The Intellectual Reception of Bourdieu in Australian Social Sciences and Humanities

by Ian Woodward *and* Michael Emmison

doi: 10.2383/31370

Introduction

In this article we critically reconstruct the story of Bourdieu's intellectual reception within Australia. Despite a number of propitious signs that his influence may have been more forcefully felt, our story charts an initial weak and patchy uptake of his oeuvre but with an eventual realisation of his significance. Bourdieu's widespread recognition and appreciation came relatively late. Although there are a few notable exceptions, prior to the mid 1990s papers that explore aspects of his conceptual armoury – or even simply make reference to his work – in Australian journals, or by Australian authors in international journals, are few and far between. Moreover when his work is referred to the citations are frequently "ceremonial" in character.[1] The process of his appropriation gathers pace in the late 1990s and intensifies after 2000. The year 2002 is something of a landmark: in that year Brisbane, the state capital of Queensland, Australia's north eastern region, hosted the International Sociological Association conference. The 2002 ISA meeting featured 6 papers addressing aspects of his work although only one of these was by an Australian based author.

The story of his reception, however, is complicated by the fact that there are initially two separate routes through which his ideas have been disseminated. One of

[1] For an account of the way that the work of the classical sociological theorists is ceremonially cited in contemporary writing, including the functions which such ceremonial citations perform in scientific communication, see Adatto and Cole [1981].

these is through his home discipline of sociology which has enjoyed a recognizable professional presence in Australian universities only since the mid-1960s when the *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* (ANZJS) – an inter-country collaboration which was to last until 1997 – was first published. However a great deal of social and cultural inquiry in Australia, particularly in regional tertiary institutions, has effectively been carried out under the auspices of the emergent rival discipline of cultural studies. Australia was one of the first nations to embrace this field and many of its leading intellectuals have closer affinities to humanities based cultural, literary and media studies than they do to the social sciences such as sociology, education, or political science. A version of Bourdieu as a cultural theorist thus exists alongside the understanding of him as an empirical social scientist.

In what follows we document in more detail his lukewarm reception and eventual uptake as a scholar of significance. First, we chart the relative lack of influence of Bourdieu in Australian sociology, specifically within class and stratification studies, a field where one might expect Bourdieu to have had some sway. By focusing on key works and researchers, we show how this area was dominated by paradigms from three other fields: those inspired by the historical and Gramscian tradition; those influenced by the North American positivist tradition of status attainment; and finally, the work of those who adopted the neo-Marxist and Weberian occupational schema models which were an important innovation in the conceptualisation of class structure during the 1980s. For each of these traditions Bourdieu's avant mix of abstract theory and method, and his idiosyncratic conceptualisations of class were largely irrelevant. Partly, this is also a story of the global networks these Australians researchers were integrated into, which tended to look toward America (Columbia, Wisconsin) and Britain (Oxford), rather than Europe (Paris). At the same time, the growth of cultural studies in Australia – the second of the two routes – took its initial inspiration from Birmingham School approaches and critical semiotics, and its key figures emerged from literary schools, rather than the social sciences. From this perspective Bourdieu's scrupulously empirical cultural investigations must have seemed antiquated. It is only since the late 1990s, prompted by an important empirical study of taste informed by both the sociological and cultural studies traditions [Bennett, Emmison and Frow 1999], that his work has been more widely appreciated by cultural analysts. We outline the relationship between this study and Bourdieu's classic work *Distinction* [Bourdieu 1984], with which it has clear affinities. In the final section of the paper we present the results of a content analysis of Australia's principal sociological journal which reveals the extent of his omission and eventual incorporation in more detail. It is clear that Bourdieu now exerts an interdisciplinary influence in a variety of contemporary research fields, yet one which is still to be unified.

Sociology in Australia: A Natural Home for Bourdieu?

The relative indifference of Australian sociology to Bourdieu's work is, on the face of it, surprising given its long standing interest in matters such as social stratification, class and inequality, and social disadvantage – all areas in which Bourdieu's influence has been productively felt in many other countries. In the case of Australia, this intellectual preoccupation by sociologists with social inequality was perhaps prompted by the need to challenge the popular mythology in which Australia has been celebrated as a classless egalitarian society.

A great deal of sociological research and writing within Australia has been expended on debunking the myth of "classlessness." Closer inspection of this literature reveals a number of divisions – mostly methodological – within the social science academy which suggest some clues as to why Bourdieu's writings were neglected. Academic inquiry into social class arguably predates the institutionalisation of Sociology as a separate academic field, the first systematic research on class in Australia emanating from the Department of Psychology at the University of Melbourne [Oeser and Hammond 1954]. Rather less attention was paid in these early studies, however, to the investigation of class structure *per se* and far more was given to subjective considerations – perceptions and evaluations of the class differences as well as some rudimentary political consequences of these beliefs. This largely descriptive interest in class imagery and class consciousness was echoed in a number of locally influential studies which followed over the next decades [Davies 1967; Encel 1970; Hiller 1975; Chamberlain 1983].

By the early 1980s, however, stratification research – to employ the more generic category – within Australia appeared to have stabilised into two broadly defined camps, distinguished primarily on methodological grounds and which were largely incompatible and occasionally mutually hostile. On the one hand was a looser collection represented most clearly by the Marxist descriptive work of Connell and her colleagues on the political left [e.g. Connell 1977; Connell 1983a; Connell and Irving 1980] but also including a number of more qualitative ethnographic studies [Wild 1974; Williams 1981]. Located within an older tradition of historical inquiry and profoundly influenced by E.P. Thompson's conception of class as a "lived experience" [Thompson 1968], Connell's work had its agenda set by an *a priori* concern with specific political – socialist – objectives. Significant or heroic moments in working class struggle, problems in the attainment of the appropriate forms of class consciousness, above all the conception of class analysis as the study of hegemonic social power figure prominently here. Connell's Marxism was primarily indebted to Gramsci, an influence which was also to extend to her later work on gender relations and

the construction of masculinity. There appeared to be no place in Connell's oeuvre on class for Bourdieu. However Connell does acknowledge the utility of Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital and his theory of practice elsewhere. In their important work on schooling and the reproduction of inequality, *Making the Difference*, Connell and her colleagues [1982] see cultural capital as contributing to an explanation of pupil success or failure at school, yet they critique this model of the school and home relationship as "drastically impoverished and static" [*ibidem*, 188]. By the time of writing *Gender and Power* Connell has crystallized her critique of Bourdieu, who along with Giddens, is now seen as failing to offer an account of agency: "History does happen in Bourdieu's world, but it is not produced" [Connell 1987, 94].

Partly in opposition to this descriptive historical mode of inquiry, and at what was perceived to be the underdevelopment of quantitative sociology in Australia more generally, an alternative approach to stratification research was established during the 1980s in which the mass survey and its associated statistical data analysis techniques became the principal component. At best indifferent to, and at times disdainful[2] of, the preoccupations of the former group these latter researchers [Broom *et. al* 1980; Graetz and McAllister 1988; Jones and Davis 1986] opted to sacrifice extended theoretical or conceptual clarification into the nature of class as a structuring principle for a limited but, it was argued, more rigorously empirical set of concerns. The theoretical inspiration for this line of inquiry came from the American "status attainment" tradition [Blau and Duncan 1967; Featherman and Hauser 1978]. Bourdieu's writings and his idiosyncratic models of class were even less relevant to this project.

A third approach to class analysis within Australia opened up in the late 1980s when researchers from the University of Queensland and Griffith University joined the International Project on Comparative Class Structure and Class Consciousness which had been inaugurated by the US quantitative Marxist sociologist Erik Olin Wright. The principal publication from the Australian researchers on Wright's Comparative Project [Baxter *et al.* 1991] was conceived as an attempt to combine the best aspects of the two existing approaches to class analysis in that it would engage seriously with theoretical conceptions of class but would also ground its claims in systematically acquired new data. However the theoretical models of class which were utilised in this study were derived, understandably, from Wright's own novel think-

[2] For a vivid illustration of this point see the acerbic exchange between Kelly and McAllister and Connell which took place, perhaps diplomatically concealed from the mainstream sociological arenas, in the pages of *Search*, the journal of science in Australia and New Zealand. See Connell [1983b], Kelly and McAllister [1983a], and Kelly and McAllister [1983b]. This struggle for ascendancy within class analysis that took place in Australia provides a vivid example of the conduct typical of the academic field that Bourdieu [1988] brilliantly dissects in *Homo Academicus*.

ing about the relational aspects of class as well as the work of the leading UK sociologist, Goldthorpe and his neo-Weberian market based conception of class position. The core focus of the study was to investigate the class structure using these rival models and to assess their applicability to conventional "class-dependent" variables such as demographic class formation, class consciousness and identity, and the nexus between work and family life. Although Bourdieu's work was not systematically rejected there was no conceptual space for his theoretical concerns in this study and his work is only perfunctorily cited.[3]

In their discussion of Bourdieu's influence on UK stratification research, Savage and Bennett observe that interest by British inequality theorists in Bourdieu's work has been piecemeal and partial. They go on to comment that

> An important reason for this relative lack of engagement between the sociology of social inequality and Bourdieu's work is linked to the specific way that Bourdieu's work was introduced into British sociology. In France, Bourdieu is generally regarded as the quintessential orthodox sociologist, committed to "scientific" empirical research, ill-disposed towards the "cultural turn" (...) In the English speaking world, however, Bourdieu has been imported through channels more sympathetic to issues of culture (...) and this mode of reception has coloured subsequent readings of his work [Savage and Bennett 2005, 2].

The appropriation of Bourdieu by Australian sociological class analysts – at least until the mid 1990s – is, as we have shown, even less conspicuous than the case of the UK. In the next section we turn to examine the reception of Bourdieu by cultural studies approaches who, as Savage and Bennett suggest, may have been more sympathetic.

Cultural Studies and the Reception of Bourdieu

The growth of cultural studies in the 1980s and 1990s was a prominent feature of the intellectual scene in a wide range of Australian institutions. This was a time when ideas and theories about culture, the cultural turn, and postmodernism had reached a degree of popularity in the academic community. As Frow [2007] documents in his situated historical survey of the currents of Australian cultural studies,

[3] We note, in passing, that Bourdieu endured a similar fate in the majority of the national studies which made up Wright's International Comparative Project. For example there is no mention whatsoever of him in the book which reports the British study [Marshall *et al.* 1988]. France, moreover, was one of the few northern European countries not to participate in this international collaborative research. Wright, (personal correspondence) has reported that his overtures to Bourdieu inquiring about the possibility of setting up a French inquiry were summarily rejected.

it was in this period that Australian universities incubated a large number of cultural studies scholars who subsequently gained international prominence. Frow observes that cultural studies was formed less as a disciplinary space than a space of intellectual flows, characterised by experimentation and fluidity. Taking inspiration from many thinkers, disciplines and theories, Australian cultural studies had at least the appearance of a relatively formless approach to studying culture which constructed the normative boundaries of its practice. In these circumstances, cultural studies was a field where one might expect Bourdieu's mix of theoretical ideas, infused as they were by questions of power, domination and cultural practice, to gain acceptance and influence. Moreover, this period was after all, and chiefly in this field of intellectual work, a theoretical moment set apart as a time of "delirious consumerism" [Morris, quoted in Frow 2007, 69] in relation to theory where celebrity, performativity, aura – and perhaps even the provenance of being "French" – mattered for the uptake and circulation of new ideas in the humanities. In Australia, for example, Baudrillard and Lyotard gave famous and well-attended public talks in Sydney in the 1990s. Leading scholars, for example the Sydney-based feminist theorist of the body Elizabeth Grosz, were responsible for championing continental theorists such as Deleuze and Guattari to antipodean intellectual audiences in the 1980s [*ibidem*, 67]. Supported by close networks of friendships and strong local publishing outlets overseen by powerful local gatekeepers, theoretical innovations – and sometimes intellectual fashionability – clearly mattered [Frow and Morris 1993].

As in the case of Bourdieu's half-hearted deployment within sociology, despite such conditions favouring both innovation and continental theory, the uptake of Bourdieu's work in Australian cultural studies has been much less extensive than other major theorists and traditions. To explain this, we must look to the nature of the field of cultural studies, and to the development of its intellectual discourses within Australian universities. Further, this must be considered in relation to local intellectual networks, considered in the context of the influence of strong global currents on Australian cultural studies. Rather than necessarily being a relatively free space of innovation, cultural studies was a structured field of academic practice where some theorists and theoretical perspective more than others became favoured. Morris [in Morris and Muecke 1991], for example, pointed out that the principal challenge for the cultural studies theorist was to immerse themselves in the space of intellectual flows and to construct theoretical innovation "on the spot," defining their space in relation to other theoretical spaces. In the 1980s, the early days of cultural studies in Australia, "the moment of theory" celebrated the potentiality of theoretical thinking freed from, and in critique of, disciplines. This in itself may have harmed the potential for uptake of Bourdieu's ideas, given his early anthropological work engaged with a

strong strand of structuralism in the tradition of Lévi-Strauss. Clearly, such a formalist pedigree would not have been attractive to most cultural studies scholars of the period who might have been interested in the Lévi-Straussian figure of the bricoleur, but not in a structuralist reading of a Kabyle house.

The disciplinary mythology of cultural studies suggested a field defined by a democracy of theoretical ideas, by innovation and intellectual bricoleurship. For example, Turner [1993] makes the case that the cultural studies tradition in Australia is without origin myths, being in a state of perpetual fragmentation. Such an assertion seems to constitute a myth in its own right. In trying to uncover the myths of Australian nationhood, it actually creates its own mythical objects, succumbing to the same logic it claims to expose. This is a point picked up on by Frow [2007], who points out that this account of the origin of Australian cultural studies uncritically overlooks the structural conditions of knowledge production in this field. Knowing about this field can inform us of the relative possibilities of Bourdieu's ideas taking hold. Before we look more closely, a qualification needs to be made: in talking about key figures we talk about them as though they were "Australian." In most cases the key figures in Australian cultural studies were globally mobile and networked. Some had received their training overseas, many or all were likely to have significant overseas research contacts or relationships, some moved to Australia from the UK to take up positions, but were nonetheless pivotal in the development of Australian cultural studies. The degree of this global networking stands in contrast to the relatively inward looking nature of the Australian sociological tradition.

Frow's genealogy of Australian cultural studies shows the multiple theoretical, geographic, institutional, publishing and network factors which have constituted cultural studies in Australia. Cultural studies took hold first in relatively young universities and regionally peripheral universities where a lack of historically entrenched research interests favoured innovation. Faculties latched onto new theoretical ideas with enthusiasm and saw themselves as creating cutting-edge research and teaching programs. So, this is partly a mix of mythology and historical fact. However, while this aspect of the cultural studies narrative of openness and innovation has probably been a foundation stone for the discipline globally, its idealism overlooks various structural realities. The intellectual provenances of the discipline's key players tended to be from strands of Marxism as played out in the British cultural studies tradition. Frow's documentation shows marxism to be a general influence, noting that a number of key players in the field came out of the Althusserian tradition. A further major strand took inspiration from Foucault's ideas on governmentality and applied them applied to cultural policy questions in the field. This perspective was originally championed by the group of scholars at Griffith University in the 1970s such as David Saunders

and Ian Hunter, and later Tony Bennett who formed the Institute for Cultural Policy Studies at Griffith in 1987, which became an agenda-setting organisation for the dissemination of research into cultural and media policy for at least the next decade. Predominantly dealing with cultural policy and with media production and institutions – a field where we might have expected Bourdieu's ideas to be useful – the key theoretical frames were articulated by media theorists from the British tradition and Foucauldian ideas about governance, citizenship and the subject.

Along with Marxism, Australian cultural studies drew heavily from the formative British tradition of cultural studies, including the work of Hoggart and Williams which tended to encourage a nostalgic embrace of the everyday and pointed to the inherent value of working-class and popular culture. Complimenting this, and inspired by Gramscian ideas of hegemony which found their apotheosis in Birmingham School texts such as *Policing the Crisis* [Hall *et al.* 1978], cultural studies was firmly grounded in critical cultural analyses of the "construction of the hegemonically organised everyday" [Frow 2007, 68]. A prominent example of this model is found in the work of Graeme Turner, whose work should be seen as developing Australian cultural studies in a way which both links to nascent forms of native cultural critique by writers such as Robin Boyd, Craig McGregor, Donald Horne and Humphrey McQueen and to the aforementioned British tradition. Turner's texts *National Fictions* (1986) and *Myths of Oz* (1987, co-authored with Fiske and Hodge) were important in this regard, undertaking cultural critiques of contemporary Australian culture using ideas principally drawn from semiotics. In *Myths of Oz* the turn toward acknowledgment of popular suburban culture arrived more fully developed, though in a rather theoretically and empirically impoverished form. This version of Australian popular culture analysis retained an interest in the principal sites which carried popular "myths" – the suburbs, shops, the beach – as did McGregor, Horne and to some extent Boyd. However, this more recent work is notable for its deployment of semiotic principles in the analysis of culture, hence its subtitle *Reading Australian Popular Culture*. Consistent with Barthes' stated goal in *Mythologies* [Barthes 1973], Fiske, Hodge and Turner's goal was to expose the ideological – capitalist, masculinist, middle-class, family-based – values which apparently lay unexposed within everyday cultural forms. The emphasis was not on cultural capital, practices and cultural fields, but was premised on the privileged position of the analyst to make a reading of a range of cultural domains. This was a (rather turgid) semiotically inspired version of cultural Marxism; Barthes without élan.

While Turner's work best illustrates one dominant trajectory within Australian cultural studies which largely ignored Bourdieu in favour of cultural Marxism and semiotics, we can look to the work of John Frow and Tony Bennett as examples

somewhat counter to this pattern. Significantly, however, it is the case that both Bennett and Frow are, by their own admissions, not straightforward cultural studies scholars. Frow [2007, 60] suggests that his work sits at the edge of cultural studies, engaging with it as a means of carrying out work that sits between the humanities and social sciences. Frow's paper in the first edition of the key Australian journal *Cultural Studies* (formerly *Australian Journal of Cultural Studies*) shows simultaneously a deep engagement with and ambivalence towards Bourdieu's work *Distinction*. In it Frow [1987] demonstrates both sensitivity and skill for social scientific empiricism as practiced in Bourdieu's work, but develops a powerful rejection of some of its basic principles. Frow's argument was that Bourdieu's model of tastes was too rigid, failing to allow for facets of relationality and tension in the way aesthetic objects are interpreted. By reworking Bourdieu's own classifications of cultural and economic capitals in the field of music preferences, Frow shows the arbitrariness of Bourdieu's assumptions, challenging his model of how class fractions supposedly relate to cultural forms. Without offering his own empirical evidence, Frow skilfully deconstructs – and then reconstructs – Bourdieu's model and suggests an account of aesthetic relations which promises greater flexibility and reflexivity.

Bennett's work perhaps sits both more centrally within cultural studies and also the sociology of culture. Whilst his earlier work on popular culture took inspiration from Gramscian perspectives on hegemony, much of his later work on museums has been inspired by the Foucauldian turn in culture. Its basic presupposition is that culture is something acted upon by policy; it is policy that constitutes culture [Jin 2008, 171]. Bennett's investigation of the emergence of the modern exhibition and museum [Bennett 1995] was primarily designed as a Foucauldian inspired investigation of techniques of governance and sites for civic inculcation. But Bennett's scholarly ambit has been more catholic, and he has deployed a mix of social scientific methodologies which allow him to maintain a research profile across the cultural studies and sociology spectrum. His subsequent interest in Bourdieu was ignited by his perceived need to investigate the relations between culture, class and power across the broader space of lifestyles. Although Bennett is ultimately equivocal about Bourdieu's contribution to these questions he recognises their utility for exploring longstanding issues in cultural inquiries relating to the nexus of culture, education and class: "Bourdieu's work points us to (...) the most theoretically productive and politically relevant framework from which to engage with questions of class analysis" [Bennett, in Jin 2008, 168].

Finally, in summarising the cultural studies reception of Bourdieu we should also note the work of Ghassan Hage, a scholar whose research crosses the boundaries of anthropology and social and cultural theory. Hage's writings have drawn extensively on Bourdieu's work and had a strong bearing on questions of belonging and

citizenship in relation to population mobilities, immigration and the negotiations of cultural difference [Hage 1998].

Bourdieu as both Sociologist and Cultural Theorist: The Australian Everyday Culture Project

The "sociological" and the "cultural studies" appropriations of Bourdieu appeared to coalesce in the mid 1990s in the institutional form of the Australian Everyday Culture Project (AECP), a major empirical inquiry into the social distribution of taste which was, in broad outline, developed as a replication of Bourdieu's analysis of the French system of tastes reported in *Distinction* [Bourdieu 1984]. The project was a collaboration between Bennett, who was then the Director of the Key Centre for Cultural and Media Policy at Griffith University, Michael Emmison, from the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of Queensland, and Frow also based at that time at University of Queensland in the Department of English. However to see the study as some mechanical fusion of these two fields is to underestimate the degree of inter-disciplinary engagement which, as we have seen, was a constituent feature of Bennett's and Frow's career trajectories. This point was made clear in the authors' introductory chapter where they comment that:

> A further difference between our work and that of Bourdieu consists in the disciplinary protocols which have shaped our inquiry. Bourdieu, of course, has always written as a sociologist; indeed, militantly so in his unremitting advocacy of the virtues of an empirically-grounded, but theoretically-reflexive, sociology over the more philosophical and, in his eyes, fanciful intellectual styles which have characterised the work of many other leading French intellectuals. In Anglophone countries, however, questions concerning the relations of culture, class, gender and ethnicity have been equally to the fore in debates within cultural studies – debates which, supposing we had an inclination to do so, have been too influential to be ignored. We have, however, had no such inclination. To the contrary, our purpose in working together on this project has been to learn from the different disciplinary perspectives we have been able to contribute as a team whose members include one whose career and professional identity has always been within sociology, a second who has moved from a disciplinary training in comparative literature to locate his work mainly within cultural studies, and a third who has moved between sociology and cultural studies at different points in his career. Given this, the question of opting for either sociology or cultural studies simply never arose; the issue was always one of how to effect a productive imbrication of the concerns and procedures of both [Bennett *et al.* 1999, 13-14].

To a significant extent this can be observed in the way the AECP study was designed so as to allow for the discovery of the distributional effects of a range of

variables – in addition to social class – in the determination of the cultural choices and tastes of their sample. Bourdieu's position, developed in detail in *Distinction*, that there was a fundamental opposition between a bourgeois aesthetic of disinterestedness and a working class taste culture structured by its habitus of the necessary was not seen as relevant to a society like Australia already well on its way to a de-industrialised service economy. Class was not ignored in the project but it was also manifestly obvious to the research team that Bourdieu's ad hoc system of class fractions derived from 1960s France simply would not translate to Australia of the 1990s. Accordingly an innovative class model, drawing on elements of Erik Olin Wright's Marxist schema – in particular so as to retain the category of "employers" as a discreet class grouping – and the Weberian occupational status model devised by UK sociologist John Goldthorpe was developed for the analysis of their data. Nevertheless the project did take significant direct inspiration from Bourdieu, down to the reproduction of very similar, or even identical, survey questions.

Suspicions about the relevance of a simplistic class taste model were borne out in the results of their inquiry. Other variables, in particular age and gender, were found to be often better predictors of taste choices. The overall picture which emerged was of an altogether more complex structuring of cultural choice than Bourdieu had envisaged. The dominant pattern of cultural practice demonstrated a clear differentiation between an omnivorous or *inclusive* mode of taste, in which people participate actively in a wide range of activities and a univorous or *restricted* mode, in which participation was relatively passive and confined to relatively narrow areas. The inclusive mode was most strongly correlated with high levels of education, with urbanity, with youth and with women rather than men; significantly its core class location was the professional not the employers or even those enjoying managerial authority and privileges. The restricted mode is associated with low levels of education, with rural and regional Australia, with age, and with men rather than women, and it was most clearly exemplified in the manual working class.

In this respect their findings gave support to the emerging work on omnivorous taste cultures in the US by Richard Peterson and his associates [Peterson 1992; Peterson and Kern 1996; Peterson and Simkus 1992]. But the AECP was able to extend and refine Peterson's work in crucial respects. For example in relation to musical culture the researchers discovered an important difference between "tastes" and knowledge of different music genres and performers. This was something that was never entertained as an issue with Bourdieu and was analytically blurred in Peterson's own work. "Omnivorousness," the neologism introduced by Peterson and Kern, needed to be understood in terms of a knowledge base rather than of any deep affinity for a range of music genres. What the AECP showed was that inclusive music taste – the

domain of the omnivore – was not to be found among those closest to the apex of the taste hierarchy. Peterson was partly correct in his view that univorous tastes are more likely to be found among those nearer the base of the socio-economic order, but this was also found this to be a characteristic of professionals' music tastes as well. Manual workers and professionals did not like the same types of music, but what each had in common was a tendency to make their selections from amongst aesthetically similar genres: more highbrow in the case of professionals, more lowbrow in the case of workers. In short both had tastes which were more restricted than other classes. Where they differ was in their command of musical cultures. Manual workers remain more restricted than other classes in the knowledge they have of both classical and popular music; in contrast, professionals have much more inclusive knowledge of both of these realms. In later work Emmison [2003] was to suggest that this greater ability to move between, and demonstrate knowledge of, "discrepant" cultural realms was a significant asset that the high status professionals enjoyed. The "cultural mobility" which this strata can exercise has also been linked to the debates concerning the growth of cosmopolitanism [Skrbis *et al.* 2004; Woodward *et al.* 2008].

Documenting the Trajectory of Bourdieu's Appropriation

Having presented the historical context of Bourdieu's partial appropriation in sociology and cultural studies, in the last section of this paper we provide a more nuanced account of the trajectory of Bourdieu's uptake within the Australian academic community. In order to do this we carried out a number of investigations of relevant publications using content analysis procedures The first was to examine all issues of the journal which has served as the "official" professional outlet for Australian sociological research. Our primary aim was to locate articles which had discussed or cited Bourdieu, using the particular work or works cited as approximate indicators of his intellectual influence. Bourdieu has provided such a rich inventory of conceptual tools that it is likely that his incorporation within Australian sociological research has drawn selectively on certain concepts as opposed to a more diffuse wholesale adoption. However, as we have noted earlier, this yielded a relatively meagre total and consequently we have supplemented our discussion by noting articles in the same journal which, whilst addressing issues germane to his *oeuvre* had *not* included a reference to his work: an index, so to speak, of his "invisibility" within the Australian sociological community – or perhaps more accurately a lost opportunity on its part. With only one national sociology journal to examine our task has been simplified but clearly this procedure is unlikely to provide an exhaustive account of all the Bour-

dieusian influenced research work by Australian sociologists. Accordingly our final step was to expand our data base by locating articles by Australians which drew significantly on his work which had been published in other national and international sociological and social science journals.

The discipline of sociology was a comparatively late arrival on the Australian academic scene. Universities were reluctant to give Sociology an independent place and although its existence can be seen in courses – generally under different names – from as early as the 1920s it was not until 1965 that the discipline achieved significant visibility. In that year the first issue of the *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* (*ANZJS*) – an inter-country collaboration which was to last until the 1990s – was published. The professed aims of the Editorial Board [1965, 1] were to "reflect what is going on in sociology in Australia and New Zealand and to tell the rest of the world about it," and second "to serve as an outlet for scholarly contributions by Australian and New Zealand sociologists as well as for articles by overseas scholars writing about Australasia." In 1997 the two national professional bodies severed connections and the *ANZJS* was relaunched as the (Australian based, internationally published) *Journal of Sociology*.

For most of its first decade the emphasis in the *ANZJS* was very much on the local scene and the journal carried a series of largely descriptive studies of Australian cities and regions. There was very little engagement with "theory" or theorists of any persuasion. At the same time as we have seen, an enduring theme in Australian sociology has been the study of class and stratification and this found its way into the journal almost from its inception. For example an early issue [vol. 5] carried a two part annotated bibliography of Australian research on social stratification for the period 1946-1967 which ran to over 950 entries. Substantive articles on class issues were also evident in these early issues, most significantly those by Australia's leading class analyst during the 1970s and 1980s, R.W. Connell. However Bourdieu is conspicuously absent in these. Perhaps most surprising is an article by Connell [1974] dealing with the causes of educational inequality. *Inter alia* Connell cites the work of Althusser, Bernstein, and Gramsci – but not Bourdieu. The same fate befalls him in another, more substantial, article by Connell [1977] which provides a detailed investigation of the theoretical logic in class and stratification research

The first citation of Bourdieu's work in the *ANZJS* occurs in an article written by Counihan [1975] in a symposium dealing with the mass media. Counihan's article is an examination of theoretical approaches to the reception of media content, in particular television. He cites, albeit ceremonially, Bourdieu's 1968 article "Outline of a sociological theory of art perception" in support of the view that media audiences

need to be understood as culturally constructed. Five years elapse before Bourdieu makes his next appearance which takes place in 1980 in a symposium on the sociology of education. Bourdieu is briefly discussed in three of the eight articles in the symposium. In one of these papers, author Jan Branson [1980, 11] observes tellingly that "among educationalists, the reading of Bourdieu remains highly selective, with few educational sociologists seeing any need to examine the theoretical basis of his approach." As we have seen the leading empirical study of schooling and the home [Connell *et al.* 1982] at this time echoed these sentiments.

For much of the 1980s Branson's comments appear apposite and the story is largely one of his omission from published articles for which his work might appear central. Two examples are Lees and Senyard's paper dealing with the way that middle class taste practices are represented in children's literature, and Ryan's explication of the role of education in class reproduction [Lees and Senyard 1985; Ryan 1986]. It is difficult to imagine that citations to Bourdieu's work would not have been included had these articles been published in any of the national European sociological journals at a corresponding time.

A significant moment in his intellectual reception occurs in 1987 when the *ANZJS* published an article by the French sociologist Loïc Wacquant who has since become a leading commentator on Bourdieu's work as well as the co-author with him of *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* [Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992]. Wacquant [1987] offered an extended, critical discussion of many aspects of Bourdieu's sociology but with a particular focus on the concept of symbolic violence. We are uncertain as to whether Wacquant's article should be included in our results. Wacquant has had no connections with Australia and was based at the University of Chicago at the time the article was published. Although we have no evidence to support this interpretation it seems likely that Wacquant submitted his paper to the *ANZJS* after it had been rejected elsewhere. Whatever the case the article did not appear to serve as the catalyst for Australian sociologists to pick up Bourdieu's conceptual tools and with the exception of a few ceremonial citations he disappears from the pages of the journal for the next eight years.

From the mid 1990s the situation changes and references to Bourdieu and research which draws significantly on his work becomes increasingly prevalent. We can also observe something of a diffusion in the disciplinary reception of his work as articles by Australian researchers citing his work, or engaging more substantively with his key concepts, begin to appear in non-sociological journals in increasing numbers. An indication of this disciplinary migration can be observed in Table 1 which lists the articles we have located by Australian scholars or those articles drawing on Australian data citing or engaging with Bourdieu's work since 1990.

TAB. 1. *Summary of published articles 1990-2008 by Australian based researchers citing or using Bourdieu*

Date	Journal	Author(s)	Title
1992	*Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*	Adkins and Emmison	"Youth theatre and the articulation of cultural capital: refocusing Bourdieu through ethnography"
1993	*Thesis Eleven*	Harrison	"Bourdieu and the possibility of a postmodern sociology"
1995	*Journal of Sociology*	Crook	"The role of mothers in the educational and status attainment of Australian men and women"
1997	*Journal of Sociology*	Crook	"Occupational returns to cultural participation in Australia"
1997	*Journal of Sociology*	Emmison	"Transformations of taste: Americanisation, generational change and Australian cultural consumption"
1997	*Language and Education*	Carrington and Luke	"Literacy and Bourdieu's sociological theory: a reframing"
1999	*Journal of Sociology*	Bulbeck	"The nature dispositions of visitors to animal encounter sites in Australia and New Zealand"
2001	*Journal of Sociology*	Franklin and White	"Animals and modernity: changing human-animal relations, 1949-98"
2001	*Poetics*	Woodward and Emmison	"From aesthetic principles to collective sentiments: the logics of everyday judgements of taste"
2000	*Social Analysis*	Uhlmann	"Incorporating masculine domination: theoretical and ethnographic elaborations"
2002	*Organizational Research Methods*	Everett	"Organizational research and the praxeology of Pierre Bourdieu"
2002	*Journal of Consumer Culture*	Turner and Edmonds	"The Distaste of taste: Bourdieu, cultural capital and the Australian postwar elite"

TAB. 1. *Summary of published articles 1990-2008 by Australian based researchers citing or using Bourdieu*

Date	Journal	Author(s)	Title
2003	*Cultural Studies*	Schirato and Webb	"Bourdieu's concept of reflexivity as metaliteracy"
2003	*Cultural Studies*	Noble and Watkins	"So, how did Bourdieu learn to play tennis? Habitus consciousness and habituation"
2003	*Journal of Sociology*	Emmison	"Social class and cultural mobility: reconfiguring the cultural omnivore thesis"
2003	*Journal of Sociology*	Woodward	"Divergent narratives in the imagining of the home amongst middle class consumers"
2004	*Thesis Eleven*	Smith	"Marcel Proust as successor and precursor to Pierre Bourdieu: A fragment"
2004	*Sport, Education and Society*	Hunter	"Bourdieu and the social space of the PE class: reproduction of doxa through practice"
2004	*British Journal of Sociology of Education*	Kenway and McLeod	"Bourdieu's reflexive sociology and 'spaces of points of view': whose reflexivity, which perspective?"
2005	*Theory and Research in Education*	Allard	"Capitalizing on Bourdieu: how useful are concepts of 'social capital' and 'social field' for researching 'marginalized young women?"
2005	*Theory and Research in Education*	Bullen and Kenway	"Bourdieu, subcultural capital and risky girlhood"
2005	*Theory and Research in Education*	McLeod	"Feminists re-reading Bourdieu: old debates and new questions about gender, habitus and gender change"
2005	*Journal of Educational Policy*	Rawolle	"Cross-field effects and temporary social fields: a case study of the mediatization of recent Australian knowledge economy policies"

TAB. 1. *Summary of published articles 1990-2008 by Australian based researchers citing or using Bourdieu*

Date	Journal	Author(s)	Title
2006	*The Senses and Society*	Gallegos and McHoul	"It's not about good taste. It's about tastes good: Bourdieu and campbell's soup … and beyond"
2006	*Social & Legal Studies*	Van Krieken	"Law's autonomy in action: anthropology and history in court"
2007	*Journal of Sociology*	Hinde and Dixon	"Reinstating Pierre Bourdieu's contribution to cultural economy theorizing"
2007	*Journal of Sociology*	Bowman	"Men's business: negotiating entrepreneurial business and family life"
2008	*British Journal of Sociology of Education*	Mills	"Reproduction and transformation of inequalities in schooling: the transformative potential of the theoretical constructs of Bourdieu"
2008	*British Journal of Sociology of Education*	Funnell	"Tracing variations within 'rural habitus': an explanation of why young men stay or leave rural towns in southwest Queensland"
2008	*Journal of Sociology*	Powell	"Amor fati?: gender habitus and young people's negotiation of (hetero)sexual consent""

There are two points we wish to draw attention to in the table. The first, which is apparent in the table, is the proliferation of areas in which his work has been applied. His concepts have been taken up in a diverse range of research fields including organization studies, sports studies, socio-legal studies and the study of the senses, but he remains predominantly used within educational research and the study of cultural consumption. The second point, which is not directly evident from the table, is that not all of these studies have appropriated his work to the same degree. The articles span the entire range from ceremonial citations to substantial research studies which seek to apply, critique and extend his core research program.

Conclusion

The transplanting of a scholarly oeuvre is subject to a number of possible competing influences. First, the work of any scholar will be read locally, through the intellectual and material traditions which structure the field of any national culture. Secondly, scholarly oeuvres will be interpreted through disciplinary prisms, so that their meaning and trajectory of influence is not guaranteed, but is differentially understood in relation to emergent and historically embedded intellectual movements. Thus, like any type of object, intellectual objects will be constructed, interpreted and utilised according to the dominant ways of seeing and knowing such objects. In the case of Bourdieu, although his work on class, social status and cultural practices is now recognised as groundbreaking and indeed constitutes a substantial theoretical and methodological paradigm across the social sciences, it was not immediately celebrated, let alone adopted, within the Australian scholarly field. The reasons for this weak uptake relate to the commitment of Australian researchers to the dominant scholarly traditions of the United States and the United Kingdom. Some received their training in these centres, others migrated from them to work in Australian universities. Consequently, it was not until the 1990s – relatively late in terms of Bourdieu's oeuvre – that Bourdieu's work began to be taken up with any eagerness. One of our main conclusions is that it was the Australian Everyday Culture Project – the most substantial Bourdieu-inspired project of this time – which was something of a watershed for the appreciation of Bourdieu's work in Australia and demonstrated the potential of these ideas outside of any narrow disciplinary orientation. The story since then has been more positive, with a proliferation of academic studies applying Bourdieu's ideas into diverse areas.

References

Adatto, K., and Cole, S.

1981 "The Functions of Classical Theory in Contemporary Research: the case of Max Weber." *Knowledge and Society* 3:137-162.

Barthes, R.

1973 *Mythologies*. London: Paladin.

Baxter, J., Emmison, M., Western, M., and Western J. (eds.)

1991 *Class Analysis and Contemporary Australia*. Melbourne: Macmillan

Bennett, T.

1995 *The Birth of the Museum: history, theory, poliitcs*. London: Routledge.

Bennett, T., Emmison, M., and Frow, J.

1999 *Accounting for Tastes: Australian everyday cultures*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Blau, P., and Duncan, O.D.

1967 *The American Occupational Structure*. New York: Wiley.

Bourdieu, P.

1968 "Outline of a sociological theory of art perception." *International Social Science Journal* 4: 589-612.

1984 *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste*. London: Routledge.

1988 *Homo Academicus*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P., and Wacquant, L.

1992 *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Branson, J.

1980 "Sociology and the Sociology of Education in Australia." *ANZJS* 16: 8-15.

Broom, L., and Jones, F.L.

1969 "Father-to-son mobility: Australia in comparative perspective." *American Journal of Sociology* 74: 333-342.

Broom, L., Jones, F.L., McDonnell, P., and Williams, T.

1980 *The Inheritance of Inequality*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Chamberlain, C.

1983 *Class Consciousness in Australia*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Connell, R.W.

1974 "The Causes of Educational Inequality: further observations." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 10: 186-189.

1977 "Logic and Politics in Theories of Class." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 13: 203-211.

1977 *Ruling Class, Ruling Culture*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

1983a *Which Way is Up?* Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

1983b "Social Class in Australia." *Search* 14: 247-248.

1987 *Gender and Power*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Connell, R.W., and Irving, T.

1980 *Class Structure in Australian History*. Sydney: Longman Cheshire.

Connell, R.W., Ashendon, D.J., Kessler, S., and Dowsett, G.

1982 *Making the Difference.* Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Counihan, M.

1975 "Reading television: notes on the problem of media content." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 11: 31-36.

Davies, A.

1967 *Images of Class*. Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Editorial Board

1965 "Statement of Editorial Board." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 1: 1.

Emmison, M.

2003 "Social Class and Cultural Mobility: Reconfiguring the Cultural Omnivore Thesis." *Journal of Sociology* 39: 211-230.

Encel, S.

1970 *Equality and Authority*. Melbourne: Longman Cheshire.

Featherman, D., and Hauser, R.

1978 *Opportunity and Change.* New York: Academic Press.

Fiske, J., Hodge, B., and Turner, G.

1987 *Myths of Oz: reading Australian popular culture*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Frow, J.

1987 "Accounting for Tastes: Some Problems in Bourdieu's Sociology of Culture." *Cultural Studies* 1: 59-74.

2007 "Australian Cultural Studies: Theory, Story, History." *Postcolonial Studies* 10: 59-7.

Frow, J., and Morris, M. (eds.)

1993 *Australian Cultural Studies: A Reader*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Graetz, B., and McAllister, I.

1988 *Dimensions of Australian Society*. Melbourne: Macmillan.

Hage, G.

1998 *White Nation. Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*, Annandale, Pluto Press.

Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J., and Roberts, B.

1978 *Policing the Crisis.* London: Macmillan.

Hiller, P.

1975 "The Nature and Social Location of Everyday Conceptual Components of Class." *Sociology* 9: 255-87.

Jin, H.

2008 "The Intellectual Genealogies and Possible Futures of Cultural Studies: An Interview with Tony Bennett." *Cultural Politics* 4: 161-182.

Jones, F.L.

1986 *Models of Society: Class, Gender and Stratification in Australia and New Zealand*. Sydney: Croom Helm.

Kelley, J., and McAllister, I.

1983a "Social Class in Australia." *Search* 14: 93-95.

1983b "Modern Sociology and the Analysis of Class." *Search* 14: 249-252.

Lees, S., and Senyard, J.

1985 "Taste and Table Manners: Class and Gender in Children's Books." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 21: 174-193.

Marshall, G., Newby, H., Rose, D., and Vogler, C.

1988 *Social Class in Modern Britain*. London: Hutchinson.

Morris, M., and Muecke, S.

1991 "Relations of Theory: Meaghan Morris talks with Stephen Muecke. In *Outside the Book: Contemporary Essays in Literary Periodicals*, edited by D. Carter, Sydney: Local Consumption Publications.

Oeser, O., and Hammond, S. (eds.)

1954 *Social Structure and Personality in a City*. London: Routledge.

Peterson, R.

1992 "Understanding Audience Segmentation: From Elite and Mass to Omnivore and Univore." *Poetics* 21: 243-258.

Peterson, R., and Kern, R.

1996 "Changing Highbrow Taste: From Snob to Omnivore." *American Sociological Review* 61: 900-907.

Peterson, R., and Simkus, A.

1992 "How Musical Tastes Mark Occupational Status Groups." In *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*, edited by M. Lamont and M. Fournier. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Ryan, B.

1986 "Understanding Education: A Defence of Class Analysis." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 22: 84-101.

Savage, M., and Bennett, T.

2005 "Editors' Introduction: Cultural Capital and Social Inequality" *British Journal of Sociology* 56: 1-12.

Skrbis, Z., Kendall, G., and Woodward, I.

2004 "Locating Cosmopolitanism: Between Humanist Ideal and Grounded Social Category." *Theory, Culture and Society* 21: 115-136.

Thompson E.P.

1968 *The Making of the English Working Classes*. Harmondsworth: Pelican Books.

Turner, G.

1986 *National Fictions: literature, film and the construction of the Australian narrative*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

1993 *Nation, Culture, Text: Australian Cultural and Media Studies*. London: Routledge.

Wacquant, L.J.D.

(1987 "Symbolic Violence and the Making of the French Agriculturalist: An Enquiry into Pierre Bourdieu's Sociology." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology* 23: 65-88.

Wild, R.W.

1974 *Bradstow: A Study of Class, Status and Power in a Small Australian town*. Sydney: Angus and Robertson.

Williams, C.

1981 *Open Cut*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Woodward, I., Skrbis, Z., and Bean, C.

2008 "Attitudes Toward Globalization and Cosmopolitanism: Cultural Diversity, Personal Consumption, and the National Economy." *British Journal of Sociology* 59: 207-226.

The Intellectual Reception of Bourdieu in Australian Social Sciences and Humanities

Abstract: In this paper we have chronicled the affordances – and repudiations – of Bourdieu's sociology in the context of Australian social sciences and humanities. The story of Bourdieu's incorporation is slow and patchy. It is characterised by indifference or lack of appreciation, as much as it is by adoption or even serious consideration. Few, if any, Australian scholars demonstrate that they had seriously considered Bourdieu's oeuvre in the 1970s and 1980s. This is despite fertile ground for appreciation of his work in this era, given the extent of research into matters of class, education, and social reproduction within sociology and also the burgeoning discipline of cultural studies. The dominant Australian paradigms in these fields took principally from neo-Marxist models of class developed predominantly in America at the time, while the field of cultural studies was dominated by a mix of the British tradition, semiotics and post-structuralism. We show this pattern to be a function of intellectual networks within and across institutions, of the scholarly training and trajectories of key players within these disciplines and of the traditional historical concerns of scholarship within these fields. All of these things meant that Bourdieu's oeuvre was likely perceived as exotic, drawing upon relatively arcane traditions such as structuralism, or based upon the deployment of idiosyncratic methods and models which held little resemblance to the US and UK-centric worldview of Australian scholars. Our analysis shows, however, a belated appreciation of Bourdieu's work across the social sciences and humanities beginning in the late 1990s and beyond, especially within educational studies and investigations into cultural consumption.

Keywords: Bourdieu, Australia, academic disciplines, stratification, sociology, cultural studies.

Ian Woodward is Senior Lecturer in cultural sociology in the School of Humanities at Griffith University and Deputy Director of Griffith's Centre for Public Culture and Ideas. In addition to publishing many papers on the cultural aspects of cosmopolitanism with Zlatko Skrbis, Gavin Kendall and Clive Bean, he has written extensively on consumption practices, subject-object relations and material culture. He is the author of *Understanding Material Culture* (2007) and co-author of *The Sociology of Cosmopolitanism* (2009).

Michael Emmison is Reader in Sociology in the School of Social Sciences, University of Queensland, Australia. His previous books include *Accounting for Tastes: Australian Everyday Cultures* (1999) with T. Bennett and J. Frow; *Researching the Visual* (2000) with P. Smith; *Calling for Help: Language and Social Interaction in Telephone Helplines* (2005) co-edited with C. Baker and A. Firth. His current research interests are primarily in the fields of language and communication and he is presently examining the impact of technological modality (telephone, email, and online web counselling) on social interaction on a national children's helpline.