

THE PLACE OF PIERRE BOURDIEU'S THEORIES IN (POPULAR) CULTURAL STUDIES

Dr. Rifat Mahbub

Assistant Professor

*Department of English and Humanities,
BRAC University*

email: rifat.mahbub@bracu.ac.bd

and

Kazi Farzana Shoily

MA student of English Literature

*Department of English and Humanities,
BRAC University*

email: kazifarzanashoily@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article examines the relevance of French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's theories to cultural studies. His key concepts such as cultural capital, habitus, field and symbolic violence are introduced and explained in relation to their prospects and limitations in the study of culture. We will argue that Bourdieu, though from a different vantage point than the key theoretical figures of cultural studies such as Raymond Williams, questions the hierarchy of cultural productions and consumptions. Importantly, his persistent argument that cultural productions (paintings, music and theatres) accrue their symbolic and social value mainly through the social status of the users is fundamental to how he challenges the hierarchy of the traditional notion of "high", "low", "elite" and "mass" cultures. Thus, "culture" for him is inherently a site of constant social struggle for change which perhaps is the key theoretical argument of cultural studies as an academic discipline. While this "bridge" between culture and society makes Bourdieu theoretically important in the field of cultural studies, we will further argue the methodological significance of Bourdieu's own work of studying people's "taste" empirically in his key tract *La Distinction* (1984). Since cultural studies as a discipline has an enduring interest in the everyday life of people belonging to different social groups in the forms of studies about their food habits, spatial positions, and medium of leisure in particular in the urban contexts, Bourdieu's theories, when used adaptively, can be particularly insightful. We will conclude this paper by examining why Bourdieu will be useful in cultural studies in the 21st century's urban Bangladesh defined by both the expansion of city lives and the "new middle class".

Key words: Pierre Bourdieu, Cultural Studies, Culture, Social class, Bangladesh.

Introduction

French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu is a well-established theoretical figure in the Eurocentric studies of sociology, and increasingly his theories are in use even in areas about which he had little to say (such as the sociology of gender and the sociology of migration). From the mid-1980s, many theorists and critics of various academic fields within the broad remit of social sciences such as feminist studies, cultural studies and media and communications have suggested the appropriateness of Bourdieu's theories in their respective

fields to locate mainly, though not exclusively, the "social" or material meanings of their studies (Mander 1987; Moi 1989). This emphasis on "social" is the key to understand Bourdieu's genealogy of knowledge which might also have led to a relatively late recognition in the field of cultural studies compared to, for example, his contemporary Michel Foucault.

Bourdieu, to start with, is a material structuralist. Unlike many of his contemporary philosophers, most notably Foucault and Derrida, Bourdieu had little dialogue with poststructuralism and post-

modernism that ruled the post-1980s' academic circles of humanities and interdisciplinary studies. He more or less remained outside the circle of core cultural theorists in his 'Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms' (1980), Stuart Hall, the founding figure of cultural studies as a discipline in Britain, charted down the intellectual 'moments' and 'ruptures' giving birth to the study of culture but Bourdieu didn't figure prominently in Hall's narrative. Hall maintained that from the 1950s to 1980s, cultural studies as an academic discipline has largely been shaped by "cultural" and "structuralist" theoretical paradigms. The culturalist paradigm comprises the shift in the definition of "culture" from collections of arts (high culture) to culture as collective experiences. As British cultural theorist Raymond Williams (1958) suggested famously, "culture is ordinary". By contrast, the structuralist mode, primarily imported by British academia from French philosophers, provides challenging nuances to the study of cultures by bringing the issue of ideology to interpret people's collective experiences. Structuralists such as linguist Ferdinand de Saussure and Marxist theorist Louis Althusser argue that without understanding the effect of ideology, the effectiveness of culture as reproduction power cannot be fully grasped (67-69). It was Hall, however who gave the post-1980s theoretical canon of cultural studies to the central figures of poststructuralism. He suggested, quite rightly, that Michel Foucault's power and knowledge, Jacques Lacan's psychoanalysis of subjectivity and Antonio Gramsci's hegemony would be the next theoretical paradigms of cultural studies as a field of discursive heterogeneity. Hall further noted that even if marginally, there would be a return to the more classical 'political economy' of culture, urging to return to the original study of base/ superstructure to understand culture as a fundamentally economic thus social class phenomenon.

According to communications theorist Mary S. Mader (1987), the reason of this distance between Bourdieu and the early theorists of cultural studies mainly lies in their contrasting definitions of "culture". She argues that Bourdieu uses culture in its restrictive and traditional sense of social cultivations of "high arts". This restrictive notion of culture is contrary to how initial prominent thinkers such as Raymond Williams and Stuart Hall offered as an inclusive meaning of culture and its anthropological etymology its fluidity and resistance within the late-industrial productions and

consumptions of cultures. Contrarily, his text for the interpretation of cultural capital does not necessarily exempt it from a notion of plurality and fluidity and the rapidly changing meanings of "culture" in the late-modern western societies. Rather, later paragraphs will argue, the notion of cultural capital has been incorporated in varied fields.

Bourdieu's significance was recognized, belatedly, in cultural studies due to reasons similar to certain schools of feminists accepting Bourdieu to take up the *social* seriously in their studies of gender as a cultural and social practice. In his much quoted essay "Notes on Deconstructing the Popular", Hall (1981) takes on the term popular culture with a range of social underpinnings. Popular culture is a site of struggle and resistance between social groups of unequal power relations. The study of cultural studies, or in this case that of popular culture, will lose its credential if the issue of societal struggle is not addressed with importance. Though Hall does not mention Bourdieu here either, the essay clearly shows how cultural studies engage with traditional and changing social forces and the subtle resistances within it.

John Fiske, a key theorist of television and popular culture, takes on many of Stuart Hall's concerns about simplistic derivation of the term "popular". Using Bourdieu's cultural capital, he develops the term 'popular cultural capital' which according to him "consists of the meanings and pleasures available to the subordinate to express and promote their interest" (1987, 509). Television as a key means of providing contemporary pleasure needs to take heterogenous cultural registers seriously since profit of television media, unlike most other commercial products, depends on its capacity to cater to various social groups rather than on the singular investment of economic capital. Jostein Gripsrud uses Bourdieu's ideas of taste as a mark of social distinction to develop his argument on the new forms of cultural hierarchies and inequalities in the fields of education, cultural consumption and social struggles. He is wary of the simplistic postmodern notion of the blurred relation of "high" and "low" cultures. He argues that despite the expansion of higher education, people with strong academic and cultural backgrounds can have "double access" to cultures. In other words, they are in a position to choose from a range of cultural options. People without such "privilege" are confined to "single accessed" pleasure: pleasures

confined or closer to the person's inherited social group. Bourdieu's references regarding the changing theoretical terrains of the cultural studies from the late 1980s increasingly utilize the empirical analysis of the consumption of cultures by social groups.

Bourdieu's Key Terms

Cultural Capital

Cultural capital is undoubtedly the key concept that puts Bourdieu at the centre of the post-1960s Eurocentric discourse of the sociology of culture. Bourdieu first uses the concept of cultural capital in relation to his sociology of education. Based on his empirical research in the 1960s expansion of school education in France, he argues that despite the state-assumed liberal position to provide standard compulsory education, individuals' academic qualifications will vary. The difference, according to him, is not based on "meritocracy" or an individual's educational acumen; rather the difference comes from the social class and family belongings of the individuals. "Cultural capital" includes the basic elements that individuals unconsciously inherit from their family and social class. These elements range from an individual's class-consciousness (such as middle-class disposition) to access to books and education at an early age and can have a lasting impact on an individual's manner, taste, choice, habits and leisure.

According to Bourdieu, cultural capital can have three forms— embodied, objectified, and institutionalized. Embodied cultural form is the "long-lasting dispositions of the mind and body" (Bourdieu 262). Amongst its three forms, the embodied one is "unconscious" but the most powerful one is based on the family logic of "transmission" from one generation to another. Some forms of cultural capital (such as ability to read widely, or appreciate "high culture" in the forms of painting and music) are mainly exercised in families. Children belonging to families with strong tradition of cultural capital find "high culture" easier to access than others without the same privilege. For them the access is "natural". Therefore, cultural capital in the embodied form is the sharpest marker of social distinction. For example, language pronunciations, accents and vocabularies can be markers of two individuals' different social/familial origins, though in terms of

"objectified" or institutionalized cultural capital they may be equal to one another. Objectified cultural capital is transmitted "materially" both in the form of economic capital (money) and in the form of symbolic capital (ownership or inheritance of a particular collections of books, paintings, or a car). While both embodied and objectified cultural capital are strongly tied to the determination of one's background, institutionalized cultural capital is the individually acquired one, ideally through academic qualifications. In Bourdieu's words "[by] conferring institutional recognition on the cultural capital possessed by any given agent, the academic qualification also makes it possible to compare qualification holders and even to exchange them (by substituting one for another in succession)" (265).

Cultural capital is clearly a bigger and more powerful force of social distinction than academic capital. Cultural capital is not necessarily mere "high culture" (such as collections of canonical literature, or paintings), rather it denotes the web of social, material, educational connections that makes societal aristocrats (and later on academic elites) enjoy traditional cultural paradigms, reinforcing both the products and the consumers' marks of traditional aristocracy. Education (educational qualifications, institutions and social networks) definitely gives people access to cultural (as well as social) mobility, though education alone cannot provide all the fineries of being rich in cultural capital. While in Bourdieusian topology cultural capital aligns closer to what is usually considered "high culture", for the culturalist definition of culture (as ordinary experience), he has a different term: habitus.

Habitus

Close to the embodied version of cultural capital is Bourdieu's most ambiguous term "habitus". Habitus and cultural capital overlap since both operate within the boundaries of culture, society, family, shared dispositions and individual's "practical sense" of doing things (Bourdieu and Waquant 166, 25 & 120). Habitus situates an individual within a social boundary since it is "defined by the possession of the minimum of economic and cultural capital necessary actually to perceive and seize the 'potential opportunities' formally offered to all" (124). Through habitus, Bourdieu proves himself an alternative philosopher to Sartre, a compatriot and one of the key

philosopher thinkers of the mid-20th century. Sartre's philosophical work championed an individual's (and intellectual's) capacity to go beyond the boundaries of society, commitments and disciplines. Bourdieu, by contrast, argues that even if individuals apparently make independent choices their choices/decisions are implicitly bound by their positions in society, partly based on the value of their accrued capital.

Habitus is ironically more pervasive and more changeable than cultural capital. Change of societal norms may result in gradual shifts and changes in collective habitus. It is through changes in habitus that many social and cultural exceptions are normalised with the passage of time. British sociologist of education Diane Reay (2004) argues that habitus can best be understood as a changing factor in particular in the contexts of globalisation with rapid cultural shifts. Within the field of cultural studies, habitus is perhaps most useful in the context of how Bourdieu himself applied the term in his empirical research. In his major work on the relationship between social class and "taste" Bourdieu argues that many of individuals' tastes (of food, what music they prefer to listen, what they do for leisure) are based on their class/cultural (and often gender) habitus. Taking a strong point of departure from the western Kantian philosophy of aesthetics as a mark of individuality, Bourdieu argues that many of our mundane and aesthetic habits are based on what come to us "naturally", or what we can take for granted. In the context of 1960s' France, Bourdieu thus shows that people belonging to certain professions are similar in what they eat, drink and do for leisure. Habitus is deeply ingrained in culture. It has an oeuvre of naturalness that may justify social inequality since some people may seem to be naturally disposed to appreciate finer things in life while others are not (Social Theory Rewired 2011).

Field

Bourdieu repeatedly uses references from "game" (such as "feel for the game", or investment in the game) to elucidate social relations, power struggles and reversal of power between different social groups. The game is constituent of a field which is determined by relational values among agents or individual who occupy positions within a field. The fields might refer to a range of institutions such as art, science and belief. Each field consists of specific rules which are pertinent to agents in

relation to the space they occupy in the field. Therefore the "game" is determined when agents have internalized these field-specific rules which allow them to formulate practices and habits based on the strategic requirements of the "game". By naming the contexts of social relations of power and the "field" of struggle, Bourdieu clearly centralises analogies of "game" in relation to his key theories of capital and habitus. "Fields" are the building blocks of the social world within which we inhabit, play our game, struggle, survive and win or lose accordingly. "A capital does not exist and function except in relation to a field" (Bourdieu and Waquant 1997, 101). However, in which field what forms of capital are useful depend on the nature and rules of the fields. For example, in the field of education, knowledge and academic qualifications may be more relevant a capital than money. The opposite may be the case in the field of business. Social capital based on people's social networks may be the most useful capital when someone changes the 'field' and enters a new field as it happens with immigrant populations. Social beings for Bourdieu are agents of actions and

The strategies of agents depend on their position in the field, that is, in the specific capital, and on the perception that they have of the field depending on the point of view they take *on* the field as a view taken from a point *in* the field (101).

Bourdieu not only sees relationality— which is at the heart of his theoretical arguments— between fields, capital, habitus and social agents, however, he argues that different fields comprising the social worlds are also relational. In other words, according to Bourdieu the epistemological and symbolic demarcations between the fields of pure "arts" and pure "science" are arbitrarily made, partly to establish authority of each field and its agents, and partly to produce legitimate successors in different fields.

Bourdieu presents many of his key ideas related to fields and their arbitrary boundaries in his writings about the "fields" of cultural reproduction such as art and literature. Writing about the historical autonomization of the fields of French literature and arts, Bourdieu argues that the establishment of arts and literature as a pure aesthetic field has an enduring history of power struggle between artists and patrons. Later on the struggle expanded and involved artists and other professionals, and

proliferated as commodity instead of aesthetic symbols. In other words, Bourdieu observes the symbolic and cultural value of art in relation to its varied consequences of conflict that arise from exposure to myriad social groups and contexts:

This movement towards artistic autonomy accelerated abruptly with the Industrial Revolution and the Romantic reaction. The development of a veritable cultural industry and, in particular, the relationship between the daily press and literature, encouraging the mass production of works produced by quasi industrial methods—such as the serialized story (or, in other fields, melodrama and vaudeville) coincides with the extension of the public, resulting from the expansion of primary education, which turned new classes (including women) into consumers of culture. The development of the system of cultural production is accompanied by a process of differentiation generated by the diversity of the publics at which the different categories of producers aim their products. Symbolic goods are a two-faced reality, a commodity and a symbolic object. Their specifically cultural value and their commercial value remain relatively independent, although the economic sanction may come to reinforce their cultural consecration (Bourdieu 2-3).

Two points are pertinent here. First, the above quote traces the complex history of the breakdown of “high” and “low” cultures in advanced countries like France due to rapid changes brought on by industrialisation, the rise of working class and urbanisation, mechanical means of producing arts in “quasi industrial method” for pleasure- issues that make cultural studies a distinct body of knowledge. Secondly, the expansion of cultural reproduction, or mass production heightens rather than obsoletes the debate about authenticity of art. Art and literature is primarily symbolic goods in the sense that they bear marks of individuals' taste and judgements. The rise of new literatures and art forms can only accentuate the debate about who consume what forms of cultural reproduction. Moreover, the debate includes consideration of how trends reflect on people's family background, level of education, social associations and personal “choices”. Like the field of art and literature, each “field” is a constant scope of expansion and struggle between different sub-fields.

Symbolic Violence

Bourdieu's concept of “symbolic violence” is similar to Marx's false consciousness, Gramsci's hegemony and Althusser's concept of ideology. In each of the three notions society seems to function through a space of shared, repetitive— thereby internalized— meaning. There seems to reside contrariness in these notions. In Marxian terms, the false consciousness seems to encompass a falsity within the functionality of the subject performing within a certain normative. Here norm becomes the consequence of falsity. Hence these notions are similar (but not the same) because symbolic violence like other forms of pervasive and insidious (often “soft”) violence, works through “consent”. Bourdieu is of course aware of the “risk” of using consent in defining violence:

Symbolic violence, [...], is the *violence which is exercised upon a social agent with his or her complicity* [italics in original]. Now, this idiom is dangerous because it may open the door to scholastic discussions on whether power comes “from below”, or why the agents “desires” the condition imposed upon him, etc (167).

Symbolic violence is consensual because of the rule of misrecognition. Misrecognition is the acceptance of what social beings take as “normal”: being born in a social world, we accept a whole range of postulates, axioms, which go without saying and require *no inculcating*, Wacquant adds importantly, that this fact of internalising certain practices without any formal inculcation makes Bourdieu's symbolic violence different from Gramsci's hegemony based on the concept of “conviction”. For Bourdieu, social order is not a “purposive action of propaganda or symbolic imposition”, rather “social subjects comprehend the social world which comprehends them” (484). The idea is reminiscent of Althusser's contention of the ISA/RSA (Ideological State Apparatus/ Repressive State Apparatus) scheme. The interrelation between the frameworks is similar to the symbolic violence where the repressive setup (RSA) which is direct in its appropriation of discipline is resonant of its ideological setup (ISA) which inculcates the normative.

In his much cited book *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (1977), Bourdieu introduces his axiomatic theories of education and social

reproduction through a definition of symbolic violence. Every power, according to Bourdieu, can be inflict “symbolic violence” if that power can successfully legitimize its powerful position by concealing its internal power relations. All pedagogic actions are forms of symbolic violence since education is a legitimised yet culturally arbitrary power relation in most societies. For example, it has been argued that the establishment of institutional education in the mid-18th century's Indian subcontinent by the British Raj had been an example of the imposition of the “cultural arbitrary” from the powerful, albeit from a liberal-meritocratic standpoint (Mahbub 2014). Through misrecognition, social agents (or groups) recognise their own and others' positions in relation to them. From the reproduction of class system and class privilege, Bourdieu extends his concept of symbolic violence to theorise gender inequality and the perpetuation of male dominance over females. Bourdieu believes that challenging symbolic violence is possible from a “collective action challenging practically the immediate agreement of embodied and objective structures” and questioning the production and reproduction of symbolic capital (174).

Bourdieu in Media and Cultural Studies

Bourdieu, primarily a sociologist, emphasised heavily on empirical research to understand and critique the social world as an institution. It is not only with his pioneering empirical survey in the *La Distinction* on French people's lifestyle, food habit and leisure that Bourdieu established his direct interest in measuring people's “taste” as a socially structured position; in his other writings as well, he showed how even sports can be a factor in relation to class. These empirical researches and their theoretical arguments opened new dimensions in the study of social groups' somewhat non-economic persuasions in understanding their complex social struggles.

However, over time, Bourdieu's rigid class-based specification of people's choices (such as cricket as a gentleman's game, or football as a game of the British working class) have given way to postmodern celebration of cultural mishmash and the rise of popular, mass and consumer cultures. Yet often it is within this fluid context of social/cultural hyper-ambiguous consciousness that class-based distinctions take place. As British

feminist sociologist Bev Skeggs argues, the mark of classiness in contemporary urban lives is not only about having “resources” (such as money and wealth), it is also about knowing the art of spending and investing. In many societies the “new middle class” can suffer from a similar crisis of reputation that Skeggs associates with the British white working class:

Working class selves have historically been unable to resource themselves in the same way. They do not have access to the right cultural capital at an early stage, as most educationalists point out very clearly. And sometimes when they do get access to the right cultural capital, they don't know how to operationalize it. They don't know how to put the culture to use and that becomes absolutely key, so it's not just a matter of having the right culture, it is about knowing how to use it. (970)

Feminist sociologists such as Bev Skeggs (1997, 2004, 2005), Angela MacRobbie (2004) and Brigit Fowler (1999) have consistently employed Bourdieu within cultural studies to understand the nuanced relationship between popular/print media, the shift to consumer culture and contemporary social class formations. These researchers argue that the relationship between social class and media is not restricted to what people dominantly enjoy on TV, or to their ability to interpret different layers of semiotic meanings. The relationship depends on how different social groups are represented and under what historical economies.

In many Asian contexts as well, Bourdieu's theories (in particular symbolic violence and habitus) are getting prominence in addressing issues of popular culture such as television programmes. Weing Udasmoro (2013), for example, writing about the contemporary Indonesian context, argues that popular television drama serials routinely (re)produce the norms of symbolic violence of gender relations based on the moral judgements of “good” versus “fallen” women. Media, therefore, much in the way Bourdieu theorises other forms of liberal power such as education, is a power of change and conformity. Often, it reproduces what one aims to change. In Bangladeshi television entertainment context, there is a trend to represent “Old Dhaka” and its communities in dramas, telefilms and daily soaps (such as *Arman bhai the Gentleman*; *Old*

versus New)¹. While this media representation of communities of Old Dhaka (often derogatively known as Dhakaiya) strongly suggests the shifts in the landscape of television drama towards inclusiveness of different social groups and away from the standard Dhaka middle class, these kinds of dramas are often essentialist, overstressing their “differences” (such as Bangla pronunciations, or certain cultural practices) from the dominant standard. This matter of stressing the difference by making popular culture suggestive of inclusiveness has also been partially discussed by Bourdieu.

It is surprising that despite his lifelong interest in cultural issues, Bourdieu directly takes on popular culture and “television” quite belatedly in the mid-1990s. His short text *Television* published in French in 1996 and translated in English in 1998 is perhaps the least known and cited of his key texts. Focusing mainly on programmes based on journalism (such as news and news analysis), Bourdieu, typical for his academic commitment, maintains considerable scepticism about media’s “democratic” performances, although he rightly asserts that television aims to have something for all. The comment below is exemplary of this aspect:

“With television,” Bourdieu writes, “we are dealing with an instrument that offers, theoretically, the possibility of reaching everybody” (14). Television thus has a great deal of promise as a tool for the democratic dissemination of information. Of course, it has hardly ever fulfilled this promise: it is instead one of those things in social life that “nobody wants but seem somehow to have been willed” (45). Bourdieu’s analysis suggests that the problem with television is structural, and so intellectuals who wish to make use of the power of television to reach the public should do so cautiously, on their own terms as much as possible rather than on the terms that television is increasingly imposing on the entire sphere of culture (Szeman 105).

The note of caution that Bourdieu maintains for television as a form of “cultural imperialism” is similar to how he criticised certain key terms of the 21st century such as globalisation and neoliberal

economic expansion. Bourdieu has little faith in the new century’s utopian view that the apparent free flow of cultures, capital and human movements, the technological revolution and the rise of “knowledge capital” will bring fundamental changes to the cultural/social inequalities within and across nation states even if the power of state is questionable in the new millennium. Poignantly, cultural theorists (see Fernandez 1987) interested in the domains of virtual media and techno-based arts often share Bourdieu’s concern that the egalitarian belief that the Internet would be the true level-playing field for world community is problematic on many fronts, not least because technology depends hugely on economic, material and knowledge-based resources.

Conclusion

The statement below shows how the nascent context of any discursive study allows a fluidity of meaning formation. This viewpoint, for Bourdieu, has been the crux of his observations. It explains the necessity of questioning boundaries that are mostly random in their formulation:

I have spent my entire life fighting arbitrary boundaries that are pure products of academic reproduction and have no epistemological foundation whatsoever, between sociology and anthropology, sociology and history, sociology and linguistics, the sociology of art and the sociology of education, the sociology of sport and the sociology of politics, etc. (Bourdieu 149)

Bourdieu obviously did not mention cultural studies in this list of unbridled/interdisciplinary academic domains. As someone passionate about breaking the arbitrary boundaries of knowledge, Bourdieu might welcome the new and applied ways his thoughts, theories and concepts use different branches of knowledge. “Culture” both as a map of collective life (*habitus*) and manner of distinctive lifestyle (cultural capital) are at the heart of Bourdieusian epistemology. Unpicking the cultural (and social) construction of what is considered as “pure” (aesthetic) versus “cheap” (vulgar) taste has been the thrust of his empirical analysis. Stuart Hall defines a cultural studies theorist as someone who “must respect the necessary displacement of culture” and who simultaneously is irritated by “its failure to reconcile itself with other questions that matter”

¹ Both the comedy dramas were telecast on Bangladeshi private television channels in 2014 and 2012, respectively.

within bigger forces of power and politics (Hall 284). Similar to how Hall envisions a cultural theorist the oeuvre of Bourdieu relentlessly questions the old and emerging hierarchies of culture as a socio-political, colonial and neo-colonial force.

Bourdieu's detractors routinely take him to task for his sole emphasis on social class as the key source of cultural, material, social and symbolic inequalities. Yet we suggest that this strong emphasis on social class within the realm of cultural consumption makes Bourdieu particularly relevant to the study of culture in contemporary Bangladesh. In many crucial ways, the contemporary Bangladeshi cultural landscape is unlike its previous phases. In the 21st century, Bangladesh has become one of the countries identified with the new global middle classes (Guarin and Knorrnga 2013), with its Asian (if not globally) shared characteristics of earning and spending disposable money on goods rich in symbolic value (such as branded items, mobile phones). Yet, characteristically, the expansions of the middle classes aggravate the tensions between "old" and "new" middle classes, partly based on their material (in)stability and partly based on their cultural and symbolic distinctions. Bourdieu, though eventually French in his theoretical and empirical practices, has much to offer us to understand the globalised yet unique cultural shifts in contemporary Bangladesh.

References

- Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. (R. Nice, Trans). London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985) The market value of symbolic goods. In *The field of cultural reproduction: Essays on art and literature*. New York: Columbia UP.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986) The forms of capital. In John G. Richardson, ed. *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (241-258). New York: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, Jean-C. (1990) *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. (R. Nice, Trans). London: Sage. (Original work was published in 1977).
- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992) *An Invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (2001) Neoliberal newspeak: Notes on the new planetary vulgate. Retrieved from <http://loicwacquant.net/assets/Papers/NEOLIBERALNEWSPEAK.pdf>.
- Fernandez, M. (1997) PostColonial Media Theory. *Art Journal*, 58 (3), 59-73.
- Fowler, B. (1999) Pierre Bourdieu's sociological theory of culture. *Variant*. 2 (8), 1-4.
- Fiske, J. (1989) The popular economy. In J. Storey (Ed.) *Cultural studies and popular culture: A reader* (537-555). 2nd ed. Harlow: Pearson.
- Gripsurd, J. (1989) High culture revisited. *Cultural Studies*, 3 (2), 194-207.
- Hall, S. (1980) Cultural studies: two paradigm. *Media, Culture and Society*, 2 (1), 57-72.
- Hall, S. (1981) Notes on deconstructing the 'Popular'. In J. Storey (Ed.) *Cultural studies and popular culture: A reader* (477-488). 2nd ed. Harlow: Pearson.
- Hall, S. (1992) "Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies". In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, P. Treichler (Eds.) *Cultural Studies* (277-294). London: Routledge.
- Mander, S. M. (1987) Bourdieu, the sociology of culture and cultural studies: A critique, *European Journal of Communications*, 2, 427-53.
- Mahbub, Rifat. (2014) *Education As Capital: Educated Bangladeshi Immigrant Women in 21st Century Britain*. Unpublished PhD diss., York: University of York.
- Moi, T. (1991) Appropriating Bourdieu: Feminist theory and Pierre Bourdieu's Sociology of culture. *New Literary History*, 22 (4), 1017-1049.
- McRobbie, A. (2004) Notes on "what not to wear" and post-feminist symbolic violence. In L. Adkins and B. Skeggs (Eds.). *Feminism after Bourdieu* (99-109). Oxford: Blackwell.

The Place of Pierre Bourdieu's Theories in (Popular) Cultural Studies

- Raymond, W. (1989 [1958]) "Culture is ordinary". In *Resources of hope: Culture, democracy, socialism* (3-14). London: Verso.
- Reay, D. (2004) "It's all becoming a habitus": Beyond the habitual use of habitus in educational research', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(4), 431- 444.
- Social Theory Rewired*. "Pierre Bourdieu". Retrieved from <http://theory.routledgesoc.com/profile/pierre-bourdieu>.
- Szeman, I. (2000) "Review of Pierre Bourdieu's *On Television*". Retrieved from <http://topia.journals.yorku.ca/index.php/topia/article/download/81/75>.
- Skeggs, B. (1997) *Formations of class and gender: Becoming respectable*. London: Sage.
- Skeggs, B. (2004) *Class, Self, culture*. London: Routledge.
- Skeggs, B. (2005) "The making of class and gender through visualizing moral subject formation", *Sociology*, 39 (5), 965-982.
- Udasmoro, W. (2013) "Symbolic violence in everyday narrations: gender construction in Indonesian television", *Asian Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 2 (3), 155-165.