Review Article

BIOMEDICAL Journal of Scientific & Technical Research

ISSN: 2574 -1241

DOI: 10.26717/BJSTR.2026.67.010476

The Conflict Between the Reproduction Theory and the Resistance Theory in Education

Rivas-Gutiérrez, Jesús*, Rodríguez-Elizondo María Guadalupe, Delijorge-González Martha Patricia, De la Rosa-Basurto Martha Patricia, Carlos-Sánchez María Dolores, Carlos-Félix Manuel Alejandro and Tavizón-García Jesús Andrés

Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico.

***Corresponding author:** Rivas-Gutiérrez, Jesús, Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico.

ARTICLE INFO

Received: October 30, 2026

Published: November 09, 2026

Citation: Rivas-Gutiérrez, Jesús, Rodríguez-Elizondo María Guadalupe, Delijorge-González Martha Patricia, De la Rosa-Basurto Martha Patricia, Carlos-Sánchez María Dolores, Carlos-Félix Manuel Alejandro and Tavizón-García Jesús Andrés. The Conflict Between the Reproduction Theory and the Resistance Theory in Education. Biomed J Sci & Tech Res 67(2)-2026. BJSTR. MS.ID.010476.

SUMMARY & ABSTRACT

Summary

Since education began to be formalized and taught in physical and delimited spaces called schools, there has been the political intention to use them as places of indoctrination and alienation (there is hardly a school that can escape this label), and also since always there has been an attempt to explain empirically and theoretically what happens inside, how the process of teaching, learning, indoctrination, emancipation, control, punishment, reward, etc. occurs and its purpose; in the case of this work, only the cultural reproduction that occurs there to maintain the social status quo from the Theory of Reproduction will be addressed, as well as the explanation of the behaviors of rebellion, indiscipline and disobedience to achieve autonomy from the position of the Theory of Resistance.

Abstract

Ever since education began to take on a formal structure and be delivered in physical, defined spaces called schools, there has been a political intent to use them as places of indoctrination and alienation (there is hardly a school that can escape this label), and there have also always been attempts to explain, both empirically and theoretically, what happens within them how the processes of teaching, learning, indoctrination, emancipation, control, punishment, and reward, among others, take place and their purpose; For the purposes of this paper, we will address only the cultural reproduction that occurs there to maintain the social status quo from the perspective of Reproduction Theory, as well as the explanation of behaviors such as rebellion, indiscipline, and disobedience aimed at achieving autonomy from the perspective of Resistance Theory.

Keywords: Reproduction; Resistance; Indoctrination; Autonomy

Introduction

Societies have never been homogeneous, they have always had inequalities and discrepancies that have marked over time their ideology, their realities, their culture and the social status quo, which is generally where all economic, political, cultural, physical, cognitive, ethnic, gender differences, etc. are reflected, these differences are clearly perceptible through the behaviors and attitudes product of the collective and individual idiosyncrasies of the subjects, but difficult to perceive clearly and consciously from subjectivity and make visible the form and the environment in which this cultural and subliminal condition is produced, reproduced and transmitted in people and internalized in their being. One of the main spaces and social institutions where it can be clearly noticed, if one knows not only how to see but also observe, is the school, a space that par excellence is the place where knowledge is educated, formed and shared and the context is apprehended where it is subsequently applied by reproducing it and subsuming knowledge to simple and plain repetition and almost always leaving aside the generation of learning and development of higher thought; but it can also be the place where the consciousness is awakened that allows the understanding and understanding of collective realities where the economic, political, cultural, physical, cognitive, ethnic, gender, etc. spheres intersect, it is in the school where the behaviors and attitudes of submission (reproduction) or rebellion (resistance) are manifested, where the struggle for power, imposition, disobedience and conflict between individuals and collectives takes place, between the Theory of Reproduction (Bourdieu and Passeron) and the Theory of Resistance (Henry Giroux).

Before continuing, we want to make it clear that the behaviors of rebellion and autonomy are not always the consequence of a level of culture and high consciousness that allows us to decipher the entire framework of reproduction, some may be the consequence of other types of situations and actions of others, but for the subject of this work, we will only address those that are produced by ideological inculcation and internalization and those that are the product of disagreement, discontent or dissatisfaction with the educational, cultural and social status quo. Next, synthetically and executively, we will talk about both processes (reproduction and resistance), which inevitably overlap with each other for the construction of the state of the question, in and during the social interaction that occurs in the educational process and the teaching-learning process within a school, classroom or other educational spaces but especially in higher education; let's start by defining and explaining some central concepts of both theories that will be mentioned gradually, but first of all let's make clear in a simple way the romantic and ideal educational discourse that is repeated regarding education and its purposes. From the perspective of philosophy, education is not simply the mere transmission of data or the teaching of a trade; it is the rational, critical, and axiological process through which human beings are accompanied in the development of their educability, that is, their innate ability to transform, learn, and perfect themselves to be a better citizen every day [1]. We will leave the concept at this point and enter fully into the subject of the manuscript.

Theory of Reproduction

The Theory of Reproduction, mainly proposed by its two main theoretical authors, Bourdieu and Passeron [2], propose that it is a set of perspectives that explains how the school and the educational system, through the pedagogical authority represented by the figure of the teacher and his work and pedagogical action that he executes during the teaching-learning process and using symbolic violence, perpetuates social, economic and cultural inequalities from one generation to another, instead of acting as an engine of social mobility. This theory is nourished by Marxism and critical theory and unlike traditional pedagogies that see the school as a neutral space, this theory postulates that the educational system reproduces the power relations of capitalism. In this theory, the socio-cultural reproduction in the students of practically any school and educational level is proposed, imposing the forced and arbitrary recognition of a culture legitimized by the dominant class (high culture, formal language, urban manners, etc.) and devalues the culture of the popular sectors, for this it uses a number of symbolic actions that are gradually decoded by the student and are subjected as a consequence to that indoctrination and alienation. He states that cultural capital, which is the set of knowledge, titles, skills, and cultural assets that are inherited from the family, social, work, and above all educational environment, develops in the student mental dispositions, habits, and ways of acting internalized from childhood, known as habitus, which facilitate or hinder school success according to class origin [2].

Louis Althusser, on the other hand, complements this theory by saying that the school functions as an ideological apparatus of the State, which has the function of inculcating the dominant ideology to ensure the submission of future workers to the capitalist order [3]; on the other hand, Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis argue that the hierarchical structure, rules, and discipline of the school correspond exactly to the division of labor in capitalist enterprises [4]. Basil Bernstein, when analyzing sociolinguistic codes (specific and elaborated), determines that their proper use in time and form further enriches the force of dominant action and submission or, on the contrary, that of independence by stating that school language (communication) favors students from the middle and upper classes [5].

Harm or Benefit of the Theory of Reproduction

Like all human behaviors that occur as a consequence of the cultural baggage that over time and experiences accumulates in the student as a result of the formative process that is carried out in practically all educational levels, these have an implicit or explicit intention or both and it is quite difficult and complicated to be able to decipher with certainty what they are and if they are correct or incorrect in relation to their purpose and achievements because it substantially depends from which point of view the judgment of opinion is projected. For some, the social reproduction that is generated through education functions as a structural detriment to equity in all senses and for others seen from a functionalist perspective it can be seen as a beneficial mechanism of social order and cultural continuity; the main damages that can be attributed to the phenomenon of reproduction is the legitimization of inequality, since the school takes social, economic and cultural differences and transforms them into academic merit, making believe that failure is the fault of the student and not of the system; it imposes the dominant culture that promotes the valuation and reward of the cultural capital of each student belonging to the upper or upper-middle classes, subtly and covertly labeling students from the lower classes as lacking or underperforming; to this end, it cunningly and effectively uses symbolic violence as a tool and invisible action where the dominant groups impose their vision of the world as the only valid one, getting the disadvantaged sectors themselves to accept their inferior position as something natural and inevitable, functioning at the same time as a brake and obstacle to true social, labor and professional mobility, instead the educational system trains the labor force according to the existing social division, limiting the rise of the most vulnerable sectors [6].

On the other hand, the benefits that can be attributed to it are that it achieves social cohesion and order from a traditional or functionalist vision, since due to the transmission of norms, values and the reproduction of academic and common knowledge, it allows society to maintain a sense of belonging, stability and historical continuity, ensuring that institutions and society function

in a uniform and peaceful way through rules, certifications and academic-school programs recognized by the State. In this sense, it is pertinent and important to also point out that there is a concept that conceptually describes the internal movement that arises within social reproduction within schools, this concept is known as organic dynamism and is understood as the quality or process by which a person is in constant movement of adaptation and transformation in a fluid way, imitating the forms and logic of natural, artificial or in this case school life, depending on the context and educational level in which it is used, as well as the experiences that have been had playing the role of student or teacher, it will be applied mainly as the opposite of a static situation, in a continuous becoming due to concepts that are self-organized within the subject, where the parts (teacher-student) interact in a coordinated way to maintain a changing balance to evolve and respond to stimuli; in other words, this situation is called symbolic interactionism.

Thinking that symbolic interactionism refers to and explains how people construct social reality and the sense of their identity through everyday relationships and interaction and the use of symbols expressed through behaviors and language, then the function and the important role it plays during educational processes will be understood. This function is based on three fundamental ideas, the first, human beings act with respect to things based on the meaning they have for them; second, the meaning of these things arises from the social interaction that is maintained with others; third, meanings are manipulated and modified through an interpretative process that the person uses when encountering things; in the end and in a few words, human behavior is not an automatic response to external stimuli, but the result of how we interpret what happens around us [7]. This concept mentioned above (organic dynamism) can sometimes be the cause of both the appearance of the sense of resistance and opposition to reproduction, a situation that will be explained later from the point of view of the authors of this work.

Theory of Resistance

On the other hand, the Theory of Resistance postulated by Henry Giroux [8], is a proposal of critical pedagogy that rejects the purely deterministic character of the Theory of Social and Cultural Reproduction. This theory makes a strong criticism of the determinism of the Theory of Reproduction, understanding this concept as a paradigm that maintains that all events (including thoughts and actions) are completely determined by a chain of previous causes, this concept implies that nothing happens randomly and that the future is predictable if the initial conditions are known. Henry Giroux points out that the Theory of Reproduction falls into a pessimistic vision where the school only serves as a cog that perpetuates the inequalities of the capitalist system without leaving room for transformation; he points out that students and teachers are not passive recipients of the dominant ideology, that they possess creativity and critical capacity to question, reject or modify school impositions and that they can have behaviors and attitudes of resistance not as simple acts of misconduct or senseless rebellion but as oppositional behaviors motivated by an emancipatory interest to disarticulate explicit or implicit domination in the school and in society. He determines that the school is transformed into a terrain of struggle where classrooms are not neutral or homogeneous spaces, but a terrain of contradiction and contradictions, where the dominant culture and the experiences or cultures of subordinate groups collide and where the identities of teachers and/or students are negotiated. This theory strives for the teacher to become a true transformative intellectual and stop being a simple technician or transmitter of content concentrated in the curriculum, who is capable of motivating and developing self-awareness, democracy and justice in the student [8].

Differences between Reproduction Theory and Resistance Theory

To understand how these two theories work and intertwine, generating rapprochement and ruptures between them, it is necessary to break down the school, educational and academic dynamics that arise within the school, both at the differential, conceptual and structural level, since the differences, interactions and gaps between them are not only conceptual, reproduction focuses on the macroeconomic and cultural structures that shape us, while resistance focuses on the micropolitics of the classroom and on the development of the ability to say "no". In reproduction, the school arbitrarily, but legitimately, imposes a particular culture (that of the ruling class) as if it were the only universally valid one; it describes that students from lower classes suffer more from symbolic violence because they lack the cultural capital necessary to decode school messages, which often leads them to failure and self-exclusion, in this sense culture becomes a filter of elimination. On the other hand, in resistance, Giroux determines that school culture is not a monolithic block of imposition and that it can become an organic dynamic culture, which despite being generated in the cultural battlefield that the school becomes, where the subcultures of the students not only suffer imposition, but also enter into living tension and conflict with the official culture, sometimes the teacher or the student or both can use their own cultural codes to reinterpret, mock or challenge the ideology and knowledge that is being imposed on them and even manage to change that reality [9].

The explicit and Hidden Curriculum Within Both Theories

In the reproduction, through the principle of correspondence, it is argued that the school reflects the reality of the world of work, producing obedient and passive workers, suitable for capitalist economies and that on the one hand the explicit curriculum is officially and obligatorily responsible for institutionally presenting the knowledge that the hegemonic class has arbitrarily determined must be taught, learned and apprehended, on the other hand,

the unofficially hidden curriculum is responsible for reproducing exactly the social relations of the capitalist workplace (hierarchy, obedience, competition, fragmentation of knowledge) and with this the school develops in the student mechanically and unconsciously the personality traits required by the labor market. On the contrary, Giroux argues that the Theory of Reproduction erroneously focuses conceptually and functionally on the explicit curriculum using the hidden curriculum, he argues that the school does not intend or achieve in a uniform or general way or to mold the personality of the students, he sees the explicit and hidden curriculum as an open text, where two educational microcosms coexist and work independently that work in opposite ways but that can be deconstructed and reconstructed and that these contradictions of the educational system itself leave fissures that students (and even teachers) can take advantage of to generate counter-discourses or new cultures and idiosyncrasies.

In reproduction, school failure is the internalization of the student's own supposed inferiority through the unconscious and automatic work carried out by the teacher, sooner or later it manages to make the student's dropout or low performance be considered subjectively but efficiently as a school and social filter that the school internalizes in society through the hidden curriculum and legitimized under the myth of meritocracy and credentialism (the student believes that he failed because of him, not because of the system or on the contrary, thanks to his efforts and academic-professional improvement he will have success). Many of the behaviors that occur inside the classroom and that are typified as indiscipline, disobedience, rebellion or autonomy are in reality incipient and disorganized forms of resistance, the refusal to do homework, absenteeism or mockery of the regulations do not always come from ignorance, but from an implicit rejection of school alienation and an institution that feels alienated to their expectations, interests or realities and then the school employs the teacher as a pawn to eliminate these attitudes through the symbolic violence that he uses during his work and pedagogical action. The school, which is considered a space of cultural arbitrariness, is at the same time the place where hegemonic ideology and culture is implanted in a subliminal and subtle way, making one think that change is practically impossible from within education; the school will only change if a structural and macroeconomic revolution occurs outside it first that overthrows the capitalist system of production; on the contrary, the resistance considers that the viability of social change also depends on the school itself.

The viability of social change and cultural and social transformation can begin incrementally within the educational institution itself, by forming critical students, the school becomes the incubator of the subjects who will eventually transform the external political and economic structures. Because of this, the main criticism made of the Theory of Resistance is that it mistakenly awakens the romantic and idealistic idea that the bad behaviors of students and acts of indiscipline are always manifestations of resistance and awakening of conscience, for example, not always a rebellious behavior accompanied by damage and destruction to furniture, equipment or didactic material is the result and is done by having an emancipatory conscience or a desire for justice and social democracy, by labeling simple apathy, vandalism or disinterest as resistance, there is a risk of justifying self-destructive behaviors that, far from liberating the student or teacher, end up imprisoning and marginalizing them even more from the system and denying them access to knowledge or the academic, labor and social improvement they need to defend themselves. Another of the great criticisms made of it is that instead of being liberating, it is oppressive and unethical by promoting sexism, racism and homophobia from school, for example, male students from the working class can resist the authority of the school and reaffirm a hyper-masculine street culture towards other classmates or female teachers [10].

The big problem and the reality that this theory faces is that almost always a teacher has to deal with saturated groups of students and with different realities of social violence, so it is unlikely that he can consciously or unconsciously design pedagogical and didactic strategies to raise awareness and that the system is already so effective and efficient that a student who resists accepting the codes of the school suffers the consequences of failing or abandoning studies, that supposed rebellion against school imposition later translates into an economic and labor defeat in the real world, since the world of work will punish him by penalizing him with precarious jobs, thus closing the circle of reproduction that the resistance intended to break.

Deconstruction of the Official Curriculum and its New Algorithmic Reconstruction

First, we will say that the transformative teacher is never generated by the system's own initiative and the school, for this it is required that he or she possess a certain initial or primary cultural capital that was generated in the family and that it is adequate to function as a subsequent trigger, first allowing the teacher to become aware that it is feasible to change or at least transform the oppressive and culturally arbitrary reality; for example, if the academic-school program requires teaching historically legitimized and unquestionable content, the teacher can introduce counter-narratives using alternative sources such as expert testimonies, national and international media, academic, historical or popular social archives, etc., to give their students information, arguments, experiences and contrary results that contrast the official versions and self-construct other answers. Currently in the era of artificial intelligence and big data, students can be taught to recognize information biases and to use appropriate search engines, questioning where the information comes from and what interests it responds to, and being able to discern what is true and what is not and select what serves them. The teacher can introduce environments around their students as an object of study, analyzing TikTok videos, texts of "X" (Twitter), urban music lyrics or marketing campaigns not to prohibit them, but to analyze their dynamics of power, transmission and message, thus

achieving critical and complementary learning using at the same time the hidden curriculum, moving from a passive pedagogy where the teacher monopolizes the word to turning the classroom into a space for peaceful dispute of ideas.

The periodic implementation of assemblies and structured debates within the classroom on real problems of the school community or global such as pollution, climate change, local gentrification, school failure, lag and dropout, bullying, etc., allows the development of critical capacity in the student (as long as they participate actively and dynamically). The teacher does not impose his position, but guarantees that everyone has a voice, models argumentative thinking and teaches to discern between an unfounded opinion and an argument supported by evidence. This new transformative teacher must be someone who does not think that accepting the logic that education is only an accumulation of scores and credentials to compete sooner or later in the labor market is inevitable and although they must comply with the formal record of grades imposed by the school and the system, they must develop and prioritize methodologies such as conscious self-evaluation and reflective co-evaluation with their peers, they design programs where success is not measured by memorizing data, but by the impact of learning on the environment, for example, service-learning projects where students solve a real problem in their neighborhood even if it is hypothetically or theoretically (Cillo, L. M. D. L. Á. 2015).

For the 21st Century, these New Teaching Profiles are Required More Than Ever

Changing the technical teacher who sees the teaching function and work as a simple job (bureaucrat), who focuses exclusively on transmitting fixed and predetermined content in the curriculum, on fulfilling paperwork and on preparing his students to take and pass standardized tests (memorization), monolithically reproducing a school, academic and social status quo, into a transformative intellectual teacher, who focuses on problematizing reality, awakening consciousness, promoting social justice and critical autonomy should be an educational priority. The teacher who assumes this role accepts that all education is a political act that maintains that teaching and learning are never neutral; on the contrary, they influence the structure of society and how people relate to power and their ultimate goal is not for students to peacefully adapt to the existing social order, but to give them the intellectual and ethical tools necessary to question and transform it.

Any Given Day at a Higher Education School (La Reproducción)

Below, we will synthetically describe one of the many situations that arise in a higher educational institution, within the classroom and during symbolic and social interaction and that are a reflection of what the Theory of Reproduction indicates: 7:05 in the morning, the teacher arrives in his classroom at school and greets everyone, takes his place behind his desk which is in front of everyone and facing his group of students in silence, places his portfolio on the desk, takes out his laptop and connects it to the fixed projector that is installed on the ceiling of the room, lowers the retractable screen that is on top of the white paint, turns on the projector and then his portable computer equipment and opens the support file that he had previously prepared to teach the class of the day and verifies that the image is projected on the screen clearly, then he takes a folder from his briefcase, opens it and takes out a sheet with names known as the attendance list, places the date of that day on top of the respective column; 10 minutes have passed since I arrive and at 7:15 he begins to name each of the students registered on that list, an action that is known as roll call, immediately the bustle that was inside the classroom ceases and all the students assume an attitude and behavior of attention waiting to hear his name and say the present word, knowing the consequences that not expressing that word can have, they are attentive because they know that not hearing his name and not saying the magic word will bring them repercussions, once they hear his name and say present, they breathe more relaxed.

This same situation is found in practically all schools and in all institutional spaces where there is a teacher and students and a class or session is taught or will be taught. But have we ever wondered why and for what? That scene and behaviors so common arise day by day, over time and as part of the beginning of a class and everyone assumes that this is inevitable because it is school protocol and that therefore it must be and is accepted in total legality and legitimacy by both (teacher and students), in education that is known as opening or initiation ritual, which in itself is one of the many manifestations of power and control through the symbolic violence that the teacher uses on his students who instinctively decode and understand it without having been taught institutionally but learned through the hidden curriculum, they have internalized it and it is part of the school culture and therefore it turns out that everyone must participate in it. The teacher, when hired by the educational institution, is automatically and subliminally invested before the students and society with a halo of pedagogical authority (which will gradually increase as he demonstrates to his peers and students his academic and professional value or on the contrary will decrease if his deficiencies and errors are evidenced and discovered), at the same time with this investiture he unconsciously assumes not only the role of teacher but also of authority, understanding that he will be able to exercise that function in front of his students to establish the control, submission and arbitrary imposition of academic content; To do this, the teacher has learned all this with the passage of time and playing the opposite role, that of the student, and as such has felt the consequences of not recognizing the teacher's authority and knows very well the permission he has to exercise symbolic violence through the domination, aggression and coercion that the attendance list represents and other school and pedagogical situations and

actions that are continuously presented during a class or session and the consequences of an absence recorded during the roll call or not complying with the indication made by the teacher; the level of impact reflected in the student's behaviors and attitudes will depend on the number of previous experiences he has had and with respect to the teacher, how perfected the use of symbolic violence is and the results he has obtained. Once the attendance roll is finished, the teacher begins his classes imposing his pedagogical authority through his pedagogical work with the pedagogical action he performs, which generally has the same format or methodological pattern always, although in some moments or situations he makes small modifications when the usual is no longer giving him the expected results, whether he uses the monologue master class, the simple reading by him or by the students of what is projected on the screen, the one of distributing a daily topic to a student or group of students so that they present the topic of the day, the one of choosing student after student to give readings to the question and answer of the questionnaire that he left previously (there may be other classroom modalities but for reasons of time and space only these will be mentioned).

We know that also in these simple examples the two theories already indicated are intertwined and that they are reflected in the following way, just as there are students who are punctual knowing that their teacher is punctual, there are others who as a rule arrive late knowing that if the roll call is not yet finished they will be allowed to enter the classroom, this decoding added to that of knowing that the roll call begins at 7:15 at the latest, they also know that if he arrives before he keeps the attendance sheet and appears in front of him asking him with a friendly tone to put him late, he will do so accompanied by the speech of "three continuous delays is a non-attendance. In the case of the teaching-learning dynamics applied by the teacher, there are students who when they go on to present a topic, answer a question or participate in some way, simply by reading or saying "something" of common sense, or just repeating what the teacher says or said, that is more than enough to satisfy the order of the pedagogical authority, even when they receive a scolding, correction or symbolic punishment, the student knows that nothing will happen after that day. The situation in these examples (which are not the only ones, since there are multiple and diverse), is not in itself only the ideological inculcation or the reproduction of the social status quo of dominator-dominated by the teacher or the manifestation of the undisciplined behavior of the student as a manifestation of resistance, it is the reflection of the imbrication that occurs or can occur in all the habitual processes that occur there with the manifestation of a habitus already learned thanks to the decoding of the symbols used, recognizing their intentionality in their use and the application of the respective and externalized counter reference can be a manifestation of cultural maturity and emancipation. In the matter of the appropriation of knowledge, when there are behaviors of submission in the student, it is only reproduced from person to person, when there are behaviors of autonomy, nonconformity or emancipation there are occasions in which reflection is made and there may even be self-learning, specifically, reproduction is synonymous with only delivering knowledge, it is not created or recreated and in resistance it is the other way around (Chávez Salas, A.L., 2006).

Reflection and Reasoning

The last reflection that will be presented will be based on the analogy used by Bourdieu and Passeron [2] in their book Reproduction. Elements for a theory of the education system, referring to the Pelican Egg. This is a critical metaphor used to illustrate the central concept of the Theory of Reproduction, and that in turn allows the presence of the essence of the Theory of Resistance, where a social determinism and a continuous and unalterable reproduction of inequalities through education are established; the metaphor is originally based on a poem called The Son of the Pelican, which describes a closed biological cycle: From the white egg of the pelican comes a pelican that lays another egg, also white and closed, source of an infinite chain of pelicans and eggs, in this way the fence closes again and again [11]. The message it contains points out and explains how social classes perpetuate themselves through a closed cycle, just as a pelican egg can only genetically be born another identical pelican, education and school are designed so that the children of the ruling class maintain their position of power and privileges (reproduction of cultural capital and habitus). The student is not a blank page, he enters the educational system with a predetermined social inheritance (cultural capital) that favors him and gives him greater and better opportunities to excel, a reality covered by the discourse and illusion of meritocracy, which points out that the school is presented as a neutral and fair space, however, by evaluating everyone equally, it actually benefits those who already bring the cultural code of the upper classes from their home, ensuring that the cycle continues in an infinite and automated way. This is an inevitable and unquestionable reality, but at the same time this metaphor ironically points out that the only way to stop this infinite chain of identical pelicans is if someone intervenes and breaks the egg (essence of the Theory of Resistance).

This means that the reproduction of inequality is not a biological or natural destiny, that school differences are not due to natural talent but to social origin, which opens the possibility of a disruptive action from an external intervention to break the power structures of the hegemonic class. But what is almost impossible to change or transform is the investiture of pedagogical authority and its pedagogical work and action, because without it it is impossible for these ideological ruptures to happen, it is possible that pedagogical authority and pedagogical work are used consciously or unconsciously to collapse the same structure that had legitimized authority for one's own interests and ends.

Conclusion

To point out that the educational and training process that is carried out in practically all higher educational institutions is incorrect or correct in relation to the purpose and achievements is something difficult and complicated, because it substantially depends on the point of view from which the value judgment and opinion are projected. For some, the social reproduction that is generated through education functions as a structural detriment to equity in all senses and for others, seen from a functionalist perspective, it can be seen as a beneficial mechanism of social order and cultural continuity. The main damage that can be attributed to the phenomenon of reproduction is the legitimization of inequality, since the school takes social, economic and cultural differences and transforms them into academic merit, making it believe that failure is the fault of the student and not of the system; it imposes the dominant culture that promotes the valuation and reward of the cultural capital of each student belonging to the upper or upper-middle classes, subtly and covertly labeling students from the lower classes as lacking or with low performance; to this end, it cunningly and effectively uses symbolic violence as a tool and invisible action where the dominant groups impose their vision of the world as the only valid one, getting the disadvantaged sectors themselves to accept their inferior position as something natural and inevitable, functioning at the same time as a brake and obstacle to true real social, labor and professional mobility, instead, the educational system trains the workforce according to the existing social division, limiting the rise of the most vulnerable sectors.

On the other hand, the benefits that can be attributed to it are that it achieves social cohesion and order from a traditional or functionalist vision, since due to the transmission of norms, values and reproducing common knowledge, it allows society to maintain a sense of belonging, stability and historical continuity, ensuring that institutions and society function in a uniform and peaceful way through rules, certifications and programs recognized by the State. In this sense, it is also pertinent to point out that there is a concept that was little mentioned during the development of the work and that conceptually describes the internal movement that arises within schools, the concept is organic dynamism, understood as the quality or process by which a person is in constant movement of adaptation and transformation in a fluid way, imitating the forms and logic of natural, artificial or in this case school life, depending on the context and educational level in which it is used and the role of student or teacher that is had, it is mainly applied as the opposite of a static situation, in a continuous becoming due to concepts that are self-organized, where the parts (teacher-student) interact in a coordinated way to maintain a changing balance to evolve and respond to stimuli; in other words, this situation is called symbolic interactionism.

Thinking that symbolic interactionism refers to and explains how people construct social reality and the sense of their identity through everyday relationships and interaction and the use of symbols expressed through language, gestures and objects, we will say that this defect is based on three fundamental ideas, the first, human beings act with respect to things based on the meaning they have for them; second, the meaning of these things arises from the social interaction that is maintained with others; third, meanings are manipulated and modified through an interpretive process that the person uses when encountering things; in the end and in a few words, human behavior is not an automatic response to external stimuli, but the result of how we interpret what happens around us. The definitive opinion regarding whether it is harmful or beneficial for society that reproduction exists within education and schools remains with each of the readers.

References

1. Paitan Compi EL, Aguirre González ME, CB Ñaccha Casaverde, CS, Sigüeñas Rodríguez, LA (2021). Importancia de la filosofía de la educación en el Siglo XXI. Revista Alpha Centauri 2(2): 44-57.
2. Bourdieu P, Passeron JC, (1977) La Reproducción. Elementos para una teoría del sistema de enseñanza. Editorial Laia, Barcelona. Consultado.
3. Backer DI (2021) Historia de la dicotomía reproducción-resistencia en la educación crítica: La línea de crítica contra Louis Althusser, 1974-1985. Revista Educación Critica 12(6).
4. Bowles S, Gintis H (2014) El problema de la teoría del capital humano: una crítica marxista. Revista de Economía Crítica, núm. 18. Consultado.
5. Op cit Medina del Moral N (2013) Análisis de los códigos sociolingüísticos en el aula. Huarte De San Juan. Filología Y Didáctica De La Lengua 13.
6. Gil Rivero J (2002) La importancia de la educación en la determinación de la hegemonía. Las teorías de la reproducción. Revista Laberinto 8: 72-84.
7. Balza Laya AM, Pérez de Balza E (2006) El dinamismo como paradigma cosmológico: Reflexiones en torno a la educación y el aprendizaje desde el Pensamiento Complejo. Revista SAPIENS 7(2).
8. Giroux H (1986) Teorías de la reproducción y la resistencia en la nueva sociología de la educación: un análisis crítico. Revista colombiana de educación 17.
9. Cillo LM DL Á (2015) El profesor como sujeto pedagógico y político: una mirada desde las críticas al reproductivismo y las teorías de la resistencia.
10. Chévez Ponce, (s/f) La producción y reproducción de desigualdades sociales en las prácticas de aulas costarricenses mediante el currículo oculto. Libro Juventud y desigualdades en América Latina y el Caribe.
11. Ciataloni F (1996) El hijo del pelícano puede matar al padre. P. Bourdieu y JC Passeron, La Reproducción. Elementos para una teoría del sistema de enseñanza.

ISSN: 2574-1241

DOI: 10.26717/BJSTR.2026.67.010476

Rivas-Gutiérrez . Biomed J Sci & Tech Res

This work is licensed under Creative *Commons* Attribution 4.0 License

Submission Link: https://biomedres.us/submit-manuscript.php



Assets of Publishing with us

- Global archiving of articles
- Immediate, unrestricted online access
- Rigorous Peer Review Process
- Authors Retain Copyrights
- Unique DOI for all articles

https://biomedres.us/