

Forms of capital and family influence on school performance from the perspective of sociology of education

ARTICLE

Deisilucy de Aragão Fernandes Sequeira

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil

Maria Luiza Canedo Queiroz da Silva

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brasil



1

Abstract

This article presents fundamental concepts of Pierre Bourdieu and James Coleman to the Sociology of Education field, as well as the reflexions and contributions of different authors aiming to show the influence of different forms of family capital on children's academic success. The work made use of a consistent bibliographical review which, in dialog with a data from the Results Report of the Basic Education Assessment System (Saeb) – Volume I (Brasil, 2021), identified the influence of family support and participation on the students' academics results. The conclusions of this study indicate that different types of capital, cultural and social, have meaningful effects on student performance, whether through support, encouragement and family participation in their children's studies or through the mobilization of the family support network, in which the 'family dialogue' and 'family educational resources' can become distinctive factors. **Keywords:** Sociology of Education. Forms of Capital. Family and Education. Student Performance.

Formas de capital e influência familiar no desempenho escolar pelo olhar da sociologia da educação

Resumo

Este artigo apresenta conceitos fundamentais de Pierre Bourdieu e James Coleman para o campo da Sociologia da Educação, bem como as reflexões e contribuições de outros autores visando mostrar a influência de diferentes formas de capital familiar no sucesso escolar dos filhos. O trabalho se valeu de uma consistente revisão bibliográfica que, dialogando com dados do Relatório de Resultados do Sistema de Avaliação da Educação Básica (Saeb), identificou a influência do apoio e da participação familiar nos resultados acadêmicos dos estudantes. As conclusões deste estudo indicam que os diferentes tipos de capital, cultural e social têm efeitos significativos no desempenho discente, seja por meio do apoio, incentivo e da participação familiar nos estudos ou pela mobilização da rede de apoio familiar, em que o 'diálogo familiar' e os 'recursos educacionais familiares' podem se tornar elementos diferenciais.

Palavras-chave: Sociologia da Educação. Formas de Capital. Família e Educação. Desempenho Discente.

1 Introduction

2

This article presents Pierre Bourdieu's contributions to the Sociology of Education, addressing the different forms of capital in the context of family-school relationships. His studies demonstrate that students' social background leads to educational inequalities, which, in turn, reproduce the objective system of positions and domination within the social hierarchy (Bonamino *et al.*, 2010).

Bourdieu brings to the discussion his thesis on the relationship between the possession of cultural capital and academic success, particularly the hypothesis of an osmotic transmission from parents to children, thus breaking with the explanation of school success based on “[...] purely individual attributes, within the ideology of talent, emphasizing instead the predominant mode of acquiring legitimate culture by culturally privileged social groups, namely: through impregnation and osmosis” (Nogueira; Resende, 2022, p. 4).

Going beyond this understanding, some authors reflect on the significant transformations of the school system since Bourdieu's classical writings, as well as on the educational practices of middle- and upper-class families who, better equipped with cultural capital, tend to adopt more visible educational strategies and investments. Thus, some authors question “the idea of automatic and inexorable transmission – beginning to focus on the concrete conditions of family socialization in the school context of children” (Nogueira; Resende, 2022, p. 4).

It is important to note that, in the first half of the 20th century, the dominant view attributed to schools a fundamental role in the construction of a new, democratic, and just society, in which access to free public education would ensure equal opportunities. For this purpose, all individuals would be within the education system under equal conditions, and those who stood out due to their individual talents would, according to the prevailing view of justice, progress in their educational careers and, in the future, occupy higher positions in the social hierarchy.

However, the marked optimism of this period was replaced by a less optimistic stance, based on the Coleman Report (1966), which established a turning point in this vision of building an egalitarian society through education for all. In this context, “Bourdieu’s studies emphasized that students’ social origin leads to educational inequalities and, moreover, that educational inequalities reproduce the objective system of positions and domination” (Bonamino *et al.*, 2010, p. 487–488).

To better understand and investigate the mechanisms of domination and power games within this hierarchical society, Bourdieu employs the concept of capital. For him, individuals and groups develop strategies that allow them to improve or maintain their social position, and these strategies are related to different types of capital. In Bourdieu’s framework, capital is a metaphor derived from the economic field, as it is considered a resource that can be applied to production and generates cultural or social advantages that individuals or families mobilize to achieve their objectives.

Bourdieu (1989), as well as Coleman (1988), introduces the concept of capital in social analysis to refer not only to its economic form but also to its cultural and social forms. Although they develop the concept of capital on distinct theoretical bases, these authors share similar conceptions regarding economic capital. It is noteworthy that both adopt an expanded conception of capital, based on empirical evidence showing the limitations of economic capital in explaining, in general, the relationship between socioeconomic background and educational outcomes. Both sociologists argue that “other forms of capital, such as social and cultural capital, directly contribute to and interact with economic capital to strengthen this relationship” (Bonamino *et al.*, 2010, p. 488).

Bourdieu conceives society as hierarchical, based on relations of power and privilege, determined by economic capital, such as income, means of production, and the set of economic goods available to the individual; social capital, corresponding to participation in groups or social networks—that is, social relations that can be leveraged for the individual’s benefit; and cultural capital, which can be identified with the body of knowledge and skills, highlighting that cultural capital can exist in three states: embodied, objectified, and institutionalized.

Cultural capital in its embodied state constitutes an integral part of the individual and cannot be exchanged instantaneously, as it is linked to the singularity of the person; that is, it comprises tastes and attitudes assimilated from one's early environment. In its objectified state, cultural capital is related to cultural goods, such as paintings, artworks, sculptures, books, and other objects recognized as legitimate. Institutionalized cultural capital primarily occurs in the form of academic degrees. It is worth noting that the degree of family investment in a child's educational trajectory is linked to the likely return that can be obtained from the educational credentials achieved, especially in the labor market.

It is important to highlight that, while the transfer of objectified cultural capital can occur through inheritance from parents to children, embodied capital presupposes assimilation that requires a certain commitment from the recipient. It manifests in the form of habitus and must be accepted and integrated by the individual into their personal repertoire. Thus, even if siblings receive the same family support, the same system of family values and rules, and have access to the same set of cultural goods, each may appropriate this capital differently, resulting in varied academic performances.

According to Bourdieu, cultural capital, especially in its embodied form, is the component of family endowment that exerts the greatest influence on educational trajectories. The possession of cultural capital facilitates academic performance to the extent that it eases the learning of school content and codes. For the author, "school education, one of the forms of cultural capital, is a resource as useful as economic capital in determining and reproducing social positions" (Bonamino *et al.*, 2010, p. 488).

Regarding Bourdieu's definition of institutionalized capital, it can be said that it bears similarities to what Coleman (1988) calls human capital, affirming that "children are affected by the human capital of their parents; however, if this capital is not complemented by social capital arising from family relationships, it may be negligible for children's educational growth" (Bonamino *et al.*, 2010, p. 491).

Degrees also have a relative value depending on the structure of capitals, which includes economic and social capital. Two students who graduate in Dentistry, for example, may hold the same diploma but have different futures depending on the amount of

economic capital that allows the establishment of a dental clinic in a prime location, as well as the social capital that facilitates the creation of a client portfolio within a particular social group.

Bourdieu's (1980 *apud* Bonamino *et al.*, 2010, p. 490) concept of social capital is consistent with his formulations regarding habitus, which "emphasizes the dimension of past learning and tends to shape and guide agents' actions." Thus, the concept of habitus—as durable dispositions functioning as structuring and generative principles of action—can help in understanding family practices related to school content.

In Bourdieu's (1980) conception of social capital, three aspects stand out: the constitutive elements, which are the relationships established among individuals belonging to a particular group and manifested in material and symbolic exchanges, presupposing recognition of this proximity by the agents; the benefits, which are obtained by individuals due to their participation in groups or social networks, such as the extent of relationships that the individual can effectively mobilize; and the forms of reproduction, corresponding to the work necessary to produce durable networks of relationships that can provide material and symbolic benefits to their members (Bonamino *et al.*, 2010).

In this line of reasoning, it is important to understand the relevance of social capital for different social classes. Bourdieu relates it to the benefits mediated by extrafamilial networks and to the competitive struggles among individuals or groups within different social fields. Coleman (1988), in turn, emphasizes the influence of extra- and intra-familial relationships, addressing the role of families in the construction of social capital from two perspectives:

The first focuses on the role of families in building extrafamilial social capital, that is, within social networks outside the home. The second examines the construction of social capital within family networks and its importance for the individual development of members, particularly regarding children's school and cognitive performance. [...] In particular, Coleman [...] examines aspects of family life that appear crucial for social capital. He demonstrates the importance of social capital within the family for children's education (Bonamino *et al.*, 2010, p. 491).

Thus, Coleman (1988 *apud* Bonamino *et al.*, 2010, p. 491) asserts that “children are affected by the human capital of their parents.” However, if this capital is not combined with the social capital present in family relationships, its effect on children’s educational development may be limited. Similarly, social capital should not be seen merely as received support, but as something capable of generating a network of partnerships that effectively consolidates this concept. In this sense, the present study aims to present a perspective in which social capital is based on family interaction and the mobilization of all available resources to support children’s schooling.

For Bourdieu, the actor in the Sociology of Education is not an isolated, reflective, and autonomous individual; rather, the subject is denied independent and individual character. According to the author, each individual is characterized in terms of a socially inherited endowment, which includes certain aspects external to them, such as economic capital (goods and services to which they have access); social capital, which is the set of influential social relationships maintained by the family; and institutionalized cultural capital (formed by academic degrees).

However, the author mentions that “more than family income, it is the cultural resources inherited from the parents that condition—if not determine—the student’s academic performance” (Nogueira; Resende, 2022, p. 4). Thus, breaking with explanations of school success that considered only individual attributes, Bourdieu emphasizes “the dominant mode of acquisition of legitimate culture by culturally privileged social groups, namely: through impregnation and osmosis” (Nogueira; Resende, 2022, p. 4).

Bourdieu’s reflections on the correlations between children’s academic success and the family ethos have inspired other authors in new research that expands understanding of the topic. Lahire (2008 *apud* Nogueira; Resende, 2022) observes that it is necessary to study the internal dynamics of each family and the interdependent social and affective relationships among its members in order to understand the degree and manner in which available resources—such as various forms of capital and the parents’ embodied habitus—are transmitted to children.

The author states that “the inheritance of cultural capital [...] obeys an incessant, daily, and enduring work [...] for the children as much as for the parents” (Lahire, 2008, p. 140, *apud* Nogueira; Resende, 2022). Lahire focuses on working-class families, seeking to identify evidence that allows children from families with limited cultural capital to achieve school success. He analyzes family forms of pedagogical investment in working-class households—investments that may take various rigorous and systematic forms to achieve the desired academic outcomes. Some parents accept personal discomforts, sacrifice their free time to assist with schoolwork, read the same books to study with their children, request explanations about studied points, among other actions, according to the family’s capacity to invest in the established objectives.

According to Garcia, “the reference to osmotic transmission still constitutes an obstacle to understanding actual educational practices” (2018, p. 199, *apud* Nogueira; Resende, 2022), since the families studied perform a true work “of transforming cultural capital into pedagogical competence,” anticipating school learning in order to supplement, reinforce, and compensate in cases of difficulty (Nogueira; Resende, 2022, p. 5).

François de Singly (2007, p. 51) “draws attention to the pedagogical work of families and the personal investment required of young people in order to appropriate an inheritance that is not passively inherited,” observing that this appropriation is the result of a complex process with uncertain outcomes, involving both identification and distancing of the young person in relation to their family. Singly states that “cultural capital is not acquired while sleeping or eating [...] and if the books in the family library are not opened, they lose their effectiveness [...]” (2007, p. 61–62, *apud* Nogueira; Resende, 2022).

Following families’ daily routines, Lareau (2007) identifies, in middle-class households, the “deliberate and continuous effort to stimulate children’s development and cultivate their cognitive and social skills” (p. 72, *apud* Nogueira; Resende, 2022). “This involves a logic of ‘concerted cultivation,’ as it encompasses a variety of structured activities that parents must manage, aligned with school logics and demands” (Nogueira; Resende, 2022, p. 6), reflecting their direct participation both at home and at school.

It is noteworthy that the Brazilian context already includes several studies, such as Nogueira (2000, *apud* Nogueira; Resende, 2022, p. 150), which aim, “through a microsociological approach, to understand, via interviews, the educational trajectories of 37 university students from middle-class families,” also highlighting the strategies developed by both families and students to achieve this.

Nogueira and Resende (2022, p. 7) report considerable “mobilization, both by parents and the young people themselves, with a very planned and careful management of the school trajectory, informed by strong knowledge of the educational system.” Similarly, Fialho’s study (2012, *apud* Nogueira; Resende, 2022, p. 7) focused on the educational strategies of upper-middle-class families, conducting separate interviews with mothers and children in a private institution in Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil. Among the findings, the author highlights “a process of intense and continuous parental mobilization, aimed at their children’s school productivity.”

Other studies also indicate that the home learning environment, that is, the learning opportunities provided by adults to children in the family context, is a predictive factor for learning in language and mathematics and for children’s socioemotional development during preschool. Thus, when social distancing measures during the COVID-19 pandemic limited interactions with teachers and learning opportunities offered by in-person attendance in early childhood education, the home learning environment with families became even more crucial for children’s development (Koslinski; Bartholo, 2021).

According to Bonamino *et al.* (2010, p. 491), family-based social capital, in Coleman’s conception, is “vital for transferring human capital (educational credentials, training) from parents to children.” What is observed is the value of interactions within the family; that is, if parents are educated, interact with their children about the social world, etc. The author emphasizes that, beyond support, all possibilities must be mobilized, since sometimes parents may lack economic capital or formal education, but possess a social support network that can aid their children’s schooling.

For this purpose, Bonamino *et al.* (2010) highlight that “Family Dialogue” and “Family Educational Resources” make a difference in students’ academic outcomes,

producing positive effects on the improvement of Brazilian students' reading performance. In this regard:

The variable "Family Dialogue" [...] was the least affected by the inclusion of various variables, indicating that family dialogue is an important factor for academic performance and all social groups benefit from it [...]. The high degree of social capital mobilization [...] shows that, even though families have low economic capital, they provide their children with "educational resources" that result in above-average performance (Bonamino *et al.*, 2010, p. 495-497).

Aiming to discuss the influence of family support and participation on the school practices and academic outcomes of children, this article is organized, in addition to this introduction and the final considerations, into methodology and results and discussion sections that show an interplay between theoretical references and data drawn from the *Sistema de Avaliação da Educação Básica – SAEB* (Basic Education Assessment System) 2021 Results Report – Volume I (Brasil, 2021). The article concludes with final considerations regarding the analyses undertaken.

2 Methodology

For the present study, an extensive literature review was initially conducted to shed light on the concepts that underpin the main contributions of Bourdieu and Coleman in the field of Sociology of Education, as well as the developments and advancements presented by various international and Brazilian authors, arising from reflections on these concepts and beyond. Subsequently, aiming to establish a dialogue with the reflections developed by the aforementioned authors, data from the SAEB (Basic Education Assessment System) 2021 Results Report – Volume I (Brasil, 2021) were used, particularly responses from the contextual questionnaires applied to students.

It is important to note that the details regarding the population evaluated by SAEB are provided in Technical Note No. 20/2021/CGIM/DAEB, published by the *Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira* – INEP (National Institute for Educational Studies and Research Anísio Teixeira) (Brasil, 2021b). It should also be clarified that the contextual questionnaire is not applied to students in the 2nd grade of

Elementary School. The questionnaires for other students were presented in three pages, with: 21 items for 5th-grade students; 22 items for 9th-grade students; and 23 items for 11th- and 12th-grade students in High School (Brasil, 2021).

It should be highlighted that, in the first volume of the report, the impacts of the pandemic are explored, identifying some quality dimensions assessed by the contextual questionnaires which, in this case, relate to family participation in children's schooling and its effects on students' academic performance.

Such information is relevant for understanding how the influence of family support and participation in the school context may be impacting students' academic outcomes, which is the aim of the present study.

Finally, a small qualitative exploratory investigation was conducted with a group of guardians of Elementary School students in the city of Rio de Janeiro in 2021.

3 Results and Discussion

We discuss the influence of family support and participation on school practices and children's academic outcomes based on the analysis of data from the Sistema de Avaliação da Educação Básica – SAEB (Basic Education Assessment System) 2021 Results Report – Volume I (Brasil, 2021), providing substantial information on family involvement in student performance during the COVID-19 pandemic. For this purpose, we present: the target population according to the grade evaluated; the number of enrollments by education level; and the number of students in each region of Brazil, segmented by socioeconomic level. We also show students' responses regarding the support received from family members and the frequency of actions carried out by parents that contributed to their children's learning, particularly during the pandemic period.

We initially analyzed Table 1, which shows the distribution of enrollments by grade in 2021, considering the grades in which the contextual questionnaire was applied to students. Observing this table, we note a significant decrease in the number of enrollments over the course of students' educational trajectories throughout basic education, confirming

data already widely reported. It is observed that 75% of the respondent students are concentrated in Elementary School, which leads us to indicate that the considerations presented here will be especially related to this educational segment.

Table 1 – Distribution of student enrollments by grade.

Grade	Number of Enrollments	%
5th grade – Elementary School	3.010.494	39,8
9th grade – Elementary School	2.668.149	35,2
11th and 12th grades – High School	1.891.624	25,0
Total	7.570.267	100,0

Source: Prepared by the authors based on Table 1 – SAEB (Brasil, 2021b).

In Table 2, we show the distribution of students who responded to the SAEB 2021 contextual questionnaires, grouped by geographic region, after expansion using the socioeconomic indicator sample weight.

Table 2 – Distribution of student respondents by geographic region after expansion using the socioeconomic indicator sample weight.

Region	Number of students	%
North	827.968	10,5
Northeast	2.308.377	29,2
Southeast	3.113.574	39,4
South	1.028.871	13,0
Central-West	627.717	7,9
Total	7.906.507	100

Source: Prepared by INEP, based on Table 3 – SAEB (Brasil, 2021).

We found that the Southeast region has the highest percentage of students, 39.4%, followed by the Northeast region with 29.2%, in contrast to the Central-West region, with 7.9% (Brasil, 2021). When combined, the two highest percentages account for 68.6% of the respondent students concentrated in the Southeast and Northeast regions.

Table 3 shows students' responses regarding the academic support they received from family members, grouped by students' socioeconomic level.

It is known that, for the socioeconomic measure adopted by SAEB, items related to the education of parents or guardians, the ownership of family assets, and the infrastructure of the student's household are considered. Based on this information, the Socioeconomic Level Indicator (INSE) is constructed, with its description and methodology detailed in the technical note "Socioeconomic Level Indicator of SAEB 2021," published by INEP (Brasil, 2021).

Table 3 – Frequency of student responses regarding family support for studying, by socioeconomic classification.

During the pandemic, indicate how often the following occurred: My family supported my studies	Socioeconomic Level Indicator Classification (8 Groups)								Total
	Level I	Level II	Level III	Level IV	Level V	Level VI	Level VII	Level VIII	
White/Null	7%	5%	4%	4%	4%	3%	3%	2%	4%
Never or almost never	13%	6%	4%	3%	3%	2%	2%	1%	3%
Occasionally	14%	11%	10%	9%	8%	7%	6%	4%	9%
Several times	10%	12%	13%	13%	13%	13%	12%	10%	13%
Always	56%	66%	69%	70%	72%	75%	78%	82%	72%
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Prepared by INEP, based on Table 17 – SAEB (Brasil, 2021)

Observing the percentages presented, it is evident that, at the highest socioeconomic level (Level VIII), 82% of students reported being "always supported by their families," while at the lowest level (Level I), the percentage drops to 56%, representing a significant difference. In the case of those who reported "never or almost never" receiving family support, the situation is reversed, with 1% of students at the highest socioeconomic

level compared to 13% at the lowest level, reinforcing the influence of socioeconomic capital.

Looking across all levels in Table 3, it can be seen that the higher the socioeconomic level, the greater the proportion of students reporting parental support “several times” or “always.” This observation aligns with critiques of the osmotic transmission of family socioeconomic capital and simultaneously indicates that families’ economic and cultural capital may be influenced by social capital.

It is noteworthy, however, that even for students with the lowest economic conditions, namely those in Levels I and II, 56% and 66%, respectively, reported “always” receiving family support. This finding corroborates Bourdieu’s studies on the structure of different forms of capital and the investment that working-class families can make in their children’s education. Parents with low economic capital who invest in their children’s education can mobilize social capital, converting it into cultural capital for their children.

Based on various studies highlighting the importance of family participation and support for children’s academic success, it can be inferred that, regardless of the possession of objectified cultural capital, parents with higher education tend to better mobilize their own embodied cultural capital or informational capital acquired through social networks, converting it into educational capital for their children.

Regarding the activities carried out by parents aimed at contributing to their children’s schooling, we analyzed those most frequently indicated by students as “always or almost always” performed by parents.

Observing Table 4, we identified that “encouraging the child”—whether to attend classes, complete homework, or study—is the action that stands out, with percentages ranging from 83% to 70%. The verb encourage conveys the idea of stimulation and incitement, that is, what drives action. Encouraging children to attend classes shows the highest percentage (83.2%), indicating families’ recognition and appreciation of the school environment, which constitutes an action in support of schooling.

At the opposite end, “reading at home” appears as the least observed activity in relation to parents, since, according to students, only 17.7% of parents “read at home.”

Frequent reading can be considered an expression of parents' embodied cultural capital, which leads us to hypothesize that families, despite having limited cultural capital, are capable of mobilizing their children toward acquiring habits they themselves may not possess but recognize as valuable for access to higher positions in the social hierarchy.

14

Table 4 – Frequency of activities carried out by guardians that contribute to children's schooling.

Activities	Always or almost always		Occasionally		Never or almost never		Blank/Null	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Reading at home	1.398.647	17,7	3.969.089	50,2	2.205.300	27,9	333.472	4,2
Talking with you about what happens at school	3.323.883	42,0	3.215.355	40,7	1.061.097	13,4	306.173	3,9
Encouraging you to study	6.271.942	79,3	1.072.510	13,6	294.388	3,7	267.668	3,3
Encouraging you to do homework	5.589.454	70,7	1.475.460	18,7	527.732	6,7	313.861	4,0
Encouraging you to attend classes	6.574.796	83,2	662.182	8,4	306.675	3,9	362.854	4,6
Attending parent-teacher meetings at school	4.468.226	56,5	2.227.201	28,2	908.552	11,5	302.528	3,8

Source: Prepared by INEP based on Table 29 (SAEB 2021 microdata)

It is worth noting that we live in a structural environment in which the mother tongue is spoken at home, parents read with their children, watch TV programs and movies, and discuss these topics. All of this can be done with little intentionality, which does not mean

that parental work is absent. In the dialogue between the literature and the data presented, it is possible to support the hypothesis that parental support and participation in schooling, as well as the mobilization of a social network, can be decisive for their children's academic success.

It is also noteworthy that students reported that 56.5% of parents “always or almost always” attend school meetings, a percentage that might be expected to be higher given the importance of family-school relationships as partners in the children's educational process.

It is important to remember that the year 2021 was marked by the return to in-person schooling in public schools, following the COVID-19 pandemic, which kept schools operating remotely throughout almost all of 2020. Calendars and models of return varied throughout the 2021 academic year among municipal schools, while in some state networks, exclusively remote education was maintained until the end of the year.

To record, albeit in a superficial and purely exploratory manner, the perspective of guardians, we conducted a small investigation through two questions sent via WhatsApp to a group of parents of Elementary School students from working-class families in the city of Rio de Janeiro. When asked about the frequency and manner in which they were monitoring their children's studies, we obtained the responses indicated in Table 5.

Table 5 – Frequency and manner of monitoring children's studies.

Frequency of Monitoring	%	Manner of Monitoring
Daily	60	Answering questions; Helping with studies; Checking completion of assignments
Several times	30	(no specific manner indicated)
Rarely	10	(only when children requested)

Source: Prepared by the authors based on the exploratory investigation conducted in 2021.

The guardians who responded “several times” did not specify the actions carried out, suggesting the absence of intentional and systematic involvement that could be characterized as effective participation in their children’s studies. Similarly, parents who indicated that they monitored their children’s studies “rarely” justified their stance by stating that children would ask for help if needed, evidencing a minimally active and non-continuous participation in schooling.

Although based on a very small group of parents concentrated in a single municipality, the responses lead us to hypothesize for future studies that the majority are involved in their children’s studies, supporting the notion of family engagement beyond low economic capital.

4 Final Considerations

This study sought to open new horizons based on the invaluable and representative legacies of Pierre Bourdieu and James Coleman for the Sociology of Education. Its aim was to offer a contribution to the field of family–school relationship studies, bringing together some contemporary discussions conducted with different authors who have greatly enriched critical reflection on the topic. The major contribution of Pierre Bourdieu’s Sociology of Education was undoubtedly providing the foundations for a rupture with the ideology of innate talent. Following Bourdieu, it has become virtually impossible to analyze educational inequalities simply as the result of natural differences between individuals.

Other authors bring new research questioning the idea of automatic transmission of cultural capital, focusing on the concrete conditions of family socialization. They draw attention to the existence of pedagogical work by families, a necessary investment in the schooling of young students so that they can appropriate a form of capital that is not inherited passively. It is known that there are families who closely monitor their children’s schooling, engaging in a process of intense and continuous parental mobilization aimed at

their children's academic productivity, demonstrating an active role of family investment in their heirs' education.

Although it is observed that the higher the socioeconomic level, the greater the proportion of students reporting parental support, a significant percentage of students from lower economic levels also reported receiving family support regarding their studies.

Regarding social capital, this study drew on a critical perspective of Bourdieu and Coleman's work concerning the role of families in constructing social capital, both extra- and intra-familial. The way families interact with their children—discussing everyday matters, engaging in dialogue, seeking social engagement in institutions, investing in social relationships, and mobilizing educational resources—demonstrates that family social capital can contribute to the expansion of other forms of capital.

The results of this study indicate that analyses related to different types of capital—cultural and social—have significant effects on academic performance, whether through family support, encouragement, or participation in their children's studies, as identified both in the literature and in students' responses to the SAEB 2021 questionnaire.

It is hoped that this research will be seen as an invitation for future studies on this topic, developing new analyses of the processes of family habitus formation and the schooling contexts of students, bearing in mind that only deep and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of these relationships will enable the long-desired partnership between the two primary socializing agents—the family and the school. Bourdieu, as a tireless scholar of the modes and mechanisms of social domination exercised through various symbolic systems, always invites us to observe, reflect, and study. Let us, then, continue on this path.

References

BONAMINO, A.; ALVES, F.; FRANCO, C.; CAZELLI, S. (2010). Os efeitos das diferentes formas de capital no desempenho escolar: um estudo à luz de Bourdieu e de Coleman. **Rev. Bras. Educ.** vol.15, n.45, pp. 487-499. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782010000300007>. Acesso em 28 mai. 2024.

BOURDIEU, P. **O capital social**: notas provisórias. In: NOGUEIRA, Maria Alice; CATANI, Afrânio (Orgs.) *Escritos de educação*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1980. p. 65-69 (3. ed., 2001).

BOURDIEU, P. **O poder simbólico**. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 1989.

BRASIL. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira (Inep). **Relatório de Resultados do Sistema de Avaliação da Educação Básica (Saeb) – Volume I**. Brasília, DF: Inep, 2021. Disponível em: https://download.inep.gov.br/educacao_basica/saeb/2021/resultados/relatorio_de_resultados_do_saeb_2021_volume_1.pdf. Acesso em: 01 jun. 2024.

BRASIL. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira (Inep). **Saeb 2021: Indicador de Nível Socioeconômico do Saeb 2021: nota técnica**. Brasília, DF: Inep, 2023. Disponível em: https://download.inep.gov.br/areas_de_atuacao/Indicadores_de_nivel_Nota_tecnica_2021.pdf. Acesso em: 25 mai. 2024.

BRASIL. Instituto Nacional de Estudos e Pesquisas Educacionais Anísio Teixeira (Inep). **Detalhamento da população e resultados do Saeb 2021: nota técnica nº 20/2021/CGIM/DAEB**. Brasília, DF: Inep, 2021b. Disponível em: https://download.inep.gov.br/saeb/outros_documentos/nota_tecnica_detalhamento_populacao_resultados_saeb_2021.pdf. Acesso em: 25 mai. 2024.

COLEMAN, J. S. Social capital in the reation of human capital. **American Journal of Sociology**, v. 94, p. 95-120, 1988.

COLEMAN, J. S. **Equality of Educational Opportunity**. Washington: Office of Education, U.S., 1966.

FIALHO, F. B. **Mobilização parental e excelência escolar: Um estudo das práticas educativas de famílias das classes médias**. 2017. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação) — Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, 2012. Disponível em: <https://repositorio.ufmg.br/handle/1843/BUOS-8TYK2V>. Acesso em: 14 mai. 2024.

GARCIA, S. **Le goût de léffort**: La construction familiale des dispositions scolaires. Paris: PUF, 2018.

LAHIRE, B. **La raison scolaire: École et pratiques d'écriture, entre savoir et pouvoir**. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2008.

LAREAU, A. A desigualdade invisível: o papel da classe social na criação dos filhos em famílias negras e brancas. **Educação em Revista**, Belo Horizonte. n. 46, p. 32-82, 2007.

Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0102-46982007000200002>. Acesso em: 23 mai. 2024.

NOGUEIRA, M. A., & RESENDE, T. de F. Com e para além de Bourdieu: revisitando duas teses centrais. **Educação & Sociedade**, 43, e268712, 2022. Disponível em: <https://doi.org/10.1590/ES.268712>. Acesso em 15 mai. 2024.

19

KOSLINSKI, M. C.; BARTHOLO, T. L. A pandemia e as desigualdades de oportunidades de aprendizagem na educação infantil. **Est. Aval. Educ.**, São Paulo, v. 32, e 08314, 2021. Disponível em: http://educa.fcc.org.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0103-68312021000100109&lng=pt&nrm=iso. Acesso em 09 jun. 2024.

SINGLY, F. **Sociologia da família contemporânea**. Rio de Janeiro: Editora da FGV, 2007.

¹ Deisilucy de Aragão Fernandes. Sequeira, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1278-4223>

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio)

Doutoranda em Ciências Humanas (Educação) - PUC-Rio. Mestre em Educação pela UNIRIO. Graduada em Pedagogia pela PUC-Rio. Professora e Pesquisadora do LAED/PUC-Rio e membro da Rede de Estudos sobre Implementação de Políticas Públicas Educacionais (REIPPE).

Author contribution: escrita do texto e desenvolvimento dos estudos.

Lattes: <https://lattes.cnpq.br/0305204505680497>

E-mail: deise.sequeira@gmail.com

¹ Maria Luiza Canedo Queiroz da Silva, ORCID: 0000-0002-2066-2613.

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio)

Doutora em Ciências Humanas-Educação pela PUC-Rio. Mestre em Bens Culturais e Projetos Sociais pela FGV. Graduada e Licenciada em Psicologia pela PUC-Rio. Professora e Pesquisadora do GESQ – Grupo de Pesquisa em Gestão e Qualidade da Educação da PUC-Rio.

Author contribution: revisão do texto e apontamentos relativos à exploração qualitativa.

Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/8531119006036997>

E-mail: luizacanedo@puc-rio.br

Responsible publisher: Genifer Andrade

Ad hoc specialist: Jhose Iale Camelo da Cunha and Neide de Almeida Lança Galvão Favaro.

How to cite this article (ABNT):

SEQUEIRA, Deisilucy de Aragão FERNANDES.; CANEDO, Maria Luiza. Formas de capital e influência familiar no desempenho escolar pelo olhar da Sociologia da educação.



Rev. Pemo, Fortaleza, v. 7, e15248, 2025. Available in:
<https://revistas.uece.br/index.php/revpemo/article/view/15248>

Received on March 21, 2025.

Accepted on May 12, 2025.

Published on October 16, 2025.

