduce the structure of inequality.

The Matrix: Bourdieusian Exclusivity

The matrix of capitals in relation to the field and the matrix of family, education, and capital are the exclusive foundations of Bourdieusian social reproduction theory. However, Bourdieu's conceptualization of these concepts differs from other theorists of the same constructs. He acknowledged the social world as accumulated history in relation to defined it, partly like Marx, as accumulated labor (Walther 2014).

Criticizing capital, Beasley-Murray argued that Bourdieu's conception of capital is a definition of "value" rather than capital itself because the labor theory of value, especially of Marx, defines value as accumulated labor (2000, 105). Bourdieu also conditioned the accumulated labor with appropriation contingently, not strictly or absolutely. Therefore, in his definition, value is a synonym for capital. Thus, the capital in the process—"which, when appropriated..."—does not solely rest upon the appropriation process to be defined but could be realized in the process. Desan (2013) also said that Bourdieu's conceptualization of capital, especially in *The Forms of Capital* (1986), reminds Marx's theory of value. However, he found otherwise because Marx's theory of value is not a theory of capital, and capital, in the process, is not a commodity. Bourdieu's definition of capital is the definition of a commodity (1986, 330). Therefore, realizing a commodity in the form of capital relies on its profitable use (331).

Nevertheless, capital without relational thinking would give no meaning to its definition because Bourdieu's epistemological postulates do not imply linear logic but relational. The question of how capital is relational evokes the inclusion of "field"—"network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 97) — in the discussion because it is the arena that determines the value of capital; that showed agent's struggle over resources; and that defines the relative position of agents. He clarified while echoing his relational thinking in terms of capital and field that capital has no existence without the existence of a field (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, 101). Thus, the existence and functions of capital depend upon a field where it is valued, conserved, consumed, and converted.

However, it does not mean imposing complete automation of a field because a field also depends on the distribution of forms of capital. He asserted that the structure of capital distribution determines a field's structure (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992, 108). Therefore, his conception of capital is not bound to the process, as of Marx, in relation to production and exploitation but realized in relation to a field.

The problems of misconception about his conception of capital and, in fact, his other constructs also arise when scholars attempt to seek his theoretical assertions and propositions within different perspectives, e.g., Marxist and Functionalist. However, he placed himself beyond such perspectives and even refused to be called a post-modernist or a post-structuralist. He said that seeking an author's work under Marxism, functionalism, etc., would tell nothing about the idea of an author (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). Therefore, his understanding of society should not be confused with other theories. However, to reduce the intensity of such misconceptions and to make his theoretical framework explicit, I comparatively discussed the social capital theory of Putnam, Coleman, and Bourdieu, the economic theory of Marx and Bourdieu, and so forth (see Chapters Two and Five). Moreover, the relationship of microcosms, i.e., fields, with agents through habitus that potentially contributes to the structure-agency problem is also described in forthcoming chapters. Here, the constructs under discussion and the matrix of relationships are briefly introduced.

While criticizing Marxist economism, Bourdieu (1984, 1986, 1990b, 1990c, 1992, 1996) and his associate (1990a) introduced and explained new forms of capital. He believed that other forms of capital were not introduced without reason. He is known for his theory of cultural capital—non-economic assets that potentially contribute to success in the field of education (Bourdieu 1986; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990a). Bourdieu

(1984, 1986) and Bourdieu and Passeron (1990a) argued that families transfer monetary and non-monetary resources to children. The non-monetary resources are skill, language, speech, etc. These characteristics represent the cultural capital of children they utilize in the educational field to succeed. Specifically, capital has three forms: embodied, objectified, and institutionalized.

The embodied cultural capital—durable personal characteristics (Bourdieu 1986)—develops, consciously and unconsciously, over time because it demands “time” to be invested. The investment of time by a family in children during early socialization influences children’s character-building, way of behaving, abilities, attitudes, etc., which are examples of the embodiment of such characteristics. However, the embodied form is not constant. Investing time in learning something new can change the embodied form.

The objectified form is cultural goods such as books, artistic pictures, furniture, etc. Moreover, taste associated with economic capital demarcates objectified form among individuals. For instance, the possession of a photograph and Picasso distinguish possessors by virtue of their taste for the art. The taste is expensive and thus conditioned by “distance from necessity”—the distance from basic needs (Bourdieu 1984). In other words, an agent with higher economic capital distances him from necessities and, in turn, increases the probability of the development of taste.

The institutionalized form is the recognition and consecration of cultural capital from a legitimate institute, e.g., an educational institute. It can be perceived in a way that the educational credentials of an agent are an institutionalized form of the cultural capital of the agent. In other words, recognizing one’s cultural capital by an educational institute means awarding corresponding academic credentials for that recognition. Thus, the credentials possess the objective value of the cultural capital invested in the educational field (Bourdieu 1996).

Cultural capital was extensively assessed in education due to Bourdieu’s proposition of its positive effect on educational success (Bourdieu 1984, 1996; Bourdieu and Passeron 1990a). Several studies evaluated the proposition and found a positive correlation between cultural capital and academic success (DiMaggio and Mohr 1985; Farkas, Grobe, Sheehan, and Shuan 1990; Katsillis and Robinson 1990; Kalmijn and Kraaykamp 1996; Crook 1997; Roscigno and Ainsworth-Darnell 1999; De Graaf, N. De Graaf, P. and Kraaykamp 2000; Sullivan 2001; Dumais 2002; Van de Werfhorst and Hofstede 2007; Cheadle 2008).

It is essential to clarify that cultural capital, especially its embodied form, is not human capital (see Becker 1964 for human capital theory). The epistemological difference between these capitals is rational and habitus-driven actions. The former is associated with human capital, and the latter with cultural capital. The human capital theory believes that educational credentials are skilled labor power. It relates these skills to upward mobility and economic productivity but neglects that the family and education system facilitates unequal human capital accumulation, production, and reproduction.

Bourdieu hardly left a chance of criticism on human capital because, firstly, he proposed that abilities (an important indicator of human capital) are the product of family investment in cultural capital, e.g., embodied form. Secondly, human capital is confined to the economic domain. Thirdly, it ignored how the education system tends to reproduce the structure of inequality (Bourdieu 1986, 17). Referring to Gary Becker, he also stated (in notes) that he focused on monetary costs and profitable returns and ignored symbolic and non-monetary profits (26-27). Thus, in analyzing positive educational outcomes, Bourdieu preferred cultural capital, including its forms, over human capital.

Social capital has three approaches that share similar properties, having subtle differentiation. The three approaches are the scholastic work of Putnam (1993, 2000a, 2000b), Coleman (1988), and Bourdieu (1977a, 1984, 1986, 2002) that unanimously acknowledged one central aspect of the capital that social capital is “network resources.” It has been explored that the various contextual experiences differentiate social capital (Lin 2001; Parks-Yancy, DiTomaso, and Post 2008). Therefore, social capital in the upper class accumulatively differs from the lower class. Additionally, several studies have examined its relationship with educational outcomes (Dufur, Parcel, and Troutman 2013; Brouwer, Jansen, Flache, and Hofman 2016).

Stanton-Salazar and Dornbusch (1995) explored a significant effect of social capital—operationalized as an individual’s relationship with institutional agents—on students’ academic success and argued that unequal distribution of relationships with institutional agents resulted in unequal academic success. He explained it as a structural problem because working-class youth have a scarcity of social capital. However, upper-class family enriches their youth’s social capital.

Mogues and Carter (2005) empirically explored and validated a neglected relationship between social capital and the reproduction of inequality by Stanton-Salazar and Dornbusch (1995). They explored that unequal distribution of social capital resulted in unequal economic capital.

In other words, actors with higher or highbrow social capital are highly likely to reproduce higher economic capital, and actors from lower economic class who possess lower social capital are highly likely to reproduce lower economic status.

Economic resources in the possession of a family are known as economic capital (Fan 2014), which is convertible into cultural capital and cultural capital into social capital. The social capital is again convertible into economic capital (Bourdieu 1986, 16). Bourdieu (1986) claimed the convertibility between economic and cultural capital because upper-class families purchase educational credentials (via economic capital) for their children to develop their taste in art and literature, language content, and speech style. This accumulated cultural capital is refined in the reproduction factory, i.e., educational institutes (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990a). Afterward, it generates economic capital through employment (Bourdieu 1996). Agents use such convertibility of capitals as one of the strategies of social class reproduction (Bourdieu 1984). The corresponding principle discovered by Bowles and Gintis (2011) also showed such convertibility but in a passive way because, according to the principle, agents in the educational system are trained to correspond with the rules of the labor market, making exploitation easier.

The Question, The Answer

Economic capital and socioeconomic status have widely been used, sometimes interchangeably, to identify class or class structure that is further used for stratification arguments. Such empirical explorations of stratification were reduced to economic order using Marxian epistemology. However, social circles, life chances, and class situations—precisely, conditions of existence—also stem from other species of capital. The sociological theories that did not reduce stratification to the economic domain are Weberian social closure, *Stände* and stratification, Bourdieusian social and cultural reproduction, and Mills' power elite. Other theorists can also be included, such as Karabel (2005).

Bourdiesian epistemological grounds, partly assumed from Weberian, Marxian, and Durkheimian theoretical axioms, have rarely been incorporated in empirical studies, particularly in Asia, to explore social space of positions, distinction in practices, and reproduction of social classes that assume homology of practices, sense of agent's place in a field, accumulation, consumption, and conversion of species of capital. These aspects, particularly the accumulation and conversion of forms of capital, are subject to the agents' struggle over these forms. This book

attempted to signify the use of these epistemological grounds and theoretical propositions, which are not confined to the economic order. It is also associated with assessing these theoretical frameworks. Therefore, this book also included the significant propositions of Bourdieusian theories because this theoretical framework is one of the essential scholarly works that integrated the previous non-economic dimension of stratification and social reproduction.

Although most studies have been conducted on the Bourdieusian theory of reproduction, especially in Europe, they partly dealt with the theory. Some studies evaluated the mediating role of habitus and cultural capital in social reproduction, and others focused on the relationship between cultural capital and educational outcomes. Some studies attempted to construct social space of positions, and a few attempted to explore changing “tastes” across generations. However, the social reproduction theory is integrated due to its relational logic that should be dealt with simultaneously to reveal how these concepts are interconnected and whether the variables, Bourdieu proposed, are crucial to reproduce the unequal distribution of resources. Therefore, this book focuses on the multidimensionality and social space approach and constructs a model dealing with major propositions of social reproduction theory. This model has the triptych level: construction of social space, assessment of reproduction, and evaluation of mediation model(s). Precisely, the book deals with the following concepts:

1. Social space of positions
2. Social class reproduction incorporating trajectory of species of capital
3. Operationalization and assessment of habitus
4. Improved equation of practice and isomorphic circuit of cultural capital in the field of education
5. Model of social class reproduction that incorporated significant propositions of social reproduction theory. Moreover, the model was also evaluated by gender, education, and family system.

However, the question remains why this work needed to be done in such a fashion that introduced theories and assessed them simultaneously. Considering the previous studies, the models on social reproduction theory were confined, such as the model of Kalmijn (1994, 1998) was limited due to its operationalization of cultural capital, which was, in fact, institutionalized cultural capital that excluded its embodied and objectified form.

Similarly, the mediation model of Dumais (2002, 2006) did not evaluate the perpetuation of inequality across generations. Therefore, assuming there is no reliable model of social reproduction, this book introduced a model of social class reproduction named “Triptych Model of Social Class Reproduction.” In relation to the model, the operationalization issues were also highlighted and attempted to solve, such as the operationalization of cultural capital and habitus, which were either confined or did not satisfy the theoretical propositions of the theory. For example, Kalmijn confined the operational definition of cultural capital, and Sullivan (2003) violated the theoretical assumptions of Bourdusian social reproduction theory.

I also introduced an improved equation of practice because Swartz (1997) pointed out that Bourdieu’s equation of practice is ambiguous. The book assessed the role of language, capital, and marriage in the reproduction of the structure of inequality. It also has statistical advantages because it introduced a model for extracting a two-by-two table from a big data table, a novel integrated use of statistical models, and quantifying new variables, e.g., cultural and exchange modes of homogamy.

PART ONE

SOCIAL REPRODUCTION: THE THEORY

CHAPTER TWO

CAPITAL I AND II

SHAHZAD FARID

Capital I: Marx and Bourdieu

Marx and Bourdieu asserted the unequal distribution of resources within their conceptual space, which is unimaginable without some concrete analysis of underlying forces within the production mechanism of inequality. On the one hand, Marx claimed that in the production process, capitalists use labor power to produce an equivalent value of this power to generate surplus value—a significant and objective contributing factor to exploitation. On the other hand, Bourdieu has an ambiguous illustration of the unequal distribution of resources in terms of capital. In *Reproduction in Education, Culture and Society* (1990a), unequal distribution of cultural capital was presupposed, the capital itself remained unspecified, and the social class differentiation was presumptive in reflections of the impositions of cultural arbitrary by pedagogic actions. However, *Distinction* (1984) is a set of concrete quantitative and qualitative analyses dealing with these concepts using rigorous methodology and statistical analysis. It introduced an improved empirical understanding of social class differences and capital. Its most significant contribution to social inequality discourses is the construction of social space of lifestyle.

Apart from the ambivalent conceptualization of underpinning concepts in the theories of Bourdieu and Marx—the transformation problem reflects the void in his theory (Gordon 2003, 341)—both have capital as the glue of their theories (Desan 2013). This centrality is taken into account to make the forthcoming Bourdieusian enunciation justifiable. Thus, to comprehend Bourdieu's theoretical inclination toward capital, the understanding of Marx's capital is explained because Bourdieu is allegedly a famous Marxist that he renounced.

The economic exchange reveals capital in the process, i.e., purchasing something to sell it for a higher profit. Such circulation of money and relation to production increases the wealth of a capitalist. The accumulation