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Abstract: This article originates from the findings of an ethnographic research which explored the perceptions and experiences of pupils learning a modern language in a school in England. All pupils in Key Stage 2 (primary, aged 7-11), including those identified with special educational needs, are entitled to study a modern language as part of the school curriculum. Thus, in the classroom, differentiation is a must. This means that learning activities are designed to provide for all abilities and ensure proficiency in the target language. This article draws on a combination of Bourdieu’s concepts of capital and habitus, and Nussbaum’s central human capabilities as theoretical tools to gain insights into the second language classroom, a learning environment where the learners’ abilities and needs are diverse. The findings highlight nuanced distinctions that can be missed as language learning in the classroom is often met with resistance, reluctance or compliance more so than enthusiasm or enjoyment.
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Introduction

The modern languages classroom usually abounds with learners who perform; those who struggle as well as learners who prefer to hold back on the learning activities. Performances in the classroom depend among other things on ability interest and social backgrounds. The importance of language learning is highly promoted by the Department for Education and Skills (2002), entitling every key stage 2 pupil in England, including those identified with special educational needs, the opportunity to study a modern language as part of the school curriculum. Modern language studies (see McColl, 2000; McKeown, 2004) support all pupils learning another language and suggest that it increases children’s self-esteem, enhances their enthusiasm and contributes to the development of positive attitudes towards other cultures. Modern languages classrooms thrive with learners of different abilities, interests and needs, who endeavour to study the target language. Owing to learners’ diverse backgrounds and abilities however, inequality is produced and reproduced in the language classroom. In this paper, I explore the value of Bourdieu’s concept of capital combined with Nussbaum’s capabilities as a framework for understanding the modern language classroom negotiations. In particular, I draw upon the roles played by cultural capital and the central human capabilities in explaining the experiences of the pupils as they strive through the learning activities.
Bourdieu’s concepts of capital and habitus

Bourdieu (1984) introduces and applies the terms capital, habitus and field to examine social class inequality that exists in society and considers differences in status (that is, of lifestyle) as manifestations of social class differences. Bourdieu defines class as a group of people who take up similar positions and who, when put in similar conditions usually display similar interests and adopt similar stances. Bourdieu offers a framework of class analysis which plays a significant role in the reproduction of social inequality in educational institutions. For Bourdieu, capital is any resource effective in a given social field that allows the individual to seize the specific profits that arise out of participation in it. In La Distinction (1984) Bourdieu explores the ways in which the features of middle class cultivation and taste are used by people as cultural signifiers as they seek to identify themselves with those who are ‘above’ them on the social ladder, and to show their difference from those who are ‘below’ them. La Distinction is a detailed study of the ways in which knowledge and cultural artefacts are brought into play, alongside basic economics, in the dynamics of social class relations. Bourdieu (1977b) asserts that cultural capital can be a significant resource where education is concerned as it contributes to individuals’ educational success.

Cultural and social capital can define the chances of success in a society as the more of these we possess, the more successful we could be in our field. Bourdieu (1986) uses this term to refer to information or knowledge about our specific cultural beliefs, traditions and standards of behaviour that promote success and accomplishment in life. He states that cultural capital is made up of familiarity with the dominant culture in a society, and especially the ability to understand and use educated language (Bourdieu, 1977b). Cultural capital is passed through the family from parents to their children. It is knowledge of high status ideas and artefacts that are ‘worth’ transmitting and is noticed when economic resources are spent on cultural valuables and specific items such as tickets to the museums or the theatre, books and other specific cultural artefacts.

With regard to language learning, cultural capital could have an impact on many factors including pupils’ interests in the target language, their motivation and their participation in the classroom. The ownership of cultural capital varies with social class and comes in three forms: objectified, embodied and institutionalised. Each form of cultural capital, Bourdieu (1977b) explains, serves as instrument for the appropriation of symbolic wealth socially designated as worthy of being sought and possessed. The objectified form manifests in items such as qualifications and books; the embodied form which Bourdieu terms habitus is demonstrated in the educated character of an individual such as learning dispositions derived from past familial experience and actively organising future experience. The institutionalised form represents the places of education such as types of schools, colleges or university attended. Bourdieu (1977b) explains that the education system expects every learner to be equipped with cultural capital thus making it difficult for ‘lower class’ learners to succeed at school.

Bourdieu (1977b) further argues that although the education system ignorantly assumes that every learner possesses cultural capital, only a few higher class learners possess this
which therefore could result in teaching and learning being inadequate. He suggests that the ‘lower class’ students, simply do not have the resources to understand what their teachers are trying to get across.

In considering the entitlement for every pupil to study another language, social class is a major factor at work in the classroom. In Britain, people’s socio-economic situations can speculate success or failure in education (Office for National Statistics, 2005). Social class which comprises of middle-class and working-class, represents economic and different forms of capital among other factors. Bourdieu (1990:163) notes that middle-class families are often able to ‘move in their world as a fish in water’ and in this, can be included the world of language learning. Working-class people however are “unknowing and tasteless” (see Skeggs, 2000).

I acknowledge that what constitutes working-class is difficult to operationalise (see Archer and Francis, 2006; Perry and Francis, 2010) and involves much more than the lack of economic capital, and I share Archer and Francis’ (2006) view that the level of income only constitutes one aspect of class and does not provide the full picture. Besides economic capital, social class comprises cultural, social and symbolic capital, to name just a few. In this research, I use the terms middle-class and working-class to refer to the different economic and social backgrounds of the pupils in keeping with Bourdieu’s concepts of capital.

The reception of Free School Meal (FSM) represents one of the predictors of educational attainment but working-class here describes pupils from families on low income whether or not they are allocated and receive FSM at the school. At the time of this research, FSM is allocated to working-class and low income families who are eligible and have applied through the relevant process. Research (Hutchison, 2003; Schagen & Schagen, 2005) show that FSM is used as a factor to indicate economic disadvantage in educational attainment. Here I use working-class to represent pupils in receipt of FSM and acknowledge that not all working-class pupils claim or receive FSM. It is my contention that many pupils come to the school more or less prepared to manage the learning activities provided in the French classroom, therefore the field of ML can be compared to a game with rules where some pupils have ‘trump cards’ (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992:98) and different amount of cultural capital with which to play.

Research findings on socio-economic gap in educational achievement by Norris (2011) suggested that students from low-income families experience among other things cultural barriers compared to students from higher-income backgrounds. She claims that ‘cultural, economic and institutional capital – or the lack of it – has a detrimental effect on young people from low-income backgrounds in the Further Education sector, and their progression into education or the workplace’ (Norris, 2011: 3). Similarly, Irwin (2009) found that although emotional support and academic motivation are fairly constant across classes, educational achievements and successes are significantly shaped by class and family educational background.

Claiming there is a connection between social class and achievement in language learning, Ellis (1994) asserts that social classes are based on levels of income, occupation
and education. Ellis further notes that working class students usually quit language learning earlier than middle-class students. Several studies (Cassen & Kingdon, 2007; Dyson et al., 2010; Kerr & West, 2010), stress that social class is the strongest predictor of educational attainment in the United Kingdom. This was reiterated by the former Education Secretary Michael Gove, when he bluntly stated that “rich, thick kids achieve more than their poor clever peers, even before they start school” (Shepherd, 2010). Children and young people from different social backgrounds have different experiences in school, get different provision in terms of resources and arguably achieve different outcomes. These differences show during the early years, (see National Equality Panel, 2010), and by the time children reach three years of age, their assessment revealed children from poor backgrounds to be a whole year behind economically wealthy children in language and communication skills. This inequality is recognised by education professionals and policy makers, hence, attempts are made through a variety of initiatives and reforms to raise standards of performance of every pupil. It would therefore be fair to claim that the entitlement to language learning is one of such initiatives as its objective is to assist every pupil regardless of their social background or ability to study and to benefit from learning another language.

Cultural capital and language learning

Where ML learning is concerned, habitus generated by pupils within their homes and families is likely to have a significant impact on the cultural capital that they can gather throughout the language learning process. Owing to habitus, an individual could have a feeling in certain practices or places like a ‘fish in water’ (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 127). In the ML classroom, the opposite could be experienced by some pupils and this could imply a feeling of alienation. Bourdieu (1977a) explains that the dominant habitus is transformed into a form of cultural capital that schools take for granted and which acts as a filter in the reproductive process of hierarchical society.

If we consider cultural capital to be essential in ML, then it makes sense to look at findings on attitudes and motivation (Dörnyei, 1998; Bartram, 2012), and findings on parental involvement (Gardner, 1975; Bartram, 2012). For example, Dörnyei (1998) suggests that motivation bestows the principal driving force to initiate the learning of the foreign language and later the impetus to continue the long and often tedious learning process. He goes on to say that without sufficient motivation, even individuals with the most exceptional abilities cannot accomplish long-term goals. He adds that appropriate curricula and good teaching are not enough on their own to ensure student achievement. Both Gardner’s (1975) and Bartram’s (2012) studies concluded that positive atmosphere in the home play a part in language learning as parents would readily encourage and support their children if they themselves have some background in language learning.
Nussbaum’s capabilities approach

The basic principle of the capabilities approach is to address ‘human problems and unjustifiable human inequalities’ (Nussbaum, 2011: xii), thus the approach aims at the struggles society faces in managing humanity, human development and human rights. There are several concepts which emerge from an application of the basic tenets of the capabilities approach to frame our understanding of humanity and political equality. Nussbaum (2006: 76 - 77; 2011: 33 - 34) draws up a list of capabilities that she explains would enable human beings to function and to fulfil their potential in society. She acknowledges that although her list of capabilities is just a proposal and is continuously under review, it gives a good indication of the central capabilities that are essential to all human beings, therefore, society needs this list as guidance to ensure that every person’s capabilities are protected at least up to the minimum threshold.

The central capabilities list has been used in education to address inclusion and exclusion, discrimination and inequality (see Hedge & MacKenzie, 2012). It has also been useful in addressing cognitive disability and ‘inclusive’ education (see Rogers, 2013) in an attempt to respond to the two simple yet intricate questions that the approach asks: ‘What are people actually able to do and to be?’ and most importantly ‘What real opportunities are available to them?’ (Nussbaum, 2011: x). For Nussbaum (2006), society urgently needs to do justice to all people, whether they have a disability or not. As it stands, a large number of young people still do not have flourishing experiences and fail in the education system because of their additional learning needs (see Hedge and MacKenzie, 2012; Rogers, 2013). The capabilities approach considers each individual as ‘a source of agency and worth in their own right, with their own plans to make and their own lives to live’ (Nussbaum, 2000: 58). As far as education is concerned, this implies that every pupil is of moral worth in all their diversity and the educational system needs to ensure their human rights. The concept most pertinent to this study is the need for an education which must reflect what pupils are able to do and be (Nussbaum, 2011) and this is explored within the context of ML learning. In the ML classroom, what pupils are ‘actually able to do and to be’ (Nussbaum, 2011: x) is a fundamental question that not only the learners ponder over but also the teachers reflect on regularly. Such a seemingly simple question secures complex and challenging responses in the ML learning process as it implies that all pupils have the same rights to learn regardless of their abilities, and, opportunities should be available to enable them to flourish.

Capabilities and language learning

If we take the capabilities into account, at least six of the ten items appear to be particularly significant and applicable in the language classroom: senses, imagination and thought; emotions; practical reason; affiliation; play; and control over one’s environment. These six capabilities can be used to explore, if in the language learning process, pupils are able to reflect on their own life choices, enjoy the language learning experience while engaging in social interaction with peers, and enjoy recreational
activities as well as participate in political choices that regulate their own life in the ML classroom. The goal of the capabilities approach however, is not to entirely match what the list provides but instead, to focus on ‘ample threshold on each of the ten capabilities’ (Nussbaum, 2009: 334).

The fourth in Nussbaum’s (2011: 33) list of capabilities is senses, imagination and thought: ‘being able to use the senses to imagine, think and reason’. As a school subject, the very nature of French being a ‘foreign’ language can be thought of by some pupils as a barrier to learning it (Williams et al., 2002; Kissau, 2006; 2007; Bartram, 2012). This view is also shared by some adults (McColl, 2000; McKeown, 2004). The capability to ‘be cultivated by an adequate education’ (Nussbaum, 2011: 33) might not exist for pupils who have poor literacy skills in English thus they could find various aspects of French learning difficult (McColl, 2000) and struggle with most tasks. To assist with this, learning activities are planned to suit the diverse needs of pupils by differentiating tasks and activities (Morgan & Neil, 2001; Ramage, 2012), hence, this capability could be used to explore whether the differentiation of activities provides pupils with their performances, what they are able to do in the French classroom.

The fifth central human capability on Nussbaum’s list is that of emotions: ‘being able to have attachments to things and other people, to experience longing, gratitude and justified anger and not have any of these stifled by fear of anxiety’ (Nussbaum, 2011: 33-34). This capability can be used to appraise the ML classroom for emotions as well as investigate whether pupils experience apprehension and discomfort when attempting to acquire or speak the target language. MacIntyre & Gardner (1991a: 86) assert that ‘anxiety poses several potential problems for the student in ML, because it can interfere with the acquisition, retention, and production of the new language’.

The sixth, seventh, ninth and tenth capabilities (practical reason; affiliation; play; and control over one’s environment) could be applied to foreign language learning. In evaluating the ML classroom against these capabilities, we could conclude that through pair and group work, pupils are encouraged to engage in critical thinking about the learning objectives and the tasks at hand (see Ramage, 2012). Some pupils may not be able to join in critical thinking about activities and in a case as such, ‘functioning rather than capability will be an appropriate goal’ for them (Nussbaum, 2006: 173). Participating in learning activities is a functioning, and these capabilities could be used to appraise whether the opportunity to participate in the learning activities is available for pupils of all abilities and needs in the classroom. Parents could also be capable of reasoning and making choices for their children in terms of their children’s schooling and future development with regard to school subjects however, pupils’ voices should be privileged and pupils should be ‘left free to make their own choices as to what they would like to do with the provided real opportunities’ (Harnacke, 2013: 771), if pupils are able to do so. In cases where pupils are not able to make certain choices regarding their central capabilities, Nussbaum (2006) suggests guardians or proxy representations should make the choices, particularly for people who have complex needs. In the educational system, many choices are made for pupils regardless of their abilities. For
example, the entitlement to language learning, although not statutory for key stage 2 pupils, is not something pupils can choose not to have on their time-table if their school offers it.

The seventh item on Nussbaum’s (2011) list is affiliation: ‘being able to live with and toward others, to recognize and show concern for other human beings, to engage in various forms of social interaction; to be able to imagine the situation of another. To have the social bases of self-respect and make provisions for non-discrimination.’ The ML classroom can be examined against this capability to consider whether the varied range of ability of pupils is taken into account and tasks and activities are differentiated to cater for every pupil’s need and ability. This capability can also identify whether, when pupils work in pairs or groups they are able to show consideration for each other in the classroom.

Play is the ninth item on the list: ‘being able to laugh, play and enjoy leisure’. This capability could be the most valued for any language learner for its mention of leisure. Guidance for pedagogy recommends making the learning environment enjoyable for the learners through the use of role-plays, video clips, games and information technology (see Edwards, 1998; McKeown, 2004; Ramage, 2012). This capability could be used to evaluate the ML classroom for opportunities given to enjoy interactive and competitive games as well as role-plays.

Control over one’s environment, the tenth item on the list is significant and could be used to appraise teaching and learning in relation to pupils’ involvement in the decisions on the language topics and learning objectives which both teachers and pupils could reflect on (Ramage, 2012). It could also be used to examine if pupils’ responses and abilities are taken into account to plan subsequent learning (DFEE, 2000; Morgan and Neil, 2001). This capability is intrinsically linked to two others; senses, imagination and thought as well as practical reason in that they all encourage critical thinking which an ‘adequate education’ entails (Nussbaum, 2011: 33).

With regard to the six capabilities described above, it could be argued that at macro level, the ML entitlement focuses to a certain extent on the individual pupil and considers each pupil worthy of equal respect and esteem. At micro level, attempts are made in the ML classroom to initiate equal opportunity and equal outcomes for pupils regardless of their abilities. The central human capabilities list, Nussbaum stresses, is not intentioned to provide answers to all issues that society faces. Instead the list is founded on the idea that capabilities are needed as basic human rights for a quality of life and all 10 items are crucial prerequisite of social justice.

Preferences and possibilities in language learning

The findings suggest that pupils from middle class families appear to be more positive about learning French and tend to demonstrate the ‘sense of one’s place’ (Bourdieu, 1987: 5) in the classroom even if they struggle with the subject or are on the SEN register. This is because some of them have the opportunity to visit France on occasions for holidays, or, have parents speak French a little, and support the target community as
well as the teaching and learning of the subject. Home conditions, and access to cultural capital enable such pupils to be more open to the foreign language as shown below in Ellie’s response:

I think French is a really good idea because in the future, like, if we wanted to do French for GCSE it’s good to know the basics like ‘bonjour’ or ‘je m’appelle’ and that. And I want to do GCSE in French. Umm [pause] I also want to get like a pen-pal from France [pause] I could write messages back in French and maybe I could meet up and we could talk umm to each other in French yeah. (Ellie – year 7 pupil)

Taking GCSE in French and possibly conversing with a pen-pal in the language in due course has an external point of reference in terms of the fulfilment of a functional purpose (Gardner, 1985) for Ellie. Her response suggests that a GCSE in French is something she has reason to value. GCSE could be seen as a functioning and the extent to which she is enabled to study for her GCSE could be seen as a capability. The capabilities approach highlights the central capabilities for human beings; what individuals are actually able to be and to do and what real opportunities are available to them. Ellie appears to know the rules of the game and shows awareness that to get her GCSE in French requires working at the basics and her determination would make her feel like a fish in water (Bourdieu, 1990) in the language classroom. Evaluating Ellie’s response against the capabilities, it can be concluded it can be concluded that she is able to form a conception of the good and engage in critical reflection about the planning of (Nussbaum, 2011) her educational experience.

However, French for Bethan below, is not something she has reason to value:

I think French is a waste of time because what happens if you go to a different country it’s not going to be any help because you won’t know much and it’s quite hard to learn it and it’s very boring compared to maths and English. It’s also hard to remember the words and letters. My dad says it’s a waste of time because we’re never going to go to France so there’s no point learning it really. (Bethan – year 7 pupil)

Bethan’s excerpt reflects negative attitude toward French as well as interests, motivation, identity and what pupils value. Although Bethan did not express that she would prefer to go to a different country, she implied that knowing French would only be useful if one went to a French speaking country. She also voiced that French was a waste of time and she recalls her father’s position regarding French. This reflects continuity with habitus and field as Bethan takes to the classroom her father’s views on the subject; an indication of her disposition against learning French is reinforced. She will not embrace French as a subject and will always draw on her father’s support. Her ‘conception of the good’ is a curriculum that does not include learning French. It could be said that her negative opinion put her off the language and caused her to claim that it is a difficult language to learn. It could also be said that her reasons for not being positive about the subject is based on hearsay from her father. Her cultural identities hence remains closely linked with her family histories and her social class (Nayak, 2003).
Some pupils, whether or not they are on the SEN register and regardless of class, only enjoy French when playing a game in the lesson is involved as in the field note below.

I stood in the corridor, outside my room to let my pupils in for their French lesson, as usual, I started greeting them one by one in French as they entered the room: “Bonjour! Ça va?” Some pupils replied back nicely in good French. Some others shouted back in English, “Hi, Miss” or “Yo, Miss” or “Alright, Miss?” Some pupils walked pass in silence. But most of the pupils asked their usual questions in English before going in: Some asked: “can we play a game today, Miss?” Some others asked: “are we having a fun lesson today?” I ignored their questions and kept on my greetings routine in French. Guessing that I’m deliberately ignoring their questions, some pupils huffed out loud as they entered the room then slumped in their seats. The last two pupils chorused: “So, are we playing any games this lesson, Miss?”

This greetings routine is habitual and carried out before pupils enter the classroom, but as we see in the extract, pupils would rather not participate and prefer to respond with the same question every time: when or if they are going to play a game in the lesson. Bourdieu (1989) and Bourdieu & Wacquant (1992) discuss language and claim that it is a form of capital which can be exchanged for other forms of capital such as social, economic or cultural. They suggest that access to legitimate language is not equal and linguistic competence is dominated by some. The legitimate language was the greetings routine and in this instance, it could be argued that some linguistic competence was achieved by pupils who responded in the target language.

While I use the greetings routine to enhance exposure to the language and encourage pupils to use the target language to participate in the short conversation, some of the pupils do not regard the exercise as necessary or indeed valuable and consequently, they never share my drive. They have their own routine which is to ignore the teacher; greet the teacher back in English; or query about what they value, which is, playing a game as they walk in. That, to them, is more important than responding to greetings in French. Pupils who regularly refuse to respond to my greetings in the target language are generally pupils who show that learning a language is of no value to them, and who express strong feelings about English being the only language they desire to converse in, as seen above, some pupils replied back in English instead of repeating the simple greetings word they regularly hear.

Habitus can be conceptualised as unconscious or mental habits which include beliefs and values of an individual. According to Bourdieu (1998), habitus is produced through practice and could also influence the way I, as a teacher involve my pupils in learning activities and here, the choices I make using this greetings routine prior to starting lessons could be generated and determined by habitus. Clemente’s (2007) study of students learning English as a second language also found that some students steadily took part in and paid attention to classroom activities whereas others did not regard the subject as important for their career and therefore did not value the learning activities. Findings by Edwards (1998) show that success for pupils arises from enjoyment and enhances learning, and through games, reluctant pupils are inspired. In considering the
ninth capability, Play, we can reason that to a certain extent, the language classroom should be equipped with recreational activities, and learning French should be about having fun and enjoying the classroom experience. This however, if carried out continuously would not lead to the recognised level of competence (DfES, 2002) in the target language but could arguably positively impact the well-being and learning experience of the pupils.

For a number of parents, cultural capital needed for success in language learning is constrained. Family background and educational experience frame what they have reason to value and arguably shape the subjects they would prefer for their children to study at school. What French learning mean to some parents revealed much about their habitus. Mr Barran explained:

We struggle with the work in this subject. I struggle. He struggles. I never did French at school so I don’t find it easy when John asks for help with homework. What I don’t understand is he is not very good at English, he finds reading and writing quite a challenge so why he is made to learn another difficult language is beyond me. When he brings his French book home, there’s not much in it that he can remember or even read on his own. I know his teacher gives him the easy stuff and he gets extra help in the classroom but he’s not getting anywhere with this subject. It’s not right for him. He might say he likes it when you ask him, being his teacher and that but ... he doesn’t, not really. The truth is he hates it. This is not a subject for him. With his learning difficulties how can he ever excel at this?” (Mr Barran at parents’ evening)

Mr Barran does not see his son John as a linguist and states the lack of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986) in terms of knowledge of the subject on his own part where French learning is concerned. This indicates that he does not have ‘the feel for the game’ (Bourdieu, 1998: 83) when it comes to supporting his child with work in French. It is also apparent that John’s teacher gives him differentiated work, from what Mr Barran has said, therefore the teacher is mindful and considerate to John’s needs and appears to know what he is capable to do. Equally, the excerpts also show that Mr Barran appears to know what his son is able to do (Nussbaum, 2011) hence he affirms that French is not a subject for him. In considering the fourth central capabilities, French does not appear to enable John to have pleasurable experiences, instead, he faces difficulties and distress that are not productive (Nussbaum, 2011) to him.

**Concluding remarks**

The capabilities approach stresses the importance of what people can actually do and be and what real opportunities are available to them. Drawing on Bourdieu’s concepts, the findings show that what the individuals in this research can actually do particularly in the learning process of an additional language is framed to a large extent to family background and personal expectations of what is important. For pupils who are on the school’s SEN register what they are actually able to do in the French classroom may be limited due to their special needs. For other pupils what they are able to do is constrained or aided by the forms of capital which they can access. The basic claim of
Nussbaum’s capabilities approach is to measure the well-being of a person by taking into account what he/she succeeds in doing and being. For Bourdieu, social advantages/disadvantages are produced and reproduced by habitus (people’s actions and dispositions), capital (resources available to people), and field (the structure of the situation people are in). Performances in this school subject appear to be dependent on Bourdieu’s theoretical concepts and the availability of Nussbaum’s central capabilities. Both theories complement each other to provide insights into the processes and experiences of what teaching and learning of a modern language in a school setting entail.
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