


GRAMSCI, ALTHUSSER AND BOURDIEU: IN DEBATE, THE SOCIAL FUNCTION OF THE SCHOOL

 <https://doi.org/10.56238/arev6n2-097>

Submitted on: 10/09/2024

Publication date: 10/10/2024

**Maristela Maximovitz de Oliveira¹, Kettlyn Carla de Souza², Neusa María Soares
Zukoski³ and Aparecida Favoreto⁴**

ABSTRACT

This article aims to discuss the social function of the school from the point of view of Gramsci, Althusser and Bourdieu through a bibliographic review. The results showed that the thinkers bring a discussion about the social function of the school, however, they differ in their arguments and elements. For Antonio Gramsci, the social function of the school should be to equip the subjects for the creation of a new culture, with a view to social transformation. For Althusser, the bourgeois school is the main Ideological Apparatus of the State, inculcating the knowledge of the dominant ideology, thus ensuring its domination. And for Pierre Bourdieu, the school acts by reproducing the inequalities between classes with its false neutrality and disregarding cultural capital.

Keywords: School Education. Culture. Social Transformation. History of Education.

¹ Master's student in Education at the State University of Western Paraná, Cascavel Campus
Specialist in Didactics in Higher Education from the Faculty of Biomedical Sciences of Cacoal
Graduated in Psychology from the Faculty of Biomedical Sciences of Cacoal

² Master's student in Education at the State University of Western Paraná, Cascavel Campus
Specialist in Historical-Cultural Psychology from the University of Paranaense
Specialist in Psychopedagogy from the University Center Venda Nova do Imigrante
Graduated in Psychology from Universidade Paranaense

³ Master's student in Education at the State University of Western Paraná, Cascavel Campus
Specialist in Neuropedagogy from the Faculty of Technology of Vale do Ivaí
Graduated in Pedagogy from the State University of Paraná

⁴ Doctor in Education from the Federal University of Paraná
Master's Degree in Education from the State University of Maringá
Specialist in Fundamentals of Education from the State University of Maringá
Bachelor's degree in History from the State University of Maringá
Professor of the Graduate Program in Education at the State University of Western Paraná

INTRODUCTION

To speak of the social function of the school is to speak of how throughout history it has taken different positions and objectives, according to needs and social conditions, but without ceasing to be a field of ideological struggle. For Nascimento and Favoreto (2018), the school is a political arena:

The school is a social institution that is inserted in a context marked by the struggle between different interests, both in the cultural and political-economic aspects. In this sense, the school is not understood as an isolated phenomenon. On the contrary, it is constituted in the interrelation between different elements, which make up a form of social being. In this process of composition, the school can be both a protagonist and a follow-up, which, in the face of contradictions, generates different possibilities of transformation or maintenance of order. Thus, it is up to the school to offer students the ability to interpret the movement of society, in order to take their positions (Nascimento; Favoreto, 2018, p. 252).

Although our objective here is not to explain the entire historical context that encompasses this theme, it is important to emphasize that there are other views, and it is also necessary to consider the context in which such discussions were woven. Next, we will start from broader understandings to finally enter into the proposed discussion - the function of the school from the perspective of Antonio Gramsci (1891 - 1937), Louis Althusser (1918 - 1990) and Pierre Bourdieu (1930 - 2002).

The social function of the school is already legitimized in some official documents based on the principle of education as a right, as is the case of the Federal Constitution of 1988 and the Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDB). According to article 205 of the Constitution, "Education, a right of all and a duty of the State and of the family, shall be promoted and encouraged with the collaboration of society, aiming at the full development of the person, his preparation for the exercise of citizenship and his qualification for work" (Brasil, 2016, p.123).

Corroborating the post, the LDB, when discussing the principles and purposes of national education, resumes education as a duty of the family and the state, and postulates in article 3 the principles on which education will be taught:

I – Equal conditions for access and permanence in school; II – Freedom to learn, teach, research and disseminate culture, thought, art and knowledge; III – Pluralism of ideas and pedagogical conceptions; IV – Respect for freedom and appreciation

for tolerance; V – Coexistence of public and private educational institutions; VI – Free public education in official establishments; VII – Valuing the school education professional; VIII – Democratic management of public education, in accordance with this Law and the legislation of the education systems; IX – Guarantee of quality standards; X – Valuing the extracurricular experience; XI – Linkage between school education, work and social practices; XII – Consideration of ethnic-racial diversity (Brasil, 1996, p. 9).

By bringing to the debate the Brazilian educational legislation, we are interested, based on it, in highlighting the importance and relevance of the proposed discussion, reflecting and questioning, through the contributions of thinkers about the social function of the school, whether this institution really has the possibility of complying with what the laws bring. According to Lopes and Caprio (2008), education has been increasingly influenced by neoliberalism, attributing a strategic role to the school in the sense of transforming parents and students into consumers, since the center of neoliberalism is the market, and, consequently, consumption.

Gracindo (1998) corroborates this debate, in which he states that the LDB does have neoliberal ideas, since politics and education are correlated - to talk about education is to talk about politics. Furthermore, every law manifests a policy and results from the clash of political forces, so in the LDB it would be no different.

Regarding the appropriation of historical production in society, Leontiev (1978) in his text "Man and Culture", emphasizes that "man is not born endowed with the historical acquisitions of humanity" (p. 283), necessary for his humanization. These, in turn, are the result of the development of previous generations incorporated into human culture, in which in an educational relationship mediated by other men, in a process of communication and transmission via education, it would enable man and the new generations to come into contact with the world, appropriating the social historical production.

In fact, we emphasize that "in modern society, it is notorious how the thesis that education could interfere in the constitution and social transformation has grown" (Favoreto; Galter, 2020, p. 3) and in this sense, in view of the urgency of the social importance of the educational area, it is necessary to problematize it, as well as to carry out studies focused on this area.

From the above, it is denoted how primordial education is, which by transmitting historical production, humanizes man. According to Saviani (2015), this would be the social

function of education, which from the educational work would produce in each individual the humanity historically produced by men. Below, we will explore this relationship better based on the contributions of Gramsci, Althusser and Bourdieu, who are similar in some points, but diverge in others with regard to the social function of the school.

GRAMSCI'S UNITARY SCHOOL

Gramsci was born on January 22, 1891, in Italy, and in his 46 years of life, he dedicated himself to the political struggle, debating the role of culture, politics, intellectuals and the school in the process of social transformation. Gramsci's studies took place in a turbulent period, in a context of great social transformations (Nascimento; Favoreto, 2018). With regard to Gramsci's contributions to education, in his work *Prison Notebooks* (2004), the author criticized the traditional education system, claiming that vocational schools, as well as traditional schools, do not train organic intellectuals for all classes.

With regard to intellectuals, the author divides them into traditional and organic, where organic intellectuals can be characterized as specialists who have the ability to organize the mass of men, while traditional intellectuals position themselves as autonomous and independent of the dominant social group. However, Gramsci discusses the doubt surrounding the intellectuals of the time, questioning their autonomy, or their conditioning to the social group to which they belong. For him, every social group, which is born and performs a function in the social fabric, creates intellectuals who produce in order to provide them with awareness, legitimacy and uniformity. However, while the capitalist entrepreneur generates intellectuals to think about industry, laws and the new culture, the peasant mass does not elaborate its own intellectual mass (Gramsci, 2004).

Historically, aiming at the ideological struggle, categories linked to the dominant social groups were formed, qualified and destined to intellectual activities. And in view of the power validated and maintained by them, intellectuality assumed a relevance, therefore, it was sought to increase specializations and improvements around it. With this, the number of schools was expanded, and this is even a parameter to measure the complexity of the intellectual function in a given State: "The more extensive the school area and the more numerous the vertical degrees of the school, the more complex will be the world of culture, civilization, of a given State" (Gramsci, 2004, p. 19). The types of school offered also refer to the type of knowledge that will be produced and the specializations created, in

this sense, while the urban bourgeoisie generates technicians for industry, the rural bourgeoisie produces state employees and liberal professionals (Gramsci, 2004).

In a relationship mediated by the superstructure as a whole, intellectuals and the "world of production" are more or less closely connected to the fundamental social groups. Gramsci indicates that there are two major plans in the superstructure, these being civil society and the State, which have the functions of liaison and organization. In this way, the ruling class delegates the functions of social and political hegemony, with the dissemination of the spontaneous consensus of the masses and state coercion, to the intellectuals (Gramsci, 2004).

Hegemony is a central theme in Gramsci's studies. The author indicates that "hegemony is the organizer of ideology, which lends the most intimate cement to civil society" (p. 375), and that every cultural manifestation contains ideological elements. Frederico (2022, p. 112) points out that Gramsci does not dilute ideology within culture, but rather points out that ideology is the "source of a collective will, of a conception of the world, of a cultural movement", characterizing itself as an objective and operative reality.

The sciences have spread in everyday life in modern civilization in such a way that practical activities have become more complex, requiring a different school and specializations for each activity, in which each area has its own intellectuals. Furthermore, this division does not occur only for areas and professions, it also appears in the particularization of the school, which is separated between professional school and traditional school, in which the professional school is intended for the working class and the classical the dominant class. In contrast, Gramsci advocated a single school, which would encompass the bourgeois class and the working class. The school would have the function of equipping individuals for the interpretation of society and the formation of intellectuals capable of modifying culture. It would also be able to develop both manual and intellectual work capacities, having a humanistic, formative and general culture character (Gramsci, 2004).

To achieve the objectives described above, the unitary school has a curriculum oriented to this purpose, divided into several levels according to the age and moral and intellectual development of the students, promoting autonomy, guidance, maturity and initiative in young people, inserting them in social activity. However, for this to be possible through a single school of humanist training, it is necessary for the State to start paying for these students, a position previously exercised by the family in the maintenance of its

young people, so that this education in the broad sense is public, without divisions between castes and encompasses all generations. Other investments, such as in infrastructure and in the teaching staff, are also fundamental for the unitary school to be effective, since Gramsci states that these should be full-time (Gramsci, 2004).

Between school and life there is a leap, a passage between more mechanical and dogmatic aspects of learning to those that require autonomy and creation. In order to account for this leap, Gramsci points out that the unitary school should have a decisive phase, destined to meet this demand. At this time, the values of humanism (autonomy and self-discipline) would be created:

In the first phase, one tends to discipline and therefore also to level, to obtain a certain kind of "conformism" that can be called "dynamic"; in the creative phase, on this basis the "collectivization" of the social type has already been achieved, there is a tendency to expand the personality, becoming autonomous and responsible (Gramsci, 2004, p. 39).

The implementation of the unitary school represents the beginning of new relationships, relationships that consider industrial and intellectual work beyond the school, but in social life, reflecting in culture, of which the academies would be the cultural organizers. "The school being separated from life was what determined the crisis of the school" (Gramsci, 2004, p. 45), in this sense, for the student to actively participate in the school, this split must be broken. Furthermore, the school must be disinterested, focused on instruction, without immediate and declared purposes, but rather formative and rich in concrete notions (Gramsci, 2004).

Gramsci's studies point to work as a teaching methodology in the unitary school. In this sense, numerous Brazilian theorists have already analyzed the national educational system and idealized a public education that would be able to lead each individual to the condition of directing and controlling who drives (Ramos, 2012; Saviani, 2007; Frigotto, 2007; Da Silva Lizzi; Favoreto, 2018).

For the author, it is necessary to ensure not only the technical mastery of knowledge, but the understanding of the scientific principles and the processes that made them possible. Therefore, based on the discussion promoted by Gramsci, as long as education is aligned with the capitalist system, without the possibility of producing critical knowledge

about the reality of workers, the objective of leading individuals to the condition of directing those who lead becomes unlikely.

ALTHUSSER: THE SCHOOL AS AN IDEOLOGICAL APPARATUS OF THE STATE

Louis Althusser was a Marxist philosopher who built his theory on the basis of structuralism. Being a structuralist theorist, Althusser takes up Marx's metaphor of the building to explain Infrastructure and Superstructure¹. Althusser's contribution in his work "Ideological State Apparatuses" allows a broad understanding of the reproduction of social life. The author points out that, for a social formation to exist, it must reproduce the conditions of its production, with the repressive and ideological state apparatuses being the systems that guarantee this reproduction (Althusser, 1985; 1999). To explain how this movement happens, Althusser highlights 3 spheres: (1) the reproduction of the means of production, (2) the reproduction of labor power, and (3) the reproduction of production relations.

The means of production are characterized in Althusserian theory as the production infrastructure, that is, the raw material, building facilities and machines, which are also reproduced. According to the author, this reproduction of the means of production goes beyond the level of the company, transforming itself into a complex context of interrelations. This means that, for production to be possible, it is necessary that the material conditions be reproduced, a movement that does not necessarily happen on the factory floor, but in the real relationships between those who produce. Thus, Althusser points out that, for a producer to be successful in his production, he depends on other producers who will make it possible to access the means of production (Althusser, 1985).

With regard to the reproduction of the labor force, the author points out that this reproduction takes place outside the factory floor, being ensured by wages. The salary is what guarantees the worker housing, food and access to health, minimum conditions for the worker to be able to work. It is at this point that the author highlights an important aspect about the reproduction of the workforce, the qualification of the workforce, which takes place in the school context. According to Althusser, the school currently acts in accordance with capitalist interests:

Now, let's see, how does this reproduction of the (diversified) qualification of the labor force in the capitalist regime take place? Contrary to what occurred in slave and servile social formations, this reproduction of the qualification of the labor force

tends (this is a tendential law) to take place no longer in the "workplace" (learning in production itself), but increasingly outside of production, through the capitalist school system and other instances and institutions (Althusser, 1985, p. 56-57).

Finally, Althusser focuses on the explanation of the reproduction of production relations. The reproduction of labor power requires more than the wage and qualification of labor power, it requires the reproduction of submission to norms, orders, ideas and relationships. Furthermore, these relations are not reproduced in the company either, but in the social whole, with the school institution being the most responsible for the inculcation of the social norms of the dominant class. In this way, the school "ensures submission to the dominant ideology and the mastery of its practice" (Althusser, 1985, p. 58).

Based on Marxist theory, Althusser builds a broader perspective that contributes to what the State is. Marx understands the state as a coercive class instrument that includes government, administration, army, police, courts and prisons that allows the ruling classes to ensure their domination over the dominated class:

For Marx, the capitalist state is the result of the divisions of society into classes and is not a neutral power above the interests of the classes. His emphasis is placed on the character of class domination of the State, considering it exclusively a mechanism of oppression and repression of the proletariat/workers to guarantee the accumulation and reproduction of capital, and with it, the reproduction of capitalism (Silva, 2015, p. 09).

Althusser (1985) starts from Marx's theory and divides the State Apparatus into the Repressive State Apparatus (ARE) and the Ideological State Apparatus (ISA). The repressive apparatus is characterized by the use of violence, whether physical or symbolic, and part of public structures, such as the government, the army, the police, the courts and prisons. The Ideological State Apparatuses, on the other hand, can be both public and private and work through ideology, and can be found in religion, family, legal, political, union, cultural and school spaces. These various Ideological Apparatuses of the State (ISAs) act in different ways from each other, with a double functioning between the public and private spheres, relating in such a way that one apparatus provides conditions for the existence of the other, linking itself to the ideology that interests the dominant class (Althusser, 1985). According to Ferraro (2014), if a certain culture or ideology wishes to

remain in a position of dominance, it must produce, at the same time as it reproduces, its effects of truth and desirable relations, with the objective of continuing its ideology.

Unlike other theorists, Ideology for Althusser is not "fundamentally a matter of ideas: it is a structure that imposes itself on us, without necessarily passing through consciousness" (Teixeira, 2005, p. 75, apud Fofano; Rech, 2021). Thus, the so-called General Ideology has no history, since it does not depend on a situation, or on a historical moment, being a structure that acts on individuals all the time and is characterized as a "representation of the imaginary relationship of individuals with their real conditions of existence" (Althusser, 1985, p. 85).

Ideology materializes, concretizes and manifests itself through an apparatus that has actions and rituals, questioning individuals into subjects. Interpellation is the process by which individuals become subjects of ideology, transforming themselves into concrete subjects, who submit to another subject through the call of ideology. When called, the individual identifies and recognizes himself, starting to act according to the designs of ideology. "The interpellation never fails the person targeted: through a verbal call, the whistle, the interpellated person always recognizes that it was to him that they were interpellated" (Althusser, 1985, p. 100). Fofano and Rech (2021) help to understand the post, saying:

For Althusser, the individuals interpellated by the ideological operation, transformed into social subjects, act according to the identification they find in the ideologies existing in the discourse of the other. The subject, when faced with the multiplicity of social discourses that exist, is interpellated by a discourse that positions him as a discursive subject (Fofano; Rech, 2021, p. 6).

In the Middle Ages, the ideological apparatus that played a fundamental role in the Ideological Interpellation was the church, accumulating functions that today belong to other AIEs. Currently, in order to meet the new needs of the capital, the School Ideological Apparatus emerges as an option for the dissemination of the ideas of the dominant class and in the maintenance of relations of capitalist domination and exploitation. Althusser points out that the school, hidden from a neutral, natural and disguised tendency, manages to encompass both children and their families due to the mandatory nature of education and the long period in which they will be in the classrooms.

In the bourgeois school that functions as an ISA, the teachers, supposedly respectful of the conscience and freedom of the children entrusted to them by their parents, make the students rise to the freedom, morality and responsibility of adults by their own example, knowledge, literature and their virtues. But all this discourse of the school reproduces only the relations of production based on a capitalist social formation (Fofano; Rech, 2021, p. 12).

Therefore, for Althusser, the function of the school in the capitalist structure is nothing more than the reproduction and maintenance of society as it is. In this way, as the Ideological Apparatus of the State, it fulfills its task of questioning and training Subjects to play necessary roles in a class society: the role of the exploited, the agent of exploitation, the agent of repression or professionals of ideology. The school acts in a decisive way in this process, working on the articulation and potentiation of the daydreams of the dominant class. An example is the school of the twenty-first century and its neoliberal influence. More and more business performances are hidden with pedagogical actions, acting and going against the current economic order.

THE REPRODUCTIVE SCHOOL AND BOURDIEU'S CULTURAL CAPITAL

Pierre Bourdieu was a French philosopher and sociologist who brought contributions to the field of education and studies on society. De Genova, Ferreira and Souza (2022) point out that Bourdieu dedicated his academic life to understanding the role of the school and its way of disseminating and permanence the power of the dominant classes. Nogueira and Nogueira (2002) point out that the functionalist view that prevailed until the middle of the twentieth century attributed to the school a central role in the process of overcoming economic backwardness, in this way, the public school would be the solution to the problem of access to education and thus equal opportunities would be guaranteed for individuals. To understand the social function of the school according to Bourdieu's thoughts, it is necessary to initially understand two of its main concepts: habitus and field.

According to Almeida (2005), habitus refers to the process of incorporation of objective structures, that is, the process of "internalized externalities" that the individual acquires throughout life in his family relationships, in his education and in contact with religion, work, in short, all the means that contribute to the formation of the individual in the social context. The habitus is divided into two concepts, hexis and ethos, the first is related

to body language and posture, while the second corresponds to the internalized values that will serve as guidance for the individual's behavior.

The concept of field, in turn, is described as the social situation in which each agent is positioned, a space in which they will carry out their practice according to the habitus learned throughout life, being marked by individuals "endowed with the same habitus in which they move as players, whose positions in the game will depend on the accumulation of capital corresponding to the field that each individual, or agent, to acquire" (Almeida, 2005, p. 04).

In agreement, Lima (2010) explains that a field is part of the social space, a concept that Bourdieu describes as a space of positions of the agents and institutions that are situated in it. Thus, depending on the weight and the overall volume of the capital they own, agents and institutions are distributed in dominated and dominant positions.

We are then faced with another fundamental concept of Bourdieu's work, capital. Capital can be economic, but also symbolic and cultural, the latter usually being transmitted by the family or institutions, such as school. For the author, "the legacy of cultural assets accumulated and transmitted by previous generations really belongs (although it is formally offered to all) to those who have the means to appropriate it" (Bourdieu, 2007, p. 297). By pointing out that the legacy is formally offered to all, Bourdieu highlights the fundamental role of the school in the transmission of culture:

For individuals from the less favored classes, school remains the only way to access culture [high culture/erudite culture], and this at all levels of education; therefore, it would be the real way to democratize culture if it did not consecrate, ignoring them, the initial inequalities in relation to culture (Bourdieu; Passeron, 2015, p. 38).

On the reproduction of the social order, Bourdieu, in his work "Economics of Symbolic Exchanges" (2007), discusses cultural reproduction and social reproduction, pointing out the need to understand habitus and how structures tend to reproduce themselves, "producing agents endowed with the system of dispositions capable of engendering practices adapted to structures and, therefore, in conditions to reproduce structures" (Bourdieu, 2007, p. 296). The author uses statistical data for this discussion that indicate that those who have access to culture and leisure, that is, cultural capital, are a limited part of society, the dominant class.

As already seen, concepts such as habitus, field and cultural capital are related in the construction of the individual, however, one more concept becomes relevant to the understanding of social reproduction elaborated by Bourdieu. It is the pedagogical action:

Pedagogical action is the imposition of a dominant cultural arbitrary. Pedagogical action selects and legitimizes culture by imposition and inculcation, seeking to form the individual's habitus according to the dominant culture. To this end, it uses a pedagogical authority in which it is possible to guarantee its action, either through sanctions or by naturalizing its impositions. Pedagogical action is all the more effective the greater the prestige of the institution mediated by it, as well as the recognition of its pedagogical authority and the proximity between the dominant culture and the culture experienced by the individual in his first education (Almeida, 2005, p. 143).

In this way, in the process of social reproduction, the education system collaborates for the reproduction of class differences. In this false neutrality of the school, it contributes to the reproduction of bourgeois culture to the extent that it camouflages social differences. According to the author, the movement in which "a few individuals carefully selected and modified by and for individual ascension helps in social stability and perpetuates the structure of class relations" (Bourdieu, 2007, p. 296). In addition:

Bourdieu denounced the false democratic character of the school, insofar as he explained that cultural capital, that is, the possession of material linked to human culture and the instruments to decode them, belong to the bourgeois class. In this sense, Bourdieu points out that not all subjects who are inside the school have access to erudite culture and scientific knowledge (Lenardão, 2022, p. 21).

In this way, the school system has the function of legitimizing the perpetuation of the "social order". The culture of the ruling class is seen as "good", "right", valued and desired and would act as a mechanism to pass on this overvaluation of the culture of the dominant class (Bourdieu, 2007). In this sense, in the author's view, those who have the means to decode, that is, to understand and appropriate culture are the individuals of the dominant class, who have direct access to the material available to enjoy cultural capital in its entirety.

However, before the school has a fundamental role in this process, Bourdieu talks about the function of the family. The author points out that the school will only be successful in transmitting erudite culture to the individual who is familiar with the world of art, that is,

the success of the transmission will depend on the degree of proximity of the family code to the erudite culture that the school transmits (Bourdieu, 2007).

The school is defined by the author as a reproducer of social structures, in which "the free play of the laws of cultural transmission causes cultural capital to return to the hands of cultural capital and with this the structure of distribution of cultural capital among social classes is reproduced" (Bourdieu, 2007, p. 297). Therefore, in his critical proposal, Bourdieu sees the school as a space that reproduces and legitimizes social inequality, allowing and solidifying the differences between social classes.

This legitimization of social inequality happens through the dissimulation of the social base of the school, which has a crucial role in this process as it has teaching and evaluation methods based on this premise in its curriculum. In this way, the school demands much more from students than the content transmitted, requiring verbal and cultural skills and mastery of knowledge that only those who are close to the dominant culture have access to (Nogueira; Nogueira, 2002). In short, based on the assumption that everyone has the same chances of school success, school failure is justified individually, judging that its root is related to lack of commitment, thus ignoring cultural heritage (Ramos, 2020).

Bourdieu, in 1964, came to see a possible solution to deal with the inequity of the school as a resource for maintaining cultural privileges, through what he called "rational pedagogy". This pedagogy would act through the systematized exposure of the functioning of school systems, carrying out uninterrupted learning with pedagogical actions, which would have the capacity to neutralize cultural inequality. However, later, Bourdieu ratified that a work like this is utopian, since, with each advance of the popular strata, the elites also advanced and moved, so it would not be through the school that this change would happen (Ramos, 2020).

Bringing Bourdieu's discussion closer to the reality of Brazil, we can perceive some political movements that, through a discourse of an ultraconservative nature, violate the constitution and the Laws of Guidelines and Bases of National Education, such as the School Without Party (ESP) movement. Silveira (2019) argues that, in an attempt to defend a supposed neutrality in school education, the projects presented in this movement attack the secularity of education with moral arguments that try to justify the implementation of ESP, expressing the interests of the dominant class.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Gramsci, Althusser and Bourdieu started from a Marxist position to explain structures and ways of functioning of society and its institutions, including the school. Gramsci saw the school as the protagonist of a "political-pedagogical praxis" capable of generating organic intellectuals for the working class, which could thereby force some educational policies, serving as an instrument for the emancipation of the dominated. According to Do Nascimento and Favoreto (2022), for Gramsci, the unitary school, with the educational principle of work, would be able to found new relations of intellectual and industrial work in the social whole, creating people able to study, think, control, and govern.

However, Gramsci's ideals diverge from Althusser and Bourdieu with regard to the possibility of social transformation. Gramsci's theory points to the school as a possible solution for social transformation by instrumentalizing the individual for the creation of a new culture, which would be necessary before the seizure of power by the subaltern classes (Nascimento; Favoreto, 2018).

In contrast, Althusser points to the school as being the main Ideological State Apparatus, responsible for disseminating the knowledge of the dominant ideology, through the interpellation of individuals into subjects, forming a submission through its structure, whether in school content or in its pure ideology, in its moral, civic, philosophical and educational aspects (Althusser, 1985, p. 79). The author highlights the importance of qualification for work, which occurs mostly outside production, through the capitalist school system, which acts silently, hidden from a supposed neutrality.

In this sense, both Althusser and Bourdieu do not defend the school as a possible means of revolution, on the contrary, for the authors, the school has the power to socialize individuals for the maintenance of the capitalist structure, of bourgeois interests. In a similar vein, Bourdieu points to the school as a cultural reproducer, pointing out that the cultural capital that the family inculcates in individuals would be important for the cultural appropriation exposed in the school and outside it.

Linking the authors' problematizations about the school with the Brazilian educational legislation, we can question the possibilities of the school to put into effect what the law says, since the capitalist social structure makes it impossible for some principles to be fulfilled, an example being principle I of the LDB (1996) on equal conditions for access and permanence in school. For Althusser, the school is not a place of equality, but of reproduction. Bourdieu, when thinking about the conditions of access and permanence,

emphasizes the heritage and cultural capital. And for Gramsci, this model of school does not enable the development of the working class.

Thus, it is relevant to reflect on what school model we have, and what interests it serves. In this sense, the contribution of the authors explained here is essential, as they show how these laws are in favor of the dominant class, producing individuals who reproduce capitalist structures, making the school a space for the dissemination of laws and rules, customs and morals that hinder a movement of social transformation. Gramsci, Althusser and Bourdieu bring important contributions to understanding the functioning of society, its contradictions and movements and provide the basis for new studies focused on the social function of the school in a capitalist society that reinforces meritocratic discourses of neoliberal orders at all times.

NOTES

Infrastructure refers to the base that determines the entire building, the ground on which the building will be raised, which is the relations of production, with the determination by the economic base. The Superstructure, on the other hand, is of the building itself, exerting the action of return on the base, being divided into two floors: The State and the Ideology (Althusser, 1985).

REFERENCES

1. Almeida, L. R. S. (2005). Pierre Bourdieu: A transformação social no contexto de “a reprodução.” *Revista Inter-Ação, 30*(1), 139-155.
2. Althusser, L. (1985). *Aparelhos ideológicos de Estado: Nota sobre aparelhos ideológicos de Estado* (3rd ed.). Rio de Janeiro: Edições Graal.
3. Althusser, L. (1999). Os aparelhos ideológicos de Estado. In *Sobre a reprodução*.
4. Brasil. (2016). *Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil de 1988*. Brasília, DF: Presidente da República.
5. Brasil. (1996). *Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional, LDB, 9394/1996*.
6. Bourdieu, P. (2007). *Economia das trocas simbólicas*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.
7. Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (2015). *Os herdeiros: Os estudantes e a cultura* (I. R. Valle & N. Valle, Trans.). Florianópolis: Ed. da UFSC.
8. Da Silva Lizzi, M. S. S., & Favoreto, A. (2018). Concepção de educação integral: Fundamentos e (res) significações na política educacional para o Ensino Médio. *Cadernos de Pesquisa, 25*(2), 129–146.
9. De Genova Ferreira, J. M., & De Souza, G. P. (2022). Cultura e educação: Contribuições de Bakhtin, Freire e Bourdieu. *Instrumento: Revista de Estudo e Pesquisa em Educação, 24*(1), 126-148.
10. Favoreto, A., & Galter, M. I. (2020). Teorias da transformação social: Paradigmas positivistas e marxistas em debate. *Educere et Educare, 15*(34), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.17648/educare.v15i34.23312>
11. Fofano, D. K., & Rech, H. L. (2021). Ideology and education from the perspective of Louis Althusser. *Educação em Revista, 37*, e232216.
12. Frederico, C. (2022). Ideologia e cultura: Notas para uma pesquisa. *Matrizes, 16*(1), 101-118.
13. Frigotto, G. (2007). A relação da educação profissional e tecnológica com a universalização da educação básica. *Educação & Sociedade, 28*, 1129-1152.
14. Gracindo, R. V. (1998). Os sistemas municipais de ensino e a nova LDB: Limites e possibilidades. In I. Brzezinski (Org.), *LDB interpretada: Diversos olhares se entrecruzam* (pp. 153-204). São Paulo: Cortez.
15. Gramsci, A. (2004). *Cadernos do cárcere* (C. N. Coutinho, Ed. & Trans.; L. S. Henriques & M. A. Nogueira, Co-eds., Vol. II). Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.

16. Lenardão, E. (2022). Diferentes disposições estéticas e cultura escolar: A posição de Pierre Bourdieu. *Educação em Análise, 7*(2).
17. Lima, D. M. O. (2010). Campo do poder, segundo Pierre Bourdieu. *Cogito, 11*, 14-19.
18. Lopes, E. C. P. M., & Caprio, M. (2008). As influências do modelo neoliberal na educação. *Revista on-line de Política e Gestão Educacional, 5*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v0i5.9152>
19. Nascimento, L., & Favoreto, A. (2018). Émile Durkheim, John Dewey e Antônio Gramsci: Em debate a teoria da educação transformadora. *Revista Educação em Questão, 56*(49), 250-273.
20. Nascimento, L., & Favoreto, A. (2022). Teorias da transformação social e da educação: Um debate à luz de Gramsci. *Revista Práxis e Hegemonia Popular, 7*(10), 158-182.
21. Nogueira, C. M. M., & Nogueira, M. A. (2002). A sociologia da educação de Pierre Bourdieu: Limites e contribuições. *Educação & Sociedade, 23*, 15-35.
22. Ramos, J. A. A. (2020). Pierre Bourdieu e Paulo Freire: Um diálogo pela educação. *Revista Entreideias: Educação, Cultura e Sociedade, 9*(3).
23. Ramos, M. (2012). Escola unitária. In R. S. Caldart, I. B. Pereira, P. Alentejano, & G. Frigotto (Eds.), *Dicionário da educação do campo*. Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo: Escola Politécnica de Saúde Joaquim Venâncio, Expressão Popular.
24. Saviani, D. (2007). Trabalho e educação: Fundamentos ontológicos e históricos. *Revista Brasileira de Educação, 12*(34), 152-165.
25. Saviani, D. (2015). Sobre a natureza e especificidade da educação. *Revista Germinal: Marxismo e educação em debate, 7*(1), 286-293.
26. Silva, M. E. B. R. (2015). O Estado em Marx e a teoria ampliada do Estado em Gramsci.
27. Silveira, D. M. N. (2019). Escola “sem” partido: A pseudo-neutralidade e o viés ultraconservador do movimento (Master's thesis). Universidade Estadual do Oeste do Paraná, Cascavel.