
INHERITANCE
AND AN ECONOMY OF DIFFERENCE
The Importance of Supplementary Education¹

Ezekiel J. Dixon-Román
University of Pennsylvania

In March 2008, then Democratic Presidential Candidate Senator Barack Obama courageously opened the tabooed lines of public discourse on race and inequality. In his speech he stated the following:

For all those who scratched and clawed their way to get a piece of the American Dream, there were many who didn't make it—those who were ultimately defeated, in one way or another, by discrimination. That *legacy of defeat* [italics added] was passed on to future generations... (Obama, 2008)

Despite the pathological characterization of this “legacy of defeat,” Senator Obama provided the public with a beginning frame of analysis on race and inequality via the intrinsic relationship between difference, heritage,² and inheritance, especially the ways in which they are

¹ Acknowledgements: The author is grateful to the Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences and Northwestern University's Institute for Policy Research for post-doctoral research support. I would like to thank Edmund W. Gordon, Aundra Saa Meroe, Linda Lin, John Jackson, the National Study Group on Supplementary Education, and the University of Pennsylvania Race & Empire Faculty Group for helpful comments. All correspondence should be sent to Ezekiel Dixon-Román, Penn School of Social Policy & Practice, University of Pennsylvania, 3701 Locust Walk, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6214, ezekield@sp2.upenn.edu.

² I will use heritage and legacy interchangeably throughout this paper.

2 - Dixon-Román

intricately associated to the various forms of inequity today, most notably in the area of education.

This essay seeks to engage the following questions in and through a theoretical trajectory: What is educational difference (or achievement gap)? What is heritage and inheritance? What does it mean to inherit a heritage? How might we understand the inheritance of difference? How might inheritance have implications on difference in learning and development? Lastly, after developing our understanding of inherited difference, what is the importance of supplementary education over and above schooling? The conceptual exploration of these critical questions will: (1) provide a more affirmative and complex conceptual framework by which to understand inherited difference and a “legacy of defeat,” (2) shed light on the limitations of schooling in order to alleviate societal inequality, and (3) show the importance of supplementary education.

In order to situate this discourse, I begin by deconstructing the hierarchical opposition of educational difference, or what is more commonly referred to as the achievement gap, by identifying traces that point to an economy of difference. What I call the economy of difference is the process of (re)producing power and privilege via a market of scarcity of the various forms of resources meaningful for the development of situated optimal human potential³ (i.e. social, economic, cultural, health and symbolic). What underlies this process is a cultural logic that hierarchizes bodies based on constructed difference through processes of socially constructed categories, stigmatization, xenophobia, exclusion, and marginalization. This economy of difference is that point of convergence (*différance*) that produces other forms of difference, particularly educational difference.

Building on the historicity of this economy of difference and how it has had implications on difference in heritage, I employ Bourdieu’s habitus: an inculcated and reproduced matrix of thoughts, perceptions, and actions produced given social space (Bourdieu, 1977). Habitus provides a rich framework of the processes of inheritance and

³ Situated optimal human potential refers to the development of human skills, knowledge, practices, and reasoning as situated within the demands of social space and practices. This moves away from the assumption of an essence in human potential, as might be understood in innate ability, as well as the universalization of knowledge and reasoning which construct a singular narrative of truth and knowledge. At the same time, this concept also moves us toward a framing of human potential as the multiplicity of human doing and knowing as situated within social context and practices.

its implications on learning and development. However, I argue that Bourdieu's articulation of habitus is over determined. Thus, I map the Derridian understanding of heritage and the double injunction of inheritance onto Bourdieu's habitus in order to escape its inherent determinism. The double injunction of inheritance suggests that heritage both chooses one but one also chooses to keep it alive (Derrida & Roudinesco, 2004). Lastly, despite the lack of existing research evidence regarding the extent to which schools mediate inheritance and familial social history I argue that community embedded supplementary education is necessary in order to mediate the inherited traces of an economy of difference. I now turn to a deconstruction of educational difference.

AN ECONOMY OF DIFFERENCE: A DECONSTRUCTION OF EDUCATIONAL DIFFERENCE

It is only on the basis of *différance* and its "history" that we can allegedly know who and where "we" are, and what the limits of an "era" might be.

– Jacques Derrida, *Margins of Philosophy*

Educational difference, or more commonly referred to as the achievement gap, has existed for over a century beginning with many of the endeavors of the eugenics movement and mental testing (Gould, 1996; Lemann, 1999). The development of mental testing was initiated as an endeavor to provide "legitimate" evidence, as defined by the dominant culture, of racial, gender, and class superiority. Beginning in the early 1900s, the psychometric technology of mental testing was escalated by the focused research agenda and professional interests of the U.S. military to sort recruits into hierarchical positions (Lemann, 1999). This resulted in the disproportionate placement of African Americans, Latinos, and the poor in lower level positions of the military and on the front lines. In 1954, dramatic shifts occurred in our society's disposition toward educational difference with the legal precedence of *Brown versus Board of Education*. This legal precedent challenged the assumptions of the then existing law of "separate but equal" which explicitly rested on the ideal that racially separate schools and (un)equal education would result in equality in educational opportunity and life chances. Despite the major legal success of the Supreme Court case, it

4 - Dixon-Román

failed to challenge the implicit underlying cultural assumption of the “separate but equal” doctrine on difference as heterogeneity, alterity, the defiled, deviant, abject, and “dirt” of society. That is to say, the “separate but equal” doctrine rested on the assumption that to be different is to be the “dirt” of society; symbolically, matter out of place (Douglas, 1966). In spite of the successes and efforts of the Civil Rights and Black Power Movements, this symbolic structure of difference has continued to endure.

The endurance of this symbolic structure of difference begs the question of what is difference? How is difference discursively constructed? In particular, how does difference relate to educational difference? I define difference as a social construction that is discursively constructed and reproduced in society. I lean on the ideas of several postmodern thinkers in order to discuss the various processes of the construction and reproduction of difference via a cultural logic that hierarchizes bodies. This cultural logic, which is embodied in disposition and in policy, constructs and scales bodies hierarchically based on difference. I further argue that this cultural logic is embodied in the policies and *tools of legitimation* (i.e. standardized assessments) of the educational system. The use of mental testing in order to legitimate the intellectual superiority of the dominant culture has evolved into the use of standardized assessments in order to evaluate, sort, and hierarchize students on levels of ability and competence. Hence, there has been a continued focus on educational difference in order to support the ideals of advanced capitalism of competition, efficiency, and rugged individualism.

Despite many of the efforts since *Brown versus Board of Education* to enable equitable educational outcomes we still continue to see disparities in education by race, ethnicity, gender, social class, sexuality, culture, and language among others. Educational difference is a system of hierarchical oppositions—that is, white/black, white/Hispanic, male/female, middle class/poor, etc.—where each form of difference consists of its own competing particularities. In fact, it is the existence of difference, and in particular statistical difference, that has enabled the social construction of the empty signifier of the “achievement gap.” The empty signifier of the “achievement gap” has become emptied of its content because of its universal use in discourse standing in place of the particularities of each social antagonism in education (Laclau, 1996). It is the “achievement gap” empty signifier that symbolically legitimates the hierarchical structure of education and

system of meritocracy as well as cloaks the reproduced culture of poverty and the rhetoric of social pathology.

Educational Difference (or Achievement Gap) ignores at least two aspects of statistical difference: (1) statistical mean differences ignore the distribution of the examined social groups, which in most cases do overlap, and (2) statistical mean differences ignore the fluidity and multiplicity of human social positionalities (i.e. race, gender, class, sexuality, etc). In the case of the latter, subject positionalities are not necessarily fixed binaries and exist on an evolving continuum. A family's social class may not be the same when the children are infants versus adolescents or one's English language fluency is likely to increase over time. In addition, no subject is situated in one social position. Their social group positionalities are always taking complicated, messy, shifting and competing configurations. For example, a working class Puerto Rican same-gender loving female embodies the construction of each category which suggest heterogeneity in social class, ethnicity, culture, language, sexual orientation, and gender and all of the competing particularities of each social position.

More importantly, I argue that these social group hierarchical oppositions of educational difference are *traces* of an economy of difference. These traces (i.e. differences in education by race, gender, class, sexuality, etc.) are the marks of that which has been deferred: a deferral of the forces which produced difference (Derrida, 1972/1982). Deferral, as will be discussed later, is the temporal process that differentiates elements. This temporal differentiation, in part, produces difference and disguises through repetition that which is deferred. Those forces which produced difference defer total or complete presence of or reference to the economy of difference in educational difference. Thus, the deferred presence of the economy of difference enables differences in education to become taken for granted, legitimated traces of the symbolic structure of power.

The economy of difference is a symbolic structure of the (re)producing control of power and privilege. This symbolic structure hierarchizes bodies based on assumed difference given processes of socially constructed categories and identities, stigmatization, xenophobia, exclusion, and marginalization. The hierarchization of bodies and symbolic structure of power is produced and reproduced via a market of scarcity of the various forms of resources of power and human development (i.e. social, economic, cultural, symbolic, and health). Each one of these forms of resources are known to have a

meaningful effect on the development of situated optimal human potential (Birch & Gussow, 1970; Bourdieu, 1986; Dixon-Román, 2007; Grant, 2005; Kalil, Pattillo, & Payne, 2004; Mandara, Greene, & Varner, 2006; Miller, 1995; Phillips, Brooks-Gunn, Duncan, Klebanov, & Crane, 1998). Thus, the economy of difference can be understood as the hegemonizing of difference, without the appreciation of heterogeneity and at the same time expelling alterity, which hierarchically controls and distributes the meaningful material and non-material resources of power and human development. This can be seen in policies such as No Child Left Behind where “poor performing” schools are “sanctioned” and “poor performing” students are “expelled” by school administration in order for the school to meet adequate yearly progress (Meier & Wood, 2004). As such, educational difference is that which defers presence of the economy of difference. In other words, the underlying symbolic structure and cultural logic of difference is not present in the signifier of educational difference, but educational difference is produced as a result of this economy of difference.

As Derrida (1972/1982) would suggest the economy of difference “is not a distinction, an essence, or an opposition, but a movement of spacing, a ‘becoming-space’ of time, a ‘becoming-time’ of space, a reference to alterity, to a heterogeneity that is not first a matter of opposition” (p. 21). Therefore, it is not sameness or a totality, but a rupture in the symbolic order which produces difference. If we recall, difference is the noun form of the verb to differentiate. In French, to differentiate is *différer* which signifies either to defer or to differ (Derrida, 1972/1982). To defer refers to the spacing in time produced as a result of the rupturing of the symbolic order. To differ, Derrida suggests that “whether it is a question of dissimilar otherness or of allergic and polemical otherness, an interval, a distance, *spacing*, must be produced between the elements other, and be produced with a certain perseverance in repetition” (p. 8). In the case of the economy of difference, I suggest that it is an allergic and polemical otherness that repetitively produces the spacing between the hierarchized social groups.

The existence of educational differences is the *trace*, the retentions and protentions, of an economy of difference. This structure presupposes that the signifier of educational difference, which defers presence of the economy of difference, “is conceivable only on the basis of the presence that it defers and moving toward the deferred presence it aims to reappropriate” (Derrida, 1972/1982, p. 9). The traces of

educational difference point to what was and what's to come in the symbolic structure of power of the economy of difference.

The economy of difference goes back to the historical beginnings of the United States with the first encounters of the indigenous people of the Western Hemisphere, to slavery, to indentured servitude, the exploitative labor of women and children, to the exploitation of service and immigrant labor in current day advanced capitalism. This non-full, non-simple, structured and differentiating origin of educational difference with its processes of exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, cultural imperialism, and violence, what Iris Marion Young (1990) calls the five faces of oppression, has produced and reproduced difference.

The social construction of difference, of the Other, begins with the body. Young (1990) suggests,

When the dominant culture defines some groups as different, as the Other, the members of those groups are imprisoned in their bodies. Dominant discourse defines them in terms of bodily characteristics, and constructs those bodies as ugly, dirty, defiled, impure, contaminated, or sick. (p. 123)

The process of defining groups as Other or different takes on Foucault's (1977) five operations of the normative gaze: comparison, differentiation, hierarchization, homogenization, and exclusion. In this process, the dominant culture initially compares and identifies difference then organizes the body on a structure of power. The last two operations try to homogenize the Other under the project of sameness and reject (exclude) difference as the defiled, the abnormal, the "dirt," the abject, and deviant.

The process of exclusion occurs in many facets of the social world and institutions. Bourdieu (1972/1977) refers to this as symbolic exclusion and violence and speaks particularly to this process within the education system. He suggests that those who do not possess the cultural capital of dominant institutions become systematically excluded because of their distance from the cultural arbitrary of the dominant group. Thus, the process of exclusion is not just a personalized one based on the bodily encounter but also transcends into the tools (i.e. pedagogy and assessments), norms, and policies of institutions. Through the cumulative process of the normative gaze and symbolic exclusion (and depending on where one or a group is positioned on that hierarchical

structure of power) those defined as the Other are marginalized from that dominant cultural capital conferred upon by dominant institutions.

Given this process of the normative gaze and symbolic exclusion, the economy of difference regulates the market of resources of power and human development. These resources include, but are not limited to, social, cultural, economic, symbolic, and health capital (for a description of these forms of capital see Bourdieu, 1986; Gordon, Bridglall, & Meroe, 2005; Miller, 1995). It is via the control and reproduction of these resources that social, economic, and educational difference is reproduced.

The reproduction of difference occurs not only via the control of these resources by the dominant group but also via the complicit and embodied behavior of difference of the marginalized and oppressed. Young (1990) states,

Within the unifying logic of modern reason and respectability, the subjectivity of members of culturally imperialized groups tends to stand in the same position as that of the privileged groups. From that supposedly neutral subject position all these despised and deviant groups are experienced as the abjected Other. (p. 147)

That is to say, members of marginalized groups take on the dominant ideologies and dispositions as the normative standard and manifest the same fears, aversion, or devaluation toward themselves and members of their own or other oppressed groups. This embodiment of the dominant ideology by the marginalized and oppressed is a misrecognition of the relations of power and domination. These taken for granted assumptions of the social world, what Bourdieu (1972/1977) refers to as doxa, is that which is naturalized and not questioned. Doxa conceals the socially constructed di-visions (or binaries) of race, gender, class, sexuality, etc. In fact, doxa is, in part, what enables the reproduction of such pejorative dispositions toward difference.

The economy of difference is, in part, what has produced such stark differences in life chances. The social inheritance of those differences in life chance is what has enabled the reproduction of difference, in particular educational difference, and it is for this reason we need to have a more complex understanding of how difference is inherited.

HABITUS AND THE DOUBLE INJUNCTION OF INHERITANCE

The differences that derive from social origin are passed over in silence, while those that are deliberately expressed in opinions and tastes are manifest and manifested.

– Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron, *The Inheritors*

Given the historicity and reproduction of the economy of difference it is necessary to have a grounded understanding of the inheritance of difference. In particular, what is the social process of inheritance? What does it mean to inherit a heritage? And, how might inheritance have implications for inequality in an economy of difference?

Inheritance is a social process of the acquisition or (re)appropriation of symbolic systems. Moreover, inheritance produces a scheme of dispositions (that is, a matrix of thoughts, perceptions, and actions) that is produced given one's location within social space (particularly from primary socialization). The matrix of dispositions is transposable and is constantly going through (re)structurings given later and new experiences in social space. This scheme of generative dispositions externalizes a homology of actions and practices in the social world that are socially identifiable or marked (Bourdieu, 1972/1977). This is what Bourdieu referred to as habitus. In other words, it is a "structured structure" that is produced based on the social and economic conditions of existence. And, it is a "structuring structure" that externalizes practices of a given social space. Moreover, it is the interiorization of the social di-vision of difference and the exteriorization of the distinct practices and habits that constitute and (re)produce social structures (Bourdieu, 1984).

Bourdieu (1984) argued that one's social space determines where they stand within the hierarchy of cultural power that exists in society. A family or individual's habitus is also predicated by the degree of access they have to the various forms of capital, particularly social, cultural, economic, and symbolic capital. And, it is the forms of capital that regulate or determine the kinds of pedagogical experiences that are meaningful and conferred upon by dominant institutions.

This is what Annette Lareau (2003) attempted to capture in her ethnographic study of the variations in family and parenting practices between Black and White poor-, working-, and middle-class families. She

argued that middle-class families engage in what she calls concerted cultivation, which she defined as the parent/caregiver's engagement with various institutions in a concerted effort to cultivate the development of the child. This is often through much adult-child interaction and discussion, adult orchestrated child leisure activities, and the training of the child's negotiation through various dominant institutions. Lareau suggested that concerted cultivation develops a sense of entitlement in their children. In contrast, poor and working-class families practice what she referred to as the accomplishment of natural growth which allows children to experience long stretches of leisure time, child-initiated play, clear boundaries between adults and children, and daily interactions with kin (Lareau, 2003). She further argued that the poor and working-class family style of parenting develops a sense of constraint in the children. Lareau suggested that

in a society in which children must attend school, and in which those schools privilege vocabulary, knowledge, and reasoning middle-class children...accrue benefits, even forms of 'capital' from the language training they receive in the course of daily life. (p. 129)

This work provides a good example of Bourdieu's habitus and the embodiment of inheritance and difference through the embodied social distinctions in parenting styles.

However, both Bourdieu and his intellectual inheritor Lareau slip into a trap of over determining inheritance and the practices of inheritance. While I believe Bourdieu's habitus is a very helpful framework in order to understand the social and cultural process of inheritance and reproduction Bourdieu's over-emphasis on social space becomes at the consequence of not critically examining the practices within social space (de Certeau, 1984). Thus, in order to address the over determinism, I lean on Derrida's understanding of heritage and double injunction of inheritance.

Heritage is something that is given; it is a sort of gift. However, what underlies this gift of heritage is a double injunction: choosing but not choosing. Heritage is that which is inherited, but inheritance is never the full and complete heritage. The double injunction of inheritance holds that one does not choose their heritage, it has chosen them; yet, one chooses to keep it alive. Through the choice and process of (re)affirmation of what (violently) chooses (or appropriates) the subject one must not just accept the past, one must (re)appropriate the past in order to keep it alive. Given that heritage is not a material

product with essential properties inheritance is never fully or completely appropriable but always a (re)appropriation. That (re)appropriation is an unfaithful gesture to the gift of heritage. It challenges the gift by creating difference in the gift from the non-full and non-complete (re)appropriation. However, it is the unfaithful gesture that keeps heritage alive and maintains its faithfulness to the legacy. Thus, inheritance is never a full and complete appropriation, but a trace of heritage and the symbolic structure of difference.

It is for this reason that I map Derrida's trace onto the conceptualization of the habitus. Accordingly, inheritance becomes a marker of the deferred presence of what was as well as deferring the presence of what's to come. For Derrida, traces are markers of *différance*; that is, the deferred presence (or meaning) of the forces which produced differentiation. Thus, the scheme of dispositions, or structured structure and structuring structure, that is constituted by social space and generates actions and practices, is a trace of inheritance of one's familial social history, but not the total or full product of origin. Furthermore, it is the non-responsiveness to inherited traces of difference (and the universalism) of the policies and tools of legitimation of dominant institutions in an economy of difference that produces differences in learning and development.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATION IN AN ECONOMY OF DIFFERENCE

Given the various resources and forces that influence situated optimal human development – that is, social, cultural, economic, and health – it is clear that schooling alone can not mediate the inequitable levels of learning and development between various social groups and, as a result, inequity in optimal human existence and participation in society. The Coleman Report (1966) and Bowles and Gintis (1976) called our attention to this 43 and 33 years ago. In fact, Comer (1997) suggested that “without significant change in our culture, neither schools nor any other institutions can solve our problems; expecting schools to do so is like ‘waiting for a miracle’” (p. 12). Each of these authors came to their conclusions in the absence of more nuanced understandings of the cumulative effects of inheritance or multiple generations of familial social history which would have enhanced their arguments (Birch & Gussow, 1970; Bourdieu, 1986; Dixon-Román, 2007;

Grant, 2005; Kalil et al., 2004; Mandara et al., 2006; Miller, 1995; Phillips et al., 1998). Furthermore, this work suggests that schooling is not enough; it is not the great American equalizing mechanism as it has, historically and currently, purported to be.

In their edited volume, *Supplementary Education*, Gordon, Bridgell, and Meroe (2005) remind us of the importance of all of the formal and informal learning and developmental experiences that occur outside of the time and place of formal schooling which enable situated optimal human development. They argue, in accordance with others (Bourdieu, 1986; Coleman et al., 1966; Miller, 1995) that it is the various forms of capital—i.e. social, cultural, human, health, polity, personal, and political—which are converted into meaningful pedagogical experiences and enable the development of high academic achievement and intellect. However, these resources and experiences, which are meaningful to situated optimal human development, are inequitably distributed and given monolithic currency in our society. In other words, there is not just inequality in the access to these resources; the shifting and multiplicative manifestation of these resources is not conferred upon by the dominant institutions of society. Therefore, the meaningful processes of learning and development that are particular to marginalized communities and practices become often in conflict with what is conferred upon by dominant institutions.

Given the material and non-material resources and processes of the symbolic structure of the economy of difference, distributive models of justice are not enough to account for non-material resources and processes such as the norms and procedures of decision making and culture (Young, 1990). For example, Young (1990) suggests that opportunity is not a matter of access and possession but rather processes and conditions that enable situated optimal human development and existence. Under this conceptualization of opportunity, equitable schooling is not enough to provide equality of educational opportunity given all that we know about the various influences of human development that go beyond schooling (i.e. social, cultural, economic, and health forces). Moreover, as mentioned earlier, our laws and policies, particularly in education, continue to rest on a distributive model of justice and have not enabled the challenge of symbolic structures such as the economy of difference.

Despite the distributive philosophy of justice that undergirds our laws and policies, schooling and all of the pedagogical opportunities that are enjoyed outside of schooling are not equally shared. It is for this

reason that democratic community embedded supplementary education needs to be enabled in marginalized communities. Democratic community embedded supplementary education refers to programs and institutions that embody and build on the particularities of cultural communities while decision making power rests in the participants of the community. Supplementary education that is democratic and community embedded should utilize the norms, values, and practices of both dominant institutions and indigenous cultural communities. Given the autonomous and non-standardized space of supplementary education, it can and needs to affirm difference as well as develop competence in the norms, values, and practices of dominant institutions. The affirmation of difference in community embedded supplementary education will enable the continued struggle and challenge against the normalization and standardization of advanced capitalism and the economy of difference.

Developing competence in the norms, values, and practices of dominant institutions does not have to result in the losing of one's indigenous ethnic or cultural norms and practices. To this point, Meroe (2005) discusses the importance of the development of reflexivity in order to negotiate dominant institutions without internalizing the symbolic violence of these institutions. Reflexivity, she suggests, requires that we are critically reflective of the habitual until we no longer take our beliefs and activities for granted. It is the common sense, or taken for granted, beliefs and practices that, in part, enable the reproduction of social structures of domination. Although reflexivity does not mean the loss of one's indigenous culture, it does assume that we critically reflect upon it in contrast to the norms, values, and practices of other cultural communities.

Reflexivity can help dispel many of the ideological contradictions that we take for granted. In a recent ethnography of Puerto Rican and African American youth, Carter (2005) found a rather striking contradiction that challenges the Fordham and Ogbu (1986) understanding of oppositional culture in involuntary minorities. Her data suggests that these youth, who are in opposition to the school culture (not academic culture), believe in the value of education and meritocracy. This suggests that although they believe in meritocracy and the value of education they also believe in the continued existence of racism and discrimination in our society and have developed oppositional dispositions toward the school given their cumulative experience of how the school has scaled, hierarchized, and sorted or excluded their

bodies. Developed reflexivity in supplementary education would demystify the contradictions and misrecognitions of their beliefs and practices as well as enable the development of negotiating and affirmatively challenging practices within these spaces.

Supplementary education can be formal educational experiences such as Sylvan Learning Center, academic summer camps, or tutoring. But, informal education might facilitate discussions and seminars about such topics as social justice and the democratic process, racism and discrimination, the value of schooling versus comprehensive education, the myth of meritocracy, employment opportunities, family relations, healthy lifestyle choices, or money management (Meroe, 2005). Both are important in order to provide the conditions that enable the development of situated optimal human potential as well as to continue to challenge and disrupt the normalization and abjection of the economy of difference. We cannot depend on schooling alone to be responsive to the inherited traces of an economy of difference. In fact, the dominant institution of schooling is structured to melt difference into sameness and to expel heterogeneity and alterity. Hence, democratic community embedded supplementary education is an imperative for marginalized communities. Opportunity, as Young (1990) defined, will not be provided to everyone with the existing focus on schooling. Moreover, the horizon effect of schooling and reductions in socioeconomic inequality (which has been increasing in post-industrial United States [Wilson, 1998; Wolff, 2001]) will continue to take several generations before we see its full benefits, if any at all. This can be meaningfully addressed with supplementary education.

CONCLUSIONS

I have discussed the imperative need for democratic community embedded supplementary education in marginalized communities. While quality schooling is unequally distributed, there is an even greater inequitable distribution of the meaningful resources of supplementary education and situated optimal human development. Moreover, in order to enable the continued challenge and disruption of normalization and standardization of the economy of difference, supplementary education can and must affirm difference while also develop reflexivity. In order to provide the necessary conditions of opportunity that will begin, in part, to address the inherited traces of difference we have

to think beyond schooling to supplementary and comprehensive education as one necessary condition.

Traces of inheritance are embodied and socially structured. Inheritance takes on a matrix of thoughts, perceptions, and actions that are produced given one's social position (especially of origin) and generates a homology of externalized practices. The matrix of thoughts, perceptions, and actions is a trace of inheritance, but not full or total products of their social position of origin. The double injunctions of inheritance—not choosing the heritage but choosing to keep it alive or the (re)appropriation of heritage in choosing to keep it alive—is what makes inheritance a trace of what was (and what's to come).

Inherited traces of difference are what enable the reproduction of an economy of difference. The economy of difference is a symbolic structure that hierarchizes bodies based on the social construction of difference as the dirt, the abject, the deviant, and the defiled. Derrida (1972/1982) reminds us,

One is but the other different and deferred, one differing and deferring the other. One is the other in *différance*, one is the *différance* of the other. This is why every apparently rigorous and irreducible opposition...comes to be qualified, at one moment or another, as a "theoretical fiction." (p. 18)

"Theoretical fictions" are what is naturalized in the social world and enables the repetition of the assumptions of difference which underlie the (re)producing structure of power. The symbolic structure of power enables the control and reproduction of inequitable access to the necessary resources for the development of situated optimal human potential. As a result, there continues to be reproducing social, economic, and educational difference.

Democratic community embedded supplementary education can enable the equitable distribution of resources necessary for the development of situated optimal human potential. Moreover, democratic community embedded supplementary education is able to address the inherited traces of the economy of difference.

REFERENCES

- Birch, H. G., & Gussow, J. D. (1970). *Disadvantaged children: Health, nutrition, and school failure*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* (R. Nice, Trans.). New York: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1972)
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste* (R. Nice, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1979)
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press. (Original work published 1983)
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1979). *The Inheritors: French students and their relation to culture* (R. Nice, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1964)
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Carter, P. L. (2005). *Keepin' it real: School success beyond black and white*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Comer, J. P. (1997). *Waiting for a miracle: Why schools can't solve our problems—and how we can*. New York: Plume.
- de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life* (S. Rendall, Trans.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. (Original work published 1980)
- Derrida, J. (1982). *Margins of philosophy* (A. Bass, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1972)
- Derrida, J., & Roudinesco, E. (2004). *For what tomorrow... A dialogue* (J. Fort, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. (Original work published 2001)
- Dixon-Román, E. (2007). *The mystery of inequity: Modeling the influence of intergenerational access on intellectual competence*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Fordham University.
- Douglas, M. (1966). *Purity and danger: An analysis of concepts of pollution and taboo*. New York: Praeger.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Pantheon. (Original work published 1975)
- Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "burden of 'acting White.'" *The Urban Review*, 18(3), 176-206.
- Grant, E. (2005). *Cumulative advantage: A new look at the effect of family social class on children's educational achievement and the black-white achievement gap*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

- Gordon, E. W., Bridglall, B. L., & Meroe, A. S. (Eds.). (2005). *Supplementary education: The hidden curriculum of high academic achievement*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Gould, S. J. (1996). *The mismeasure of man* (Rev. ed.). New York: Norton & Company Inc.
- Kalil, A., Pattillo, M., & Payne, M. R. (2004). Intergenerational assets and the black/white test score gap. In D. Conley & K. Albright (Eds.), *After the bell: Family background, public policy, and educational success* (pp. 170-194). New York: Routledge.
- Laclau, E. (1996). *Emancipations*. New York: Verso.
- Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Lemann, N. (1999). *The big test: The secret history of the American meritocracy*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Mandara, J., Greene, N., & Varner, F. (2006, June). *Intergenerational predictors of the black-white achievement gap in adolescence*. Paper presented at the 2nd Annual Conference of the Achievement Gap Initiative, Cambridge, MA.
- Meier, D., & Wood, G. (Eds.). (2004). *Many children left behind: How the No Child Left Behind Act is damaging our children and our schools*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Meroe, A. S. (2005). Supplementary education, the negotiation of socio-cultural marginality, and the uses of reflexivity. In E. W. Gordon, B. L. Bridglall, & A. S. Meroe (Eds.), *Supplementary education: The hidden curriculum of high academic achievement*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Miller, L. S. (1995). *An American imperative: Accelerating minority educational advancement*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Obama, B. H. (2008, March 18). *We the people in order to form a more perfect union*. Speech given at the Constitution Center, Philadelphia, PA.
- Phillips, M., Brooks-Gunn, J., Duncan, G. J., Klebanov, P., & Crane, J. (1998). Family background, parent practices, and the black-white test score gap. In C. Jencks & M. Phillips (Eds.), *The black-white test score gap* (pp. 103-145). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Wilson, W. J. (1998). The role of the environment in the Black-White test score gap. In C. Jencks & M. Phillips (Eds.), *The black-white test score gap* (pp. 501-510). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Wolff, E. N. (2001). Recent trends in wealth ownership. In T. Shapiro & E. N. Wolff (Eds.), *Assets for the poor: The benefits of spreading asset ownership* (pp. 34-73). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

EZEKIEL J. DIXON-ROMÁN, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor of Social Policy & Education at the University of Pennsylvania. His main fields of interest are the sociology of education and culture, critical social thought, marginalized groups, and quantitative methods in the social sciences. He is currently studying the inheritances of "difference" in educational difference and working on a book volume which seeks to deconstruct the "achievement gap" revealing its social fabrications in construction and measurement, the limitations in lenses of analyses, and the constraints and possibilities in and through policy.