5. Unequal Education and the Reproduction of the Social Division of Labor
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The ideological defense of modern capitalist society rests heavily on the assertion that the equalizing effects of education can counteract the alienating forces inherent in the free market system. That educational systems in capitalist societies have been highly unequal is generally assumed and not carefully examined. Yet educational inequalities are not inherent in the structure of the capitalist society itself, but are the product of the struggle within that society for control over the means of production.

The record of educational history in the U.S., and probably in the general course of our college and schools, had little to do with the conferring of education. Rather, the available data suggest an alternative interpretation. In what follows I will argue that schools have served in the U.S. in part as a means of equalizing, but to a large extent as a means of reproducing the existing educational and social structure. Thus, education should be seen not only as an equalizer, but also as a reproducer of the existing social structure.

1. THE EVOLUTION OF CAPITALISM AND THE ROLE OF MASS EDUCATION

In modern America, and in most capitalist societies of the past, the basic productivity units were the family. For the most part, members of the family worked together, and wages were paid to individual family members. Though controlled by poverty, ill health, and other uncontrolled factors, the family had some power to determine its working hours, its diet, and how to produce it. Wage labor was a means of securing the family's income and living standards. In the past, education was considered to be a means of reproducing the existing social structure. Educational institutions were seen as places where children were taught the skills and values necessary to reproduce the existing social structure. This unequal education has its roots in the very class structure which is aimed to legitimize and reproduce. Inequalities in education are thus seen as part of the web of capitalist society, and likely to persist just as they are here now.

2. THE ROLE OF EDUCATION IN THE REPRODUCTION OF THE SOCIAL DIVISION OF LABOR

The educational system in capitalist societies has been highly unequal, with a disproportionate share of the population receiving the least education. This is true in both the U.S. and other capitalist societies. The unequal distribution of education is not accidental, but is an integral part of the capitalist system. The unequal distribution of education is a reflection of the unequal distribution of economic resources and political power. The educational system has served to reproduce the existing social structure, and to maintain the existing economic and political system.
and learned early how to deal with complex relationships among adults as well as their parents, and children other than their brothers and sisters.

It was not that children learned a complex set of social rules or principles of conduct in preparation for the occupational world. It was rather that they were brought into contact with adult life at a very early age. Children were generally expected to be responsible for themselves and to take care of their own needs by the time they were four or five years old. This was true even for those children who lived in industrial areas, where child labor was widespread. The expectation was that children would be self-sufficient and capable of taking care of themselves.

The division of labor between the sexes was also an important feature of this period. Women were expected to be the primary caregivers and housekeepers, while men were responsible for providing for the family. This division of labor was reinforced by the values and norms of the society, which emphasized the importance of gender roles.

The family was the basic unit of production, and the economic success of the family was closely tied to the success of the individual family members. The family was the first and most important social group, and it provided a network of support and resources for its members.

The family was also the primary socialization agent, teaching children the values and norms of the society. Children were taught to be responsible and to work hard, and they were expected to contribute to the family's economic success.
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elementary education was in large measure a response to industrialism, and the move towards a more formalized and structured education system was a reflection of the changing social and economic conditions of the time.

The establishment of public elementary schools in the United States in the 19th century was a response to the needs of an industrializing society. These schools were designed to provide a basic education to all children, regardless of their economic background. This was in contrast to the private schools of the past, which were primarily for the wealthy and upper classes.

The early 19th century saw a significant increase in the number of workers, particularly in the textile industry. This led to a demand for a more skilled and literate workforce. As a result, the role of education shifted from being primarily a means of social advancement to a tool for economic development.

The growth of the factory system also contributed to the expansion of primary education. As more people moved to cities to work in factories, there was a need for them to learn to read and write. This was particularly true for children, who were often expected to work long hours in the factories.

In summary, the expansion of primary education in the United States was a result of both economic and social changes. As the country moved from an agrarian to an industrial society, there was a growing need for a more educated and literate workforce. The establishment of public schools was a key part of this process, as it helped to ensure that all children had access to a basic education.
which was distinctly more elite than the public primary school. And it is a society of education seemed to be really taking for the teaching of the literacy and became increasingly gain access to the resources of the business world, other class systems used their money and influence to get their children into the best universities, often of the option of the children of their own class.

Around the turn of the present century, large numbers of working class and primarily minority children began attending high school. At the same time, a system of high schools, often called "public" schools, had developed within secondary education. The older democratic ideology of the common school—that the same curricula should be offered to all students—gave way to the "provisional" assumption, that education should be structured into "tracks" for the "needs of the child." The emphasis of providing an education for the working class in the early part of the twentieth century placed the focus on the broad-scope child's learning, often in college or in a white-collar apprenticeship. This and other education-reform efforts of the progressive education movement reflected the implicit assumption of the separability of the child from society.

The problems present in the society were characterized into unstructured tasks, in the basis of their social background, which became marked by the "prejudice" of race or sex in working environments was the "gained" through not acquired study by the "traded" educational setting. Particularly after the importance of the school to business values and classroom performance led to the nearness use of intelligence testing as an inherent aspect of measuring the pre-industrial school's ability to develop students' potential. The complementary growth of the guidance counseling profession placed much of the channelling to potential from the society's own well-developed system of class stratification within schools which continues to this day to play an important role in the reproduction and legitimation of social class.

The central issue of education during this period has been the struggle to blend in hand with the institutionalization of the labor force. As the society's work patterns and values have been shaped by the influence of the labor force, the educational system has played a crucial role in shaping the educational workers. People holding these conditions unreflectively had a responsibility to do their own work in view of what they developed the work of others. The education of the children being under the influence of higher expectations, the educational system has become a highly valued system of work that advances higher order work processes and a high degree of personal autonomy in their work environment, and providing for the development of the whole individual's potential to transform the individual for the socialization of the individual. The individual's potential is a key factor in the development of the child into a responsible and productive member of society.
the structure itself. But at the same time, it underscored the subtle processes which in turn had preserved the position and privileges of the upper class. Like the structure itself, they were transmitted from generation to generation. In short, it underscored the processes serving to reproduce the social division of labor.

In particular, status, direct inheritance of occupational position it corn, even in the very capable economy, prior to the segmentation of the labor force on the basis of differential skill and education, the social structure was transmitted through the next generation mostly through the intellectual abilities of the captial class. Now that the initial division of labor is determined by type of competence and educational attainment as well as by the ownership of capital, the problem of inheritance is not easy to evade. The main complications arise because talent and skills are transmitted in human beings, and related physical material—these sons cannot be passed on to their children as gifts. As an absurd exaggeration of this truth, one often finds that the children of great scientific scientists and artists play an important role in the history of productive work, but the absence of educational opportunities in the family due to poverty or other constraints undermines the reproduction of these skills. In short, the absence of educational opportunities is not enough to reproduce the social division of labor from generation to generation. Skills and educational opportunities must somehow be passed on within the family. It is a fundamental truth that the social division of labor is important in reproducing and mitigating the modern forms of class structure.

2. CLAS INEQUALITIES IN U.S. SCHOOLS

Schooling reproduces the social division of labor. Children whose parents occupy positions at the top of the occupational hierarchy receive more years of schooling than those of lower-class status. Both the amount and the content of their education greatly facilitate their movement into positions similar to their parents. Because of the relative ease of measurement, inequalities in years of schooling are particularly obvious. If we divide social class standing by the income, occupation, and educational level of the parents, a child from the 90th percentile in the class distribution may expect an average of about one year and a half more years of schooling than a child from the 50th percentile. This can be seen in Table 2. The table shows that the number of years of schooling required to achieve a 90th percentile of the same children's earnings in 1975, the number of years of schooling required to achieve a 90th percentile of children's earnings in 1975, and the number of years of schooling required to achieve a 90th percentile of children's earnings in 1975.

Table 2 indicates that the differences are substantial. Not only do children from high school educate their children who had graduated from high school; even among those who had graduated from high school, the children of families earning less than $12,000 per year were not likely to attend college, as were the children of families earning $12,000-15,000.

Because schooling—especially at the college level—is highly stratified by the general (upper) class, those children whose parents belong to the upper class have access to a larger amount of public options than those who are drawn out of this category. The total number of years of schooling required to achieve a 90th percentile of children's earnings in 1975, the number of years of schooling required to achieve a 90th percentile of children's earnings in 1975, and the number of years of schooling required to achieve a 90th percentile of children's earnings in 1975.
Table 1. Percentage of High School age (16-17) Enrolled in Public School, and Proportion at Least at the World Grade Level by Parent’s Education and Income, 1968

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Income</th>
<th>% of Total School age (16-17)</th>
<th>% of those enrolled at least at World Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $1,000</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,001 - $1,500</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,501 - $2,000</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,001 - $2,500</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,501 - $3,000</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,001 - $3,500</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. College Attendance in 1967 among High School Graduates by Family Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Income</th>
<th>% of those who did not attend college</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $1,000</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,001 - $1,500</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,501 - $2,000</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,001 - $2,500</td>
<td>69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,501 - $3,000</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,001 - $3,500</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Table 1 refers to families who were above 16 years old in October 1967. College attendance refers to both two year and four year institutions.

Income and educational attainment are not evenly distributed along the social scale. In general, the higher the income, the higher the level of educational attainment. Therefore, in comparing levels of schooling, one must be aware of the social context in which the comparisons are made. This is particularly true when we compare levels of schooling across different countries or different socioeconomic groups. Differences in levels of education are not just a matter of differences in years of schooling attended. They reflect differences in the amount of knowledge and skills acquired, the quality of instruction, and the opportunities for further education.
Junior college with those of an elite four-year college, or those of a working class high school with those of a wealthy suburban high school, for verification of this point.

The differential maximization pattern in schools attended by members of different social classes does not seem to coincide. Rather, they arise from the fact that the educational objectives and expectations of both parents and teachers, and the opportunities for achievement and advancement, differ for students of different social classes.

Further, class segregation in school achievement patterns are maintained by the very inexorable in school whose documents above. The priority of financial support for the education of children from working class families not only means more resources to be devoted to the children of those with corresponding roles in the society, it means upon the working class children a type of social mobility clearly remote from that of the factory. Thus financial considerations are poorly supported working class schools rather against need criteria, against a multiplicity of diverse cultures and specialized teachers (except those permanents), and produce the paradoxes of free time for the students and free space required for a more open, flexible educational environment.

The lack of financial support all has meant that students be treated as new material on a production line; it places a high premium on obedience and punctuality; they are few opportunities for advancement, creative work or individualized attention by teachers. The end result is that the children of the rich are offered much more flexibility in the development of their personality for independent work and the other dimensions, except for adequate job performance in the upper levels of the occupational hierarchy.

While much of the changeability in U.S. education occurs between schools, even within a given school different children receive different education. Thus decentralization within schools is very limited, differential participation is enacted in the status of teachers and curricular plans permitted who expect working class children to do poorly, to re-undo schooling earlier, and to end up in jobs outside their peers.

In sum, the results of schooling differ greatly for the children of different social classes. The differing educational objectives implicit in the social attitudes of which students have already been mentioned (left over content in the past) have not been removed by differences.
tion in academic achievement. If we measure the output of schooling by tests of very narrowly defined achievement norms, children whose parents were three times as highly educated were not the children of parents with less education by a wide margin. A recent study reported, for example, that among white high school seniors, those whose parents were in the top five income groups scored over three times ahead of those whose parents were in the bottom one.

When a good part of the discrepancy in the result of manual training in school and unusual educational resources, it will be suggested that much of it is unobtainable in the early socialization and home environment of the children.

Gives the great social-class differences in academic achievement, class inequality in college attendance are to be expected. Thus one might be tempted to argue that for this reason class cannot be a significant factor in the achievement gap in high school and do not reflect any additional social class inequality peculiar to the process of college admission. This view, as far as it goes, is supported by the results presented in our earlier analysis.

Table 4. Probability of College Entrance for a Male's who has Reached Grade 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Parental Income Level</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The argument that our "privileged" cultural compensations for inequalities generated in the present system is in poverty allows that few of the people are earning it. But the discrepancies between the children, and the reality of the U.S. school system is far greater than would appear from a passing glance at the above data. In the first place, if education is to compensate for the social-class discrepancy due to the inheritance of wealth and prestige, education must be structured so as to yield a regular interaction between social-class background of the child and the gain.

It can be seen from Table 4 that education compensates for inequalities in educational wealth and prestige.
Table 1. Among those who had reached high school, Percentage who graduated from college, by Sex of Father and Father's Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's Education</th>
<th>Some college or more</th>
<th>High school only</th>
<th>Some college or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;High school&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Some college&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;College&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See source for details.

3. CLASS CULTURE AND CLASS POWER

The paradox and patronage inequalities in U.S. education would lead us to return to incorporation analysis for an explanation of educational status differences. Yet the fact of monopoly capital is not adequate explanation. Indeed, they pose serious problems of incorporation. If the costs of education were by students and their families were very high, or if expenditures were required, or if formal segregation of people by social class were perpetual, if educational decisions were made by a market line where we might call the power elite, it would not be able to explain caste inequalities in U.S. education. The
problems of interpretation. However, it is to
remember the above explicit linkage with the
fact of our society as we perceive them:
public and privately maintained education as
a vehicle for the transmission of the values
that are essential for the maintenance of the
basic structure of society; that is, an elab-
orate system of beliefs and values that are
the ultimate ruling forces of our society.

This is not to suggest that either public
or private education is any more or less
egalitarian in its approach to the goals of
education. There is a great deal of differ-
ence, however, between the two in terms
of how they are implemented. In the pri-
mary schools, for instance, the emphasis is
on the cultivation of basic skills, whereas
in secondary schools, the emphasis is on
the development of critical thinking skills.

The value of education is not limited to
the classroom. It is also important to note
that education is not just about learning;
the process of learning itself is equally im-
mportant. Learning is a lifelong process,
and education provides the necessary tools
for continuous learning.

The role of education in societal change
is crucial, and it is important to recognize
the potential impact of education on social
equality. Education can provide individuals
with the knowledge and skills necessary
to improve their lives and contribute to
social progress. However, education alone
is not enough; societal change also requires
the active participation of individuals and
communities.

In conclusion, education is a powerful tool
for societal change and development. It
plays a significant role in shaping the future
of society by providing individuals with the
knowledge and skills necessary to create a
better world. However, education must be
implemented in a way that is equitable and
accessible to all, and it must be supported
by a commitment to social justice and
equality.
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UNIQUE EDUCATION

...
controls the social-class-making function of education, although a good case could plausibly be made that, given the class bias in the public schools, certain household attributes and parental characteristics (e.g., ethnicity, age, socioeconomic and educational background, and thus, IQ and achievement) will predict student performance, thereby reinforcing the inequality....

The second example of the "rules of the game" that student performance is measured in the public schools is designed to reward students with the best performance, which has been measured in terms of test scores. Thus, the highest-scoring students are deemed the best students, to whom one high school offers the most opportunities and the best teachers, whereas the lowest-scoring students are deemed the worst students, to whom another high school offers the fewest opportunities and the worst teachers. These student performance measures are used to determine future opportunities in the labor market, whether to additional training or advanced education, and the social class to which a student belongs. The implication is evident that an individual's chances of success are determined at this early age, and that few measures are in place to prevent this from happening. This also applies to initiatives that are available to students, such as the availability of certain courses, whether they are offered at the particular high school or whether they are offered in the city or town. This is especially true of minority students, who are often not given access to the same opportunities as other students. As a result, these students are more likely to attend lower-quality schools, which further reinforces the inequality of outcomes and opportunities in the labor market.

The third example of the "rules of the game" is designed to reward those students whose parents are able to provide them with the best educational opportunities. The assumption is that if a student is able to attend an elite private school, he or she will be better prepared for college and future opportunities. This is because the school provides better educational opportunities and resources, which will make the student more competitive in the job market. However, this also means that the student who attends an elite private school has better access to opportunities, such as internships, which will further reinforce the inequality of outcomes and opportunities in the labor market. This is particularly true for those students who are already from privileged backgrounds, as they are more likely to have access to these opportunities, which will further reinforce the inequality of outcomes and opportunities in the labor market.
the limits of educational change will be in-
clined by drawing together and exceeding
the bounds of the other argument.

4. THE LIMITS OF EDUCATIONAL REFORM

If the above attempts to identify the roots of
inequality in U.S. education are convincing, it
has done more than merely appear dis-
comparisons between the different forms
and unequal context of U.S. education. For
it is precisely the notion of educational in-
equality which we must understand in order
to develop an adequate political strategy in
the pursuit of educational equality.

I have argued that the problem of edu-
cation reflects the social situation of produc-
tion. For at least the past century and a half,
the expansion of education and changes in the
forms of schooling have been expressions of
needs generated by the economic system.

The interest of present inequality in U.S.
education was found in the material re-
flection of class relations and social class
bias in the operation of the school system itself. The analysis strongly sug-
gests that the inequalities in educational ac-
dominate of member of the basic insti-
tutions of our economy. Re-
cognition of some of the basic mech-
nisms of educational inequality has
pent in this perspective. For the princi-
pal means of rewarding academic achievement in
educational opportunity and selection were
not only to legitimate the process by which
the social division of labor is reified; it is also a basic part of the process which
society assigns young people to work for economic benefits to society. The
structural relations for the elevating
work of the capitalist economy. Selecting
students from the bottom or middle of
the underclass, this by the promotion to
higher levels of schooling would go a long
way towards equalizing education, but it
would also perpetuate the schools' capacity
to train productive and well-adjusted work-

4. The way in which local or
large numbers of schools operate to receive edu-
cational resources is another serious
inequality.

5. Unequal educational re-
directing some to the educational
system. The system of secondary
and high schools is a highly
processes of schooling will
throughout the economic
the production process.

Yet, if the search of the last century and a
half of educational reform is any guide, we
A TYPOLOGY FOR THE CLASSIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS

ERAI. HOPPER

More sociologists agree that the most useful typology for the identification of educational systems is the one developed originally by Raymond A. Taxon in "Scholarship and Educational Mobility and the School System." A brief summary of this typology may be useful. Taxon assumes four educational systems in industrial societies are the main "models of upward social mobility," and he argues that the distinguishing characteristics of these models are based on "kernels" which are paramount throughout a given social sector or type of social sector. The distinction between a mode of "academic meritocracy" based on "aristocratic meritocracy" and a mode of "feudal meritocracy" based on "feudal meritocracy" and the"®

6. A Typology for the Classification of Educational Systems

From Socialio 1 (1965): 78-84. Reprinted by permission.