


UDC: 37.01.

LBC: 74.03 (3)

MJ № 303

 10.33864/2617-751X.2025.v8.i4.112-127

**PAUL WILLIS AND PIERRE BOURDIEU'S EDUCATIONAL THEORIES:
EDUCATION IN ENGLAND AND FRANCE**

Dashdamir Mahmandarov*

Abstract. Education has become an even more important nuance, especially in the modern world. Unlike in previous periods, the expansion of education to all social strata in the modern world has increased its significance among social theorists. In the modern era, the compulsory and accessible nature of education was evaluated as everyone having the same opportunities in society in this regard. Thus, the accessibility of education was expected to contribute to both societal well-being and personal development. In the modern era, such goals were at the forefront of education. The establishment of their own educational systems and the export of educational services by various countries have caused states to attach special importance to educational policies. In addition, some countries (e.g. England and France) are distinguished by having special educational systems and educational policies. In this article, the concept of education of these two countries will be discussed based on the research of sociologists from them. These sociologists are Paul Willis from England and Pierre Bourdieu from France. This article will provide an overview of the education systems of England and France based on the research of these sociologists on education. The views and criticisms of the education systems in the rules here identify all students. Respective countries of Willis, who explains how the working class learns to be workers through the education system, and Bourdieu, who examines how education reinforces class barriers, will be analyzed from a sociological perspective.

Keywords: Education, Paul Willis, Pierre Bourdieu, Class, England, France, Culture, Reproduction

* Doctor of Philosophy in Sociology,
Teacher of the Theology Institute of Azerbaijan; Baku, Azerbaijan
E-mail: dasdemirmehmandarov@ait.edu.az
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9604-4766>

To cite this article: Mahmandarov, D. [2025]. WILLIS AND PIERRE BOURDIEU'S EDUCATIONAL THEORIES: EDUCATION IN ENGLAND AND FRANCE. *"Metafizika" journal*, 8(4), pp.112-127.
<https://doi.org/10.33864/2617-751X.2025.v8.i4.112-127>

Article history:
Received: 15.04.2025
Accepted: 31.07.2025




Copyright: © 2025 by AcademyGate Publishing. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the CC BY-NC 4.0. For details on this license, please visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

УДК: 37.01.

ББК: 74.03 (3)

МЖ № 303

 10.33864/2617-751X.2025.v8.i4.112-127

ТЕОРИИ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ ПОЛЯ УИЛЛИСА И ПЬЕРА БУРДЬЕ: ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ В АНГЛИИ И ФРАНЦИИ

Дашдамир Махмандаров*

Абстракт. Образование становится все более важным аспектом, особенно в современном мире. Распространение образования на все слои общества в современном мире, в отличие от предыдущих периодов, повысило его значимость среди социальных теоретиков. В современную эпоху обязательный и доступный характер образования оценивался как наличие у каждого человека одинаковых возможностей в обществе в этом отношении. Таким образом, предполагалось, что благодаря доступности образования будет обеспечено благосостояние общества и развитие личности людей. В современную эпоху такие цели стояли во главе угла образования. Создание собственных образовательных систем и экспорт образовательных услуг различными странами привели к тому, что государства стали придавать особое значение образовательной политике. Кроме того, некоторые страны отличаются особыми системами образования и образовательной политикой. К таким странам относятся Англия и Франция. В этой статье будет рассмотрена концепция образования этих двух стран, основанная на исследованиях социологов из этих стран. Этими социологами являются Пол Уиллис из Англии и Пьер Бурдьё из Франции. В этой статье будет представлен обзор систем образования Англии и Франции, основанный на исследованиях этих двух социологов в области образования. Уиллис, который объясняет, как рабочий класс учится быть рабочим через систему образования, и Бурдьё, который исследует, как образование укрепляет барьеры между классами, рассмотрят с социологической точки зрения взгляды и критику систем образования своих стран.

Ключевые слова: Образование, Пол Уиллис, Пьер Бурдьё, класс, Англия, Франция, культура, воспроизводство

* Доктор философии по социологии,
Преподаватель Азербайджанского Института Теологии; Баку, Азербайджан
E-mail: dasdemirmehmandarov@ait.edu.az
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9604-4766>

Цитировать статью: Махмандаров, Д. [2025]. ТЕОРИИ ОБРАЗОВАНИЯ ПОЛЯ УИЛЛИСА И ПЬЕРА БУРДЬЕ: ОБРАЗОВАНИЕ В АНГЛИИ И ФРАНЦИИ. Журнал «Metafizika», 8(4), с.112-127.
<https://doi.org/10.33864/2617-751X.2025.v8.i4.112-127>

История статьи:

Статья поступила в редакцию: 15.04.2025

Отправлена на доработку: 16.06.2025

Принята для печати: 31.07.2025




Copyright: © 2025 by AcademyGate Publishing. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the CC BY-NC 4.0. For details on this license, please visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

UOT: 37.01.

KBT: 74.03 (3)

MJ № 303

 10.33864/2617-751X.2025.v8.i4.112-127

PAUL WILLIS VƏ PIERRE BOURDIEUNUN TƏHSİL NƏZƏRİYYƏLƏRİ: İNGİLTƏRƏ VƏ FRANSADA TƏHSİL

Daşdəmir Mahmandarov*

Abstrakt. Təhsil xüsusilə modern dünyada daha da əhəmiyyətli bir nüansa çevrilmişdir. Təhsilin modern dünyada əvvəlki dövrlərdən fərqli olaraq cəmiyyətin bütün təbəqələrinə yayılması onun əhəmiyyətini sosial nəzəriyyəçilər nəzdində də artırmışdır. Modern dövrdə təhsilin icbariləşməsi və əlçatan olması cəmiyyətdə bu baxımından hər kəsin eyni imkanlara sahib olmaları kimi qiymətləndirilirdi. Belə ki təhsilin əlçatan olması sayəsində cəmiyyətin rifahının və insanların şəxsi inkişaflarının da təmin edəcəyi gözlənilirdi. Modern dövrdə təhsilin önündə bu kimi hədəflər dayanırdı. Müxtəlif dövlətlərin özlərinə xas təhsil sistemləri qurmaları və təhsil xidmətlərini ixrac etmələri dövlətlərin təhsil siyasətlərinə xüsusi önəm vermələrinə səbəb olmuşdur. Bununla yanaşı bəzi dövlətlər xüsusi təhsil sistemlərinə və təhsil siyasətlərinə sahib olmaları ilə seçilir. İngiltərə və Fransa həmin dövlətlərdəndir. Bu məqalədə bu iki dövlətin təhsil anlayışı həmin ölkələrdən olan sosioloqların tədqiqatları əsasında ələ alınacaqdır. Bu sosioloqlar İngiltərədən Paul Willis və Fransadan da Pierre Bourdieu'dür. Bu məqalədə bu iki sosioloqun təhsili ilə bağlı tədqiqatları əsasında İngiltərə və Fransa təhsil sisteminə ümumi baxış keçiriləcəkdir. Fəhlə sinfinin təhsil sistemi vasitəsilə necə fəhlə olmağı öyrəndiyi izah edən Willis və təhsilin siniflər arasındakı bariyerləri necə qatılaşdırdığını araşdıran Bourdieu'nün ölkələrinin təhsil sistemlərinə baxışları və tənqidləri sosioloji olaraq ələ alınacaqdır.

Açar sözlər: Təhsil, Paul Willis, Pierre Bourdieu, Sinif, İngiltərə, Fransa, Kültür, Yenidən-istehsal

* Sosiologiya üzrə fəlsəfə doktoru,
Azərbaycan İlahiyyat İnstitutunun Müəllimi; Bakı, Azərbaycan
E-mail: dasdemirmehmandarov@ait.edu.az
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9604-4766>

Məqaləyə istinad: Mahmandarov, D. [2025] PAUL WILLIS VƏ PIERRE BOURDIEUNUN TƏHSİL NƏZƏRİYYƏLƏRİ: İNGİLTƏRƏ VƏ FRANSADA TƏHSİL. *"Metafizika" jurnalı*, 8(4), səh.112-127.
<https://doi.org/10.33864/2617-751X.2025.v8.i4.112-127>

Məqalənin tarixçəsi:

Məqalə redaksiyaya daxil olmuşdur: 15.04.2025

Təkrar işlənməyə göndərilmişdir: 16.06.2025

Çapa qəbul edilmişdir: 31.07.2025



1.Introduction

The emergence of the modern world is the result of centuries of radical changes. In addition, various stages in which new concepts and approaches emerged in different periods have also ensured the formation of modernity. The idea of modernity, which is believed to have begun with the Renaissance movement and further shaped by the French Revolution (1789), was a way for humans to break free from traditions, rigid customs, and the domination of religion. Through these changes, humanity gains intellectual and personal freedom. Class struggle in societies and strict boundaries between classes weaken and are minimized. Thus, a political system is established in which all people will participate, and everyone is guaranteed by modern law. The main feature that distinguishes modern law from the legal concepts of previous ages is its basis in rational reason.

Along with the establishment of the modern state, ensuring that people live in societies with equal rights also included ensuring that every citizen has access to the things provided by the state. Since states are the driving force of societies, they take necessary measures to transform them into a society based on rational reason, and aim to cleanse them of superstitions by increasing literacy rates.

Human freedom and its protection by the state and law stand out as the fundamental feature of the modern world. It is thought that making education compulsory is the most productive way to perpetuate this feature. Education is made compulsory and everyone is expected to have access to education. It was believed that education would save people from the concept of a class society and create an equal society. The fact that the philosophy of the Enlightenment brought reason to the forefront and that states tried to implement this through education and educational institutions was a result of this concept.

In pre-modern times, it was thought that societies had class characteristics and that the struggle between classes shaped society. The philosophy of the Enlightenment, however, intended to minimize the struggle and conflict between these classes and, where possible, eliminate them completely.

With the establishment of the modern state, new institutions also began to function. These institutions represented the generally accepted concepts of the state and made efforts to make them acceptable to the people. As educational institutions, schools came to the fore as the most effective institution to distinguish and purify the modern world from previous eras and the peculiarities of those eras. These institutions introduced the universally accepted concept of man, the concept of the world and the universe, the concept of science and citizenship to people. Educational institutions worked to implement the integration of people into society in the most optimal way.

This included issues such as eliminating inequalities in society, ensuring equality of everyone before the law, and teaching citizenship duties, powers, and obligations.

All these lofty goals together with the rise observed in the criticisms against modernity in general in the second half of the twentieth century, serious criticisms began to be made against the idea of enlightenment education, the idea that educational institutions, especially schools, would eliminate or minimize inequalities in society. This study will be discussed in particular two countries and two authors. The first is the theory of sociologist and cultural researcher Paul Willis, who shows how class inequalities in English education are perpetuated through educational institutions. The second theory belongs to the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. In his work in various fields such as education and class inequality, and the relationship between culture and classes, he explains how education in France perpetuates these inequalities and strengthens invisible boundaries. This study will briefly discuss the ideas of these two authors.

2. Paul Willis and educational theory

In his 1977 work *Learning to Labor: How Workingclass Kids Get Working Class Jobs*, Paul Willis presents his ethnographic research and analysis of students at a boys' high school in a predominantly working-class area of Middle England who did not follow school rules and refused to obey the school's disciplinary rules. This work primarily explores the challenges faced by children from working-class families regarding school, its rules and formal education, and identifying disciplinary rules. A school is a state institution that provides formal education, has certain disciplinary rules, and considers these rules to be necessary requirements for all its students to obey. The rules here identify all students. They invite them to obey and aim to ensure that the integration of students into society is carried out in the most appropriate way. School rules create a form of culture and require all its students to obey that culture. The central issue in Willis's work is the "naughty" students who reject this culture, creating a counter-culture, defy rules and regulations and discipline, and ridicule teachers and students who conform.

In his work, Willis calls the school as a formal school and anti-school culture as an informal one. While the school creates and applies rules and regulations, anti-school behavior creates an informal culture. Thus, "the school is a place of formality and has a very clear structure: its building, rules, pedagogical practice, administration, whose power is ultimately approved by the state - as we have seen a small example - the majesty and sovereignty of the laws and the police, the armed force of the state. The supporters of the administration invest in this formal structure and hope that in exchange for a certain loss of

autonomy, the official guards, in general, will fulfill the requirements of sacred rules, even if they are outside their duties. What believers sacrifice must be taken from unbelievers" [Paul Willis, 2016: 47]. Meanwhile, Willis defines the informal as follows: "Anti-school culture is informal. It is a place where the basic demands of the formal are rejected and the response is to express dissent in style, small-scale affectations, and discourses that are not accepted by the public. In working-class culture, opposition manifests itself mainly by returning to the informal sphere and expressing itself in specific ways that the "hand of the law" cannot reach" [Paul Willis, 2016: 47].

While the individuals shaped by the state and standardized by educational institutions remain on the formal side, the group that does not comply with this standardization process and forms an opposite culture is on the informal side. The struggle between these two cultures aligns with Marx's concept of class struggle. Classes create their own culture and ensure its continuity by passing it on from generation to generation. Since each culture dictates a behavioral model, the formal culture created by the school and the informal anti-school culture struggle with each other. Informal culture and its carriers find strength in places where formal culture cannot or does not want to take over. The school is also one of the main centers of struggle between these two cultures. The behavior of schoolchildren belonging to the working class inside the school building, or rather within the school culture, manifests itself in the form of opposing all elements of this culture. Willis emphasizes that the most basic, most obvious and most open form of anti-school culture is to oppose the government in a general and personal way [Paul Willis, 2016: 29]

The students' adoption of anti-school culture, their refusal to follow rules and their violation of discipline are mostly manifested in the form of violence, money and sexism. This is a way of displaying their personality and is the most universal form of rebellion. They distinguish themselves from rule-following students through these characteristics and attribute them to distinct culture. In Willis's work, the fact that working-class boys, in particular, deliberately distance themselves from school through these characteristics suggests that they are not inclined to achieve upward mobility through education. Instead, they prefer to spend time in the workshop rather than in school, embracing its rules. What Willis reveals is that working-class students choose to live in a cultural world outside the school, not out of compulsion, but voluntarily, there by reproducing their class culture. According to Liz Gordon, what confines these students to workshop-based labor is their resistance to following rules and regulations. Life in the workshop is seen as celebration of their liberation from the conformist pressures of society (as observed in the school system). At the

same time, it is a reproduction of the existing relations of production and the system that the youth reject [Liz Gordon, 1984: 106].

The fact that the behavior of working-class students differs from that of other students, and that the emphasis on violence, sexuality, and masculinity is prominent, is also an indication that they understand the real world better than their teachers and peers. *“Violence is a resistance to the traditional tyranny of ‘laws’, and this resistance is possible through male power. The flow of meanings that are unsatisfactory, imposed from above, or limited according to circumstances is subjected to a decisive failure through violence. Temporary and simple people become important through violence”* [Paul Willis, 2016: 65].

When working-class students with such characteristics are forced to choose between mental and physical labor, they prefer physical labor, that is, manual work. Because they consider mental labor to be more difficult than physical one. At the same time, they consider the penetration of the capitalist system and ideology into mental work to be easier and more enduring. Therefore, students from the working class do not value mental work or any skills and knowledge that the school offers. The most valuable thing for them is labor. Since they know that what the school can provide them is only accessible through adherence to its rules, they choose labor and reproduce the culture and class existence from which they originate. The increasing number of certifications for working-class students serves not to create higher-quality jobs but rather to obscure the absurdity and meaninglessness of labor and create false hierarchies in order to group individuals under certain ideologies [Paul Willis, 2016: 212]. Willis also states that those from the working class believe that diplomas and certificates, contrary to what the official discourse, help those already at the top to maintain their positions instead of ensuring that people move up [Paul Willis, 2016: 214]. At the same time, although it is emphasized that those from the working class can also have positions at the top if the rules are followed, this does not necessarily lead to upward mobility. While it is possible for individuals to be influenced by the school and its explanations of its advantages, the anti-school culture knows better than the state and its institutions what kind of life is more suitable for them. Anti-school and other forms of working-class culture are one of the most obvious criticisms of individualist ideology and expose the falsity of the individualist promises that official ideology makes through school [Paul Willis, 2016: 215].

All this was realized through the fact that working-class students preferred to perpetuate their class culture rather than to seek upward mobility through school. This was made possible by the combination of bodily activity and the idea of masculinity associated with it. Willis explains this situation as follows:

“The rejection of school and the cultural penetration of the unfair ‘equivalent’ that school offers can be considered a rejection of individualism. In a sense, it is actually a rejection of mental activities as well” [Paul Willis, 2016: 235] The preference for physical work also align with the students’ display of masculinity through their bodies, as shown in the ethnography section of the book. The value given to physical labor is perceived as a tone of masculinity [Paul Willis, 2016: 243]. Such an acceptance is evaluated as an act of cultural reproduction.

Daily life, the use of time, the rituals, the promises of the future offered by the state and its institutions, especially the school, were seen as totalizing forces. Those from the working class, on the other hand, create an anti-school culture, resisting the hegemonic culture that is offered, presented, and imposed upon them, and they make it possible to continue this resistance by creating their own spaces, timelines, activities, and behavioral models. Willis has shown with this work that the idea that school actually offers the same advantages to all classes has no value from the workingclass perspective. Those from the working class, not trusting the promises of school, choose to accept and reproduce their own cultural forms.

3. Bourdieu’s theory of education

The origins of school sociology studies in France dates back to the beginning of the 20th century, and the first signature in this work belongs to Emile Durkheim. His work *L’Évolution pédagogique en France (The Evolution of Pedagogy in France)* is considered the first significant study in this field. Durkheim viewed the school as a space for socialization that aimed to ensure social integrity by instilling in individuals the moral values that form the foundation of society. Thus, it also ensures the preservation of social order and liberates the individual from the dominance of the family [Anne Jourdan, Sidonie Naulin, 2020: 49]. According to this approach the French school reforms, the compulsory nature of secondary education, and the accessibility of education to all social classes and people were regarded as a democratization process. It was claimed that equal access to diplomas and schools had been established for all people. However, the research carried out jointly by Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron questioned the validity of this concept and analyzed the barriers to the democratization of the spread of compulsory education [Anne Jourdan, Sidonie Naulin, 2020: 50].

Pierre Bourdieu’s main works on the sociology of school are: *Les Héritiers. Les étudiants et la culture* (1964, with Jean-Claude Passeron), *La Reproduction: Éléments pour une théorie du système d’enseignement* (1970, with Jean-Claude Passeron), *La Noblesse d’État* (1989). Jourdan and Naulin summarize the main argument in these works as follows: “The school, far from

preserving equality of opportunity, contributes to the reproduction of social inequalities and the legitimization of these inequalities through a meritocratic discourse. Although Pierre Bourdieu, like Emile Durkheim, acknowledges the school as one of the important institutions of modern societies, he takes a critical stance, contrasting with Durkheim's view of the school as a purveyor of moral norms" [Anne Jourdan, Sidonie Naulin, 2020: 51].

In the texts in which Bourdieu examines the relationship between education, social inequality, and school/university, it is emphasized that even in times when education was accessible to everyone, the opportunity for higher education was more favorable to those in the upper classes of the social structure. It is claimed that university education, in particular, is in the hands of the privileged classes, that is, the children of those upper-class families have a greater place in higher education. Contrary to the claims that education has a democratizing function, Bourdieu claims that schools and universities reproduce the existing class structure. Swartz says "Bourdieu states in *Reproduction* that the educational system has three important functions. First, it performs the function of "preserving, instilling and exalting" a cultural heritage. This is the "internal" and "fundamental function" of education. Education does not only transmit technical knowledge and skills but also ensures socialization within a certain cultural tradition. Like the Catholic Church, the school is "an institution specifically designed to preserve, transmit and instill the cultural canons of society". It performs the function of cultural reproduction" [David Swartz, 2015: 265]

Some concepts are striking and key to Bourdieu's sociology and his theories about education, and without understanding them, it is impossible to fully grasp his ideas. The claims he makes about education can be understood within the framework of these concepts: Habitus, Cultural Capital, and Symbolic Violence. Of course, the concepts presented by Bourdieu's sociology are not limited to these. Hereby, we will try to explain Bourdieu's thoughts about education along with these concepts.

4.Cultural capital and education

The concept of cultural capital holds a significant place in Bourdieu's sociology. It is a concept that he uses to study education, privileged classes, social inequalities, those belonging to the upper culture, ruling class, and their behavior. The idea that cultural capital is the main distinguishing feature of modern stratified societies is one of the basic claims of Bourdieu's sociology. That is to say, instead of eliminating class divisions, the democratization processes of states have strengthened them by changing the areas of competition between classes and making the transitions between classes invisible. Classes compete with each other in terms of whether they have

cultural capital and in terms of competing for a place in the field of power of cultural capital. Cultural capital mainly includes characteristics such as "knowledge, culture, and educational qualifications (qualifications/merits)" [David Swartz, 2015: 192]. These characteristics, which are inherited from family and class, are acquired effortlessly. These are characteristics of the upper class, which place them in a superior position to those from other classes to advance in the educational ladder. Characteristics such as high language skills, being Parisian, an interest in and knowledge of the arts, etc., constitute cultural capital and are not knowledge and skills that can be learned in school. Bourdieu and Passeron explain this as follows: "Cultural privilege exists when there is a real contact with [cultural] works. Such a contact can be established not only by going to the theater, the museum, or a concert organized by the school, or by going on an occasional basis, but also by going regularly" [Pierre Bourdieu, Jean-Claude Passeron, 2015: 35]. Bourdieu and Passeron explain how the possession of cultural capital leads to class differences as follows:

"Moreover, a strong knowledge of classical theatre, which is associated familiarity with avant-garde theatre and even of boulevard theatre, does not mean the same thing for the sons of Parisian high-ranking managers, who know classical theatre but are completely ignorant of avant-garde and boulevard theatres, as it does for those whose fathers work in Lille or Clermont-Ferrand. We then see clearly that a culture only acquired through formal education is a fragment of a broader cultural whole"; because the elements that compose it do not have the more comprehensive meaning. Does the school, for those who- due to their social background- have no cultural capital beyond what they acquire through formal education, not instill in them a concept of a "general knowledge" that contradicts what it criticizes as the practice of teaching culture?" [Pierre Bourdieu, Jean-Claude Passeron, 2015: 38].

The authors emphasize that school is the only means for those from the lowest classes to access culture. At the same time, the authors argue that while this aspect of schooling has the potential to serve a democratizing function in society, it ultimately fails to do so. This is because the school reinforces and reproduces pre-existing inequalities [Pierre Bourdieu, Jean-Claude Passeron, 2015: 40].

As students progress through the stages of education, decisions regarding specialization, the point at which individuals exit the education system, and the overall trajectory of their academic journey vary depending on their social class. Because according to Bourdieu, those from the lower classes, who lack cultural capital, do not want to pursue to higher levels of education. This depends on the fact that they cannot acquire the knowledge and skills necessary for higher education during their education period and that they do not have

the material and cultural capital necessary for such an extended academic career. Bourdieu emphasizes that those who do not have such cultural capital leave education voluntarily, thereby continuing, and reproducing the class culture to which they belong. Swartz explains this situation as follows: “Young people belonging to the working class do not aim to achieve high success in education because, according to Bourdieu, those who do not have much cultural capital have assimilated the limited opportunities that those who do not have much cultural capital have in terms of being successful in school and have limited themselves in this way. In contrast, young people belonging to the upper middle class, assimilate their social advantages in the form of expectations of academic success and stay in school. Indirectly, Bourdieu reveals that the process of selection in the field of education is largely self-selection” [David Swartz, 2015: 274] Another indication of this is the finding that those from the lower classes turn to their teachers in choosing a specialty, while those from the socially upper classes act according to the recommendations of their families [Pierre Bourdieu, Jean-Claude Passeron, 2015: 31]. This dynamic underscores that the upper classes, in particular, reproduce their position, their cultural investments, and inherited privileges.

5.Habitus, education, and reproduction

One of the most important concepts in Bourdieu's sociology is habitus. Although Bourdieu was not the first to use this term, the concept has largely become synonymous with his habitus. Bourdieu adopts this concept from the history of philosophy (Aristotle's *hexis* in the *Nicomachean Ethics* becomes habitus in Thomas Aquinas's *Summa theologiae*; Husserl, Heidegger, and Merleau-Ponty call it by different names in their phenomenology) and constantly works on it, expanding its scope [Pierre Bourdieu- Loïc Wacquant, 2021: 355]. Bourdieu first used this concept in his work *Esquisse d'une théorie de la pratique: Précédé de Trois études d'ethnologie kabyle*, and later expanded the scope of this concept in his work *La Reproduction*. Bourdieu defines habitus in his first work as follows: “Habitus are systems of permanent dispositions, structured structures that tend to function as principles of production and structuring of practices and representations that can be collectively in harmony, objectively “regulated” [réglées] and “regular” [régulière], without being the product of obedience to rules, without consciously aiming at results and without being the product of the organizing action of a conductor” [Pierre Bourdieu, 2018: 158] Bourdieu continues to reveal what habitus is in other places. Since he views habitus as the product of history, the means aimed at constructing a social structure in practical world knowledge and action are also socially constituted, that is, shaped by the world they shape. In this way, habitus, shaped by the world and within the historical

process, shapes history and the world in the same way [Pierre Bourdieu, 2016: 178]. Bourdieu's concept of habitus is similar to Peter L. Berger's *The Sacred Canopy*, in which personal experiences are objectified over time and emerge as personal experiences of new generations in later stages of history [Peter L. Berger, 2011]. Bourdieu expresses it as follows: “To speak of habitus is to reveal that what is individual, even what is personal and subjective, is social and collective. Habitus is a socialized subjectivity” [Pierre Bourdieu- Loïc Wacquant, 2021: 178].

The structured nature of *habitus* has made it a useful concept for Bourdieu's research in the field of school sociology. The stratification of societies, the cultural capital they possess, habitus, and behavioral patterns also determine the behaviors they exhibit in the educational process. Since individuals are carriers of the habitus of the classes they belong to, their state and behavior in society, their perceptions of the world, their expectations of the future, and their hopes for education and advancement in society are formed by that habitus. Bourdieu even describes *habitus* as a form of class identity that is inscribed onto the body [Pierre Bourdieu, 2015: 634].

Bourdieu introduces the concept of habitus to overcome the difficulty created by the agent-structure dichotomy in sociology. The paradigms that are the sides of the debate about what is the main driving force and what plays a decisive role in the lives of people and societies are rooted in this dichotomy. One paradigm argues that the agent shapes world history, while the other asserts that the structure shapes the world. Bourdieu attempts to reconcile this debate by proposing that these two sides shape each other and that this is how history is formed [Ümit Tatlıcan-Güney Çeğin, 2016: 312]. Through his field studies and analyses, he explains the relationship between domination and the fact that people remain in the upper classes and accept their position in the lower class with the concept of habitus. It may seem that this dichotomy gives more weight to the structure. However, since the concept of habitus tries to explain a multifaceted and largely uncalculated field such as human behavior, class behavior, and social structure, there are also points that it leaves certain aspects open to interpretation.

In addition, Bourdieu emphasizes that classes and individuals in the field of education exhibit behavior and make choices based on their habitus. He tries to explain which classes are more likely to succeed in certain fields, which classes are more likely to pursue technical fields (with short and job security), and which ones are more likely to pursue humanitarian fields (with long and no job security) by their habitus. For example, humanities fields do not appeal much to students who choose technical and professional fields because they are not economically secure. Moreover, this curriculum functions as a kind of

selection mechanism: Academic success in the field of humanities requires a worldview and developed language skills. Therefore, the content and style of the curricula give an advantage to those who possess the “linguistic capital that yields educational benefits”, that is, the “bourgeois language”: This language’s fascination with “abstraction, formalism, intellectualism and the restraint of implicit words” reflects a literary inclination, most common in the ruling classes, that bears the stamp of a certain culture [David Swartz, 2015: 276] This also shows that the habitus possessed is a very important, even decisive, feature in achieving academic success. This way, classes preserve, reproduce, and transmit their existing habitus and social positions to future generations.

Habitus deals with a specific group in his text *Homo Academicus*, [Pierre Bourdieu, 2021] in which he explains how those belonging to the upper class continue their existence in state administration, how they study in the best schools and universities and occupy positions inherited from their ancestors, and how academic activity interacts with forms of power and capital. Here, he also discusses how positions within the university are formed and reproduced.

When all this is reviewed, it is seen how education occupies an important position in class struggle in Bourdieu’s sociology. The school and the education system are the most important conflict and competition areas of the class struggle. This competition, the display of behaviors, and the reproduction of positions continue existing habitus and pass them on to future generations. Although students from lower classes achieve academic success, they cannot find a place for themselves in the upper echelons of society and the state due to the characteristics of the habitus they carry. This also appears as confirmation of what Bourdieu calls reproduction. Pupils and students from the lower classes do not consider it appropriate for them to move up, because they do not have the socio-cultural characteristics required by the upper classes, such as the worldview, literary language, and economic security. They consider themselves obliged to start life earlier and to provide for their needs economically. This ensures the continuation of the financial and cultural behaviors inherited from their ancestors.

Bourdieu’s main claim in the sociology of education was that social inequalities continued in the academic field. This manifested itself in choices such as choice of specialty, choice of field, and whether to continue academic activity. Social inequalities reflected themselves in behaviors, in the economic and cultural capital possessed, and in individual and class habitus. In other words, Bourdieu claims that educational institutions, under the guise of technical neutrality, function as a “mental machine” that instills primitive intellectual classifications that confirm existing social classifications [Pierre Bourdieu, 2024: 42-53].

6. Conclusion

Especially after the Second World War, the new movements and democratization processes that took place in Europe have also manifested themselves in the field of education. England and France have also made changes in their education policies in this process, making it technically possible for everyone, people from all classes of society, to access education. These new education policies aimed to eliminate class and social inequalities and to identify the entire society. This shift was often viewed as a democratization of education. The May 1968 movements that took place in France in particular have led to radical changes in the state's education policies.

Along with all these events, claims that these changes are not radical, that class divisions have not been eliminated, and that all levels of education are not equally accessible to everyone have also manifested themselves in the same years as the field studies. This article aimed to highlight these claims through two key examples. The first of these is the theories of Paul Willis and the second is Pierre Bourdieu.

The first of these theories primarily dealt with the relationship of working-class students with school and school rules. The "rebellious" students, who objected to the uniform culture, order, and schedule created by the school, created an anti-school culture characterized by more flexible time and rules according to the characteristics of the class to which they belonged. Through this anti-school culture, they were able to resist school rules, order, and discipline, teachers and administrators, reject their demands, and praise those who followed those rules as supporters of the school. In this way, they reproduced the culture they received from their families and the class to which they belonged.

This technique of reproduction is also seen in the work of other theorists. Pierre Bourdieu, in his studies on social inequality, stratification, and educational institutions, found that these social inequalities continued in the same way in academic life. Thus, the rules and regulations applied by the education system, exams, curricula, processes required for academics to become staff in universities, language skills, etc., showed that education was actually an assertion that was made for everyone. Through these studies, Bourdieu explained how different classes behaved at different points and positions in the educational process with concepts such as cultural capital and habitus.

Although both Paul Willis and Pierre Bourdieu's theories highlight the importance of critically examining the democratization of education, it is crucial to recognize that their claims are not universally applicable. In the light

of these studies, new studies can be conducted to examine the educational systems of different countries.

REFERENCES

1. Jourdan, A., & Naulin, S. (2020). *Pierre Bourdieu's theory and sociological uses* (Trans. O. Elitez). Istanbul: Iletisim Publications. (in Turkish)
2. Swartz, D. (2015). *Culture and power: The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu* (Trans. E. Gen). Istanbul: Iletisim Publications. (in Turkish)
3. Gordon, L. (1984). Paul Willis—Education, cultural production and social reproduction. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 5(2), 105–115. (in English)
4. Willis, P. (2016). *Learning to labour* (Trans. D. Elhuseyni, p.47). Ankara: Heretik Publications. (in Turkish)
5. Berger, P. L. (2011). *The sacred canopy: Elements of a sociological theory of religion* (Trans. A. Coskun). Istanbul: Ragbet Publications. (in Turkish)
6. Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (2021). *Invitation to reflexive sociology* (Trans. N. Okten). Istanbul: Iletisim Publications. (in Turkish)
7. Bourdieu, P. (2015). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste* (Trans. D. F. Shannan & A. G. Berkurt). Ankara: Heretik Publications. (in Turkish)
8. Bourdieu, P. (2018). *Outline of a theory of practice: Three ethnological studies on Kabyle society* (Trans. N. Okten). Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press. (in Turkish)
9. Bourdieu, P. (2024). *State nobility: Elite schools and the spirit of the elite* (Trans. A. Sumer). Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press. (in Turkish)
10. Bourdieu, P. (2021). *Homo academicus* (Trans. N. Okten, A. N. Kocasü & E. Gulbey). Istanbul: Istanbul Bilgi University Press. (in Turkish)
11. Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (2015). *The inheritors: Students and culture* (Trans. L. Unsaldi & A. Sumer). Ankara: Heretik Publications. (in Turkish)
12. Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (2015). *Reproduction: The Principles of a Theory of the Education System* (Trans. A. Sumer, L. Unsaldi & O. Akkaya). Ankara: Heretik Publications. (in Turkish)
13. Bourdieu, P. (2016). *Critique of Practical Reason: Attempts at Pascalian Thinking* (Trans. P. B. Yalim). Istanbul: Metis Publications. (in Turkish)
14. Tatlican, U., & Cegin, G. (2016). Bourdieu and Giddens: Habitus or the duality of structure. In G. Cegin, E. Goker, A. Arli, & U. Tatlican (Eds.), *Fire and craft*. Istanbul: Iletisim Publications. (in Turkish)

ƏDƏBİYYAT

1. Jourdan, A., & Naulin, S. (2020). *Pierre Bourdieu'nün kuramı ve sosyolojik kullanımları* (Tər. Ö. Elitez). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
2. Swartz, D. (2015). *Kültür ve iktidar: Pierre Bourdieu'nün sosyolojisi* (Tər. E. Gen). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
3. Gordon, L. (1984). Paul Willis—Education, cultural production and social reproduction. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 5(2), 105–115.
4. Willis, P. (2016). *İşçiliği öğrenmek* (Tər. D. Elhüseyni, s.47). Ankara: Heretik Yayınları.
5. Berger, P. L. (2011). *Kutsal şemsiye: Dinin sosyolojik teorisinin ana unsurları* (Tər. A. Coşkun). İstanbul: Rağbet Yayınları.
6. Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (2021). *Düşünümsel sosyolojiye davet* (Tər. N. Ökten). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.
7. Bourdieu, P. (2015). *Ayrım: Beğeni yargısının toplumsal eleştirisi* (Tər. D. F. Şannan & A. G. Berkurt). Ankara: Heretik Yayıncılık.
8. Bourdieu, P. (2018). *Bir pratik teorisi için taslak: Kabiliye üzerine üç etnoloji çalışması* (Tər. N. Ökten). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
9. Bourdieu, P. (2024). *Devlet soyluları: Büyük okullar ve zümre ruhu* (Tər. A. Sümer). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
10. Bourdieu, P. (2021). *Homo academicus* (Tər. N. Ökten, A. N. Kocası & E. Gülbey). İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
11. Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (2015). *Varisler: Öğrenciler ve kültür* (Tər. L. Ünsaldı & A. Sümer). Ankara: Heretik Yayıncılık.
12. Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (2015). *Yeniden üretim: Eğitim sistemine ilişkin bir teorisinin ilkeleri* (Tər. A. Sümer, L. Ünsaldı & Ö. Akkaya). Ankara: Heretik Yayıncılık.
13. Bourdieu, P. (2016). *Pratik aklın eleştirisi: Pascalca düşünme çabaları* (Tər. P. B. Yalım). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.
14. Tatlıcan, Ü., & Çeğin, G. (2016). Bourdieu ve Giddens: Habitus veya yapının ikiliği. In G. Çeğin, E. Göker, A. Arlı, & Ü. Tatlıcan (Ed.), *Ocak ve Zanaat*. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.