RESEARCH ARTICLE

Qian Min-hui

The study on the core concepts of contemporary sociology of education and its theoretical construction

Abstract　Within the sphere of contemporary social sciences, the terms "modernity," "post-modernity" and "globalization" have penetrated, as the core concepts, into various fields of social sciences in a logical way. In constituting the concept of "modernity," sociology of education develops the educational theory, as sociological theory does, into a "grand narrative" and "foundationalist" theory; the contribution of post-modernity is pluralism and self-examination in an attempt to transcend modernity. Globalization, a kind of expanded modernity, makes education sociologists broaden their perspective from single and traditional "nationality," "society" and "nation" to an international society and even to the global society, which has broken through the research paradigm of modernity with ethnocentrism, anthropocentrism and Euro-centrism. These changes have required urgent constitution of the conceptions and theoretical frameworks of sociology of education to be applied on a global level.

Keywords　sociology of education, core concept, modernity, post-modernity, globalization

Qian Min-hui(✉)
Department of Sociology, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China
E-mail: qianmh@sachina.pku.edu.cn

Introduction

Modernity has not been fully discussed in the field of sociology of education. However, the founders of this discipline focused on modernity and constructed various theoretical systems, like what has happened in sociology. It is decided by the fact that sociology of education is a sub-field of social sciences, and that it studies the educational institutions and people in modern society. Although the theory of sociology of education is as complicated as sociological theory, grasping the core concepts can be the logical starting point and the common thread of development shared by various theories. This paper intends to discuss how sociology of education constructs its theories and puts the theories into practice around modernity, and hopes to find out the causes of the reconstruction of sociology of education theories in the ideology of post-modernity. Finally, it explores the new perspective and trends of sociology of education theory in terms of globalization.

Modernity: core concepts and the logical starting point of the theoretical frameworks in sociology of education

Why is modernity regarded as the core concept and the logical starting point of the theoretical frameworks in sociology of education? We discuss this issue by analyzing the arrival of modernity, which is the origin of sociology.[1] According to its history, sociology as an independent discipline appeared along with modernity. The object of sociological research is the outcome of modernity, and at the same time, sociology aims at explaining and interpreting modernity and its consequences. Specifically, the birth of sociology, which is significant for exploring the transformation from pre-modern society to modern society and its consequences, is also the immediate result of the rising of the nation-state, the appearance of modernity, the consequences of the industrial revolution, the great changes brought about by the social structures, the growth of modernity and the consistent division of scientific knowledge (Giddens 2003). B. Smart, a

---

[1] Main subjects of modernity are "science," "rationality," "democracy," "advancement," "development," and so on. When sociology was founded, one of its founders Auguste Comte, had obvious intention to make it like physics, that is to say, to research society by the methodology adopted in physics. He gave sociology the top position in his construction of the structure of sciences. As for the substantial content of Comte's research, social statics and social dynamics are two of his perspectives. Another founder of sociology, Emile Durkheim, made a clear distinction between traditional society and modern society and pointed out that traditional society is held together by mechanical solidarity while modern society is characterized by organic solidarity. Both Marx K. and Weber M. started their theoretical exploration from modern society and both were interested in "democracy and rationality," "the motive force for development and advancement," based on which they did research and constructed theories that had influenced their descendants deeply. Therefore, it is reasonable to say that sociology originated in modernity.

British scholar, gave his explanation in more details, "the specification of the field of sociological research, the construction of the key themes and certain development of methodology, are all for explaining both the phenomena in the modern society systematically and the social techniques. Such technique exists not only for the established rules or dominance in contemporary social life but also exerts certain 'reasonable' influence on them. It is based on these terms and hypotheses that sociology has its position in the hierarchy of modern affairs and in 'the project of modernity.'" It is just like what the French sociologist R. Aron said, "Sociology can be explained as a kind of consciousness of modernization" (Giddens 2003). In other words, this consciousness is the central theme of sociological research—modernity.

Being a sub-discipline of sociology, sociology of education shares a basic rule with sociology. Thus, educational phenomena cannot be regarded as an individual action but a social phenomenon or even a social being. The research field of sociology of education belongs to sociology instead of pedagogy. That is to say, the core concepts of sociology of education in modern times should reflect modern social phenomena. Then, what are modern social phenomena? First of all, modern society originated in the modernization movement. [2] According to Giddens, "So-called modern society refers to the social life or the way the society was organized which first came into existence in Europe at the turn of the 15th and 16th century and later influenced the whole world" (Dodd 2002). It can be inferred that modern social phenomena are what happens to modern social life and social organizations. Education is a part of modern social organization and the modernization of education is the result of modernization movement. Various education phenomena in the modernization process are reflections of social phenomena. Therefore, sociology of education should not only deal with the relationship between modernity of education and modern society, but also the connection between modernity of education and rationality. As a result, sociological theorists in sociology of education should be responsible for the exploration of these relationships.

As for the relationship between modernity and modern society, Marx and

---

[2] Two concepts, modernity and modernization, are involved. According to some scholars, they should be distinguished. Modernity is different from modernization. The anthropologist Manning Nash, focusing on the research of minority nationality, country, preindustrial society and industrial society, is the first one who distinguished the two concepts. He regarded modernity as a social and mental structure that promotes the application of science in production. "Modernization" is a process in which society, culture and individual acquire tested knowledge, respectively, and apply it to daily life. According to contemporary scholars, modernity means a set of characteristics of social organization and corresponding ideology, while modernization is a kind of movement, something people ask for with will, and a kind of mobilization. Whatever social force it relies on, it is, in the end, the nation that mobilizes it. Refer to Touraine, Atain (2000). "Modernity and cultural peculiarity," in Social Sciences in China Press (中国社会科学杂志社) (ed.) *Social Transformation: Society of Multi-culture and Multi-nationality* (社会转型：多文化与多民族社会). Social Sciences Academic Press, 1–25. (Original work published 1990)

Durkheim examined the tension between social integration and function differentiation brought about by economic development. Marx found the contradictory relationship and put his analysis within his historical dialectics theory. Unlike Marx, Durkheim believed that the relation between society and its function is close, which is based on his distinctions between the solidarity in traditional society and that in modern society. Methodologically, Durkheim's theory of modern society examined the relation of all parts of society; namely, their mutual influences and their contributions to the development to society as a whole. Obviously, this explanation has a touch of functional analysis, which provides methodological illumination for functionalism and later becomes the foundation of functionalism's rising to mainstream sociology. However, for Marx, the key to his criticism on modern society was the concept of class, and he believed that the struggle between classes defined modern society, which was not the syndrome of ill adjustment but was historically inevitable. Marx used conflict as the thread of his sociological methodology. For example, he believed that social transformation and rearrangement of wealth relations were necessary for resolving the structural contradiction of society. This idea later became the theoretical foundation of conflict theory, which has powerfully revealed and criticized the problems and the unreasonable side of capitalism and has made Marxism and neo-Marxism the most influential theoretical currents in sociology after functionalism.

Early theories in sociology of education are mostly based on the aforementioned ideas perpetuated by the two sociologists. Durkheim, the first one who put education in the "the project of modernity," defined the purpose and content of education based on the relationship between modernity and modern society, which has led to succeeding sociologists of education to become incapacitated in avoiding this functional way of analysis when dealing with modernity and modern education. For example, the American sociologist Parsons' analysis of modern school system and the structure and function of class was a specified analysis and application of Durkheim's idea of the socialization function of education, and Parsons added the selective function of education and the role that teachers play. The theory of technical functionalism of education explores the relationship between the change of vocation structure and education in modern society, which emphasizes the modernity of education and important functions of education in modern society; The British sociologist of education B. Bernstein and some others adopted Durkheim's concepts such as "organic solidarity" when analyzing modern educational organizations. As for Marx, his perspective of class struggle when dealing with modern social institutions revealed the nature of education in capitalist society—that

education was the tool of the dominant classes; and that this perspective has provided the conflict theory in sociology of education with theoretical basis and foundation in reality. "Reproduction theory," "resistance theory," "theory of relative independence and will," and "cultural capital theory" and so on have strong echoes of Marxism.[3]

As for the relationship between modernity and rationality, Simmel and Weber's works were of great significance, in which the influence that instrumental rationality exerts upon modern culture was discussed. Simmel treated the characteristics of rationality from the psychological point of view, who believed that as human beings, the difference between other creatures and us was that we had the capability of pursuing goals in a conscious and tactful way. As one of the results, diploma, the most ordinary representative of rational and willful action, is merely a symbolic tool like money which has indispensable applicability. For example, for a long time, Americans held a belief that education is a reliable way to achieve economic success and resolve social problems. In the American way of life, one deep-rooted opinion is the access to education and the insistence of local community's control over education. The problem of education is entangled with that of poverty, ethnic relations and economy in both the city and the countryside. Therefore, in American society, the increasing amount of diploma's given out is the result of the increase of rational ideas and actions. For Weber, rationality is the basic element for analyzing human action, so he puts forward four kinds of social actions (Waters 2000).

Simmel and Weber's theoretical interpretation of modernity and rationality has had great influence on the hermeneutics school of sociology. Symbolic

---

[3] The main representative figures of the reproduction theory of education are American sociologists S. Bowles and H. Gintis, whose ideas are collected in the book *School Education in Capitalist America*. Their main point and belief is that education in the United States plays the role of maintaining capitalism or reproducing it, which is one of the social institutions that keeps or strengthens current social and economic order. Therefore, education cannot be a revolutionary force for more equity and social justice. In this regard, it is similar with the state and government. The leading exponents of resistance theory and the theory of relative independence and will are American sociologists M. Apple, H. Giroux and P. Willis. Apple's main idea is that reproduction theory does not really analyze what is happening inside school. As a matter of fact, students only partly accept, if they do, the formal and hidden courses, which they even openly resist. School is a "field" of resistance, conflict and struggle. Giroux also emphasizes the touch of voluntarism of the resistance theory, and believes that the reproduction theory despises the importance of the freedom of human beings and self-determination, and that students in school are not completely governed by the broad economic and social institution, which have relative freedom and may resist collectively. Willis, whose theory originates from the ethnological research, directly gives the idea of counter-school culture, and he believes that students with the strongest will of resistance are those from the family of workers. Their parents pass them a culture of resistance successfully, which enables them to enter the "culture of factory-floor" when they struggle with the school authority. The main representative figure of cultural capital theory is P. Bourdieu, who advocates that in modern society, social stratification is so complicated that every class has their own cultural capital and taste. Children from the family of the dominant class in society, having already acquired a culture similar with the culture of the school they will be educated in, have more choices of what kind of education they receive and have more advantages to choose the academic life. Refer to Barry, Hunt (Li, Jin-xu (李锦旭), trans.) (1993). *The Theory of Sociology of Education* (教育社会学理论). Taiwan: Laurel Book Company. (Original work published 1985)

interaction mainly benefits from Simmel's "formal sociology," while it is Weber's action theory that has influenced phenomenology more. Among the theory in the field of sociology of education, Weber's action theory is still the main theory for the research of modern educational phenomena, especially in some macro and micro research, including the change of modern educational organization and institution, the diploma society and interpersonal interaction in class activities.

Weberian ideas belongs to the hermeneutics school of thought. It cares about both macro and micro processes in society. It intends to explain individual human action and to understand its subjective meaning. In order to obtain real understanding, individual action should be put in its social environment, because every action is taken in certain social and economic circumstance, while in another circumstance, the action may not able to be authentically understood. It is Collins's "diploma society" theory in sociology of education that inherits the Weberian way of analysis. As Weber has mentioned, the meaning of the devaluation of the diploma cannot be understood in a country that lacks universities, because the university reflects a modern social institution, while in traditional society no modern universities can be founded. Modernity distinguishes the modern from the traditional, the advanced from the backward, the developed from the underdeveloped and the civilized from the barbarian. In other words, modernity split from tradition, which can be found in the split of institution, idea, life, technology, culture and education (Wang 2005). A globally widespread view is that the poor and undeveloped countries first experienced this split, and after they adopted the educational system of western modernity, they could develop fast. Therefore, schools, colleges and universities are regarded as the most important sections of modernity. In fact, after the 1960s, many developing countries in Africa and in other parts of the third world have tried their best to develop modern education while modern universities, the offspring of modernity, expands consistently, which according to Weber, must go together with the disenchantment[4] of culture, the intellectualization and rationalization of daily life. Now, to judge whether a nation or a country is modernized or not, the population that has received higher education is regarded as one of the most important indicators.

Here, we went back to the key theme of sociology of education and the logical starting point of the theoretical construction. It seems that the conclusion can be made from two points. On the one hand, the theoretical

---

[4] "Disenchantment" can be defined as the disappearance of the illusory thought and practice. This process not only suggests the decline of religious belief, but also indicates the rationalization of religious activities. Disenchantment of the world has the traditional worldview divided into a specialized field treated with different kinds of knowledge, especially in the field of science, ethics and art, which have become the exclusive domain in modern universities.

orientation of sociology of education originates in the modernity project, because educational organization can best reflect the attributes and characteristics of modern social institution[5]. In modern society, the motivational force of the change in education is mostly the modernization movement and the need of modernity. On the other hand, the content and fact that the sociology of education treats are modern educational system, interpersonal interaction among individuals with consciousness of modernity, how classes embody modernity, and how a person is "torn up" and socialized into a modern individual when he or she receives education in schools. Therefore, it can be argued that modernity is the logical starting point of the theoretical construction in sociology of education, and it is around modernity that the future research themes are built. Modernity is expanding globally[6]. In the recent years, modernity has been challenged by post-modernity, which mainly originates from the complete crisis that western education faced from the 1960s to 1970s when education as an embodiment of modernity did not promote, but rather inhibited, the development of human beings; education did not reduce, but rather reproduced, inequity between people; education did not advance the economic development but made some countries and individuals suffer, which could be found in African countries and other developing countries; education investment reached a peak but still could not satisfy the demands, and so on. Education receives criticism from all parts of society. Reflection has to be made on modern educational system, which is a part of the capitalist institution. Crisis in education shows crisis of capitalist society. In this situation, the theories constructed in sociology of education are collapsing and are being questioned, which claims the coming of the epoch while "post"-modern theory in sociology of education is to be established.

---

[5] That education reflects the need and attribute of modern society has been explained by "technology-function theory of education," which can be generalized into the following facets: (1) In modern society, the technological content of a vocation increases with the revolution and advance of technology. Especially in society with knowledge-based economy, jobs involving high technology are replacing the traditional vocations with general technology, and the ones requiring no technology are becoming fewer. (2) Formal education, especially vocational education and higher education, plays an irreplaceable role in promoting training in skill and capability, especially in terms of the provision of corresponding certification of qualification and education. (3) More and more people have to extend the duration of their education to meet the requirement of a diploma and educational degree as required by the labor market. Refer to Zhang Ren-jie (张人杰) (ed.) (1991). *Basic Select Readings of Foreign Sociology of Education* (国外教育社会学基本文选). Shanghai: East China Normal University Press, 45.

[6] According to Giddens, modernity is composed by three interactive motivational forces: separation of time and space, the development of the mechanism of disembedding and the application of the reflexivity of knowledge, and these forces, consolidating and shaping the world, are slowly increasing and disseminating.

Post-modernity: reflection and reconstruction of the key themes in sociology of education

In the past ten years, modernity has been questioned by some theorists, and a new concept of counter-rational logic—post-modernity—has received more attention from academic circles. Some scholars try to explain that we have passed the modern period and entered a period of "after modernity," and others believe that "post-modernity" symbolizes a dynamic process involving many fields, not only aesthetics or architecture, but also sociology, economics, education, science and technology and philosophy, and so on [7]. "Post-modernity" advocates a new world view, which supports innovation and revolution, emphasizes openness and diversity, admits and tolerates differences, and opposes explaining and dominating the world with a single and fixed logic, formula, principles and a universal rules. "Post-modernity" breaks the "Three Myths[8]" and makes the commonly accepted centers disappear. Post-modern discourse such as openness, polysemy, uncertainty, possibility, unpredictability replaces modern discourse such as generality, universality and unity. Also, some scholars believe that post-modernity is a historical period in which radical pluralism has become a widespread basic idea, and in which the basic experiences consist of completely different forms of knowledge, and where the design of life, the indispensable right of thinking and doing, and real criticism can be found (Welsch 1999).

According to Zygmunt Bauman, the modern social theories are composed of concepts and metaphors, which are not suitable for post-modern conditions. Simply because post-modern social theories add "the semantic scope of sociological concepts" to the hypothesis of the form and rule of social interaction in modern society, the primary task of the theories is to build a completely new semantic scope.

All in all, post-modernity is an emerging way of representing society, which suggests a change of stage related to modernity. However, scholars have different views on it. The British sociologist Giddens believed that post-modernity was nothing but an extension of modernity, and modernity in a "radical" form or a "super" form (Robertson 2000). Similar to this idea,

---

[7] Although many statements are involved so far as post-modernity is concerned, all these have something intrinsic in common: such as anti-foundationalism, anti-essentialism, uncertainty, doubt about scientific reason, and the deconstruction of generality and unity. In the context of post-modernity, science is not an objective knowledge, but rather a subjective and relative one; it can offer no trans-historical, external and universal rules, but rather partial, special and historical explanation. This idea has attacked the central position of science and has given rise to epistemological revolution.
[8] Three myths were created in history: the emancipation of human nature created by Enlightenment, mental teleology by idealism and the interpretation of meaning by historicism. Post-modernity attacks and deconstructs these myths, which not only counters modernity, but also provides chances for various civilizations to participate in globalization.

another statement is that "postmodernity is not a stage after modernity, it is not a remedy to modernity—it is modern itself. More exactly, post-modern perspectives may best be described as the self-reflection of modern consciousness" (Heller 2005). These views imply that post-modernity, as a matter of fact, is not a deconstruction of modernity. Dialogues about post-modernity can be regarded as a sign of transformation occurring in the interior of modernity, because the so-called "brand new" semantic systems offered by post-modernity are built on the basis of the opposite side of modernity, and the systems are especially concerned with the following concepts: rationality, truth, subjectivity and advancement. But there are different opinions, for example, S. Lash, in order to test the differences between post-modernity and modernity, pointed out in his *Sociology of Postmodernism* that "Postmodern sociology in a sense is not a general idea of culture, rather, it is composed of three relating subjects: First, cultural changes, modernity is a process in which culture is differentiated, while post-modernity is a process in which contra-differentiation of culture occurs; Second, cultural patterns, the form of culture in modernity is discourse, which in post-modernity is icon; Third, social stratification, the producers and corresponding spectators and postmodern culture can be found in the decline and avalanche of social classes and their composite parts."(Xie 2004)

   In the field of education, the theoretic debate between modernity and post-modernity is also fierce. Universal knowledge, which is communicated through education, is facing serious challenges, and modern educational institutions, convention, rules of course and of knowledge and cultural preferences are also being questioned. The reason given by the post-modern theorists is that modernity always pays attention to intellectual and epistemological activities, but not actual daily life. According to post-modernity, one of the main tasks of education is to teach people how to live with the world in their daily life, instead of how to change the world into the one we conceive. Therefore, a teacher in post-modern society does not enter the classroom as an authority of knowledge or let the students acquire eternal objective truth by textbooks or texts, nor does he make the students influenced by logic-centered modernity, that is, being serious about social ranking, arrogance, bigotry, contention prone, and having a style of their own. Rather, the teacher should enable his students to care about relevance, ecology and conversation, be modest and mysterious, and hold a firm belief that beyond the surface of a matter is an in-depth structure, which should be researched in order to get an authentic understanding of the fact (Smith 2000). Students should feel and realize that the cultural heritage they inherit is one among the many heritages inherited by human beings; any heritage is not merely an accumulation of knowledge or values, but a way of

configuring the world developed in the process of history. The contents of courses, therefore, should not be cumulative knowledge or store of values, but structuralized encounters. The purpose of education is to let the students experience various ways of configuring the world themselves, so that they can realize the limits of their horizons and broaden their views.

Believers of post-modernism, when reflecting on education of modernity, are striving to construct a kind of post-modern education—critical education, and to rebuild the relationship between education and politics, which is related to democratic movement and social revolution. According to their claims, post-modern education can be best called politics of education (Giroux 1997).

Radical politics of education depict a picture in which one can find individual freedom advocated by liberalists, peculiarity noticed by post-modernity, emphasis on everyday politics by feminists and historical recall of unity and public life by democratic socialists. According to the statements of post-modernity, we are living in an age when civic responsibility is cross-national and the old ideas of modernity about center and frontier, family and exile, familiar and foreign are collapsing. Geographical, cultural and ethical boundaries are replaced by power, community, space and time. Franchise can not only be the discourse of euro-centrism and colonialism, but new space, relation and identity have to be produced so that people can get across the boundary and see something different, which is later made into the public and democratic discourse. Intellectuals should walk out of their study and classrooms, and ensure that their work is related to broader social issues that may help in the construction of a democratic social order.

Here are the propositions about the post-modernist educational practice: it is based on various cultural backgrounds, partial and special knowledge and all kinds of desires; it emphasizes the experience of study as an interior part of one's "life style," and it intends to construct a new way of education, so that learners from different cultural backgrounds can enjoy education in various ways as best as they can. This kind of practice directly causes decentralization and blur of boundaries of modernist education, which can be found in two aspects. On the one hand, the formal composite parts of modernist education can no longer claim their exclusive possession of the values of education, because any activity in any cultural background can declare its ownership of that value; on the other hand, education is no longer understood in a narrow sense; rather, it should be explained as one aspect of culture. An "educated" person is not only one who acquires diploma through a specific educational organization any more, rather, anyone, to some extent, is an educated person, which is different from a person with a diploma and a

degree, even in post-modern economy when diploma and degree may become more and more important (Lu 1997).

Based on the aforementioned reflection, criticism and statement of modernity given by the post-modernists, these scholars never withdraw their views from modernity. Therefore, the author agrees with the position that, we are experiencing post-modern modernity[9], as post-modernism offers a chance of reflecting and reexamining modernity. In post-modern conditions, although modernity is experiencing crisis, this crisis has a positive side in that it enforces the reflection on and the re-planning of modernity. This reflection involves all sociological sub-fields, and sociology of education, having accepted Boudieu's reflexive sociology, starts to understand itself with its own research tools and transforms every aspect of the world of education into the objects of research, which makes the theorists of sociology of education realize that the world of education is experiencing a process called "globalization." The fact that globalization has started is no longer questioned, but for education, the early globalization was a process in which the western way of education was transplanted, while the current globalization is different, which is a process of the integration of diversities, not transplantation but assimilation. For instance, English has become the language of the world; science, the commonly pursued aim; ethics, the collective responsibility, and an educated person is facing the world and labors are entering the world. In this case, post-modern educational theorists do not show interest in overthrowing modernity any more; rather, they start to focus on the global expansion of modernity. In other words, globalization has become the crucial key theme of their sociological analysis, which can be proved by the positions on globalization offered by the post-modernists such as Bauman and Mike Featherstone (Lyon 2004).

Globality: the extension of the core concept of sociology of education

If globalization cannot be avoided and globality is the expansion of modernity, what are the challenges that educational theory and system built on modernity are facing, and how should educational theory as the product of modernity be reconstructed, when facing the extended globality, are questions that require discussion.

---

[9] According to Bauman, sociology of post-modernity is the sociological continuance of sociology of modernity, for example, a way of giving rational and systematic discussion, and striving to develop a post-modern society is adopted to extend sociology of modernity. Refer to Ritzer, George (Yang, Shu-jiao (杨淑娇), trans.,) (2005). *Contemporary Sociological Theory and Its Classic Root* (当代社会学理论及其古典根源). Beijing: Peking University Press, 212. (Original Work published 2003)

For each society, globalization is the great motivational force of social change. Economic globalization brought about by the rapid increase of trade gives rise to the new rules of economic competition, and international economic competition relies more on the quality of education and training in a country. What globalization means to education and economic development can be regarded as the change of three rules: the rule of eligibility, the rule of management and the rule of making a fortune (Brown and Lauder 1997), which urges the adoptive change of educational institution and policies. For example, in order to reply to the new rules of economic competition and meet the challenges of globalization, the western society, when dealing with its interior economy and exterior affairs, has to adjust its policies of social organizations and human resources. The economic development of Japan and the "four Asian tigers" suggests that the human resources of an enterprise form a crucial element that cements its victory in global economic competition. Knowledge, information, competitive strength of research and technology have become new factors in international commerce. It is the quality of a country's education and training that decides its place in the international division of labor, its international status and its prosperity. As a matter of fact, countries are engaged in a battle for a knowledge-based economy.

Strategies adopted by every participant country, in the competition for knowledge, are different; accordingly, strategies used in education and training systems are different. But generally speaking, neo-Fordism and post-Fordism[10] have become the alternative patterns that every country has to adopt to deal with globalization because the central logic of contemporary globalization is the logic of the market, and it is almost impossible for a country to set up its own new rules of education and training and protect its labors from the strong impact of international competition. For that reason, The Organization of Economic Corporation and Development held two sessions of "Forum of The Trade in Educational Service" in 2002 and 2003, respectively in the United Stats and Norway. The main issues discussed in the forums were the main form and trend of cross-national education and the policies of the involved countries, the relationship between cross-national education and the trade in educational service, and the attestation of qualification and guarantee of quality of trans-national education, around

---

[10] The neo-Fordist strategies of economic development can be described as follows: producing greater flexibility of market by reducing the right of the labor union and cutting the management fees, promoting the construction of public facilities and the privatization of the welfare states, encouraging the culture of individual competition. Contrarily, post-Fordism is based on the customization of product and diversity of service. Countries such as Japan, Germany and Singapore adopt post-Fordism strategies, while Britain and the United States adopt neo-Fordism. Refer to Brown, Phillip and Lauder, Hugh (1997). "Education, globalization, and economic development," in Halsey, A. H. et al. (eds.) *Education: Culture, Economy and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, 172−192.

which the attendants discussed the internationalization of education, the policies, forms and the diverse trends of the trade in educational service (SRCED 2004).

It is impossible for scholars in sociology of education to disengage with the logic of market when pondering on the globalization of education, and to construct a global educational idea and institution requires long-term research. Scholars treat the same phenomenon with their own understandings and cultural backgrounds, so that different orientations can be found in their theoretical exploration on globalization. Thus, theories on globalization are diversified and multi-perspectives are involved, and the interpretation of globalization cannot be limited in the past single theory. In contemporary research of sociology of education, for all the theoretical and practical troubles, the theoretical statements of neo-Fordism and post-Fordism are limited to neither "functionism" nor the "conflict school," but relate to trans-disciplinary and cross-disciplinary research involving economics, politic sciences, education, managerial sciences, and so on, because the central main theme of sociology of education—modernity—has become a global issue, and shows a pluralistic trend. In this situation, like other social sciences, sociology of education is orienting toward a direction of combining the macro and the micro, and their close integration. Some interpretive approaches applying to globalization have been gradually developed out of the old theories, which we call the analysis framework of the "theories of sociology of education concerning globality."

In this new analysis framework, neo-institutionalism, without any doubt, opens a window for sociologists of education. In the last fifteen years, at least three different approaches have claimed neo-institutionalism: historical institutionalism, institutionalism of rational choice and sociological institutionalism. For the researchers in sociology of education, it is easier to accept sociological institutionalism, which has mainly the following three inspirations.

First, sociological institutionalists define institution in a broader sense than theorists of the functionism and conflict school, which includes not only formal rules, procedures and norms, but also symbolic systems, cognitive patterns and ethic plates within the same framework of the human action. This definition breaks the boundary between the concepts of educational institution and culture, while the two fields are inter-related; and this definition challenges theorists, who subscribe to functionism and conflict, that these theories should be used to explain institutions on the basis of the organizational structure while explaining culture on the basis of viewing it as shared attitudes and values. It is unreasonable to dissever the interaction between institution and culture, so that neo-institutionalists are inclined to

define culture itself as an institution. If this definition is accepted, during the reform of educational institution in the background of globalization, culture should be considered as an important institutional factor, that is to say, culture is not only attitudes or values relating to feelings but also norms, symbols or network of play as templates for the reformers of educational institution.

Second, the old sociological analysis of education treated the problem of the relation between institution and individual action by relating institution to "roles," namely, institution endows roles with norms of action that influence individual action. According to neo-institutionists, the way institution influences action is by offering cognitive template, category and pattern indispensable to action, which is not simply because one cannot explain the world of education and others' behavior without institution. Some institutionlists in sociology of education emphasize the frequent interaction between and isomorphism of institution and individual. When conducting his action according to the social conventions, an individual will naturally consider himself as a social actor, who participates in actions with social meaning attached to it and then reinforces the social and educational conventions that he is practicing.

Finally, the institutionalists in sociology of education adopt a unique way of explaining the origin and change of educational institution. When explaining the institutional origin of educational organizations, the institutionalists of sociology of education believe that the reason why an educational organization adopts a set of systems is not that it can increase the means–ends efficiency of the organization, but because it can enhance the validity of the organization or its participants. In other words, educational organizations, in the backdrop of globalization, adopt a certain kind of system or practice pattern (neo-Fordism or post-Fordism) for its greater value in a broader cultural background (international market of education) (Xue and Chen 2004).

In these new analysis frameworks, the second one is the network analysis advocated by Ulf Hannerz, which is a more systematic method for explaining the relationship among the societies in the world, and which accounts not only the framework of the meaning adopted by the actors, but also the action and the environment exerting influences on the action; in other words, this analysis cannot only make it clear how actors construct their identity through existent meaning, but also the nature of the reflective relation between actors and the outer world (including natural and societal one) is revealed. Network analysis treats the global ecumene as a network composed of many networks in which individuals and groups are involved in a more globalized world. For example, globalization of education is in

essence an integration that can be found in the increase in the number of global educational organizations, such as UNESCD, IBE, ILD, World Bank, WTO, SEPA, OECO, SEAMED and EEC, and so on. For this reason, the 19th century is described as "a century of international meetings," while the twentieth century is regarded as "a century of international organizations." These organizations are now playing a more important role cross-nationally and even cross-regionally, which causes increasing integration of countries, so that the function of the nation-states in the traditional sense is, to some extent, subject to erosion (Wu 2002).

The biggest advantage of this network analysis is that it grasps the openness of the relation between education and society and includes the relationship among economy, politics, culture, in a broader sense. However, its system prevents it from going deeper into some aspects; for example, it only regards place as the space for the flow of meaning but not as the possible background in which identity can be formed (Yang 2002), which weakens the effect of the place, and on the other hand, brings some problems to the actors' identification. In recent theoretical discussion of globalization, more scholars admit that globalization will be a phase in which unity and diversity, generality and peculiarity exist together. Especially in the field of education, the existence and development of local diversity is emphasized to a great extent, which is regarded as the characteristic of globalization of education. As some scholars pointed out, although the motivational force of capitalism, cross-national system and the appearance of new division of international labors are the composite parts of the trend of generalization, the very result is the complication rather than unification of the global world. To elaborate further, actors, when bounded by globalization—restricted by the international educational organizations—have clearer understanding of their own characteristics and develop their own view of the globe. In this situation, all special identity gets reinforced, which foretells that all diversities will coexist during globalization.

The third analysis among the new analysis frameworks is "the cultural capital theory in globalization" established by the idea propagated by Bourdieu. Bourdieu gave three forms of cultural capital: first, concrete forms, existing in spiritually or carnally lasting "disposition"; second, objective forms, namely, cultural products (such as pictures, books, dictionaries, tools and machines, etc.), which is the realization or objectification of theory; they can also be certain theories, criticism on some issues; third, institutional forms exist in objectification and should be treated in a distinctive way. According to Bourdieu, cultural capital is formed, transformed and expressed through habitus and field. Habitus is the mental and cognitive structure through which people deal with the world. A certain habitus in a

particular period is created in the collective history, while habitus in any individual comes from his personal experience, which is also the result of the particular social and historical moment during which time the habitus functions. Thus, it can be inferred that habitus itself is a kind of cultural capital; different nationalities and classes have different habitus, and when they understand and define the world, clear distinctions can be found. In order to understand better the effects of habitus, Bourdieu introduced the concept of field into his analysis. Field is a real social background and environment, namely, a network relation of the places of the objects. In this relation, various kinds of capitals (economic, cultural, social, symbolic), in order to battle and struggle for the protection and betterment of the current positions, are utilized and deployed. Field represents a "social arena in which people struggle for, seek and employ certain resources and interests," each field, by its definition, has "its position of dominance or subjection, struggles for usurping rights and excluding others, and mechanism of reproduction." In other words, a field must have the following features: existence of injustice; (unequal) competition; power relations; hindrance and restriction; privilege and affiliation (Xue and Cao 2005).

In the backdrop of globalization, Boudieu's concept of field has undoubtedly expanded, and the competition in the field of education has extended from that within certain groups, classes, nationalities and countries to that among nationalities, countries and international organizations, and has modernized globalization. For example, in western sociological research of education, the educational system is regarded as the field in which the dominant classes and the nation struggle and exert monopolization by symbolic violence mainly through educational system and school courses. The persons in power establish a set of arbitrary cultural norms and priorities, which overrides other cultural norms that they have perceived before, and induces the people in this cultural background to regard the culture they were originally in as inferior culture[11]. Globalization of education, whether in public statement or in its metaphorical sense, treats localized educational system and content of courses as a backward and undeveloped inferior culture, and if not brought into the globalization process of education, local education as inferior culture, like local economy, which is backward, will soon be eliminated. As an educated individual, only when one accepts global

---

[11] In fact, school education and the courses given have an orientation of nationalization or globalization, which seldom emphasizes the study of local community and local culture, although most students, as a matter of fact, live under the control of the regional frameworks. Local language is disappearing, local history and regional culture seldom receive the attention it deserves, which can be seen by the globalization of English language. Refer to Elizabeth, McEneaney, H., and John. W. Meyer (2004). "The content of courses: an institutionalist perspective," in Hallinan, Maureen T. (ed.) (Fu, Song-tao (傅松涛), trans.). *Handbook of Sociology of Education* (教育社会学手册). East China Normal University Press. (Original Work published 2000)

knowledge and skills can one make one's cultural capital to match the field of globalization. This kind of cultural capital will not only make the "quite suited students," when entering the educational system, believe in the value of the "favorable education," but also help them obtain success in the system in advance.

When the global cultural capital is reflected upon, although Boudieu's cultural capital and symbolic violence theory has sometimes been overly simplified, it suggests that Marxist economic theories have made a complicated but uniform transformation into the social and cultural field. As a matter of fact, cultural capitalism, the same as cultural capital, is not only an existence, it is made, disseminated and circulated, the form and content of which changes corresponding to the changes that take place in globalization. That is to say, globalization is reshaping "cultural capital" continuously, and cultural capitals are undergoing a reallocation that relies on globalization, the result of which is that in the capitalist society, differentiation occurs to the highly educated people, and the new nature of the power owned by the monopolists of knowledge is to be reestablished.

After Bourdieu, some scholars intended to develop theories that can surpass the cultural capital theory. However, more intellectuals, having considered the general trend of globalization of education, regard cultural capital as a theoretical perspective and an analyzing tool, and have explored and reconstructed the importance of the family-school relation, especially the importance of cultural capital for the parents' participation in education, and analyze the mutual concepts of habitus and field in the background of the global world, so that a new practice of education and culture may come out. To explore these fields will undoubtedly offer a rich context for the connection between the micro-level analysis and the macro-level one.[12] From this point of view, the cultural capital theory adopted by scholars is now exceeding the boundary that Bourdieu once defined and employed.

References

Brown, Phillip and Lauder, Hugh (1997). "Education, globalization, and economic development," in Halsey, A. H. et al. (eds.) *Education: Culture, Economy and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, 172−192.

Dodd, Nigel (Tao, Chuan-jin (陶传进), trans.) (2002). *Social Theory and Modernity* (社会理论与现代性). Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press, 3. (Original work published 1999)

---

[12] Refer to "Transcending cultural capital: toward a symbol-dominant theory", written by Bill Martin and Evan Szelényi and translated by Chen Gang; another article is "Class differentiation in family-school relations: on the importance of cultural capital", written by Annette Lareau and translated by Zhou Jun-hua, both of the pieces above are published in *Globalization and Cultural Capital*, 296−329, 367−400.

Giddens, Anthony (Wen, Jun (文军) and Zhao, Yong (赵勇), trans.) (2003). *Social Theory and Modern Sociology* (社会理论与现代社会学). Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press, 7; 1−2. (Original work published 2000)

Giroux, Henry (1997). "Crossing the boundaries of educational discourse: modernism, postmodernism, and feminism," in Halsey, A.H. et al. (eds.) *Education: Culture, Economy and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press, 113−130.

Heller, Agnes (Li Rui-hua (李瑞华), trans.) (2005). *Theory of Modernity* (现代性理论). Beijing: The Commercial Press, 13. (Original work published 1999)

Lu, You-quan (陆有铨) (1997). *A Century in Agitation—Educational History of 20th Century* (躁动的百年——20 世纪的教育历程). Jinan: Shandong Education Press, 168.

Lyon, David (Guo, Wei-gui (郭为桂), trans.) (2004). *Postmodernity* (后现代性). Changchun: Jilin People's Publishing House, 127;149. (Original work published 1999)

Robertson, Roland (Liang, Guang-yan (梁光严), trans.) (2000). *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture.* (全球化：社会理论与全球文化) Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 201. (Original work published 1992)

Smith, David Geoffrey (Guo, Yang-sheng (郭洋生), trans.) (2000). *Globalization and Postmodern Pedagogy.* (全球化与后现代教育学) Beijing: Education Science Publishing House, 148. (Original work published 1990)

The State Research Center of the Educational Development (SRCED) (2004). *Green Paper on Education in China in 2004—The Annul Report of the Educational Policies in China* (2004 中国教育绿皮书——中国教育政策年度分析报告). Beijing: Education Science Publishing House, 253−258.

Wang, Min-an (汪民安) (2005). *Modernity* (现代性). Guilin: Guangxi Normal University Press, 28.

Waters, Malcolm (Yang, Shan-hua (杨善华), trans.) (2000). *Modern Sociological Theory* (现代社会学理论). Beijing: Huaxia Publishing House, 21. (Original work published 1998)

Welsch, Wolfgang (Zhang, Guo-feng (章国锋), trans.) (1999). *Our Postmodern Modernity* (我们的后现代的现代性). Beijing: Social Science Academic Press, 41−49.

Wu, Zhi-hui (邬志辉) (2002). "Globalization of education: paradox and challenge" (教育全球化：悖论与挑战). *Journal of Northeast Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)* (东北师范大学学报) (哲学社会科学版) (1), 102.

Xie, Li-zhong (谢立中) and Ruan, Xin-bang (阮新邦) (2004). *Social Theories of Modernity and Postmodernity: Interpretation and Comments* (现代性、后现代性社会理论：诠释与评论). Beijing: Peking University Press, 450−451.

Xue, Xiao-yuan (薛晓源) and Cao, Rong-xiang (曹荣祥) (2005). *Globalization and Cultural Capital* (全球化与文化资本). Beijing: Social Science Academic Press, 280−281.

Xue, Xiao-yuan （薛晓源） and Chen, Jia-gang （陈家刚） (2004). *Globalization and Neo-institutionalism* (全球化与新制度主义). Beijing: Social Science Academic Press, 195−213.

Yang, Xue-dong (杨雪冬) (2002). *Globalization: The Frontier of Western Theory* (全球化：西方理论前沿). Beijing: Social Science Academic Press, 64−65.