The translation of cultural capital theory to English secondary schools: knuggets, wild words and pipelines

Sally Riordan

Published online: 12 Jul 2024.

Submit your article to this journal ⏎

View related articles ⏎

View Crossmark data ⏎

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

The translation of cultural capital theory to English secondary schools: knuggets, wild words and pipelines

Sally Riordan 🆔

Institute of Education, University College London, London, UK

ABSTRACT

Much cultural capital research has accumulated since its inception in the 1970s and researchers have charted the corresponding development of cultural capital theory in academic communities. This empirical study takes the further step of offering an account of cultural capital as it is interpreted in schools. This 'interventionalist account' is based on classifications of practices that had been explicitly implemented at 14 secondary schools in England in order to give students access to cultural capital. The collection of cultural capital practices was compiled from 38 interviews with senior leaders, teachers, and support staff. Practitioners justifiably believed these practices to be supported by research evidence. It was found, however, that a wide variety of cultural capital practices exist in schools today, with limited support from research evidence and theory. I discuss how the 'evidence pipeline' has broken down in this case and is sometimes an inappropriate metaphor for conceptualising research dissemination.

1. Introduction

In English-speaking, academic communities, 'cultural capital' is a concept that is most usually traced back to the publication of *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* in 1977, Richard Nice's translation of Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron's 1970 work *La Reproduction*. The French sociologists had used the term to expound their theory of how wealth and social status are transmitted across generations by mechanisms other than financial or genetic inheritance. In the following decades, Bourdieu expanded on the concept of cultural capital, most notably in *The forms of capital* (1986), *Distinction* (2010) and *The State Nobility* (1996). It has since been embraced and utilised by researchers in a multitude of ways and in different disciplinary contexts, including economics, health, and business studies (see, for example, Groeniger and colleagues' et al. (2020) exploration of its impact on obesity and Nissenbaum and Shifman (2015) examination of cultural capital as social media memes). Several commentators have attempted to chart the evolution and use of 'cultural capital' in academic communities, most especially its varied and changing use by English-speaking sociologists of education (Davies and Rizk 2018; Lareau and Weininger 2003). This current study takes the further step of investigating its migration into school settings.

In the 50 years since *La Reproduction*, the term 'cultural capital' has permeated educational discourses beyond academia. In England, it is referenced in school policies, websites, and handbooks to articulate school strategy and vision. In 2019, 'cultural capital' featured for the first time in the inspection framework for England's schools, in which it was used to describe the purpose of a good curriculum (Ofsted 2019a). The commonplace usage of the term 'cultural capital' in schools raises questions regarding how its use-in-practice relates to its academic origins, as well as the evidence and theoretical developments that have accumulated since. Recent studies have compared teachers' views with Ofsted's vision of cultural capital (Bates and Connolly 2023, 2024). This study expands on this work, looking more widely at the dissemination of cultural capital research into English secondary schools:

(RQ1)   How do school practitioners use 'cultural capital' (and how is its meaning revealed in practitioners' choice of school practices)?

(RQ2)   How do current uses of 'cultural capital' in schools correspond with academic accounts of cultural capital (most especially Bourdieu and Passeron's theory)?

(RQ3)   How do school practitioners perceive their use of 'cultural capital' to be related to research evidence?

This research draws from a textual analysis of interviews conducted with 38 school leaders, classroom teachers, and support staff at 14 secondary schools during the 2019-2020 school year. These interviews were part of a larger study exploring how schools support students facing socio-economic disadvantages. Further details of the research methods are provided in §3. To facilitate comparison between practitioners' and academics' use of 'cultural capital', an academic account is first presented and justified in §2. The study highlights diverse (and sometimes conflicting) interpretations of 'cultural capital' in schools, as well as disparities between academic and practitioner perspectives. The common assumptions underlying school practices are synthesised to formulate an 'interventionalist account' of cultural capital. Practitioners believe their practices to be strongly supported by research evidence, but the disparities between academic and practitioner accounts demonstrate this is not so. I do not argue that this undermines or devalues the interventionalist account. What I present here is an exploration of how the products of research (findings, evidence, and theory) come to be implemented in schools and the messy reality of putting research to use.

2. A theoretical framing of cultural capital

Suppose we understand cultural capital to be a personal and embodied resource that:

(1)   is inculcated (not necessarily consciously) in children (usually of pre-school age) by parents/carers of high social status; and

(2)   is recognised and rewarded (at least partially or sometimes arbitrarily) by educational and professional establishments; and thus

(3)   is a means by which families retain their high social status across generations (other than by direct inheritance of wealth or 'natural talent').

I refer to this as an 'academic account' of cultural capital. It is intended to be as far as possible faithful to Bourdieu and Passeron's original theory of social reproduction (1970)

as well as Bourdieu's later writings (most especially 1986, 1996 and 2010). This is challenging because it is widely acknowledged that these writings are ambiguous, even to the extent of hindering empirical research (Goldthorpe 2007; Jaeger and Breen 2016; Kingston 2001; Lamont and Lareau 1988). I clarify the position I have taken on some major debates of interpretation below, but the articulation also draws from a wider spectrum of interpretations, to enable comparison between academic and practitioner perspectives more generally. In the rest of this section, I justify and further articulate the choices I have made in formulating an academic account, as well as identifying points of significant variation in academics' use of 'cultural capital'. This results in a series of five points of comparison (P1 to P5), which were used in this study to explore the views of school practitioners.

P1: Cultural capital defined abstractly as a 'resource'. Academics have classified cultural capital in many ways, including as knowledge or familiarity with something (Breinholt and Jæger, 2020; Collin 2021; Gaddis 2013; Jaeger and Breen 2016), as skills or abilities (Edgerton, Roberts, and Peter 2013; Lareau 2011), and as dispositions, tastes, or traits (Davies and Rizk 2018; Dimaggio and Useem 1978). Even when arguing for a sharper definition of cultural capital, commentators have retained the use of all-encompassing terms such as 'cultural resources' or 'cultural values' (Goldthorpe 2007; Kingston 2001). In one of the earliest and most influential conceptual critiques, Lamont and Lareau argued for a narrower interpretation of cultural capital, but allowed for a multiplicity of kinds, namely 'attitudes, preferences, formal knowledge, behaviours, goods and credentials' (Lamont and Lareau 1988, 156). This all-encompassing approach has been largely followed since. Academics have assumed that cultural capital can manifest in many ways, defining it by reference to multiple genera without distinguishing any as primary, as exemplified by Chiu and Chow's, 'cultural resources, knowledge, skills, and values' (Chiu and Chow 2010, 580) and Friedman and Laurison's, 'educational credentials and the possession of legitimate knowledge, skills and tastes' (Friedman and Laurison 2019, 14). To express its multi-faceted nature, I define it inclusively, albeit abstractly, as a 'resource', mirroring Bourdieu and Passeron's original description as 'goods' (*bien*) (1990, 30). This is no more informative than the term being defined, and perhaps less so because it has fewer connotations than 'capital' (as argued by Goldthorpe 2007).

P2: Cultural capital as personal and embodied. Although characterising cultural capital broadly, I take it to pertain to resources that are of or about a person. This is not straightforwardly in agreement with Bourdieu's later writings. Most famously, he presented a tripartite taxonomy of cultural capital as a long-lasting disposition of the mind or body, a cultural object, or an academic credential (1986). I take the former to be the most representative how cultural capital is interpreted in empirical research (as argued by Gaddis 2013). Even when researchers have use objectified or institutionalised measures of cultural capital, these are usually proxies for personal attributes (see Sieben and Lechner (2019) discussion of household books).

It is arguably the case that the personal and embodied form of cultural capital was primary for Bourdieu, too. In *La Distinction*, he often exemplified cultural capital as the tastes of the dominant class, such as appreciation for Ravel's *Concerto for the Left Hand* (2010, 68), the ability to identify film directors (p.530) and reading historical books for pleasure (p.114). This interpretation inspired a stream of research that construes cultural capital as 'highbrow' or 'beaux arts' tastes, originally developed by DiMaggio and colleagues in the 1980s (Davies and Rizk 2018; Lareau and Weininger 2003). Highbrow conceptions of

cultural capital have become increasingly controversial. Prieur and Savage have argued that there is a rise of more diverse tastes in dominant social groups in European societies, what they call 'cosmopolitan cultural capital' (2013). In addition, academics have increasingly recognised the resources that students bring to school as a result of their cultural background, described by Yosso as 'community cultural wealth' (Yosso 2005).

P3: Cultural capital primarily determined by social (not economic) status. In 1960s France, Bourdieu and Passeron used father's occupation as the sole determinant of social class. They were able to rank clerical workers above agricultural workers, and scientific administrators above senior executives without justification (1979, 149). Because of evolving social norms, as well as differences between societies, we face the challenge of formulating cultural capital theory for use in modern contexts. In the UK, it is recognised that people do not clearly identify with social class according to occupation (Evans and Mellon 2016), at least partly because psychological factors are involved (Beswick 2020; Reay 2005). In government discourses, 'social class' has been replaced by 'socio-economic status', most prominently by the implementation of the National Statistics Socio-Economic Classification (NS-SEC) in 1994 (Rose and O'Reilly 1998). The NS-SEC reflects a tendency towards more nuanced models of class that incorporate measures of wealth, educational status, as well as cultural and social capital (Savage et al. 2013). Because such concepts of class have subsumed elements of Bourdieu and Passeron's work, it is potentially circular to use them to articulate a theory of cultural capital. Although I do not use 'class' to articulate the academic account, I maintain a focus on *social* status (over *socio-economic* status) to reflect the original role of cultural capital as an alternative explanation of academic success to natural talent and wealth (Bourdieu and Passeron 1990). The distinction has in general been carefully maintained in quantitative cultural capital research, where parental income and household financial capital are measured separately to parental cultural capital, in order to account for the impact of each separately where possible (De Graaf et al. 2000; Jaeger and Breen 2016).

P4: The transmission of cultural capital is laborious. I use the word 'inculcate' to reflect Bourdieu's view that cultural capital is not easily transmitted but is the result of 'accumulated labour' (1986 p.241), usually with pre-school children (Bourdieu and Passeron 1979, 1990) It is the comparison with paid labour that justifies the choice of the term 'capital'. Bourdieu and Passeron viewed cultural capital as a long-term investment that is difficult to replicate outside of homes of high social status (1979).

Empirical research has focussed on correlational studies rather than intervention-based approaches, underscoring the difficulties of inculcating cultural capital (Davies and Rizk 2018). It has also provided some evidence that cultural capital transmission requires significant time and effort. Participation in cultural activities that are relatively simple to instigate (such as visits to museums) are not correlated with academic success, once background wealth is controlled for (Breinholt and Jæger, 2020). Researchers have not, however, embraced the idea that cultural capital transmission primarily occurs in pre-school children, focussing on older children, even in early cultural capital work (DiMaggio 1982; Eryilmaz and Sandoval-Hernández 2021).

P5: Cultural capital as somewhat arbitrary. The arbitrariness of cultural capital is suggested by Bourdieu and Passeron's concept of the cultural arbitrary (*l'arbitraire culturel*), a cultural scheme passed on by pedagogic action (more broadly construed than classroom teaching), and of which cultural capital is a special case (1979). Cultural capital is thus not determined by its academic merit, but by the whims of the dominant classes. This interpretation is also supported by Bourdieu's later discussions of how symbols of high social

status are mistakenly taken to indicate academic talent (2010, 387; 2016, 30-57), resulting in teachers unwittingly contributing to the retention of social inequalities (1996, 30-57). For Bourdieu, education systems are at fault in contributing to the persistence of social inequalities. Locating blame in this way suggests an arbitrariness to cultural capital, what Goldthorpe believes to be essential to understanding the novelty of Bourdieu's theory (2007). Lareau and Weininger, however, have argued that such an interpretation requires making a clear distinction between cultural capital and academic merit, which Bourdieu avoids doing (2003). Research has also cast doubt on the idea that misrecognition is the mechanism by which cultural capital brings academic advantage (Breinholt and Jæger, 2020). I therefore acknowledge that academic accounts only sometimes or partially view cultural capital as arbitrary.

Summary. Formulating an academic account of cultural capital provides several points of comparison to consider practitioners' perspectives: 'tastes/preferences' and 'highbrow' (what kind of thing do practitioners understand cultural capital to be?); 'inculcation' (how is it passed on?); 'economic resources' (do practitioners distinguish cultural capital from financial wealth?); and finally, 'arbitrariness' and 'blame' (do practitioners believe cultural capital to be valuable in its own right? Is there blame to be apportioned to school, families or elsewhere?)

3. An empirical study of cultural capital practices in English secondary schools

In this section, I describe the research methods and contextual details of the study. I present a summary of cultural capital practices identified during the research (Table 1), showing how the term 'cultural capital' is being used in practice (RQ1).

3.1. Research methods and context

This study draws from interviews with 152 school leaders, teachers, and support staff at 30 mainstream, secondary schools conducted between October 2019 and March 2020 as part of the 'Against the Odds' project (Riordan, Jopling, and Starr 2021). These semi-structured, face-to-face interviews, the majority between one and two hours in duration, explored schools' use of the pupil premium grant.[1] Interviewees were asked what their schools were doing to support pupil premium students and why. They were probed on how interventions had been selected and what kinds of evidence were used in these decisions. Interviewees were not asked directly about cultural capital and there was no prior intention to focus on this topic. It was raised, however, by interviewees during 38 interviews (25%) at 14 schools (47%). This subset of interviews (identified simply by the term 'cultural capital') forms the dataset of the present study. It comprises of interviews with 11 senior leaders, 14 middle leaders, 10 classroom teachers and 3 support staff, collectively referred to as 'school practitioners' (sometimes shortened to 'practitioners'). It should be noted that because the analysis here was of the unprompted usage of 'cultural capital', this may have resulted in a less coherent account of the concept. Teachers connected cultural capital with particular interventions taking place, and the resulting analysis closely associates its meaning with how it is being used, following a long tradition in the philosophy of language associated with Wittgenstein. It is also important to note that, in the context of the wider study, interviews were conducted with practitioners knowledgeable about their school's approach to

Table 1. Cultural capital practices and their justifications at 14 English secondary schools in 2019-20.

Practice	Justification	Cultural diversity focus?	Theory of Change				School ID	No. of schools
			Influence family life	Mimic family life at school	Compensate in other ways	Reconfigure schooling		
CULTURAL KNOWLEDGE/SKILLS								**10**
Adapting the history curriculum to recognise achievements of black people	'lack of cultural capital,' 'we have a responsibility to develop students' social and cultural capital,' 'more than how to add up fractions'	Yes				✓	029	1
Adding financial skills and career information to mathematics lessons (non-examined)	'give pupils the knowledge that pupils from the more middle class backgrounds would have,' 'keyed up in what it means to be financially savvy,' 'not just about getting pupils good grades,' 'hopefully lead better lives,' 'the things that they don't know is just gobsmacking,' 'what we think those students should learn throughout their education'	No		✓			007 017 028	3
Incorporating texts about current affairs and social inequalities into the English curriculum	'give our young people a taste of what's happening in the world they live in now and what's happened in the past,' 'encourage students to challenge [views at home],' 'you just got to be passionate and exciting about what texts to actually use to broaden their horizons'	Yes	✓			✓	001	1
Incorporating topics that will engage pupils into the English curriculum	'to encourage the students to become absolutely absorbed in the stories or the theme,' 'they are getting curious about things'	Yes				✓	008 028	2
Arranging students to meet mathematics undergraduates	'give them another perspective of maths,' 'exposure with people who they might not necessarily meet normally,' 'remove some of the abstractness of the curriculum,' 'cultural capital elements in an academic way,' 'problem solving investigative stuff'	No		✓			017	1
Arranging lessons with native speakers of languages to learn language and culture	'have access to people from different countries,' 'a greater awareness of other people that they might not have otherwise,' 'understanding of other cultures'	Yes			✓		030	1
Cooking club after school for pupils and parents/carers, including Chinese cooking	'to raise cultural capital,' 'to support knowledge of whole family'	Yes	✓	✓			025	1
Visiting museums	'give powerful knowledge,' 'they know what's out there,' 'getting them out in the community to learn'	No		✓			008 028	2

(Continued)

Table 1. Continued.

Practice	Justification	Cultural diversity focus?	Influence family life	Mimic family life at school	Compensate in other ways	Reconfigure schooling	School ID	No. of schools
Organising a day off timetable for celebrating languages and culture	'raising the profile of languages,' 'introduce as many cultural events as we can,' 'raise boys' motivation,' 'so language seen outside the language department'	Yes			✓		004	1
Providing lessons for parents regarding GCSE preparation	'how to help your kid through GCSEs,' 'we've got a group of parents who want to support but don't know how'	No	✓				008	1
Nurture programme of timetabled lessons in small groups	'programme to develop cultural capital,' 'improve their attainment then hopefully […] social mobility as well'	No			✓		013	1
Taking students on curriculum-inspired trips	'improve expressive writing,' 'don't see the bigger picture,' 'widen their view,' 'if you're trying to teach any text, they always allude to other texts or bits of history,' 'visit the war graves in the history context'	No		✓			001 004 008	3
CULTURAL EXPERIENCES								**10**
Paying for families to go on trips outside school	'we will have contact from the parents, asking us for support with something they'd like the kids to do or vice versa we will say to them, it would really help them,' 'because their horizons are naturally a little bit narrower',	No	✓				001 004	2
Taking students on UK trips	'lots of our students have never been to the theatre,' 'they don't get an opportunity to do,' 'we would put it on to the 'wellbeing 'heading […] the pupil attended, the pupil was happy, they were engaged', 'they experienced what everybody else experienced,' 'exposed to the experiences that mattered,' 'every student […] goes to the theatre […] that's the bit that's missing,' 'none of these kids have never been outside of the M25,' 'they don't know anything about going bowling,' 'there was a room full of 17-year-olds whod never been.'	No		✓			001 004 008 017 021 042	6
Taking students on international trips	'visit places with cultural capital,' 'going to CERN and also the UN offices.… so quite big cultural capital in both of those places,' 'MFL trips would be a big one for the cultural capital'	Yes		✓			030 027	2

(Continued)

Table 1. Continued.

Practice	Justification	Cultural diversity focus?	Theory of Change				School ID	No. of schools
			Influence family life	Mimic family life at school	Compensate in other ways	Reconfigure schooling		
Using time in the school day for extra-curricular activities	'it's about engagement,' 'opportunities they wouldn't necessarily have,' 'pupil premium students engage significantly less with enrichment, regardless of if it's at break, lunch or after school'	No		✓		✓	017	1
Engaging with external company to provide amateur dramatics	'giving them their own voice,' 'understanding identity and all those things'	Yes			✓		008	1
Playing chess and pacman in tutor time	'quite funky and quite cool,' 'increasing cultural capital'	No		✓			001	1
Providing extra-curricular leadership programme in sports	'promoting cultural capital,' 'feel valued,' 'positive impact on their level of commitment and their work ethic'	No			✓		041	1
Working with charities to provide experiences for pupils	'experience with big employers,' 'making sure those pupils have those experiences,' 'more about they were exposed to the experiences that mattered'	No			✓		008	1
Taking pupils to local university for short lectures	'get that sense of engagement with academia,' 'be really successful 20 years from now,' 'that world don't seem so alien and distant and otherworldly then therefore they will be able to engage with it better'	No			✓		017	1
Organising community service for pupils at local primary schools	'increase cultural capital,' 'build those habits,' 'provide enrichment,' 'that's a really important part of like that cultural capital'	No			✓		017	1
Encouraging discussion at family breakfast club using topic cards	'opportunity to come and have breakfast together, sit around the table,' 'opportunity to discuss or have that discussion,' 'be able to confidently debate around the table,' 'students that don't have that experience'	No	✓				009	1
LINGUISTIC CAPITAL								**4**
Implementing small group literacy intervention outside of standard lessons	'fill that gap,' 'to skill children up,' 'helping the child feel good about themselves as a learner,' 'not doing them any harm going through concepts again'	No			✓		008 009	2
Vocabulary drive in English lessons, e.g. extra English lesson that is double-staffed	'one of the biggest gaps,' 'vocabulary you need for daily life that they're missing,' 'lack of cultural capital is about children not reading anymore,' help articulate 'what they want to get out,' 'having access to knowledge that you're entitled to'	No			✓		029 041	1

(Continued)

Table 1. Continued.

Practice	Justification	Cultural diversity focus?	Influence family life	Mimic family life at school	Compensate in other ways	Reconfigure schooling	School ID	No. of schools
Dedicating tutor time to reading, pupils follow text as tutor reads aloud	'close that gap,' 'never had a parent read to them,' 'reading is not part of their life,' 'don't see their parents reading,' 'engage them in reading,' 'address social and cultural issues,' 'books that are very diverse,' 'exposing them'	Yes		✓			029	1
Delivery of literacy lessons by higher-level teaching assistants	'to build their vocabulary, because one of the biggest gaps,' 'what we're trying to do is close that gap,' give access to 'knowledge of what's out there beyond the end of the street', best use of teaching assistants	No			✓		008 029	2
CONFIDENCE								**7**
Meeting and greeting students every day	'development of the whole child,' 'can they shake someone's hand? [...] confidence to look someone in the eye,' 'engagement with other adults with the bigger and wider outside world', 'self-confidence around that'	No		✓			042	1
Organising activities with native speakers of foreign languages	'character development of young people through a focus on well-being,' 'cultural capital is where we need to be,' 'when they apply for employment or university, they can write all the enrichment they've done'	No			✓		017	1
Using apps for basic maths skills	'having that little bit self-esteem that they can solve a problem,' 'they have a stigma about maths'	No			✓		001	1
Getting to know parents	'produce kids that are well-rounded,' 'self-belief', 'parents on board with school,' 'parents believe in school,' 'having that relationship with kids,' 'that will be a confidence thing'	No	✓				041	1
Taking students to a theme park	'we need to be that family that engages with other activities,' 'building those relationships that they've never had at home,' 'we are their family,' 'students don't step foot out of their own towns,' 'unique experiences'	No		✓			001 008 021	1
Taking students on public transport	'getting students out of town,' 'about how they get their confidence,' 'a lot of kids they've never been.' 'it feels like a long way away' show them 'how to get to [city] on the bus.'	No		✓			026 027	1

supporting students eligible for the pupil premium. The schools were selected from a pool of 285 secondary schools in England that had responded to a national survey (for further details see Riordan, Jopling, and Starr 2021). Practitioners were readily able to justify their schools' practices, as required by pupil premium regulations (DfE 2021).

3.2. Analysis of interview scripts

The interview scripts were thematically analysed in two ways. Firstly, the codes were generated inductively by the data (broadening horizons, community, confidence, cultural diversity, curriculum, deficit model, enrichment, literacy, non-academic purpose, and relationship building). The scripts were also analysed deductively using pre-determined codes to enable comparison with academic accounts of cultural capital as presented in §1 (tastes/preferences, highbrow, inculcation, economic resources, arbitrariness, and blame), with the additional code 'evidence' to collate practitioners' views regarding research evidence.

Additionally, the interview scripts were analysed to identify all cultural capital practices described by practitioners as taking place in their schools during the 2019-20 school year. I construe 'cultural capital practice' broadly to mean a non-statutory intervention or activity taking place in or *via* the school (short-term or continuous, intra- or extra-curricular) that is explicitly justified (by school staff) as giving students access to cultural capital. I use the term 'giving access' because this was the most common term used by practitioners during the interviews (discussed in §4). The resulting list of 33 cultural capital practices is presented in Table 1, including practitioners' reasoning (in their own words). This list is not comprehensive because the interviews were not conducted with this intention. In most cases, cultural capital practices at different schools were sufficiently different (either because of the practice itself or the reasoning for it) that they are listed separately, but in nine cases they were sufficiently similar to be combined.

3.3. Classification of cultural capital practices

Table 1 also shows the three ways in which cultural capital practices were classified: by the kind of cultural capital they were aimed at giving access to (cultural knowledge or skills/ cultural experiences/linguistic capital/confidence); whether they were intended to tackle issues of cultural diversity (yes/no); and the underlying theory of change (influencing/ mimicking/compensating/reconfiguring).

I began classifying the kind of cultural capital that each practice was aimed at by using a tripartite scheme reflecting those of cultural capital research: 'cultural knowledge', 'cultural skills/activities', and 'linguistic capital'. Typically, researchers use categories of this kind when operationalising cultural capital to account for its multifaceted nature (P1). For example, it mirrors Sullivan's (2001) classification of cultural capital into 'knowledge', 'activities', and 'language' (see also Breinholt and Jaeger (2020) division into 'performing arts', 'clubs and activities', and 'reading interest', and Raudenská and Bašná's (2021) division into 'high-culture participation' and 'reading interest'). Applying the taxonomy to school practices was not straight-forward and thus informative in itself in comparing the use of 'cultural capital' by academics and practitioners. The simplest category to apply was 'linguistic capital'. Some practices intended to directly improve children's literacy skills were readily accommodated by this category. Other practices were not so easily classified because practitioners

emphasised the importance of having experiences, and of building self-esteem or confidence. As a result, 'cultural skills/activities' was renamed 'cultural experiences', and a category 'confidence' was added to the taxonomy. It was generally difficult to determine whether a practice was better described as giving access to knowledge, skills, experiences or activities, and the classification was highly dependent on the justification of a practice in addition to its description. The category 'cultural knowledge' was therefore retained but extended to included skills. It was clear, however, that practitioners did not restrict cultural knowledge, skills, or experiences to those associated with dominant social groups. Thus, although the categories appeared to be similar to those in academic communities, they contained cultural capital practices (such as attending premier league football matches) that would not necessarily be recognised as such by academic accounts. In particular, some cultural practices were aimed at increasing awareness and understanding of minority cultures. To capture this difference, an additional classification was applied to identify such practices ('cultural diversity focus' in Table 1). These first two classifications supported the comparison between academics' and practitioners' perspectives on what cultural capital is (P1 & P2).

Finally, the cultural capital practices were classified according to their underlying theory of change and thus the approach they take to tackling inequalities of cultural capital: by changing what families do at home (influencing); by copying the presumed home life of children with high cultural capital at school (mimicking); by attempting to get the same results in other ways (compensating); or by altering school systems (reconfiguring). Classification relied on the richer detail of the interview scripts: in some cases, similar practices were classified differently because of the reasons given for them. This classification supported comparison between academics' and practitioners' theorisations of how cultural capital is transmitted (P3, P4 & P5).

4. A Comparison of practitioners' and academics' use of 'cultural capital'

In this section, I share the study's main findings on how practitioners' use of 'cultural capital' compares and contrasts with academic accounts (RQ2). I summarise these findings by outlining the main tenets of an interventionalist account of cultural capital, synthesising practitioners' interpretations of 'cultural capital' (RQ1). Finally, I report on how practitioners justified their school's practices by reference to research evidence (RQ3).

4.1. A personal quality manifesting in many ways but distinct from economic capital

It is apparent from Table 1 that schools are implementing a wide variety of cultural capital practices across England's secondary schools. When discussing students' cultural capital, one practitioner talked about reading at home, another of the ability to make eye-contact, a third about knowledge of Black history. For practitioners, cultural capital is not just a constellation of many kinds of things (experience, skill, knowledge, value, belief, habit etc.), but these elements are interchangeable and are emphasised differently in different circumstances. It was difficult, for example, to determine whether the opportunity to meet mathematics undergraduates was best interpreted as an experience (practitioners mentioned the 'exposure' it provided) or a skill (practitioners emphasised the problem-solving abilities it was intended to promote). Distinctions between these categories were not obviously helpful

to practitioners in describing or justifying these practices. 'Cultural capital' appeared, in fact, to be a useful term precisely because it encompasses many different kinds of thing. Its unprompted use in interviews indicates that it is now an established term in English school settings. For practitioners today, it perhaps has fewer associations with financial capital than Goldthorpe's alternative suggestion 'resources', and it less limiting than his alternative 'values' (2007). Bates and Connolly (2023) have proposed that teachers' use of 'cultural capital' should be viewed as a *rewording* of the term in Fairclough's sense (2013). What is seen here, however, is not a systematic replacement of an existing dominant term in order to control how the discourse is perceived. Instead, a term is undergoing a tacit change of meaning during *wilding* of the term: I shall describe 'cultural capital' as a wild word.

Although practitioners used the term cultural capital in a variety of ways, in every case it was discussed as if it were a personal characteristic, in contrast to Bourdieu's objectified or institutionalised cultural capital (P2), and carefully distinguished from economic wealth or possessions (P3). At every study school, 'cultural capital' was reserved for strategies that go beyond direct financial support. In one case, families were provided with money, but this could only be spent on outings deemed suitable by the school. In contrast, the pupil premium grant was also being used to provide students with material resources (such as revision guides, library books, and calculators) that could be viewed as objectified cultural capital under Bourdieu's taxonomy (1986) but were not considered to be cultural capital practices by practitioners. A central tenet of the theory of social reproduction is thus widely accepted in schools: it is not merely wealth in itself that brings about academic success.

4.2. Intrinsically valuable and not primarily for academic improvement

There was a lack of consensus amongst the practitioners regarding what kind of thing cultural capital is, albeit one that is happily embraced (P1). It is perhaps most easily defined by its effects: cultural capital is what children from wealthier homes gain from their homelife (apart from financial wealth) that is educationally advantageous, whatever that may be and however it might manifest. Defining cultural capital in this way takes a theory of cultural capital for granted: there is something about the home environment of wealthier families (other than the wealth itself) that increases academic success. Goldthorpe called this weak hypothesis the 'domesticated version' of Bourdieu's theory, arguing that it is an insufficient interpretation because this was already widely accepted prior to Bourdieu's work (2007). A more radical version additionally assumes that there is nothing educationally valuable about cultural capital in itself.

The practitioners interviewed firmly rejected the idea that cultural capital is in some way arbitrary (P5). In the first place, their discussions about cultural capital were premised on its intrinsic value. Practitioners did not readily offer explanations for their focus on cultural capital. A mathematics teacher stated, 'what we want to work on is cultural capital', and a head of English justified a practice because 'it increases cultural capital'. There were several explicit acknowledgements of its value, along the lines of 'enrichment is important' (extra-curricular lead teacher) and, 'It's important to have a fully rounded sort of overview in the world' (English teacher). The theme 'non-academic purpose' emerged from the interview analysis because of the frequency at which practitioners reported that a practice was not mainly or solely for the improvement of academic outcomes. As one headteacher put it:

It is not about exam results. Part of it is about the development of the whole child, you know? Can we have a conversation? Can they shake someone's hand, come in, look someone in the eye? Are they organised, you know? All of those skills that sometimes get forgotten in this world, because we get into the exam factoring drill. And that is important. And, it's not. So cultural capital, for us as a school, is really important.

A minority of practitioners proposed that the association was weaker still: they believed that the cultural capital practices they were implementing were unlikely to affect academic outcomes. In two schools where arrangements were made for students to experience public transport, for example, practitioners were adamant that it did not matter whether this would have a longer-term impact on examination results. Cultural capital was being interpreted as an advantageous in itself and not because (or solely because) of its academic value. In this way, teachers conceptualise cultural capital more broadly than the neoliberal discourses they are responding to. This has been described by Bates and Connolly (2023), who identify this as a positive instinct of teachers to overcome the limited view of cultural capital propounded by Ofsted. When considering the divergence from academia more generally, we find it has negative consequences for implementing cultural capital research. As we shall see, all practitioners believed the cultural capital practices they were implementing were backed by research evidence. However, much cultural capital research relies on the analysis of academic outcomes, which cannot therefore provide comprehensive evidence for practitioners' use of cultural capital practices to prepare children for 'getting everything else out of life' (teaching assistant).

4.3. The prominence of experience, easily imparted

Although practitioners viewed cultural capital to manifest in many ways, it was most commonly fundamentally portrayed as an experience. When explicitly being described as the possession of knowledge or skill, it was nevertheless related to an experience that conferred that knowledge or skill on a child. When discussing the choice of texts to improve students' knowledge of current affairs, for example, a senior leader explained, 'That's a key gain that they're going to make, because they don't come from families that sit around and discuss the news.' Curriculum adaptations were frequently presented as a proxy (and second-best option) for experience, in order to 'take them places they can't go' (history teacher) and provide 'what they can't get directly' (pupil premium lead). In a few cases, teachers emphasised knowledge over experience, albeit using a more inclusive conception of powerful knowledge to that of Ofsted. For example, one teacher talked about providing students with facts about careers such as typical earnings and qualifications.

The experiences that counted were those that equip students with a viewpoint they would not otherwise have: 'because their horizons are naturally a little bit narrower in this corner of the southeast' (head of house); 'to broaden their horizons' (head of English); 'they don't know anything about going bowling' (head of year); 'giving more things that they're probably not even heard of or seen' (student mentor). This resulted in a broad view of what counts as a cultural capital experience, including trips to theme parks and premier league football matches, not clearly in agreement with highbrow accounts of cultural capital (P2).

Having experiences is not explicitly central to many academic definitions of cultural capital, even if it is tacitly understood to be the mechanism of inculcation. In contrast,

practitioners are immediately faced with the challenge of inculcating cultural capital and are thus focussed on experience. This means that the aims of cultural capital researchers are not always aligned with the most pressing issues facing practitioners. Bourdieu set the academic scene by suggesting that cultural capital is hard-won, taking many years of nurture:

> [T]he accumulation of cultural capital in the embodied state […] presupposes a process of embodiment, incorporation, which, insofar as it implies a labor of inculcation and assimilation, costs time […] it cannot be transmitted instantaneously. (1986, 17-18).

The view of cultural capital as labour-intensive has been supported by ethnographic studies, for example in the 'concerted cultivation' parenting style described by Lareau (2011), but has not filtered into practice (P4). Cultural capital practices widely assume that giving students access to cultural capital is a relatively simple matter, achieved in an annual outing or a series of half-hourly extra-curricular sessions. Practitioners did not raise issues regarding the experience itself or how it was presented to the child. It mattered that students were taken on a visit, but less so what happened once they were there. As a headteacher put it, 'We've just got to get all of them to the beach. I can't imagine a child not having that'.

I have been using the phrase 'giving access' because this was the most common description of cultural capital transmission used by practitioners. It connotes the ease at which cultural capital can be transmitted. Eight practitioners described the process in this way, e.g. 'ensuring that they have access to the trips and cultural capital' and 'having access to knowledge that you're entitled to'. Practitioners also used further (and usually multiple) terms when describing cultural capital transmission: 'increasing'; 'giving'; 'improving'; 'skilling up'; 'raising'; 'gaining'; 'filling in'; and 'compensating for'.

Few schools were tackling cultural capital inequalities through fundamental changes to educational systems ('reconfiguring' in Table 1), such as changing timetables or examination content. More commonly, practitioners were attempting to change children's experiences at home, providing experiences that mimicked those of children from affluent homes, or compensatory alternatives with similar outcomes (see 'Theory of Change' in Table 1). At one school, for example, parents were invited to the school's breakfast club, where topic cards were laid out to direct discussion. The purpose was to change family dining habits. Thus, in most cases, the underlying theory of change placed the cause of cultural capital inequalities (and potentially the blame for them) in the home environment. Practitioners do not view schools as upholding social inequalities, but as part of the solution in dismantling them. This raises the possibility that practitioner accounts of cultural capital may foster deficit models in education.

4.4. Community cultural wealth and deficit models of cultural capital

One theme that emerged from the interview scripts analysis was deficit models of cultural capital. In a weaker sense, I take a deficit model in education to be a perspective from which a student's poor academic performances, attitudes or behaviours are automatically attributed to the student's background and homelife. In a stronger sense, a deficit model does not just locate the problem within the student's homelife, but further places blame on the student and/or family: the parents and/or student should have prevented or remedied the situation. Tichavakunda has pointed out that Bourdieu and Passeron's theory of social reproduction does not necessitate a deficit model of cultural capital (Tichavakunda 2019). Nevertheless,

cultural capital research has been associated with deficit-model thinking (Nightingale 2020). This possibility was partially supported here. Practitioners frequently expressed deficit-model thinking when discussing cultural capital, although most clearly only in a weaker sense: they focussed on the absence of cultural capital rather than its presence; and they located the cause of the problem in students' homelives.

At every school, practitioners interviewed referred to a lack, missing gap or deficiency of sorts: 'We find students come in with, well, imagine a brick wall that has gaps missing' (head of mathematics); 'One of the big things we notice is that lots of PP [pupil premium students] don't have that cultural capital' (English teacher); 'It's about getting all these resources that they're not getting at home' (head of English); 'You're starting from a lacked position… from a lag in literacy and numeracy' (P.E. teacher); 'a pupil premium student […] they haven't got the words to articulate it well enough' (deputy headteacher); 'It's just trying to fill those gaps, really' (English lead practitioner). The use of language in this way did not necessarily coincide with a stronger deficit model, in which blame is apportioned to students' families. There was often a matter-of-factness to practitioners' discussions about the way things are, without clear indications of fault. An English teacher, for example, discussed poor performance as a 'vocabulary gap', explaining that some parents did not have the time to read stories to their children. The further inference to stronger deficit-model thinking was impossible to ascertain, as was frequently the case:

> Kind of through parents, they have a stigma about maths. [Head of mathematics]

> Reading is not part of their life. They don't see their parents reading. [Assistant headteacher].

> We feel that pupils from more middle-class backgrounds, […], their parents might be better at managing finances and talking about that. [Mathematics teacher]

On two occasions, the discussions more clearly spilled over to parental blame. A pupil premium lead expressed annoyance at lack of parental engagement ('there needs to be a national change') and an English teacher was disgusted by a pupil's home environment ('he was getting negative sort of things said to him').

There were also occasions, however, when discussions about cultural capital prompted positive statements about what children bring to the classroom from their homelives. At eight schools, cultural capital practices were intended to provide students with opportunities to engage with the traditions, beliefs, and languages of minority cultures in the UK. One school had hired an external organisation to cook Chinese food with students. Such practices are potentially in contradiction with academic accounts of cultural capital, which predict that knowledge of minority cultures will not improve (and may limit) academic attainment. Practitioners' views of cultural capital are therefore sometimes better captured by Yosso's concept of community cultural wealth (and what Bourdieu and Passeron called 'cultural arbitraries') than the academic account of §2 (Wallace 2018; Yosso 2005).

4.5. Cultural capital practices are understood to be supported by evidence

In every study school, practitioners believed that the overarching strategy to give students access to cultural capital was well supported by research. One teacher described the message from research: 'When you look at the social research, you know you are starting from that position of where they've not done any cultural capital.' More usually, interviewees did not

offer descriptions of research findings. Just the two words 'cultural capital' were used to describe what the research says, for example as in, 'The research that's behind cultural capital' (pupil premium lead), 'We know it's the cultural capital' (English teacher). In one case, an explicit reference was made to academic research: a senior leader had studied Bourdieu as an undergraduate and attributed the evidence for cultural capital to his work. I would suggest that the evidence used by Bourdieu to support his theory (including student surveys in the 1960s and essay feedback for *grande école* applicants in the 1970s) are not readily transferable to the practices of Table 1 (1970, 1990).

In all other cases, however, practitioners believed research evidence to exist but were unfamiliar with it. They felt it was obvious that some children were disadvantaged educationally because they lacked access to cultural capital ('It's known', 'Of course, it's driving the gap', 'You see it'). For something so obvious, there must be supporting research, and this was probably known by colleagues (headteacher, senior leaders, head of department). Colleagues that were named in this way were, however, unable to provide further details. In two schools, cultural capital was explicitly associated with Ofsted's then latest inspection framework, and in a further two it was recognised as a recent development ('the new thing here', 'what schools are bringing in'). Practitioners assumed there would be evidence for Ofsted's 'cultural capital push.' This evidence chain does not, in fact, connect practitioners to cultural capital research. In the 2019 inspection framework, Ofsted had defined a good curriculum as one that is 'designed to give learners […] the knowledge and cultural capital they need to succeed in life', but the evidence it cited for this in its accompanying evidence document came from curriculum theory associated with Michael Young and Gert Biesta and not cultural capital research (Ofsted 2019b, 2019a). As carefully explicated by Bates and Connolly (2023), Ofsted have continued to propound a concept of cultural capital that draws more from Matthew Arnold's idea of 'the best that has been thought and said', rather than Bourdieu's work on cultural capital (Ofsted 2022). Thus, although practitioners were confident of research evidence existing, it was not possible to identify any part of the large body of cultural capital research since Bourdieu that had been influential on school practices.

In fact, it is challenging to identify supporting research evidence for some of the practices of Table 1, regardless of whether the evidence played a causal role in its implementation or not. It is easier to support linguistic capital practices retrospectively because (unsurprisingly) stronger correlations have been found between academic outcomes and linguistic capital in comparison to other kinds of cultural capital (Breinholt & Jæger, 2020). There is, for example, a broad base of research regarding the development of literacy skills in the home (see the meta-analysis by Dong et al. 2020). This work is, however, only indirectly related to academic accounts of cultural capital: ideas that children's success at school can be boosted by reading at home, discussions in the evening, or books in the living room pre-date cultural capital theory (Goldthorpe 2007).

4.6. Summary: an interventionalist account of cultural capital

In *The Inheritors*, Bourdieu and Passeron were pessimistic about what could be done to tackle the inequalities associated with cultural capital, proposing that schools could take students' backgrounds into account when assessing them (Bourdieu and Passeron 1979). There are several reasons why they did not believe that the solution to generational social inequality lay in practices of the kind listed in Table 1: they saw cultural capital as arbitrary;

they located the cause of the problem in educational establishments; and they understood the inculcation of cultural capital to be a labour-intensive process most easily done with pre-schoolers in the home. Just by implementing cultural capital practices, practitioners are rejecting these aspects of academic accounts of cultural capital. Any theorisation of cultural capital that reflects school practices will necessarily be an interventionalist account, presupposing that schools can and should act to ensure all students have access to cultural capital. Drawing from the findings of this study, I propose that an interventionalist account is one that takes cultural capital to be a personal and embodied resource that:

(1) is developed in children and adults through experiences beyond their immediate surroundings and everyday life (including experiences of other cultures);
(2) manifests in different ways, including skills, knowledge, habits and characteristics that often (but not necessarily) promote academic success;
(3) is valuable in its own right to promote a broader/healthier view of life;
(4) can be incrementally developed through individual and one-off experiences.

In addition, the interventionalist account assumes that it is a duty of schools to give children access to cultural capital, especially those with limited access in their home lives. The inequality of cultural capital is viewed as a problem in its own right, not necessarily aggravated but potentially minimised by schools, and the cause of which lies in the inequal opportunities that children have to experience the world. In assuming that education systems play a positive role in reducing cultural capital inequalities, teachers are more aligned with Ofsted's neoliberal vision of cultural capital than that proposed by Bourdieu and Passeron. It is striking that teachers are focussed on providing children with the most basic of cultural experiences, such as travelling by public transport, visiting a beach, going to the city, and cooking food. As Bates and Connelly recognised (2023), teachers intuitively work with interpretations of cultural capital that are broader than the traditional view of Ofsted. We might further infer that teachers' understandings of 'cultural capital' are influenced by how they perceive the needs of the children in their care. The interventions implemented perhaps more closely reflected teachers' reactions to their environments than the research evidence. This is possibly another reason why, in comparison to academics, practitioners have a different view about the value of cultural capital, what it is, and its underlying cause.

5. The role of research evidence in educational practices: oil pipes; cloth dye; wild words; and knuggets

This study examined how the term 'cultural capital' has been borrowed from academic discourses, transformed into something new, and implemented in multifarious ways. The variety is perhaps neither surprising nor concerning in itself. Given the looseness of the concept for academics, we might expect to see similar variety in practice. Further, Table 1 gives us much to celebrate regarding practitioners' creativity and determination in tackling socio-economic inequalities. It also demonstrates, however, that cultural practices are not as well evidenced as we assume them to be. It is not possible to trace the causal pathways backwards from current cultural capital practices to identify how research has been brought to bear in this case. I suggest that this is not merely because the 'pipeline' has broken but that the analogy of a pipeline is inadequate: there is no direct link between 'the evidence'

and practice. Although there is considerable pressure within education communities to generate, enable and ensure evidence-based education, we do so with inappropriate conceptualisations of research dissemination.

It is a reasonable and natural position to take on the research-practice interface to suppose that research findings should be selected, synthesised, and put into a suitable format (short and easy-to-read) before being delivered to practitioners. The Education Endowment Foundation (EEF) epitomises these principles in its mission statement, 'Summarising the best evidence in plain language for busy, time-poor teachers and senior leaders.'[2] This model of research dissemination captures much of our everyday thinking and is perhaps both a useful and unavoidable idealisation underlying dissemination practices. It assumes a conceptualisation that represents research dissemination as the refinement of crude oil and its subsequent delivery through a pipe. This has at times been explicitly recognised by policy-makers (for a clear example, see Shepherd 2016). However, not all the consequences of this conceptualisation are commonly recognised. From the pipeline perspective, research evidence is immutable, unchangeable, and easy to transmit. How it is received does not depend on the receiver, nor on the mode of delivery. The assimilation of cultural capital findings and theory into secondary schools does not share these characteristics. There are no straight-forward evidence chains from research to practice along which research messages have been passed intact.

In the first place, it is not clear that there had been particular moments at which practitioners had received cultural capital evidence from a particular source which had then influenced their decisions about what to do. Practitioners mentioned colleagues who they had talked to about cultural capital, their headteacher's vision, and Ofsted. Perhaps many dozens of interactions bring a practitioner to believe that cultural capital is well-supported by evidence and this process is better likened to the slow discolouring of fabric in the sun over time. We do not consider the psychological realities of information transmission, of how practitioners are themselves changed and how they change research messages. In this case, the term 'cultural capital' has been appended to an older and simpler idea than Bourdieu's, regarding the impact of children's homelife on their lifetime opportunities. The headteacher who oversaw annual expeditions to the beach had taken part in trips of this kind 30 years previously. At some point in that time period, he first heard the term 'cultural capital' and has since been encouraged to justify the practice using research evidence. Despite this, it is not clear that he is doing it now for different reasons now than he did 30 years ago.

Although the term 'cultural capital' has been successfully transmitted from academia (and is recognised as such), it has been passed on unattached to further nuance, details or particulars of cultural capital research. Cultural capital practices are justified by a generalised and vague principle perhaps best summed up as, 'We know [the research] says cultural capital is a good thing' (assistant headteacher). It is as if researchers have arrived with the pipe to deliver the research, but nothing is flowing from it. This is not an outlying case; I have documented other cases in which research messages are too generalised to be meaningful (Riordan 2022). Practitioners believe that 'cultural capital' is well evidenced, but we should question whether evidence can ever meaningfully support such general outlooks as 'giving access to cultural capital', 'metacognition', 'quality feedback', 'direct instruction', etc. For a particular body of research (perhaps as small as one study), we can use 'knugget' (a nugget of knowledge) to describe the minimal amount of

information that needs to be understood in order to portray the research accurately for a particular use in a particular context. In the case of cultural capital research, the literature is extensive and complex. It includes a large body of literature about the literature. It is clear in this case that, 'cultural capital is a good thing' is not a knugget, regardless of the context it is being delivered in.

'Cultural capital' is a *wild word* in education communities: it is being used in different ways that demand different theoretical and evidential underpinnings. This is not to say that this is necessarily or entirely negative, because wildness is a natural characteristic of language. It is problematic, however, if we believe all cultural capital practices to be equally supported by the same (and undefined) body of research. Justifying cultural capital practices by reference to research in this case provides a false sense of security: we are not, as a community of educators and educationalists, telling ourselves accurate stories about how education progresses and why we are doing what we are doing.

Notes

1. The pupil premium grant is awarded to state schools in England to raise the educational attainment of students facing socio-economic disadvantages. For further details see https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/pupil-premium/pupil-premium
2. Retrieved from https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/.

Acknowledgements

Ethics statement

This study was approved by the Ethics Panel of the Faculty of Education, Health and Wellbeing at the University of Wolverhampton (submission 0622019SRUOW). All participants in this study gave informed consent for the data they provided to be processed and for resulting findings to be published in academic journals.

Disclosure statement

The author is unaware of any conflict of interest.

Funding

ORCID

Sally Riordan 🔵 http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5390-8694

References

Bates, G., and S. Connolly. 2023. "'Different People, Different Backgrounds, Different Identities': Filling the Vacuum Created by Policy Views of 'Cultural Capital.'" *The Curriculum Journal* 34 (3): 505–520. https://doi.org/10.1002/curj.198.

Bates, G., and S. Connolly. 2024. "Exploring Teachers' Views of Cultural Capital in English Schools." *British Educational Research Journal* 50 (3): 1350–1366. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3965.

Beswick, K. 2020. "Feeling Working Class: Affective Class Identification and Its Implications for Overcoming Inequality." *Studies in Theatre and Performance* 40 (3): 265–274. https://doi.org/10.1080/14682761.2020.1807194.

Bourdieu, P. 1986. "The Forms of Capital." In *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, edited by J. G. Richardson, 241–258. New York: Greenwood.

Bourdieu, P. 1996. *The State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Field of Power* (L.C. Clough, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. 2010. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (1st ed.). London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P., and J.-C. Passeron. 1979. *The Inheritors: French Students and Their Relation to Culture, Translated by Richard Nice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bourdieu, P., and J-Claude Passeron. 1990. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.

Breinholt, A., and M. M. Jaeger. 2020. "How Does Cultural Capital Affect Educational Performance: Signals or Skills?" *The British Journal of Sociology* 71 (1): 28–46. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12711.

Chiu, M. M., and B. W. Y. Chow. 2010. "Culture, Motivation, and Reading Achievement: High School Students in 41 Countries." *Learning and Individual Differences* 20 (6): 579–592. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2010.03.007.

Collin, R. 2021. "Ethics and Competition in Bourdieusian Studies of Education." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 53 (3): 353–367. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2020.1866680.

Davies, S., and J. Rizk. 2018. "The Three Generations of Cultural Capital Research: A Narrative Review." *Review of Educational Research* 88 (3): 331–365. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654317748423.

De Graaf, N. D., P. M. De Graaf, G. Kraaykamp, N. Dirk, and D. Graaf. 2000. "Parental Cultural Capital and Educational Attainment in The Netherlands: A Refinement of the Cultural Capital Perspective." *Sociology of Education* 73 (2): 92. (https://doi.org/10.2307/2673239.

DfE. 2021. *Pupil Premium: Conditions of Grant 2021 to 2022 for Academies and Free Schools*. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/.

DiMaggio, P. 1982. "Cultural Capital and School Success: The Impact of Status Culture Participation on the Grades of U.S. High School Students." *American Sociological Review* 47 (2): 189–201. https://doi.org/10.2307/2094962.

Dimaggio, P., and M. Useem. 1978. "Social Class and Arts Consumption: The Origins and Consequences of Class Differences in Exposure to the Arts in America." *Theory and Society* 5 (2): 141–161. https://www.jstor.org/stable/656694?seq=1&cid=pdf-.

Dong, Y., Wu, S., Dong, W., and Tang, Y.(2020). The Effects of home literacy environment on children's reading comprehension development: A meta-analysis. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice* 20: 63–82. https://doi.org/10.12738/jestp.2020.2.005.

Edgerton, J. D., L. W. Roberts, and T. Peter. 2013. "Disparities in Academic Achievement: Assessing the Role of Habitus and Practice." *Social Indicators Research* 114 (2): 303–322. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0147-0.

Eryilmaz, N., and A. Sandoval-Hernández. 2021. "The Relationship between Cultural Capital and the Students' Perception of Feedback across 75 Countries: Evidence from PISA 2018." *International Journal of Educational Research* 109: 101803. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2021.101803.

Evans, G., and J. Mellon. 2016. "Social Class: Identity, Awareness and Political Attitudes: Why Are we Still Working Class? British Social Attitudes, 33." *British Social Attitudes* 33: 1–19.

Fairclough, N. 2013. *Language and Power*. 2nd ed. London: Taylor and Francis.

Friedman, S., and D. Laurison. 2019. *The Class Ceiling : Why It Pays to Be Privileged*. 1st ed. Bristol: Policy Press.

Gaddis, S. M. 2013. "The Influence of Habitus in the Relationship between Cultural Capital and Academic Achievement." *Social Science Research* 42 (1): 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2012.08.002.

Goldthorpe, J. H. 2007. "Cultural Capital": Some Critical Observations." *Sociologia* 2: 1–23. https://doi.org/10.2383/24755.

Groeniger, J. O., W. de Koster, J. van der Waal, J. P. Mackenbach, C. B. M. Kamphuis, and F. J. van Lenthe. 2020. "How Does Cultural Capital Keep You Thin? Exploring Unique Aspects of Cultural Class That Link Social Advantage to Lower Body Mass Index." *Sociology of Health & Illness* 42 (7): 1497–1515. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.13120.

Jaeger, M. M., and R. Breen. 2016. "A Dynamic Model of Cultural Reproduction." *AJS; American Journal of Sociology* 121 (4): 1079–1115. https://doi.org/10.2307/26545706.

Kingston, P. W. 2001. "Extra Issue: Current of Thought: Sociology of Education at the Dawn of the 21st Century." *Source: Sociology of Education* 74: 88–99.

Lamont, M., and A. Lareau. 1988. "Cultural Capital: Allusions, Gaps and Glissandos in Recent Theoretical Developments." *Sociological Theory* 6(2): 153. https://doi.org/10.2307/202113.

Lareau, A. 2011. *Unequal Childhoods Class, Race, and Family Life (Second)*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Lareau, A., and E. B. Weininger. 2003. "Cultural Capital in Educational Research: A Critical Assessment." *Theory and Society* 32 (5/6): 567–606. (Special Issue on The Sociology of Symbolic Power: A Special Issue in Memory of Pierre Bourdieu). https://about.jstor.org/terms. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:RYSO.0000004951.04408.b0.

Nightingale, P. 2020. "As If by Osmosis': How Ofsted's New Deficit Model Emerged, Fully Formed, as Cultural Capital." *Power and Education* 12 (3): 232–245. https://doi.org/10.1177/1757743820961417.

Nissenbaum, A., and L. Shifman. 2015. "Internet Memes as Contested Cultural Capital: The Case of 4chan's/b/Board." 19(4): 483–501. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444815609313.

Ofsted. 2019a. *Education Inspection Framework (EIF)*, Last Updated 11 July 2022. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/education-inspection-framework

Ofsted. 2019b. *Research for Education Inspection Framework: Overview of Research*.

Ofsted. 2022. *School Inspection Handbook*. www.gov.uk/government/publications/school-inspection-handbook-eif/school-inspection-handbook

Reay, D. 2005. "Beyond Consciousness?" *Sociology* 39 (5): 911–928. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038505058372.

Riordan, S. 2022. "Improving Teaching Quality to Compensate for Socio-Economic Disadvantages: A Study of Research Dissemination across Secondary Schools in England." *Review of Education* 10 (2): 1–34. https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.3354.

Riordan, S., M. Jopling, and S. Starr. 2021. "*Against the Odds: Achieving Greater Progress for Students Facing Socio-Economic Disadvantage.*"

Rose, D., and K. O'Reilly. 1998. "*The ESRC Review of Government Social Classification.*"

Savage, M., F. Devine, N. Cunningham, M. Taylor, Y. Li, J. Hjellbrekke, B. Le Roux, S. Friedman, and A. Miles. 2013. "A New Model of Social Class? Findings from the BBC's Great British Class Survey Experiment." *Sociology* 47 (2): 219–250. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038513481128.

Shepherd, J. 2016. *How to Achieve More Effective Services: The Evidence Ecosystem - Social Care Online*. https://www.scie-socialcareonline.org.uk/how-to-achieve-more-effective-services-the-evidence-ecosystem/r/a11G0000006z7vXIAQ

Sieben, S., and C. M. Lechner. 2019. "Measuring Cultural Capital through the Number of Books in the Household." *Measurement Instruments for the Social Sciences* 1 (1): 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1186/s42409-018-0006-0.

Tichavakunda, A. A. 2019. "An Overdue Theoretical Discourse: Pierre Bourdieu's Theory of Practice and Critical Race Theory in Education." *Educational Studies* 55 (6): 651–666. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2019.1666395.

Wallace, D. 2018. "Cultural Capital as Whiteness? Examining Logics of Ethno-Racial Representation and Resistance." *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 39 (4): 466–482. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2017.1355228.

Yosso, T. J. 2005. "Whose Culture Has Capital? A Critical Race Theory Discussion of Community Cultural Wealth." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 8 (1): 69–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/1361332052000341006.