

Instructions for authors, subscriptions and further details:

<http://ijep.hipatiapress.com>

## **The Sociocultural Psychology as a Postformal Theory of Academic Achievement: Interrogating Formal Education**

Chetan Sinha<sup>1</sup>

1) Christ University, Bangalore, India

Date of publication: June 24th, 2013

---

**To cite this article:** Sinha, C. (2013). The Sociocultural Psychology as a Postformal Theory of Academic Achievement: Interrogating Formal Education. *International Journal of Educational Psychology*, 2(2), 221-242. doi: 10.4471/ijep.2013.25

**To link this article:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.4471/ijep.2013.25>

---

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

The terms and conditions of use are related to the Open Journal System and to Creative Commons Non-Commercial and Non-Derivative License.

# **The Sociocultural Psychology as a Postformal Theory of Academic Achievement: Interrogating Formal Education**

Chetan Sinha  
*Christ University*

## **Abstract**

The present paper interrogates the dominance of formal education. As formal education system relies on ability based academic achievement as a goal, exploring post-formal approaches, such as sociocultural notion of academic achievement is the hallmark of present paper. An attempt is made to interrogate the existing cultural dominance in formal education referring to the need of ability stereotyped groups, not discarding formal education totally. Taking the route from sociocultural experience of children, paper also explores their process of social identification with the present educational system. The way students identification gets constructed and co-constructed, either acknowledges or discards the achievement domain of education, is the major point of contention. Overall, the paper tries to answer the basic psychological question that “Why particular form of education and achievement under the mainstream discourse of education is legitimized and valued in the social psychological representations?”

**Keywords:** academic achievement, sociocultural psychology, formal education, postformal education

# **La Psicología Sociocultural como Teoría Postformal del Rendimiento Académico: Interrogando la Educación Formal**

Chetan Sinha  
*Christ University*

## **Resumen**

Este artículo se cuestiona la dominación de la educación formal. Dado que la educación formal se basa en la habilidad de rendimiento académico como objetivo, la exploración de enfoques post-formales, como la noción socio-cultural de rendimiento académico es el aspecto central de este trabajo. Se pretende interrogar la dominancia cultural existente en la educación formal en lo que se refiere a la necesidad de contar con grupos estereotipados por cuestión de habilidad, sin descartar totalmente la educación formal. A través del camino marcado por la experiencia socio-cultural de las niñas y niños, este artículo también explora su proceso de identificación social con el sistema educativo actual. La forma cómo la identificación de estudiantes se construye y co-construye o reconoce o rechaza el aspecto de rendimiento de la educación es un aspecto de máxima disputa. En general, el artículo intenta responder a la siguiente pregunta psicológica básica: “¿Por qué una forma particular de educación y rendimiento bajo el discurso dominante en educación es legitimada y valorada en las representaciones psicológicas sociales?”

**Palabras clave:** rendimiento académico, psicología sociocultural, educación formal, educación post-formal

*The opposites of great truths may also be true; it is only the opposites of small truths that are false (Neil Bohr, the great quantum physicist)*

The most basic question often repeated in the educational discourse is that ‘why some students get difficulty in adjusting with school environment resulting in either dropout or low academic performance?’ The answer to this question has been explored through various approaches via, cognitive (Kintsch, 1988), motivational (Dweck & Master, 2008), contextual (see Sirin, 2005) and cultural (Kityama & Uskul, 2011). Cognitive approach insisted on development of mental structure where various information processing activities happens pertaining to the task given, for example, intellectual ability of the student in mathematical tasks. Motivational approach conceptualized factors that influence learning, such as factors that directs or limits choice of action and factors that affect intensity of engagement with the task (see Winne & Nesbit, 2010). Contextual approach emphasized the immediate social context of learner which either hamper or promote learning, for example, social class or socioeconomic status. And cultural approach emphasized the use of artifacts in a social space through which children are socialized. Many theorist visualized the role of context and culture as observed to be the real causal factors where the chances of explaining psychological processes was expected to be better. However, it was observed that these two factors have been interrogated as a separate entity rather than as macro level forces shaping the individual level phenomenon. Contrary to this, the mainstream psychology separated its form and structure from social experiences and history of people from diverse background (for other views see Winne & Nesbit, 2010). In this regard, present work pondered on sociocultural position as a critical postformalist catapult aiming at understanding and interrogating formalist legacies dominating the discourse of academic achievement and education.

Recent direction for introducing continuous and comprehensive evaluation system (CCE) in Indian schools is an attempt to relieve students from the burden and stress of exam has important policy implication. This is done by more uniform and comprehensive patterns in education for the children all over the nation. Though CCE is expected to improve students’ classroom performance by identifying students’ learning difficulties by regularly employing suitable remedial measures for enhancing their learning performance, still the pedagogy

and curriculum is regulated by the formalists' agenda of mainstream education. This drive towards the homogenization and nation building in contemporary society through an effort to control diversity in a school seems to be regulated by prevailing societal values representing the dominant identities in power.

However, there is a prospect in revisiting to the failed attempts of improving students' performance, by interrogating existing structure and history of society. The issues of identity and sociocultural experiences of students from disadvantaged background have not been addressed openly, thus limiting education to increase in literacy rate only. The scheme of continuous and comprehensive evaluation depends upon the discretion of schools to plan their own academic schedules as per specified guidelines on CCE. However, the possibility of negligence of low performing students who do not fit into the school value system can't be denied.

Academic performance of students, as represented by the dominant society, preferred to value cognitive ability as it appeared legitimate in the technocratic world motivated by the values of economic gains. The third world countries (e.g. India) were the colony of the western power that came to understand orientals for their political and economical expansion. Due to their powerful and structured economy the notions of the methodologies were observed to be superior for controlling the colonial nations (see Said, 1978). Thus, the western interlocutor prioritized and legitimized western values to be better than the indigenous. This took historical turn by recognizing new divide in the social structure as elite and non elite. The mode which was creating this divide was based on the various metaphors of intelligent quotient (IQ), where privileged were considered as moral, intelligent, hardworking and gracious as compared with the underprivileged. Any other opinion how much empirically validated was rejected unless accepted by the scientific community. This formalist approach highlighted individualistic agency responsible for prevailing inequality in ability and academic achievement. In other words, it gave importance to the permanent aspects of one's ability rather than shaping it through adequate environment (see Dweck & Leggett, 1988). It also goes beyond the entity and malleable notions of ability to the reproduction of

inequality legitimizing dominant identity as genuine.

The criticism of formalist approach is not new (Kincheloe, 1999, Kincheloe & Horn, 2007). The formalist approach represented a paradigm of thought that ruled the educational system and was the powerful criterion under which various facets of human agencies were judged. The other approaches whose metatheory derived its aspects from the experience of oppression in the history by dominant culture were either not prioritized or abandoned. The Postformalists' perspective got space in academic circle via the dominant discipline like sociology and political science under the umbrella of postmodern thoughts. However, when the call for intervention arises, the formalist conception of ability became more prominent. This defines the power structure of society which is regulated by political dynamics driven by power ideology. The sociocultural apparatus shaped through the diversity of experience has different metatheory of assessment when compared with the universal model of academic achievement. The social constructivist viewpoint of Vygotsky (1978) and his contemporaries acknowledged the social and political dynamics of micro human behaviour. It was based on the assumption that human activities are embedded in cultural contexts, mediated by artifacts like language and other symbolic systems, and can be better understood by exploring the history of development (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). Emphasizing the sociocultural facets of children may offer better insight into the problems of formalist approach and create a platform for understanding postformalist agenda.

The formalist approach to ability and academic achievement became universal phenomenon and took the form of grand truth worldwide. The problem of the democratic education as expressed by the formalist may be derived from the dominant value system considered as legitimate. Any opposite patterns of thought is not valued until its grandiosity gets fixated by the other truth emerging out from actors' viewpoint and experience (see also Steele, 2010). The challenge of sociocultural psychology towards the psychometric tools of formalist created alternative inputs to the politics of psychology and its philosophy.

### **Social constructivism and sociocultural model: Let the postformalist come in**

Psychologists have long been interested in knowing the causal factors behind high and low performance of students in the classroom. These causal factors dominated the construct academic achievement positioning them in the dominant worldviews in many ways, two of which were quite prominent representing traditional and realist epistemology, namely, the organismic and mechanistic nature of human agency (Prawat, 1996). The Organismic view holds Piagetian or schema-driven brand of constructivism in which self organization was an inherent feature of the organism, a tendency most evident in the activity of the human mind which was nurtured under the paradigm of rationalism. Themechanistic world view was tailored under the academic regime of realism which was philosophical antithesis of Piagetian constructivism. These worldviews were observed to be more individualistic rather than social in orientation and was placed under the deficit model of achievement (for other view see Kitchener, 1991). Apart from the traditional and realist worldviews, the alternative worldviews comprised sociocultural model, symbolic interactionist model and ‘mind in society’ model. These alternative worldviews were more context driven, and were positioned under the postmodernist paradigm of social constructivism rejecting the formalism completely (see Blumer, 1969; Cobb & Yackel, 1996; Gergen, 1985; Harre, 1986; John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996; Toulmin, 1995; Vygotsky, 1978).

Social constructivist perspectives focused on the interdependence of social and individual processes in the co-construction of knowledge (Palincsar, 1998). The social constructivist comprises mainly of Piagetian and Vygotskian explanation. However, presently the focus shall be on Vygotskian notion of academic achievement and also an effort will be made to interlink and differentiate it from other perspectives. Apart from these perspectives of education, rest shall be presumed to be inherently the area of formalist agenda of mainstream educational psychology (Gallagher, 1999; Kincheloe, 1999).The reason behind this categorization as formalist and post-formalist educational psychology is manifold. One of the reasons which impelled the present discussion in this direction is not universal but more or less based on

sociocultural understanding of academic achievement. The formalist forms of education, though, fiercely debated under diverse disciplinary circle compared the students of ability stereotyped group under the same mainstream and middle class educational value system.

It was obliquely stated that those who were not fitting under the formalist system of education were enough to be projected as deficit in ability, thus strengthening the existing legitimizing myths portrayed by the traditional class and culture (See [Beteille, 2007](#); [Tyler, 2006](#)). These formalist approach dominant in educational system due to colonial impacts demeans the cultural and linguistic diversity of historically marginalized students ([John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996](#)) and became reified as common sense knowledge. This representation of education in the form of academic achievement disregarded other aspects and paradigms of education. For example, category of students involved in proper education, their achievement as compared to underachiever or low achiever, their cultural representation in schools, their social identification never had become part of people's understanding of academic achievement. Urgent need to understand other aspects of education and their representation is the need of present hour.

A very practical illustration of present educational system is its classroom effect which has sustained the authority of past educational system in its discourses. In this sense, the representations of formalist education weakens the position of students' from marginalized and low socioeconomic status (SES) background and labeled their under performance in the school as deficit and not as different from the children from un-marginalized and high-SES background (see [Meacham, 2001](#)). Some cultural arguments problematically define certain ethno-racial identities and cultures as subtractive from the goal of academic mobility while defining the ethnic cultures and identities of others as additive and oriented toward this goal ([Warikoo & Carter, 2009](#)). This has shown that dominant formalist force accepted the superiority of the students coming from privileged socioeconomic background ([Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1993](#)). In the process of judging students' academic achievement, larger educational context was never interrogated. [Meacham \(2001\)](#) argued from Vygotskian perspective that 'a culturally diverse learning environment, in contrast to the tradition of deficit, may embody important advantages in higher-order conceptual



development' (p. 190). The exploration of factors beyond the individual and structural dimensions in terms of children viewpoint about themselves in particular social context and situations has been major concern of sociocultural theory. The understanding of these dimensions may hold the possibility of mitigating the gap in terms of cultural practices of marginalized communities and those assumptions of the school regarding learning, which were expected to be beneficial for literacy achievement (Heath, 1983; Moll, 1992; Moll & Whitmore, 1993). Thus, totally rejecting formalism, as supported in the postformalist formulation of education may overlook the link between policy and practice. In this context, Sharma (2012) posited that children who belong to extremely marginalized communities may get certain sense of empowerment through the knowledge of letters and limited access to any kind of formal education.

At the outset, it seems that people of minority and disadvantaged background when come in contact with the outgroup context justify their present status as legitimate (See Jost & Banaji, 1994; Jost, Banaji & Nosek, 2004). This justification of underachievement by people of disadvantaged background undermines their sociocultural experience as deficit and not equally important. This may project marginalized members as uncultured and bastion them with imposition of education that is not representative. This demerit of formal education doesn't reduce its charm among policy makers and educators. However, linking of several aspects of formal and post formal education enrich the substance of education which are the fundamental right of every child. On the other hand, Govinda and Bandopadhyay (2012) recently pointed towards the multifold expansion of educational infrastructure for the improvement of accessibility and availability of education, the way system has grown seems to be contributing to further social divisions in the country. The nature of social division attribute to discriminatory factors causing more psychological harms rather than perception of equality. Therefore, varied paradigms comprising implicit processes of self and cognition due to one's experiences with the contexts and practices of artifacts also need to be vigorously debated.

### **Factual understanding of sociocultural theory and literacy acquisition**

Literacy acquisition has been the central concern of sociocultural theory (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996, p. 202). Scribner and Cole (1981) in their analysis of relation between literacy and cognitive development of a child expressed possibility that literacy acquisition can be independent of schooling and have contextual implication in the development of cognitive competencies. Sociocultural approaches emphasize the interdependence of social and individual processes in the co-construction of knowledge (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996, p. 191). One reason attributed was that, “children from working-class and lower-socioeconomic-class homes do not ascribe the same importance to the mental functions required by intelligence tests or achievement tests and academic work in the same way as do middle- and upper-middle-class students” (Kincheloe, 1999, p.2). Studies showed that school failure resulted from the cultural inferiority of the poor or the marginalized and teaches us that power relations between groups (based on class, race, ethnicity, gender and so on) must be reconsidered when students’ performance is studied (e.g. Zweigenhaft & Domhoff, 1991). Also, it was posited that, working-class and poor students often see academic work as unreal, as a series of short-term tasks rather than something with a long-term relationship to their lives (Kincheloe, 1999).

The social context and power relations of the culture at large and the school culture in particular may be essential in understanding the class and cultural dynamics of student performance (Block, 1995). Kincheloe (1999) emphasized socio-political cognitive theory which tried to understand the way consciousness and subjectivity is shaped by the society. This emphasis on socio-political theory rejects the Cartesian-Newtonian mechanistic world view that is embedded in the cause-effect, hypothetical-deductive system of reasoning. Lev Vygotsky theorized in the 1930s that individuals do not develop in isolation but in a series of interconnected social matrices in which cognition is viewed as a social function (Kincheloe, 1999, p. 9).

In a socio-psychological context, Vygotsky’s work creates a space where integration between macro social forces and micro psychological forces takes place. Analysis of these integrated spaces becomes a central

activity for a democratic post-formal educational psychology concerned with the way identity is formed by large social forces and mediated by individuals operating in specific environment (Kincheloe, 1999, p.4). Such understanding allows us to imagine pedagogies that move individuals to greater understanding of themselves and their relation to the world, to higher orders of thinking, previously unimagined (Vygotsky, 1978; Marsh, 1993; Driscoll, 1994; Werstch & Tuviste, 1992; Weisner, 1987).

The most fundamental concept of sociocultural theory is that the human mind is mediated (Lantolf, 2000, p.1). Sociocultural revolution focused on learning in out-of-the school context and on acquisition of skills through social interaction (Voss, Wiley, & Carretero, 1995). Failure of educational system has resulted into new revolutions which very much deviated from the established framework of looking at education. Vygotsky (1978) argued that human being do not act directly on the physical world but with the help of cultural tools and labor activities. This gives us the freedom of self to operate on its ecology and systems and to change it. The use of symbolic/cultural tools or signs, to mediate and regulate our interaction and operation with the others is the major characteristic of sociocultural model of human experience.

### **Recent development in sociocultural theory in postformalist context**

Child's mind is, as pointed by sociocultural theorists, culturally shaped and has the flexibility to grasp the utility of the artifacts in the social settings in the form of experiences, thus developing new identities. In the process of understanding children in their school contexts, Vygotsky reasoned that adequate approach to the study of higher mental abilities is through genetic analysis (Palincsar, 1998). Sociocultural theory recognized four genetic domains viz., phylogenetic domain, sociocultural domain, ontogenetic domain and microgenetic domain, though, most of the research has been carried out in the ontogenetic domain (cf Lantolf, 2000). For example, focusing on exploring the ways in which abilities such as voluntary memory are formed in children through the integration of meditational means into the thinking process (Lantolf, 2000). However, these four aspects were found to be interwoven together in the development analysis from Vygotskian

perspective (Palincsar, 1998). Hence, it was with the application of ontogenetic analysis that the complex interplay of meditational tools, the individual, and the social world is explored to understand learning and development and the transformation of tools, practices, and institutions (Palincsar, 1998). According to Lantolf (2000) their mental system had been reformed as a result of their participation in a culturally specified activity known as schooling (p. 5). A well established fact of child cognitive development fragmented in the stages were challenged by the notion that learning is not the result of pre-established stage of certain form of maturation but rather as result of social interactions and socially learned phenomenon giving impetus to the inner development of child.

The social context ascribes varied meaning to the individual or group performing the task due differences in motives and goals underlying the behaviour (Lantolf, 2000). Activities in different settings (e.g., classrooms) do not seem to unfold smoothly but there may be chain of one activity reshaping itself into another activity in the course of its unfolding (Lantolf, 2000). Shift in activity may increase the need to discover different meditational tools for carrying out new activities with the help of identifies group or peer. In this regard, Palincsar (1998) pointed that “the peer collaboration resembled interactions between teachers and children, resulting in the generation of new story elements and more mature forms of activities. Thus facilitative aspects of peer interactions in the form of shared perspectives imparted more meaning to sociocultural psychology of children.

### **Social class and sociocultural experience**

Behaviorist and latter constructivist agenda was limited to discourse of teaching and learning, pontificating the framework of individual agency based on maturation and rewards, thus ignoring cultural-historical-political forces. In the classroom discourses, students form a shared identity with each other which can be very effective factors to be utilized for practical learning through dialogues and discussion. Gee (1990) suggested that as researcher and teacher we must go beyond mere recognition of discourses' role in producing or potentially challenging hierarchies of power. Therefore, it becomes foremost to

look into the basic tenets of child which had its genesis in the sociocultural configuration and experiences (Cohen, 2009). This sociocultural format has been dominantly synchronized by the Childs' SES whose definition has become more contextual rather than unequivocal as in earlier formalists rudiments.

It was observed that despite expansion in educational reforms and access to education, the subtle form of discrimination still continues. The exclusion and blatant sort of discrimination faced by children depends upon their position in the social ladder both because of their social identity and their role in a domain. Burkit (2008) pointed toward social class as a fit for certain category of capitals essential in ones understanding of social selves. Categorization of SES as objective criterion for measuring ones hierarchical position is based on set of variables which is clustered and complementary. Thus, for the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, the social class differences and distinctions between individuals that influence their biographical trajectories and identities were not just based in the ownership or non-ownership of material capital, or in the person's relation to the division of labour, but also depend upon the possession of cultural, social and symbolic capital (Burkit, 2008). These capitals can be associated with Vygotsky's sociocultural and postformal theoretical assumptions given long before Bourdieu's thesis. However, these associations of capitals decide the social position of the individual in any social situations such as classroom. According to Bourdieu (1993) each individual occupies a position in a multidimensional social space or field where he or she is not defined only by social class membership, but by every single kind of capital he or she can articulate through social relations. These invisible and visible accumulations of capital include the value of social networks, which Bourdieu showed could be used to produce or reproduce inequality.

The argument tried to differentiate the cultural control from the sociocultural experiences where social class as a cultural perception and practice seems to have its genesis in the history of legitimate ideology. To simplify it further, the perception of one's objective position on the socioeconomic ladder can be a derivative of one's self concept, values and beliefs depending upon the reciprocal interaction of cultural variations or social environments with one's individualistic self. The

notion of individualistic self used here draw from phylogenetic reality of individual which at one hand categorize as prototype of human being and at other as a individual having experience gained from own human agency. This complex structure of human and society impels Snibbe & Markus (2005) to remark that, “Cultural models are sets of assumptions that are widely (though not universally) shared by a group of people, existing both in individual minds and in public artefacts, institutions, and practices. At the individual level, these cultural models provide implicit blueprints of how to think, feel, and act. When people act according to these blueprints, they reproduce the public models, thereby perpetuating the cultural context from which both were derived.”(p. 704). Above definition of cultural model can also add to its three major forms, namely, religion, SES and region (Cohen, 2009), where SES has been seen as of major practical importance. The American Psychological Association’s Task Force on Socioeconomic Status (2006) recently noted that differences in socioeconomic status and social class have important implications for human development, well-being, and physical health. In research on socioeconomic status and social class, these are commonly operationalized as combinations of variables such as income, education, and occupational prestige. When investigating social class and socioeconomic status, many investigators also probe subjective social class, or individuals’ estimation of their own social class (Cohen, 2009, p. 197). People may perceive their social class to be different from what objective indicators might suggest (Cohen, 2009). Thus, socioeconomic and class inequality may be perceived not only in terms of tangible resources such as income but also in terms of structural aspects such as power, privilege, and social capital (American Psychological Association, Task Force on Socioeconomic Status, 2007; Cohen, 2009).

Cohen (2009) highlighted that, “whereas much attention has been paid to the effects that socioeconomic status and social class have on domains such as health, development, and well-being, psychologists have not often taken a culturally informed approach or considered the rich culturally textured beliefs, values, and practices of higher versus lower social class individuals” (p. 197). Snibbe & Markus (2005) through various experiments had shown how people of low and high socioeconomic status differ in their views of agency. It was found that

high socioeconomic status people are more able to control their environments and influence others whereas those of low socioeconomic status are more likely to have to adapt to their surroundings and maintain their integrity because of their inability to directly control their environments (Snibbe & Markus, 2005). Thus, Snibbe and Markus claimed that the culture of high socioeconomic status valued control and agency, whereas the culture of low socioeconomic status valued flexibility, integrity, and resilience (Cohen, 2009). Thus, it can be concluded that children of different socioeconomic status are enculturated to have different values (Snibbe & Markus, 2005).

Providing meaningful education for all children sets the agenda for more diverse form of education to the child (Palincsar, 1998). In this context, Moll (1992) asserted that “in studying human beings dynamically, within their social circumstances, in their full complexity, we gain a more complete and a much more valid understanding of them (p. 239). Failure of the school to serve children from all diverse background (e.g. SES) have been explained through the following sociocultural explanations viz., a) discontinuities between the culture (values, attitudes, beliefs and SES) of the home and school (Gee, 1990; McPhail, 1996), b) mismatches in the communicative practices between children of lower class and SES and mainstream teachers who represent monolithic value system of middle social class that lead to miscommunication and misjudgment (Heath, 1983), c) the internalization of negative stereotypes by minority groups *or people of working class* who have been marginalized and may see school as a site for opposition and resistance (Steele, 1992), and, d) relational issues, such as the failure to attain mutual trust between teachers and students (Moll & Whitmore, 1993) and a shared sense of identification between the teacher and the learner (Litowitz, 1993). Adding to the above sociocultural explanations of mismatches between value assumption of child and the school, the children co-construct their knowledge system in the social processes with their use and familiarity with the artifacts. Thus, we may call for alternative views that reconsider tradition and scheme of schools and provide major overhauling through awareness. This is required to have a shift in the perceptions of an observer and to value the agency of the child which is actor and bearer of the oppressive situations. Therefore it becomes important in understanding child’s

appropriation of his/her cultural values and to provide better education from the diverse perspective.

### **Sociocultural experience in text: Reconsidering tool for literacy and pedagogy**

According to Giroux (2010), critical pedagogy is situated as a political and moral project. Its proponents recognize that pedagogy is always political because it is connected to the formation and acquisition of agency. As a political project, it illuminates the relationships among knowledge, authority, and power drawing attention to questions concerning who has control over the conditions for the production of knowledge, values, and skills. Moreover, it sheds light on the ways in which knowledge, identities, and authority are constructed within particular circuits of power. Most importantly, it draws attention to the fact that pedagogy is a deliberate attempt on the part of educators to influence how and what knowledge and subjectivities are produced within particular sets of social relations. Ethically, critical pedagogy stresses the importance of understanding what actually happens in classrooms and other educational settings. This was done through raising questions regarding the choice, direction and desirability of knowledge. It also takes seriously the important relationship between how we learned and acted as individual and social agents. In this instance, critical pedagogy was concerned with teaching students not only how to think but also how to assume a measure of individual and social responsibility—that is, what it means to be responsible for one's actions as part of a broader attempt to be an collectively engaged citizen.

### **Prospects and conclusion**

We discussed about the role of sociocultural psychology as a postformal approach. The challenges associated with the formal education in terms of increasing achievement gap is not new and more serious attempt is required to understand the existing reform policies in education. The present work, however, highlighted the nuances and merits associated with formal and post formal viewpoints only, and highlighted the need



for understanding sociocultural aspects of human psychology. The necessity to understand the problems and prospects of both the perspectives may provide better picture of educational system. In recent times, lot of researchers have attempted to look into the arguments presented in this paper through different cultural contexts, yet many questions still remained to be answered. As it is evident from the review presented here, this topic is one with manifold aspects to its ranging from broad ones such as cultural issues, government policies and plans to subtle nuances such as teaching strategies and curricula. Hence future researchers may consider the employment of collaborative effort from social scientists belonging to various disciplines so that the different issues associated with the subject maybe dealt appropriately. The need also arises to understand the tenets of social class and SES as structure under which various other identities gets represented and constructed depending upon the volatility of social context and situation. The universal aspect of social class may not only mutually constitute the individual and structural factors but also convey about the construction of selves depending upon the situation of the domain, that is system of education and classroom affects. Giroux (2010) pointed in migratory context of America that it is time for Americans to take note of the fundamental importance of retaining educational theories and pedagogical practices that produce the knowledge, values, and formative culture necessary for young people to believe that democracy is worth fighting for. Taking the recourse from Giroux (2010) and Portes (2005), intentions are to develop awareness program to reinvent the society, so that its education system may understand real meaning of democracy and stay away from its myths sidelining itself from corrosive and oppressive corridors. The generation of empowerment among marginalized both in perceptions and objectivity may then reflect the possibilities of diversity inclusion.

Thus, the need is to respect diverse form of education suitable for everyone's sociocultural experience without legitimizing one form of educational culture and methodology. It may be more justifiable to acknowledge the promises associated with both formal and post formal educational system. That may create more democratic framework for education where no child is neglected for being not fitting into the systems and values of other identities.

## References

- American Psychological Association Task Force on Socioeconomic Status (2006). Report of the task force on socioeconomic status. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Retrieved in 2010, from [www.apa.org/pi/ses/resources/publications/task-force-2006.pdf](http://www.apa.org/pi/ses/resources/publications/task-force-2006.pdf)
- Beteille, A. (2007). Classes and communities. *Economic and Political Weekly* (March 17). Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4419363>
- Block, A. (1995). *Occupied reading: Critical foundations for an ecological theory*. New York: Garland.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Outline of a theory of practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Burkitt, I. (2008). *Social Selves: Theories of Self and Society*. 2nd ed. London: Sage Publications.
- Cobb, P., & Yackel, E. (1996). Constructivist, emergent, and sociocultural perspectives in the context of developmental research. *Educational Psychologist*, 31(3/4), 175-190. doi: 10.1080/00461520.1996.9653265
- Cohen, A. B. (2009). Many forms of culture. *American Psychologist*, 64(3), 194-204. Retrieved from <http://people.auc.ca/brodbeck/4007/article17.pdf>
- Driscoll, M. (1994). *Psychology of learning for instruction*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 256-273. Retrieved from [http://www.stanford.edu/dept/psychology/cgi-bin/drupal/system/files/A%20social-cognitive%20approach\\_0.pdf](http://www.stanford.edu/dept/psychology/cgi-bin/drupal/system/files/A%20social-cognitive%20approach_0.pdf)
- Dweck, C. S., & Master, A. (2008). Self-theories motivate self-regulated learning. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Motivation*

- and self-regulated learning: Theory, research, and applications* (pp. 31–51). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York and London: Continuum.
- Gallagher, S. (1999). An Exchange of Gazes. In J. L. Kincheloe, S. R. Steinberg & L. E. Villaverde (Eds.), *Rethinking Intelligence: Confronting psychological assumptions about teaching and learning* (pp. 69-84). Routledge: New York and London.
- Gee, J.P. (1990). *Discourses, socio-culturally situated educational theory, and the failure problem*. Paper presented at the University of Delaware.
- Gee, J.P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Gergen, K.J. (1985). The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist*, 40(3), 266–275. Retrieved from [http://www.swarthmore.edu/Documents/faculty/gergen/Social\\_Constructionist\\_Movement.pdf](http://www.swarthmore.edu/Documents/faculty/gergen/Social_Constructionist_Movement.pdf)
- Giroux, H. A. (2010). Dumbing down teachers: Rethinking the crisis of public education and the dismiss of the social state. *Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*, 32, 339-381. doi: 10.1080/10714413.2010.510346
- Harre, R. (1 986). An outline of the social constructionist viewpoint. In R. Harre (Ed.), *The social construction of emotions* (pp. 2-14). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Heath, S.B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- John-Steiner, V., & Mahn, H. (1996). Sociocultural approaches to learning and development: A Vygotskian framework. *Educational Psychologist*, 31(3/4), 191-206. doi: 10.1080/00461520.1996.9653266
- Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 33 (1), 1-27. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.1994.tb01008.x
- Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system

- justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology*, 25 (6), 881-919. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00402.x
- Kincheloe, J. L. (1999). The Foundations of a Democratic Educational Psychology. In J. L. Kincheloe, S. R. Steinberg & L. E. Villaverde (Eds.), *Rethinking Intelligence: Confronting psychological assumptions about teaching and learning* (pp. 1-26). Routledge: New York and London.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & Horn JR, R. A. (2007). *The praeger handbook of education and psychology* (vol 1- 4). London: Praeger.
- Kincheloe, J.L., & Steinberg, S.R. (1993). A tentative description of postformal thinking: The critical confrontation with cognitive theory. *Harvard Educational Review*, 63(3), 296–320. Retrieved from <http://her.hepg.org/content/h423221226v18648/>
- Kintsch, W. (1988). The role of knowledge in discourse comprehension: a construction-integration model. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 163–182. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/index.cfm?fa=buy.optionToBuy&uid=1988-28529-001>
- Kitchener, R. F. (1991). Jean Piaget: The Unknown Sociologist? *The British Journal of Sociology*, 42 (3), 421-442. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/591188>
- Kityama, S., & Uskul, A. K. (2011). Culture, mind, and the brain: Current evidence and future directions, *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62, 419-449. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-120709-145357
- Kuhn, T.S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. In J. P. Lantolf (ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 1-26). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Litowitz, B. (1993). Deconstruction in the zone of proximal development. In E. Forman, N. Minick, & C. Stone (Eds.), *Contexts for learning: Sociocultural dynamics in children's development* (pp. 184-196). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marsh, D. (1993). Freire, Vygotsky, and special education, and me. *British Columbia Journal of Special Education*, 17(2), 119-234.

- McPhail, J. (1996). *The use of narrative methods to explore failure to succeed in medical school*. Presented at Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association ( 77 th), New York.
- Meacham, S. J. (2001). Vygotsky and the blues: Re-reading cultural connections and conceptual development. *Theory into Practice*, 40 (3), 190-197. doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4003\_7
- Moll, L. C. (1992). Literacy research in community and classrooms: A sociocultural approach. In J. L Green, M. L Kamil, T. Shanahan (Eds), *Multidisciplinary perspectives on Literacy Research*(pp. 211-44). Urbana, IL: National council of teaching, England.
- Moll, L. C., & Whitmore, K. (1993). Vygotsky in classroom practice: Moving from individual transmission to social transaction. In E. A. Forman, N. Minick & C. A. Stone (Eds.), *Contexts for Learning: Sociocultural Dynamics in Children's Development* (pp. 19-42). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Muro, A. (2012). Pedagogies of change: From theory to practice. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 4 (1), 2-17. Retrieved from <https://partnershipsjournal.org/ojs/index.php/ijcp/article/view/490>
- Palincsar, A. S. (1998). Social constructivist perspectives on teaching and learning. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 345-75. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.345
- Portes, P. R. (2005). *Dismantling educational inequality: A cultural-historical approach to closing the achievement gap*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Prawat, R. S. (1996). Constructivisms, modern and postmodern. *Educational Psychologist*, 31(3/4), 215-225. doi: 10.1080/00461520.1996.9653268
- Said, E. (1978). *The orientalism*. London: Penguin.
- Sarangapani, P.M. (2003). *Constructing school knowledge*. New Delhi: Sage.
- Scholes, R. (1985). *Textual power*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1981). *The psychology of literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sirin, S. R. (2005). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(3), 417–53. doi: 10.3102/00346543075003417

- Sleeter, C. E. (2011). *Un-standardizing curriculum: multicultural teaching in the standards- based classroom*. *Urban Education*, 46 (4), 880-887. doi: 10.1177/0042085910377854
- Snibbe, A. C., & Markus, H. R. (2005). You can't always get what you want: Educational attainment, agency, and choice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88 (4), 703-720. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/index.cfm?fa=buy.optionToBuy&uid=2005-02948-008>
- Steele, C. M. (1992). Race and the schooling of black Americans. *Atlantic Monthly*, 269, 68–78.
- Steele, C.M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist*, 52(6), 613-629. Retrieved from <http://psycnet.apa.org/index.cfm?fa=buy.optionToBuy&uid=1997-04591-001>
- Steele, C.M. (2010). *Whistling Vivaldi: How stereotypes affect us and what we can do*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Stephens, N. M., Markus, H. R., & Fryberg, S. A. (2012). Social class disparities in health and education: Reducing inequality by applying a sociocultural self model of behaviour. *Psychological Review*. doi: 10.1037/a0029028
- Shyman, E. (2012). Differentiated instruction as a pedagogy of liberation. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 4(1), 65-75. Retrieved from <http://partnershipsjournal.org/ojs/index.php/ijcp/article/view/303>
- Toulmin, S. (1995). Forward. In R. F. Goodman., & W. R. Fisher (Eds.), *Rethinking knowledge: reflections across the disciplines* (pp. ix-xv). Albany: NY Press
- Tyler, T. R. (2006). Psychological perspectives on legitimacy and legitimation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 375–400. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190038
- Voss, J. F., Wiley, J., & Carretero, M. (1995). Acquiring intellectual skills. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 46, 155-81. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ps.46.020195.001103
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher*

- psychological processes*. M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, E. Soubelman (Eds). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Warikoo, N., & Carter, P. (2009). Cultural explanations for racial and ethnic stratification in academic achievement: A call for a new and improved theory. *Review of Educational Research Spring*, 79(1), 366–394. doi: [10.3102/0034654308326162](https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308326162)
- Weisner, T. (1987). Review of J. Wertsch, Vygotsky and Social formation of mind. *American Anthropologist*, 89 (2), 479-480. doi: [10.1525/aa.1987.89.2.02a00500](https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1987.89.2.02a00500)
- Werstch, J., & Tulviste, P. (1992). L. S. Vygotsky and contemporary developmental psychology. *Development Psychology*, 28 (4), 548-557.
- Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class job*. New York: Columbia University press.
- Winne, P. H., & Nesbit, J. C. (2010). The psychology of academic achievement. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 61, 653-678. doi: [10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100348](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100348)
- Zweigenhaft, R., & Domhoff, G. (1991). *Blacks in the white establishment*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

**Chetan Sinha** is Assistant Professor in the Department of Psychology at Christ University, Bangalore, India.

**Contact Address:** Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Chetan Sinha, Dept. of Psychology, Christ University, Hosur Road, Bangalore, Karnataka, India - 560029. E-mail: [chetan.sinha@christuniversity.in](mailto:chetan.sinha@christuniversity.in)