

PAPER DETAILS

TITLE: Pierre Bourdieu'nun Toplumsal Eylem Kuramı

AUTHORS: SINASI ÖZTÜRK

PAGES: 143-156

ORIGINAL PDF URL: <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/217343>

PIERRE BOURDIEU'S THEORY OF SOCIAL ACTION

Şinasi ÖZTÜRK*

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on a discussion of Pierre Bourdieu's theory of social action and his main concepts that are habitus, capital and field. Related to his theory, the conceptions of praxis and power are also analyzed. Praxis is the center of Bourdieu's theory of social action and power is the key concept to analyze society. Additionally, Bourdieu's sociological understanding, namely reflexive sociology, is discussed. Lastly, the second purpose of this paper is to make some connections between Bourdieu's conception of structure and Durkheim, Marx, and Weber's conceptualization of social action.

Keywords: Bourdieu, social action, habitus.

Pierre Bourdieu'nun Toplumsal Eylem Kuramı

ÖZET

Bu makale Pierre Bourdieu'nun toplumsal eylem kuramı ve habitus, kapital (capital) ve alan (field) kavramlarının tartışması üzerinde odaklanmıştır. Bu kuram ile ilgili olarak praksis (praxis) ve güç/iktidar (power) kavramları da incelenmiştir. Praksis, Bourdieu'nun toplumsal eylem ve güç/iktidar kuramında (theory of social action and power) toplumu incelemede kullandığı temel kavramdır. Ek olarak, Bourdieu'nun toplumbilimsel yaklaşımı da, Reflexive Sosyoloji olarak adlandırılır, bu çalışma içerisinde tartışılmıştır. Son olarak, bu yazı Bourdieu'nun yapı kavramı (conception of structure) ile Durkheim, Marx ve Weber'in toplumsal eylem (social action) kavramlaştırmaları arasında bir bağ kurmayı amaçlamıştır.

Anahtar Kelime: Bourdieu, toplumsal eylem, habitus

Introduction

Pierre Bourdieu, as a French sociologist, in his early career, affected from E. Durkheim and structuralist ideas. Bourdieu tries to combine Durkheim's functionalism and structuralism on his early studies. Nevertheless, he began to use dominantly Marxian and Weberian approaches in his theory by the time. By doing this combination, he aims to a new understanding, or a new way of analyzing society. He used this combined viewpoints not only in his theory, but also on his researches. His works are mostly on the areas of education, labor, kinship, economic change, language philosophy, literature, photography, museums, universities, law, religion, and science.

The first part of the paper includes a discussion of social action and praxis conceptions, which are center themes of Bourdieu's studies. In Bourdieu's usage, socio-economic factors can be cited as objective influences operating within the field in which the center was situated, but the nature both of that field and of the center was the products of Bourdieu's reflexive project. The sustained production of empirical researches entailed a process of reproduction as much as did the transmission of cultural arbitrariness within the

* Yard. Doç. Dr., Muğla Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Bölümü.

educational system. Practice was the culmination of pedagogy but, at the same time, the implementation of a program of practice involved the creative construction of institutional conditions for practical and authority and work (Munch, 1994).

Social Action and Praxis

The interrelationship between society and societal development is main concern of Bourdieu's conception of social action and praxis. Bourdieu's starting point for social action is the assumption that social action is praxis. He placed the praxis at the center of his approach and related it with the Marxist thought. This concept has two closely related meanings; first, it suggests action as opposed to philosophical speculation. Second, it implies that fundamental characteristic of human society is material production to meet basic needs. Thus, man acts on the natural world or works, and only secondarily thinks about it. In other words, this term refers that human action occurs on the natural and social world, and there is the transformative nature of action and the priority of action over thought (Bourdieu 1990a).

From this base, according to Bourdieu, praxis is more than social action that is seen as an isolated event. Praxis is an activity by which human individuals produce and reproduce society in its cultural, social, and economic dimensions. It has a mediary role between individual human action and societal development. The individuals' action by praxis becomes part of societal development. To make it more explicit, by praxis people produce, and reproduce their culture, social structure, and economic wealth. This production and reproduction process is also related with overall organization of economic production and reproduction (Bourdieu 1998a, 1990a).

The economic praxis, for Bourdieu (1987, 1998a), mediates between individual and collective interest of groups, class, on strata, such as workers, managers, bankers and governments; and it mediates between the social organization of economic production and reproduction of society's wealth. The result of this economic praxis is a certain level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of individual or collective interests, and the renewal the social organization of production and reproduction of society's economic wealth. This renewed level economic praxis leads to a change in economic wealth and distribution of wealth between individuals, groups, strata, and classes.

In these conceptualizations of social action, praxis and social development, it is obvious that, Bourdieu uses Marxist ideas of praxis. Over these bases, Bourdieu develops a dialectical theory of social development, which is core on praxis as the mediatory link between individual and collective action and social structure (social organization of the production and reproduction of society). Bourdieu takes the relationship between class habitus and current capital as realized within the specific logic of a given field as basis

in the analysis of social practice. The agent's capital itself is the product of habitus. The habitus, for him, is "self-reflexive." It is animated in practice each time and it encounters itself both as embodied and as objectified history.

Habitus as Acquired Patterns

Bourdieu describes habitus as a set of acquired patterns of thought, behavior, and taste. Bourdieu uses this term to constitute the link between social structures and social practice (or social action). This concept offers a possible basis for a cultural approach to structural inquiry and permits a focus on agency. He defines habitus as; "the past which survives in the present", "immanent law.... laid down in each agent by his earliest upbringing", "The habitus.... makes possible the achievement of infinitely diversified tasks", "dominated by the earliest experiences" (Bourdieu 1977: 81-83, 87).

Bourdieu (1987, 1985) puts habitus as central idea of his theory of practice. By Habitus, he wants to transcend the opposition between theories and practice. In which case, he assumes theories which grasp practices exclusively as constituted. Shortly, habitus includes two important aspects structuring structures and structured structures. Both shapes and are shaped by social practice.

Bourdieu (1985) uses habitus as a system of general generative schemes. They are durable and transposable from one field to another. In this sense it is inter-subjective which means it is the place of constitution of person-in-action. At the same time, habitus is a system of disposition time, which is objective and subjective. Thus, habitus is the dynamic intersection of structure (objectivity) and action (subjectivity). In other words, it has a mediary role between society and individual.

Bourdieu analyzes the behavior of agents as objectively coordinated and regular without being the product of the rules on the place. He uses Durkheim's conscience collective, by transforming it as 'conscience, which is collectively constructed'. For Bourdieu (1977, 1998c), individuals, in their actions, incorporate social structure and organizations. Individuals do this by exteriorizing their individual interests, world-views, and dispositions to act. These renew social structure and organization as it is shared the same conditions, they develop the same habitus, while doing the people incorporates social structure and organization. In this sense, the concept of habitus can be related Durkheim's conscience collective. For example, Bourdieu's explanation of limited living conditions and limitation of people's scope for action in which people occupy the higher levels of societal space, is parallel to Durkheim's societal density and societal volume which are used to explain degree of conscience collective.

Alternatively, Bourdieu thinks that individuals' socially determined habitus is different from their individuality. An individual shares his/her habitus with the people who have been exposed to the same conditions of living. However, each individual passes through a unique interiorizing process. This makes up his/her individual personality and vision of overall social habitus. According to Bourdieu, same living conditions and same position in society lead to the same habitus. To say it in Durkheimian sense, in these conditions people develop same 'conscience collective'.

Moreover, Bourdieu's thinking of the habitus of social being brings together the interplay between agents, who are positioned in the symbolic realm of representations that can be termed as the exchange of meanings (1990a: 131):

"So the representations of agents vary with their position (and the interest associated with it) and with their habitus, as a system of models of perception and appreciation, as cognitive and evaluative structures which are achieved through the lasting experience of a social position. The habitus is at once a system of models for the production of practices and a system of models for the perception of practices."

Therefore, conceptualization of habitus can be defined on prepositions in that it contains the meanings given to social being through which individuals make sense of their world and with which they construct knowledge. The links with agents' position and interest are that Bourdieu builds into the social space or set of relations in which the habitus exists.

Lastly, habitus is a consistency of meaning between objective situation and position and subjective disposition to act, which can be called as elective affinity between class situation and position. This is the conceptualization of habitus to characterize the consistency between class situation and ethical convictions.

Capital as a Form of Power

Bourdieu begins his analysis of capital with Marx by the following definition (1986: 241):

"Capital is accumulated labor (in its materialized form or its 'incorporated', embodied form) which, when appropriated on a private, exclusive, basis by agents or groups of agents, enables them to appropriate social energy in the form of reified or living labor."

Bourdieu's usage of labor theory of capital is, in some way, similar to Marx's usage. Bourdieu describes the social world as "accumulated history".

Additionally he states that we can analyze the whereby they are accumulated and transmitted to succeeding generations (Bourdieu, 1986: 253):

"The universal equivalent, the measure of all equivalencies, is nothing other than labor time; and the conservation of social energy through all its conversions is verified if, in each case, one takes into account both the labor time accumulated in the form of capital and the labor time needed to transform it from one type to another."

On the other hand, different from Marx, he does not examine the historically specific conditions under which labor is abstracted into temporal units of measurement. For Bourdieu, labor time means simply amount of work, it does not include other specialties what Marx explains such as transformation of qualitatively different forms of work into a quantitative equivalent.

Although Bourdieu borrowed some ideas about labor and capital from Marx, his explanations are different at some points. For Bourdieu, capital is a source, form of wealth, which produces power. On the other hand, for Marx, capital is not only wealth, but also, a complex relation of production. This mode of production, capitalism, intensifies and expands the process of exploitation.

Bourdieu uses capital not only in economic sense but also he gives it some different meanings. For him, there are different forms of capital such as cultural, symbolic and social (1987: 3-4; 1986: 245). This definition of capital reflects his multidimensional explanation of social phenomena. For him "The social world can be conceived as a multidimensional space that can be constructed empirically by discovering the main factors of a given social universe, or, in other words, by discovering the powers of forms of capital which are or can become efficient" (Bourdieu, 1987: 3-4). Economic capital is "immediately and directly convertible into money" (Bourdieu, 1986: 245), but cultural capital (educational credentials) and social capital (social connections) are not. Capital is a form of power. It is different from Marxian and formal economical terms. The concept of "cultural capital" is among Bourdieu's most distinctive contributions to critical theory.

According to Bourdieu, (1984: 128-129) it is a simple observation, which shows that cultural capital is full capital and understanding its logic as logic of capital (if specific to a particular field) offers direct analytical gains. Therefore, it is possible to understand both the structure of the social field and the various position takings within it in terms of the differing absolute volumes of capital held by particular agents and of the differing composition of particular agents' capital assets, which will be made up of varying proportions of cultural and economic capital. Therefore, class hierarchy and class alliances or disputes can

be understood in terms of multi-dimensional space, rather than in terms of simple linearity. The notion of cultural capital's convertibility with economic capital also enables struggles within a particular class to be understood now as struggles over "the conservation or transformation of the 'exchange rate' between different kinds of capitals" (Bourdieu, 1998b: 34).

Bourdieu thinks that (1986, 1998), the conception of capital is the notion that entails the capacity to exercise control over one's own future and that of others. It serves, at the same time, to theoretically mediate individual and society is structured by the differential distribution of capital. On another level, individuals strive to maximize their capital. In this case, the capital gives chance to individuals to define their "social trajectory" (their life chances). Additionally, it serves to reproduce class distinctions.

Bourdieu focuses on social, cultural, and economic capital that they are interplay among each other. Economic capital is the most efficient form of capital. Bourdieu defines it as a characterizing trait of capitalism. It can be more easily and efficiently converted into symbolic capital, which is social and cultural capital. At the same time, symbolic capital can be transformed into economic capital. From this point it is easily be seen that, Bourdieu took effects of economy in the center of his analysis of modern society. It means, in a sense, he sees material or economic determination over culture and society. This reminds us Marx's theory of base and superstructure.

Although the economics is crucially determining, for Bourdieu, it is symbolically mediated at the same time. However, the undisguised reproduction of economic capital would reveal the arbitrary character of the distribution of power and wealth. The function of symbolic capital (social and cultural capital), as Bourdieu thinks (1986, 1998), is to mask the economic domination of the dominant class and socially legitimate hierarchy. This process occurs by the way of essentializing and naturalizing social position. That is non-economic fields articulate with, reproduce, and legitimate class relations through mis-recognition. For him, in this sense, status and class are interrelated. Bourdieu defines the process of obtaining from economical, social, and cultural production and reproduction by the individuals, groups, strata, classes, and societies as economic, social, and cultural capital. On this point, economic capital is constructed on money income as the form of wages or profits. Social capital is the intensity of social relationship, which a person can rely on. Cultural capital is the educational degree, which enable to demonstrate good taste for individuals' life style. Economical, social, and cultural capital constitutes symbolic capital if other people evaluate their possessions.

Bourdieu divides struggle into two types. The first one is real struggle, which is the struggle on distribution of economics, social and cultural capital among individuals, groups, strata, classes, and societies. The second one is

symbolic struggle, which is the struggle on the evaluation of economic, social, and cultural achievements. This type of struggle occurs especially among classes, which rely on one or two types of capital.

Bourdieu compares each fields to a market in which individuals and collective actors compete for accumulation of capital. This analogy reminds us Weber's thought that places of each individual or group in stratification are determined according to their market positions. He makes another analogy between individuals or collective actors for economical, social, and cultural possession and calls them as investment material. In each market, the agent starts with a certain amount of capital and invests them. By this way, it has a chance to achieve in competition. For example, if an agent has more capital, this means it has more chance to be successful against to other agents who have less capital. It is crucial to remember that Bourdieu uses capital to refer to economic, social, and cultural things, such as money, web of social relationship, and education relatively.

Using Marxist sense, Bourdieu says, the conditions competition on these markets, economic, social and cultural, are not equal (Bourdieu 1970). The main reason for this inequality lays on historical evaluation of markets from hierarchically structured societies, which are stratified into lower, middle, and higher estates. On the other hand, agents can find a chance to achieve higher position or more capital. Thus, in the each market, the balance may change over time. On that occasion, Bourdieu talks about a paradox. In the each market, competition works in the direction of reproduction of inequalities, which was the result of traditional hierarchies and earlier phases of competition. This causes more production and innovation and improves everyone's living standard. Networks of social relationships expand for everybody. Cultural education expands for everybody's use. In this way, economic, social, and cultural living standards rise for whole society. Nevertheless, at the same time the competition for higher status by gaining more capital is highly intensified. In previous historical time, if someone had more capital, it means s/he has more chance to keep on that level his/her level of life. Likewise, if someone is born on lower level, s/he must struggle to be successful in a highly competitive market. Bourdieu explains this paradox by using the following statements (Bourdieu, 1970: 169-70):

"Economic, social, and cultural reproduction are permanently pushed a higher level of economic wealth, social solidarity, and cultural education, but at the same time economic, social, and cultural competition shifts to higher levels, and increases the demand to achievement. Competition intensifies, what appears to increase equality of opportunity ... turns out to be rising of the

requirements for economics, social, and cultural achievement. The education that previously gave excess to top cultural distinction and top managerial positions is now a necessity for reaching middle-level distinction and appointments. We do not approach more equality in this way but only a reproduction of inequalities on higher levels of achievement."

Field as a Space of Conflict and Competition

Bourdieu uses this concept to analyze modern society as a space of conflict and competition (1998c). Field is an account of the multidimensional space of positions and the position taking of the agents whose position is the result of interplay between these people's habitus and their place in a field of positions. Agent's place in a field of positions is defined by the distribution of the appropriate form of capital. This positions range and nature varies socially and historically. Thus, Bourdieu uses idea of field to provide the frame for a 'relational analysis'.

Bourdieu distinguishes three fields in the social space in which praxis takes place and society is produced and reproduced. They are the social field, economic field, and cultural field. The social field is made up of groups, strata, and classes. The individuals belong to them according to their social origin, activity or dissociation and unfamiliarity with people. In this sense, the social production and reproduction of society is the production and reproduction of new relationships between people, associations, and dissociation, groups, strata and classes. This field also includes distribution and redistribution of them (1998c).

In the economic field, labor dealing with scarcity and competing for opportunities to acquire income, production and distribution of goods and services, and the exchange of goods and services are the process of building up wealth of society. Economic production and reproduction implies the distribution of the products among individuals, groups, strata, classes and societies.

The cultural field includes the acquisition of education, certificates, titles, world-views, product of arts, mass culture, sports activities, way of consuming, dressing, etc. In this sense, cultural production and reproduction of society are the production of the elements of culture. This field also includes distribution of them.

Each of these fields has their laws and each field guided by these laws. Actors play specific games on a certain field. These three fields also have some common features. All off them are the place of the production and reproduction of society for the distribution of their products. They are also places of societal praxis where individuals, groups, strata, classes, and societies produce and

reproduce culture, social association, and economical wealth. The agents of societal praxis are also in competition over distribution of these products. Bourdieu puts his social analysis on the center of this competition or struggle.

Each field is semi-autonomous and determined by its own determinant agents, accumulation of history, logic of action and forms of capital. On the other side, capital may be transferred to another field. These fields are immersed in an institutional field of power. In other words, they may be transferred into the field of class relations. Moreover, these fields are the side of struggles.

Power as a Main Force

For Bourdieu (1977, 1986), power is the major force in social development and which relegates any other force to a secondary status. He has worked out a multidimensional view of power by differentiating economic, social, cultural, and symbolic capital as power sources. He does not separate the concept of power from the concepts of economic, social, cultural, and symbolic capital. Power is the chance to enforce one's will even against the resistance of others at the same time. From this starting point, Bourdieu explains how the agents transfer the symbolic power into economic, social, and cultural power to be successful against to other agents who compete for the same achievements.

Power is fundamental for Bourdieu as it is in Weber. The relationship of power constitutes and shapes social field. Then, it involves domination and differential distribution. Lastly, it is always used in social relationship whether consciously or unconsciously.

Influences of Durkheim, Marx, and Weber on Bourdieu

In his study of *Algeria*, Bourdieu did a case study of a society in transition from traditional to modern. His focus was a cross-cultural change. In order to explain this cross-cultural change he used analytical procedures. Doing this he used and test validity of Durkheimian, Weberian, and Marxist theories of social organizations.

In this study, he used mostly Durkheimian approach, especially conscience collective and transformation of mechanical solidarity to organic solidarity. Bourdieu simply transformed the concept of 'conscience collective' by arguing; it is a 'conscience that is collectively constructed'. His primary concern was the tribes that were to protection internal social ability. This concern was made crucial for the tribes by the poverty of their physical environmental and by the inadequacy of their technical resources. On this point, the social structures can be understood by locating human activity within the local ecological system.

In *Algeria*, his theoretical analysis of Algerian society was strongly affected from Durkheimian social analysis. According to Robbins (1991: 72):

“...Durkheimianism gained the ascendancy within French higher education as a result of an internal patronage which operated by means of ‘clusters’ of influence, ... for Bourdieu and Passeron, shoved every sign of being a superficial organizational sociology which imposed its own limitations on the phenomena which is observed. They were intent on retrieving the complexity of historical factors that shaped the progress of Durkheimian whilst simultaneously condemning the contemporary sociology which was incapable of appreciating that complexity.... Bourdieu and Passeron wanted to retrieve a full comprehension of the institutionalization of Durkheimianism precisely”.

However, on this point, Bourdieu suggests that the grand of positivist phenomenology is different from contemporary positivism and form contemporary structuralism because of his position like as Durkheim’s original position. Both interested in historical account and reflection on the force of contingent institutional interference. On the issue of sociology of knowledge, Bourdieu accepts Durkheim, Marx and Weber’s theoretical unification and he tries to construct unified sociology of knowledge (Munch, 1994). Bourdieu (1993b) believes that there must be clear-cut distinction between theory of sociological knowledge and theory of social system.

At the same time, he uses Weberian approach in relation to Puritanism and capitalism by the way of transforming its religious doctrine, which is secondary status since it is dependent on the willingness of individuals to accept its concurrence with behaviors. These behaviors functions as the primary roles of their social organization.

Bourdieu also uses Marxist analysis by focusing on economic conduct. He appoints economic conduct a secondary status. In this regard, he asserted that economic changes are symbolic actions. These symbolic actions are subordinated to the primary goals of the societies within which the transaction occurs.

Bourdieu explains three stages in the acquisition of a scientific knowledge of society, which is different from theory of social system (1977). The first stage is the primary apperception of phenomena. The second one is the delimitation of primary apperception and the consequent construction of sociological knowledge. The third one is the theoretical unification. In these stages, we can see the affect of Durkheim, Marx, and Weber. For example, in third stage, Bourdieu wants to use Durkheimian approach as an end in itself that allows for the description of relational structures. On this issue, he uses religion for sociological consideration that led him to bring together both Durkheimian

hypothesis of social genesis of schemes of thought and the Marxist commitment to the facts of class divisions. For this purpose, as Robbins (1991: 94) states, Bourdieu suggests that, religion contributes to the imposition of the principles of structuration of the perception and thought of the world and, in particular, of the social world in proportion as it imposes a system of practices and representations whose structure, objectively founded on a principle of political division, presents itself as the natural/supernatural structure of the cosmos.

After studying Algerian society, Bourdieu states that; “in all actions in everyone’s heart of a religious law which is lived at the same time as a rule which is imposed from outside and as an inner guide to conduct.” (Robbins, 1991: 19) In the study of Mozambite cities, Bourdieu found that religious practice has the pragmatic effect of transforming constituted doctrine into lived experience. His explanations mostly carry Weberian analysis of Puritanism and capitalism. For him, the Mozambite commercial success and their doctrine could be explained in economical terms. Therefore, the poverty of the soil enforced resource to commerce. This caused an emphasis on virtues, which were enforced by dogma. In other words, by using Weberian ways of explanation, Bourdieu expresses that with some kind of autonomous validity the doctrines prepared the Mozambites for their economic success. On the other hand, he uses Marxist explanation by saying that economic conditions and relations relatively determine social action. He puts religious doctrines into secondary status by this way, because it is dependent on the willingness of individuals.

Bourdieu is affected from Weber’s theory of art perception with the conceptual framework of fields. In his early studies (in 1960s and 1970s), he used ways to understand the relationship between the production and consumption of art objects in history. Therefore, he also tried to understand the social usage of those objects in the present. For him, after the 19th century intelligentsia freed them from church and this freedom led them into artistic activity that was established itself as an economic activity. For illustration, art became commodity, which was produced and consumed (Bourdieu, 1984). Thus, artists define their power according to market relations. To put it in other way, the more the art market become it an independent economy, the more it become essential for artists to distinguish themselves within that market in order to make their works marketable.

Bourdieu's Contribution to Sociology and Conclusion

Bourdieu’s first contribution to sociology is his analysis of the mediation of social structure and individual action by praxis and of social structure and praxis by the habitus of individuals. This study is an interpretation of social structure and individual action and the ongoing reproduction of individual and

society. This analysis can be named as a theory of structuration (which means pointing out how social structure and the individual personality are produced), reproduced, and transferred in praxis. Praxis refers here as mediating link between them.

Bourdieu's another contribution is to relate power to the economic, social, and cultural fields and to generate a complex understanding of the working of power, paying particular attention to its economic, social and cultural resources. In this way, Bourdieu's theory can be considered as theory of economic, social, and cultural production of power (Robbins 1991). This theory explains how the production and reproduction of power work in economic, social, and cultural terms. Bourdieu distinguishes the internal laws of each field due to their structural limits on achievement in the power game in those fields. It is structuration of power game by the laws of economic, social, and cultural fields (Calhoun and M. Postone 1993).

Beside these, Bourdieu tries to develop an approach to the production of sociological knowledge. For this reason, he analyzes individuals in three lines of inquiry that he names as three intersecting lines. These are; first, relationship between social structure and individual in which he tries to abstract the gaps between subjective and objective dimensions of social life. This is the gap between embodied, practical knowledge and apparently objective structures, which are agreeable to theoretical understanding. Second, he delineates and classifies the reflexivity concept. Third, he develops the notion of interrelationship of social structure, systems of classification and language.

Over these viewpoints, he began to construct a new theory on cultural practice. His result is that such a theory can be developed only if the analysts are able to transcend inherited opposition and dichotomies, and the limitations of vision, which always entails. In this theory, he tries to develop an unorthodox theoretical approach. In this sense, this theoretical approach seems a critique of classical theories. For Bourdieu, an opposition between subjectivist and objectivist approaches characterizes classical social theories. Subjectivist viewpoints focus on centered beliefs, desires and judgment of agents, and these approaches consider these agents endowed and empowered to make the world, and act according to their lights. Contrarily, objectivist viewpoints explain social though in terms of material and economical conditions, social structure, and cultural logic.

Bourdieu, in his books *Outline of a Theory of Practice* and *The Logic of Practice*, tries to find a mediary way between objectivist and subjectivist approaches. Thus, he connects objectivism to especially structuralism that depends on understanding and orientations to subjectivism especially Sartre's phenomenological approach, which reflects to explore the objective social conditions that produce subjective orientations to action. Bourdieu tries to

combine these two approaches to grasp social life. Social life must be understood in terms that do justice to objective material, social, and cultural structures, to the constituting practices and experiences of individuals and groups (Munch, 1994).

From this starting point, for Bourdieu, to transcend the opposition between science and its object, we have to accept science and scientists as part and product of their social life and universe. To share this objective-subjective dichotomy, he suggest a reflexive science of society, and tries to formulate a reflexive approach to social life which is, in fact, an ongoing attempt to overcome theoretically the opposition that have characterized social theory. Lastly, Bourdieu adapted different strategies to sustain a school of thought and an associated group of research in mid of the 1970's.

In summary, Bourdieu formulates a reflexive approach to social life. This social life uncovers the arbitrary conditions of the production of the social structure and of those attitudes, which are related to it. His formulation bases on three conceptions: habitus, capital, and field. In his analysis, he connects these three concepts and a notion of emancipation. Therefore, for Bourdieu, the study of human life must include meaning of human actions. He seeks to clarify the social and cultural reproduction of inequality by analyzing process of misrecognition, and by investigating how the habitus of dominated groups can cover or mask the conditions of their subordination. Bourdieu uses reflexive approach. Thus, for him, there is no point outside the system from which one can take a neutral and/or uninterested perspective.

As overall viewpoint, Bourdieu highlights critical theory by stating the project of social theory that undertakes simultaneously critique of received categories, critique of theoretical practice, and critical substantive analysis of social life (Calhaun, LiPuma, and Postone, 1993: 18).

Lastly, Bourdieu carries on his theoretical approach to Durkheimian structural functionalism, and Marxist and Weberian critical perspective to investigate and define social action. Therefore, he can be named as mediator of micro and macro perspectives, and subjective and objective approaches because of his analyses of social structure and social action at which he investigates social action by dividing it into correlated areas of economy, society, and culture.

References

- Bourdieu, Pierre and J.D. Reynaud. (1974). "Is a sociology of action possible?". In *Positivism and Sociology* ed. Anthony Giddens. London: Heinemann.

- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1970. "The Berber house or the world reversed". *Social Science Information* 9(2), 151-170.
- Bourdieu, Pierre and Loic J. D. Wacquant. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*; Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1962). *The Algerians*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1975). "The specificity of the scientific field and the social conditions of the progress of reason". *Social Science Information* 14(6), 19-47.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1979). *Algeria 1960: The Disenchantment of the World, the Sense of Honour, the Kabyle House or the World Reversed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1981). *Men and machines*. In *Advances in Sociological Method and Methodology*. Ed. K. Knorr-Cetina and A.V. Cicourel. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1983). "The field of cultural production, or: the economic world reversed". *Poetics* 12, 311-356.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1988). *Homo Academicus*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1989). "From the sociology of academics to the sociology of the sociological eye". *Social Theory* 7(1), 32-55.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1990a). *The Logic of Practice*; California: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1990b). *In Other Words: Essays towards a Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1993a). *The Field of Cultural Production*. Cambridge: Polity Press; New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wacquant, Löic J.D. (1992). "How to read Bourdieu" in *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, by Pierre Bourdieu and Löic J.D. Wacquant. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp.261-264.