


SCHOOL SUCCESS AND FAILURE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF BOURDIEU AND LAHIRE: HOW SCHOOL AND FAMILY CAN DEFINE A CHILD'S COGNITIVE AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

SUCESSO E FRACASSO ESCOLAR SOB A ÓTICA DE BOURDIEU E LAHIRE: COMO A ESCOLA E A FAMÍLIA PODEM DEFINIR O DESENVOLVIMENTO COGNITIVO E SOCIAL DA CRIANÇA

ÉXITO Y FRACASO ESCOLAR DESDE LA PERSPECTIVA DE BOURDIEU Y LAHIRE: CÓMO LA ESCUELA Y LA FAMILIA PUEDEN DEFINIR EL

 <https://doi.org/10.56238/sevened2025.030-055>

Adriana Marques de S. Teixeira¹, Matheus Rodrigues dos Reis²

ABSTRACT

“Success” and “failure” in school are broad and diverse fields of research, historically marked by extensive debates regarding educational challenges and perspectives. In this context, this study addresses the concept of cultural capital, as defined by Bourdieu (2014), which highlights how education tends to serve the interests of the dominant class. In contrast, Lahire (1997) emphasizes the relevance of family beliefs and practices in explaining school “success” or “failure,” noting that, regardless of families’ cultural, social, or economic capital, some children still achieve academic success. Linked to this concept is the notion of school culture, which, according to Julia (2001), extends beyond the social relationships established within the school environment and encompasses a set of norms, behaviors, and practices aimed at disseminating the dominant culture. Based on these theoretical frameworks, it is understood that the factors influencing school “success” or “failure” cannot be attributed to a single element but rather result from a complex network of determinants that span the child’s social, familial, and educational life.

Keywords: Education. School. Family. Culture. “Failure”. “Success”.

RESUMO

O “sucesso” e o “fracasso” escolar são campos de pesquisa amplos e diversificados, que sempre foram palcos de grandes discussões acerca dos desafios e das perspectivas educacionais. Diante disso, esse trabalho traz o conceito de capital cultural, definido por Bourdieu (2014), que evidencia como a educação tende a se orientar para a manutenção dos interesses da classe dominante. Em contraposição, Lahire (1997) destaca a relevância das concepções e práticas familiares para explicar o “sucesso” ou o “fracasso” escolar, ressaltando que, independentemente do capital cultural, social ou econômico das famílias, algumas crianças conseguem obter êxito no percurso escolar. Associado a esse conceito, surge também a noção de cultura escolar, que, segundo Julia (2001), não se limita às relações sociais estabelecidas no ambiente escolar, mas envolve um conjunto de normas, condutas e práticas voltadas à difusão da cultura dominante. A partir desses referenciais,

¹ Master's student in Education, Language and Technologies. Universidade Estadual de Goiás PPG-IELT (UEG). E-mail: marquessiqueira2518@gmail.com Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-5771-4015>

² Master's student in Education. Universidade Estadual de Goiás PPG-IELT (UEG). E-mail: matheusrdosreis@gmail.com Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2185-9840>

compreende-se que os fatores que influenciam o “sucesso” ou o “fracasso” escolar não podem ser atribuídos a um único elemento, mas decorrem de uma complexa rede de condicionantes que atravessam a vida da criança na dimensão social, familiar e escolar.

Palavras-chave: Educação. Escola. Família. Cultura. “Fracasso”. “Sucesso”.

RESUMEN

El éxito y el fracaso escolar son campos de investigación amplios y diversos que siempre han sido objeto de intenso debate sobre los retos y las perspectivas educativas. Por ello, este trabajo introduce el concepto de capital cultural, definido por Bourdieu (2014), que destaca cómo la educación tiende a orientarse a mantener los intereses de la clase dominante. En contraste, Lahire (1997) destaca la relevancia de los conceptos y prácticas familiares para explicar el éxito o el fracaso escolar, enfatizando que, independientemente del capital cultural, social o económico de las familias, algunos niños tienen éxito en su trayectoria educativa. Asociado a este concepto surge también la noción de cultura escolar, que, según Julia (2001), no se limita a las relaciones sociales establecidas en el entorno escolar, sino que abarca un conjunto de normas, comportamientos y prácticas destinadas a difundir la cultura dominante. Con base en estos marcos, es evidente que los factores que influyen en el éxito o el fracaso escolar no pueden atribuirse a un solo elemento, sino que surgen de una compleja red de factores que permean la vida del niño en los ámbitos social, familiar y académico.

Palabras clave: Educación. Escuela. Familia. Cultura. “Fracaso”. “Éxito”.

1 INTRODUCTION

School success and failure have historically been the subject of intense debates and constitute one of the greatest challenges faced by different educational perspectives. This discussion involves not only the trajectory of education as a social institution, but also the development of the subjects, in the light of the conceptions of those who participate in the teaching-learning process. However, factors such as economic conditions, family structure, social context and cognitive development, although fundamental, are not always analyzed in an integrated way as determinants of school performance. Frequently, these variables are analyzed in isolation, which makes it difficult to understand the complexity involved in school success or failure.

Thus, it is necessary to seek an approach that articulates multiple elements capable of explaining, in a broader and more critical way, the different results achieved in the students' educational path. Understand the dynamics of different cultures – school, family, as well as those related to gift and cultural, social and cognitive skills – in the child's life, and how these factors influence their performance. Based on the conceptions of Lahire (1997), Julia (2001), Gadotti (2003, 2009), Bourdieu (2014), among others, it seeks to elucidate what constitutes these cultures and how they determine the success or failure of the child.

First, it will be analyzed what school culture is and how it defines the paradigms, concepts and methodologies present that end up perpetuating the dominant model of school and society. In the second moment, to bring to light a research that elucidates the levels of development of a child regardless of its cultural, social and financial capital, showing the perceptions of society and school in the emancipation and autonomy of the subjects.

It seeks to elucidate how these contexts, these pedagogical approaches influence educational results. After readings and analyses, delve into the complexities involved in the process of critical development of the subjects, bringing not an answer, but reflections on the "culprits" of school success and failure.

2 CULTURE WITHIN THE SCHOOL AND THE SCHOOL WITHIN CULTURE

Saviani (2015) clarifies that the most important factor for the effectiveness of an efficient educational practice is that it knows and understands precisely the way in which the society in which it is inserted is structured. Understanding that most societies are supposedly organized in a democratic way, which ensures equal rights and duties for all, and even with the predominance of the capitalist system (it is based on the private ownership of the means

of production, profit and the accumulation of wealth), is decisive for education to base its actions on the formation of individuals who understand and act critically around the realities experienced within the social group to which they belong.

In a capitalist society (driven by the structures of the ruling class), interests are antagonistic, that is, incompatible. From this perspective, the role of the school institution will be one, if it is placed at the service of the development of capital, therefore, at the service of the dominant class. And it will be different, if it positions itself in favor of the interests of the workers" (Saviani, 2015, p. 106). What role is the school engaged in? Innovative or maintainer of the social, cultural and economic standards imposed by the capitalist system? Does the school liberate or oppress? Is there a possibility of being neutral? The school's own pedagogical organization states that there is no such possibility. The system, the projects, the practices, the didactics, everything corroborates so that the school does not get rid of what is imposed on it by capitalist society.

In view of this, it is perceived that education cannot be dissociated from society and its characteristics, and that the object of study should not be limited to existing standards and that, in a way, remain rooted in the school culture. A libertarian, citizen pedagogy is useless; or discourses of resistance, anti-racism and anti-sexism in the face of social inequalities, if reality often bows to omission. Engagement often manifests itself in actions that clash with the proclaimed discourse, and the problems that cross the school environment invariably end up being attributed to the student or to his cultural heritage, to cultural capital.

To think of school success and failure as measurable based on guidelines, practices, school contexts or even the grades achieved by students in the evaluations is to consider, or rather, to disregard the entire context to which the child is subjected, both in the family and school environments. The *ethos* of a certain group or individual, whether they belong to the school or the family, will guide the coping situations throughout the child's academic journey.

The school, as a social institution, as well as the processes of human formation, has undergone significant transformations over time. Several researchers and historians have focused on the analysis of the paths taken and the challenges that the school environment is going through, in line with social dynamics, economic policies and the constraints imposed by market demands at different times in history. From a school model focused on the interests of the bourgeoisie to the proposals for full-time teaching centers, Brazilian educational policies have been formulated under the assumption of full human development. These initiatives are often guided by the attempt to address structural problems, such as illiteracy,

school dropout, high failure rates (today they are automatic approvals), and the proficiency gaps that affect the subjects inserted in this training process.

Adorno (1995) already addressed that society has become a mass of manipulation of the cultural industry; in which art ceases to be expensive and becomes popular, becoming just a product to be consumed. Knowledge and criticality lose place to the consumer market, to the trivialization of culture in the face of the need to meet the will of a public that is permissive and standardizing.

In the same way, Adorno (1995) points to the school as an instrument to promote human emancipation. Empowering them for enlightenment and autonomy. Kant (1985) already stated that the individual needs this clarification to get out of his self-inculpable ³ minority, that is, he lives under the tutelage of others without the ability to think and act for himself. Only with enlightenment could individuals exercise their majority, the ability to think for themselves.

Adorno (1995) criticizes the segment and the proposals of schools that allocate a project to a teaching model that aims at students considered cognitively gifted, another at students with average performance and, finally, a school for those seen as "not gifted". Such pedagogical logic becomes a prefiguration that reinforces the condition of minority of individuals, instead of promoting their emancipation.

In this context, the school institution, although it is supported by proclaimed ideals of equality, quality, equity and universality, ends up reproducing superficial discourses that are little materialized in practice. As Bourdieu (2014, p. 45) observes, the school becomes "one of the most effective factors of social conservation, as it provides the appearance of legitimacy to social inequalities, and sanctions cultural heritage and the social gift treated as a natural gift".

If, on the one hand, the school is the maintainer of the cultural capital of a colonial and patriarchal society and education is the result of this heritage, it is clear that even in this century, it has remnants of these models of social organization. That is why the crises of society directly involve the school and the subjects who build it. The school is today the stage of a whole discussion where society questions itself about itself and questions the school

³ Kant states that the human being lives in a state of self-imposed "minority" (Unmündigkeit), that is, the inability to use one's own understanding without the direction of others, when this condition does not result from a lack of reason, but from self-indulgence and cowardice. Thus, the individual becomes "self-blameless" by remaining in this minority, since he has the means to overcome it, but he does not do so because he does not want to take responsibility for thinking for himself (Kant, 1985).

about its role in the face of challenges and changes so that the scenario, still stagnant in the old concepts, changes.

The validity of questioning the school also comes up against the subjects who belong to it, those who are in formation; And this does not exempt teachers from also seeking constant training. The fact is that the school universe cannot reflect only what is in its physical space. Gadotti (2009) points out the citizen school, the integral school. That of knowledge of the world, of the city, of society, of the environment, of prior knowledge of subjects, of freedom and democracy. That the school and its subjects can be competent and participative, has the power to decide on its guidelines and not wait for public policies to guide pedagogical and school didactics.

Can the school get rid of the old stereotypes, of traditional education or does it still hesitate in doubts whether to educate is:

To reproduce or transform, to slavishly repeat what it was to opt for the security of conformism, for fidelity to tradition or, on the contrary, to confront the established order and run the risk of adventure, to want the past to configure the whole future or to start from it to build something else? (Gadotti, 2003, p. 18).

According to Bourdieu (2014), the school is unable to critically reflect on its actions to promote the emancipation and autonomy of students. Except for those who already have cultural capital and the gift for cognitive development. It masks a pedagogy of equality to justify the non-need to provide the student with the culture and gift that can be acquired, if stimulated. In reality, it requires from the student a cultural capital as recommended in their cultural requirements, leaving aside or ignoring the issues of how to transmit knowledge considering all the cultural, social and even economic capital of the student. It can be seen that the school places an education system based on equality and equity without, however, considering the specificities and needs of the students.

There is, on the part of the school, an objectification of the subjects, to the extent that their subjectivities are disregarded in favor of the demands and disputes imposed by the capitalist market. Such dynamics refer to the fact that it is more comfortable to teach children who already have cultural and social capital from the family structure, disregarding — at least at this moment — financial capital. It is explained that cultural capital is a set of knowledge, practices, oral and linguistic skills, knowledge of art, music, in short, the *habitus* and familiarity of individuals in the face of different cultures, while social capital refers directly to the power

of access to resources in the face of their social relations, which defines the degree of knowledge and belonging, the individual being favored through this model of capital (Bourdieu, 2014).

In the face of these criticisms, it is essential to highlight the origin of the different "capitals" (cultural, social and economic) and the way in which they interfere in the formation of the subjects. Often, a logic of reciprocal blame is installed: the school blames the family, the family transfers the responsibility to the school and, ultimately, both blame the system. However, from the perspective of Bourdieu (2014), such an interpretation is limited, as the school does not fail to fulfill its social function. On the contrary, it acts as one of the main mechanisms for the reproduction of inequalities, insofar as it legitimizes the cultural capital inherited from the dominant classes, giving it the appearance of a natural gift. Thus, families that have this capital are able to provide their children with symbolic and cognitive resources that favor their school career, perpetuating the current social structure. It is worth emphasizing the origin of these "capitals" and how they interfere in the formation of the subjects. This cultural heritage makes schools, even imperceptibly, conduct the task of forming the child as something natural, after all, what the child presents is consistent with the school's own cultural policies.

On the other hand, families that organize themselves according to their basic needs: housing and food. They know the importance of school, but, due to their own cultural heritage, they are unable to maintain and sustain the standard necessary for the success and permanence of their children in school. In many cases, there is a withdrawal due to the need to work to help with the family's costs.

The school organization itself, its practices, differ these students through its cultural capital, its natural gifts, which are transmitted in an osmotic way, "[...] which contributes to reinforcing, in the members of the educated class, the conviction that they only owe to their gifts this knowledge, these aptitudes and these attitudes, which, in this way, do not seem to them to result from learning" (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 51).

The family organization and the cultural heritage of parents, grandparents and the use they made and how they were passed on reinforces that culture does affect the actions of the school towards its students. The teacher cannot get rid of his own concepts and "how could they not integrate, even and above all without being aware of it, the values of their environment of origin or belonging to their ways of judging and teaching?" (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 60).

And this is precisely where the process of "selection" of these already lies. The degree of knowledge, familiarity with different cultures, appreciation and ease with the language are indeed instruments that often portray the connection between the teacher and the student. And in view of his expectations, the teacher approves the student's conduct, because he sees in him the same environment, the same attitudes, even though he, the teacher, has come from a less favored class. The academic status he achieved now refers him to the category of the elite, the holders of culture and knowledge.

The student from the middle or lower class, on the other hand, needs a superhuman effort to acquire a respectable culture in academic circles and even so, he is judged according to the *ethos* of the elite. For the school, without cultural heritage and social capital, the student is not able to equal himself in merits, because according to Bourdieu (2014) the school is the maintainer of the culture of the elite and for this very reason cannot get rid of the stereotypes already rooted in the school culture.

Laval (2008) points out the contemporary school that tends to structure itself as a company, organizing its pedagogical and administrative practices in order to maximize measurable results and productivity. In this model, the training of students is articulated in an instrumental way, prioritizing quantifiable competencies and performance in external evaluations, to the detriment of broader processes of critical, social and cultural development. Thus, the school institution ends up internalizing market logics, promoting an education oriented towards efficiency and competition, instead of stimulating reflection, autonomy and the collective construction of knowledge. The school includes and excludes through the logic of the market. This concept is integrated into the analyses where cultural capital, as elaborated by Bourdieu, can be related to the notion of school culture, defined by Julia (2001), as the set of norms, conducts and practices that structure the life of the institution and regulate the transmission of knowledge aiming at the current social structuring, capitalism.

In this sense, the school is not limited to socializing knowledge, but acts in the reproduction and expansion of the dominant cultural capital, reinforcing its link with the interests of the hegemonic classes. It is, therefore, an institution historically designed and programmed to serve an elite, being "responsible, under the cloak of abstract equality, for conveying intact the inherited inequalities, for the reproduction of cultural heritages and for the replacement of the world as it is" (Julia, 2001, p. 11).

This set of norms and practices arrive at the school as a way of maintaining the status quo of the current cultural capital, serving as a smokescreen, that is, "the formal equality that

guides the pedagogical practice serves as a mask and justification for indifference with regard to real inequalities in the face of teaching and the culture transmitted, or, rather, required." (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 53).

In the face of these practices of conservation (of inequalities) of a dominant culture, the school has an extremely fundamental role in the dissemination of such conservation. Bourdieu (2014) will bring that if we look at the school, from this perspective we will realize that the entire school system is unfair, where they will promote "egalitarian" ideas, but that will only allow a propagation of a dominant cultural capital, making students who did not have access to such cultural capital feel - or end up - being excluded from the school system and consequently from the school.

This is justified in view of the statistics pointed out. Children with capital (cultural, social and economic) are always the ones who most access schools. Likewise, school institutions have a high number of recruitments. The most important thing is to recognize that inequality in the face of school only corroborates the factors arising from the classes to which these children belong, and it is to these that the school clings to justify the success or failure of these children.

A closer look will more easily understand why schools repeat the social pattern of the elites. The work with students who have a cultural heritage concerns more autonomous individuals, with skills already built by their cultural capital, which reinforces in the school culture a symbolic violence that legitimizes a political and arbitrary power. It is this policy that will base the school curriculum, supposedly, in an egalitarian way, but in reality it is an imposition; Not by persuasion, but because it is specific to "specific" groups, which makes everyone accept, including the dominated class, precisely because they do not know how this culture is structured.

Today culture is sold as a universal good; without, however, being elucidated that it is a culture originating from the "culture" of the elites. The school pedagogical authority validates them, having the conviction that the dominated class does not know them and even so they do not care to hide possible chances for children from other cultures to achieve school success.

And even though they are aware that each class has its own culture, they are ignored by the dominant culture. And the school is arbitrary in hiding these cultures, reproducing only those of the elite. The school is aware that many or all of the *habitus*, and that the social structuring of the child, are determinant for his success. What happens is that the school

wants to determine the change of these *habitus* to its ideal model. It reproduces in its practices, sometimes without awareness, what is already predetermined and which is the model of education that capitalism, the elite, wants to be maintained. And only in this way, the status quo of this elite is maintained.

[...] The pedagogical act should not be based on idealized representations that feed the pedagogical illusion, reducing both students and teachers to preconceived and stereotyped images and models, mainly due to the interests of international capital" (Costa Neto, 2003, p. 146).

However, the representations and realities experienced in the school context do not seem to refer to an evolution of the subjects. The principles that guide school practices today and the conditions to which subjects are still subjected reflect precisely what has been presented. There is also the "aegis" of a democracy, of a democratic school for all, of subjects who hold knowledge and a praxis that supposedly conceptualizes and validates a "school of equality and equity". How to explain the society that still suffers from the ills of exclusion? The indices of inequalities are still accentuated within the school itself, the labor market, higher education opportunities, among others. How can we understand that "the school is averse to the system", but does not detach itself from it? It is really the "Cultural Capital" of the school

3 CULTURE WITHIN THE FAMILY AND THE FAMILY WITHIN THE SCHOOL IN THE PROFILES ANALYZED BY LAHIRE

If, on the one hand, the school is seen as an instrument to maintain the social organization as determined by the dominant class, which in a certain way is sanctioned by the school culture, by its structure and functioning; on the other hand, there is the family organization and how it "accepts" or reacts to its specificities and needs. How does it position itself in the face of human formation, school and society, its perceptions and perspectives of adaptation to society.

Contrary to what Bourdieu proposes, that the school maintains the determinations of capitalist society, Lahire will bring that even in families with low economic power, and the same standard of cultural and social capital, children manage to "circumvent" the system and achieve school success. For Lahire (1997) Cultural Capital is the set of knowledge and skills that the family has and how these are transferred to the children, it is what will determine the

relationship of this family with the school, with society and how these relationships will directly impact school success.

Even though they belong to the same social class, in this case, low-income families, such as factory workers, domestic workers, seamstresses and the unemployed – the families position themselves in different ways in relation to school. According to their orientations, examples and cultural heritage, showing that each class has its own cultural capital, children are guided and stimulated, or not, as to the importance of education. Whether as a means of escaping illiteracy, of entering the labor market or of seeking social ascension, it is these attitudes and concepts transmitted by the family that, ultimately, influence the success or failure of children at school.

The child's personality, his reasoning and behaviors, his actions and reactions are incomprehensible outside the social relations that are initially retained between him and other members of the family constellation, in a universe of objects linked to the forms of intra-family social relations (Lahire, 1997, p. 17).

If the child is the object of the "work", the individual in formation, there is nothing more certain than to know the primary conditions of their development, that is, their cultural heritage to understand or even justify their trajectories; analyze their desires and their own vision of society, of school. The personality traits of a child, even if they are "inherited" from his family structure, do not exempt him from having his own desires, desires and aspirations. "In fact, the most intimate, the most particular or singular of the traits of a person's personality or behavior can only be understood by constituting the 'fabric of social imbrications' with others" (Lahire, 1997, p. 18).

From this point of view, there is no way to build totally critical, autonomous and emancipated individuals if we isolate this subject and do not consider the plurality of their ways of life, of their social organization. Fully forming the subjects requires more than predetermined formulas, concepts, or policies that say that the appropriation of knowledge can occur in a homogeneous way, since these students are in the same grade.

Measuring the performance of children by the cultural standard of the school and the environment in which it is inserted is no less dangerous than judging only by their financial conditions. Lahire (1997) states that judging both school "success" or "failure", especially of individuals from the lower classes, should not be limited merely to their financial, cultural, or

social capital. But how families relate to them, unless otherwise, there will be a range of hypotheses that will point to the causes of school "success" or "failure".

According to Lahire (1997) this plurality is perceived and understood in different ways, however, the individual relates to plurality through the process of coexistence, causing him to "receive" knowledge, cultural capital.

The conditions for school "success" or "failure" will permeate several areas and knowledge acquired directly and indirectly, knowledge that will make the child relate "well" or "badly" with the school environment. Lahire (1997) gives an example of the use of writing and reading, he also brings examples of everyday life where, indirectly through the family, the child will understand and understand how his family uses writing and reading, his relationships with the other and his social conceptions and authority, investment in the formation of children and the bonds of affection with them.

Where these children will learn to manage time, list priorities, that is, "thus, a large part of writing practices can contribute to the constitution of a specific relationship with time in learning the ability to extend (their desires, their impulses) and to plan" (Lahire, 1997, p. 22).

Economic conditions are also important, however, for Lahire they do not define school "success" or "failure", as there are examples of children from the lower classes who achieve school "success", that is, "[...] immediate, conjunctural economic conditions do not mechanically determine economic behavior or economic dispositions." (Lahire, 1997, p. 24).

This leads us to understand that economic conditions are extremely necessary, but that they are not conditioning, for Lahire (1997), the conditions, both material and economic, without intellectual understanding, without management will not mean much.

The same capital, the same economic situation can be treated, managed in different ways, and these ways are as much the product of the family socialization of origin and of school and professional trajectories, as well as of the present economic situation (Lahire, 1997, p. 24-25).

Another point highlighted by Lahire (1997) is the importance of a family configuration that understands the development processes of the child, the young people, as well as the importance of the school for such an attempt to be effective. But a stability that guarantees support, companionship, trust, cognitive stimulation. An environment in which the child understands the "difficulties", but is encouraged to seek his autonomy, is held accountable for his actions; where morals and ethics prevail over the financial aspect.

The school and the family must consider the specificities of each child, evaluating their levels of involvement, development, behavior and appropriation of knowledge. Several situations need to be taken into account, such as adequacy problems, grade-age distortion, cognitive delays, language difficulties; All these factors contribute to the challenges within the classroom. Thus, a dilemma arises for the teacher: without truly knowing the origins and context of the students, they are expected to have a culture that they do not have, appropriate behaviors, alien to their environment, in addition to attention and concentration that are difficult to sustain. Many of these actions end up being justified only by the need to comply with the curriculum, pedagogical proposals, guidelines and school regulations.

At that moment, things go downhill and the war begins. Families are summoned, but do not attend; Warnings become routine, without success, transfer is sometimes required. The student is constantly in coordination and the most intriguing thing is that no one pays attention to the fact that an eight, nine, ten year old child has to take responsibility alone, for his school tasks, for forgetting the book, the parents' note signing, and so on. The child buys a fight that is not only theirs! And that, in the construction of this triad, school, family and child, the latter is the greatest victim.

Analyzing what Lahire (1997) brings about the ways of structuring the child's behavior and personality, which reverberates in the primary point of his existence: the family. The author points out the following structures: "the family forms of written culture", "economic conditions and dispositions", "the domestic moral order", the forms of family authority", "family forms of pedagogical investment"; They are, according to the author, some of the structures that, in a certain way, "dictate" the child's behavior in the social environment, more specifically, the school. In the face of these structures, he will bring and expose an analysis that may or may not refer to school success or failure.

There is a veiled dispute between school and family, since the school is governed by rules and disciplines, and the family does not always accept and understand or even give credit to the school, justifying the persistent "lack of time". For Lahire (1997), the exercise of authority is not part of the child's script at home and does not realize, through the family script itself, that at school, the script is different. This explains the emergence of the stigmas of undisciplined, messy, disinterested, among others. From another angle, there are families that, precisely because they do not have enough cultural and social capital to designate good performance, use the tactic of moral and servile conduct. The child cannot question, he has to be silent, obey and be docile. In the same way, it is the family's relations with the school,

they are present, they accept all considerations, complaints, perhaps it is precisely because they are not able to provide adequate cognitive support to their children.

Also according to the author, attention is paid to the need to glimpse what the child is being exposed to; either he experiences the tension between the same family and school organization regimes, or he is faced with these totally contrary regimes without being able to internalize these actions; The child does not see himself as belonging to this new world of rules, of power, of submission.

To attest to the relevance of the environments in which the children are inserted, Lahire (1997) brings a series of interviews, where the author made an effort, in its construction, to sociologically organize a single construction of the object, making its observation go against the social realities, with regard to the particularity of each family.

In reality, our way of proceeding has not neglected the uniqueness of each situation, but above all it has not been content with making pure ideological descriptions, without comparisons, which betray the absence of a clearly defined interpretative orientation (Lahire, 1997, p. 71).

In the first profile presented by Lahire (1997), it is noted that it is a family that left their country of origin, Comoros Islands – Africa, bound for France, in this family, composed of 5 children, the children's father attended normal school for 3 years and the mother attended for 4 years. Regarding the language (language), the father speaks the Comorian language correctly and expresses himself, both in reading and speaking, with a certain difficulty in French, while the mother knows how to read Arabic (not understanding many times) – at the time of the interview, the mother was attending a literacy course.

In the field of children's education, parents act with control, both moral and ethical control, that is, when it comes to school, parents are not strict. "However, he said that he does not take any special action when he finds that the grades are not good." (Lahire, 1997, p. 84).

In this scenario, the children do not receive support from their parents in matters related to school matters, even stating that they do not know if the children have done their homework, however, this omission comes from the justification of the fear of helping "badly", so this task is delegated to the uncle.

The father's school investment is, therefore, very weak. Although he is aware that the school and especially the diploma (which he does not have) are important for having

a good profession in France, his effective practices indicate more of an overall moral concern than a specifically school concern. (Lahire, 1997, p. 85).

The second profile, Lahire (1997), will bring an example of school "success" in the lower classes. The parents are originally from Algeria, where both the father and mother never attended school. However, the father, even without qualifications, has been working for 16 years in an electricity company, "I manage to do so, but I am not qualified" (Lahire, 1997, p. 165). Her mother, on the other hand, arrived in France in 1980 and never worked, only after a while did her mother start doing some cleaning.

Through a family, with a history of school "failure", her daughter finds herself on the spectrum of school "success", where her school performance has remained constant, even getting high grades in the final exams.

Salima's case meets all the objective conditions for a probable school "failure". In fact, his father, an unskilled electrician, and his mother, a part-time cleaner, did not go to school. His mother is illiterate, and his father reads a little French, but hardly writes. And yet, Salima has never repeated grades, is "succeeding" in 2nd grade, and has maintained good school performance throughout the year. Even in this case, it will be the combination of characteristics of the family configuration that will allow us to understand his "success" at school. (Lahire, 1997, p. 165).

Lahire (1997) emphasizes that, in this case, school "success" did not occur through reading practices, because the father reads very little and the mother does not know how to read, in addition to not having reading practices, there are no writing practices, the family environment is contextualized by radio and/or television; However, "understanding domestic writing practices also does not open the way for us to understand what happens in the family." (Lahire, 1997, p. 166).

In the school field, the father cannot say in which classes the children are, but this does not mean that the father is not interested in the education of the children. For the father, the school is treated as something of extreme importance. The father only goes to see the teacher when he is needed, however, he has never seen his daughter's teacher, Salina, he is also rarely seen in meetings.

However, in this family, the father is very active in the education of his children, in relation to the first family mentioned. When it's vacation time, the father makes a point of buying exercise books, taking them to the library, even buying storybooks. Even though he does not know how to write, the father "forces" all his children to write. "I force the children to

write important things on the calendar, but I don't. I don't know, when there's an excursion with the school, things like that I say: 'you need to write it down before that...' (Lahire, 1997, p. 169).

Lahire (1997) states that, for this family, the father's authority is exercised not based on physical violence, but on the apprehension of his words by the children, that is, when the children bring low grades, the father does not use physical violence, but dialogue. Mutual respect, the organization of the family, the authority of the father, the routine built is for the development of the child and reinforces his success at school and how the child sees him.

Despite the number of respondents in the survey - 26 families - , Lahire (1997), we will not point out all of them. Somehow, the portrayal of the two in the previous paragraphs does not differ from the others. Most are immigrants, illiterate. Without great prospects, they transfer it to their children. What we have are children who cannot detach themselves from the family structure and take this to school. It repeats the patterns, the discourses, the failure of the parents, assimilates and replicates the difficulties, the lack of reading and writing practice, the little relevance delegated to the school. A large part of the parents interviewed do not know the teachers, do not go to meetings; they are limited to punishment, or rest from school activities. Either because they are unable to help, or because they believe that it is the school that should be responsible for these activities or because they do not have the necessary control over their children.

In families where children "fail", similar discourses, postures and organization that prioritizes other situations in the child's context are noted, relegating the school to the background. They do not assimilate that the family, regardless of its social or economic position, can give the child different expectations. Not that it doesn't happen. But it remains only in the field of conjectures: "study so as not to be like us", "study to have a good job". The actions go against the grain because they do not pay attention or do not have the cultural capital to understand the implication of this in the academic life of their children. It is enough to attend school.

Families that dialogue, example, encouragement and commitment to accompany the development of children, they are more successful. Even with similar financial conditions, parents strive to maintain the organization of the house, reading, writing and their children's schedules. And these obey spontaneously, grow up in the home where authority is respected, limits are understood and responsibility is positively scored. The school is still seen as an "opportunity" to improve economic and social conditions; But there is a pact between the

family and the school, there is dialogue and the child feels he belongs to the school environment. This confers an appropriation of knowledge, rules, norms, which does not differ from what is customary to it.

4 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Analyzing the foundations of the aforementioned authors in a more forceful way, a consensus can be reached: understanding education requires study, understanding, analysis, evaluation and criticality. It is also understood that no matter how much society evolves, it always comes up against economic factors that hinder the development and emancipation of individuals, and these come up against cultural capital, cultural heritage and social capital. Now, if over the years laws have been created to guarantee the rights of individuals, if education is for everyone and as such should be egalitarian, why does society still carry the unpleasantness of a rejected history of individuals who live on the margins of it?

It is then understood that school culture should be one of the instruments to provide its "conductors" with a primary emancipation, so that they could walk emancipating their subjects and, consequently, society. But that in the bias of this school culture that advocates the dictates of a dominant class, there is a family structure that will contradict and confront this culture. These are not fallacies, since it has been proven that even fighting hard against the system, children from an underprivileged social class of all "cultures" succeed. And that the role that the family has in providing them with a family organization supported much more than the financial, cultural and social capital of these children is also wide open.

In a tangle of questions that seem to be clarified, it is irrefutable, through corroborating statistics, that the students who reach higher education are infinitely greater than those who do not have them. Even the financial investments for education. However, there are elements that also prove that the family is indispensable, regardless of its "capital", for the success of children; She is able to establish bonds of order, affection, dialogue, understanding, organization and partnership with the school, listing significant and lasting principles for the children's school career.

In the situations presented in a forceful way, where families, policies, actions, guidelines, pedagogical practices, cultural heritage, social and financial capital are instituted to ensure equality, these seem to get lost in human capital, which fails, even involuntarily, to

allow individuals not only to ignore how capitalism directly infers their lives, but to keep them excluded from this understanding.

There is, therefore, no one to blame for school success or failure. They are a set of factors; the complexity that exists between society, family, public policies and school and how they are articulated to break the current paradigms and contribute to overcoming inequalities and not simply measuring the child through their cultural heritage, their family environment, economic or even their grades.

It is thus considered that it is necessary to change social conditions, educational policies so that there is a new education system, however, this seems contradictory: a new education system is necessary to modify the realities of the education system that guides the realities that regulate the formation of the subjects.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W. (1995). *Educação e emancipação* (W. L. Maar, Trans.). Paz e Terra.
- Bourdieu, P. (2014). *Escrito de educação* (M. A. Nogueira & A. Catani, Eds., 15th ed.). Vozes.
- Costa Neto, A. da. (2003). *Paradigmas em educação no novo milênio* (2nd ed.). Kelps.
- Gadotti, M. (2003). *Educação e poder: Introdução à pedagogia do conflito* (13th ed.). Cortez.
- Gadotti, M. (2009). *Educação integral no Brasil: Inovações em processo*. Editora e Livraria Instituto Paulo Freire.
- Julia, D. (2001). A cultura escolar como objeto histórico. *Revista Brasileira de História da Educação*, (1), 9–43.
- Kant, I. (1985). *Textos seletos*. Vozes.
- Lahire, B. (1997). *Sucesso escolar nos meios populares: As razões do improvável* (R. A. Vasques & S. Goldfeder, Trans.). Ática.
- Laval, C. (2019). *A escola não é uma empresa: O neoliberalismo em ataque ao ensino público*. Boitempo.
- Saviani, D. (2015). *História do tempo e tempo da história: Estudos de historiografia da educação*. Autores Associados.