

Javier Callejo

# The Spanish Sociological Field as Seen Through Bourdieu

(doi: 10.2383/27722)

Sociologica (ISSN 1971-8853)

Fascicolo 2, settembre-ottobre 2008

**Ente di afferenza:**

()

Copyright © by Società editrice il Mulino, Bologna. Tutti i diritti sono riservati.

Per altre informazioni si veda <https://www.rivisteweb.it>

**Licenza d'uso**

Questo articolo è reso disponibile con licenza CC BY NC ND. Per altre informazioni si veda <https://www.rivisteweb.it/>

# The Spanish Sociological Field as Seen Through Bourdieu

by Javier Callejo

doi: 10.2383/27722

## Introduction

What role has Bourdieu's work played in constructing sociology in Spain? This question is the starting point of this work. Moreover, if we use a term of the writer himself, the question becomes, "What use has been made of Bourdieu in configuring the sociological field in Spain?" By field we mean a sense horizon where the interpretation of any references to Bourdieu can be silhouetted and analysed. A way of shaping that sociology of sociology that was one of the demands of this French thinker, with the peculiarity that he himself became the foremost figure in this configuration.

## The Possibilities of a Specific Reflexive Sociology

Bourdieu [1980, 22] repeatedly put forward a sociology of sociology as one of the cornerstones of scientific sociology. A proposal for reflexive sociology which here would form the backbone of the discipline. The special feature being that Bourdieu himself was positioned as the instrument to bring this about.

Every proposal for reflexive sociology conceals a subject as observer, who, in turn becomes the object of observation: the observer attempts to observe what he/she does. It is an understanding of the subject as object, which tends to lead to indissoluble paradoxes when it comes to empirical practice [Callejo 1999]. However, one potential way out of the paradoxes of reflexivity is to be found in what might be

called a double distancing. On the one hand, by broadening the approach to social conditions where the discipline of sociology is to be found; this points the way to the concept of field: a sociological field. To what extent does the field of a discipline become confined by national borders so that we can speak of Spanish sociology or French or Algerian sociology, etc.? It is something that can only be explained by the studies that have accumulated over the years that take such borders for granted.<sup>1</sup> The second distancing occurs when observation is based on a specific reference: on a research technique, on a theoretical tendency, or as is the case here, on a writer. Even so, in spite of such distancing, the difficulties faced by a sociology of sociology are considerable. Every field contains social relations and positions, agents in conflict. When the observer becomes part of the observation they are no longer an abstract concept. Material dimensions come into play, what we might call interests or survival in the field.

As may be easily concluded, the analysis proposes following Bourdieu's path and even his canon. It proposes following in his footsteps and incorporating him into the development of the work making Bourdieu simultaneously a model for analysis and the object of analysis. A work that follows the canon set by Bourdieu himself and the footsteps that he left behind:

intellectuals are prepared by all the logic behind their training to treat works inherited from the past as a culture, that is, as treasures to be contemplated, venerated, celebrated and valued for their own sake; in sum, as assets destined for exhibition to produce symbolic dividends or simple narcissistic gratification and not as productive assets to be invested in research to produce effects [Bourdieu 1988, 39].

Bourdieu is used, as he himself says, to produce effects, symbolic dividends. By taking Bourdieu as object it will be attempted to look at the effects sought by those who use Bourdieu in the sociological field.

At the outset, the question posed by this attempt at a sociology of sociology takes on a purely descriptive tone: to what extent has Bourdieu penetrated Spanish sociology as a specific context that indicates the acceptance of his work in society as a whole?

### **The Process of Institutionalisation of Sociology in Spain as a Context**

If we are to understand how Bourdieu's work has been accepted in Spain, it would seem advisable to begin by pointing out the most general features of this con-

<sup>1</sup> On Spanish sociology in English, see Giner and Moreno 1990.

text of acceptance; particularly that context shaped by the process of institutionalisation undergone by the field of sociology in Spain. However, firstly, it is interesting to open up that field somewhat more and elevate the perspective to an even more general level, to that of the hazy intellectual field.

The Spanish intellectual field in the Twentieth century was truncated by the consequences of the Civil War and Franco's dictatorship. During the conflict most intellectuals either died or emigrated. Spain was practically left without any figures capable of becoming a collective point of reference that would make us reflect on our collectivity. The philosopher Ortega y Gasset alone was capable of very partially filling an obvious vacuum, which, when it came to left-wing thinking was even more acute. The crisis in Spanish thinking, which appeared to have its origins in the distant past, became acute after the war [Abellán 1989]. Such intellectual poverty opened up the doors of intellectual circles to foreign names and an admiring reception was given to these names from without with an open attitude to external influences [Rodríguez Morató 2006, 339]. This is something that would become prevalent in the practice of Spanish sociology where the considerable attraction of everything from without co-exists with the silence concerning domestic sociological literature [Rodríguez Ibáñez 2004], all part of the tradition of filling papers with quotations from foreign authorities without the least mention of Spanish writers.

Intellectual circles were initially reduced to social positions of obvious bourgeois origins, to certain well-off families. Young people were gradually absorbed into these groups who formed a new urban middle class. Originally of rural origins, even though they did not devote themselves to agriculture or farming,<sup>2</sup> they succeeded in gaining access to University thanks to the economic development of the 1950s. They became intellectual circles that were to exhibit two main tendencies. Firstly, a commitment to change in the political system, which led to the feeling that they dominated left-wing thinking. At least, they considered themselves to be the heirs to the defeated Republic. Secondly, there was a considerable upsurge in publishing despite the obstacles placed by dictatorship. Thus, many small publishers were founded, which, in turn, served to bring these circles together. In addition, there was the influence of groups of emigrant intellectuals on Mexican and Argentinean publishers. All this made it easier for the ideological context, intellectual circles, the material context and publishers to be on the alert for any echoes of critical voices coming from the outside. This explains why, even though the dictatorship was to inflict another twenty years of

<sup>2</sup> The similarity to Bourdieu's career path in France is obvious. To learn more about his career, apart from the author's specific references – particularly the *Esquisse pour une auto-analyse* – see the recent work by Lescourret [2008].

hard censorship, the Frankfurt schools of thought and structuralism managed to get a foothold in those intellectual circles. It could be said that there was a thirst for points of reference, although Bourdieu took quite a time to make a full entrance, as we shall see when we analyse Bourdieu's publications in Spain. Moreover, in this growing intellectual field in the Spain of the transition to democracy at the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s where a need for collective reflection seems to have materialised, figures of the density of Habermas or Derrida became important, and even those less dense like Lipovetsky, including the debate on post-modernity (Bell, Lyotard, Baudrillard, Morin, Virilio, Vattimo); Bourdieu, however, was scarcely to be seen. He was not part of the general discourse that reflected on the sense of current societies, discourse that was dominant in a society desirous to "get up to date" as fast as possible. It was only at the later stages when articles appeared in pamphlet form concerning television or gender relationships that Bourdieu was to rise to a relevant position in intellectual circles; that is, when Bourdieu was already widely recognised throughout the world.

Bourdieu's gateway to Spain was in the restricted field of social sciences and particularly that of sociology. A sociological field that in the 1970s was undergoing complete institutionalisation even though it still continued to be a marginal discipline. Maybe the same was occurring in other parts of Europe [Fleck and Nowotny 1993], but in Spain it had the additional problem of having been born into a political system that inevitably forced one to take up a position: to be for the regime or against it. This is why a reflection on the political role of sociology was constantly at the very heart of this process of institutionalisation. The discipline was also highly politically instrumented, either to place it at the service of a clearly conservative power structure that was attempting modernising reforms or to place it at the service of protest and action of a society that was beginning to organise itself politically (parties and trade-unions were coming out of hiding). Functionalist sociology from America would be placed at the service of the former. The latter would be united by Marxism mainly through the Frankfurt school of sociology first, and then through structuralist sociology. Some islands remained between the two taking refuge in the American "soft" schools (symbolic interactionist school, ethnomethodology school, or the Goffman dramaturgical perspective), attempted to distance themselves from the heat of the ideological and political struggle while taking up middle positions as the discipline became more academically professional. The latter would be the young academics promoted to professorships after a stay at American or German universities at the beginnings of the 1980s which is when Bourdieu's works began to arouse interest in Spanish sociology; and, as will be seen, even in the face of resistance by a majority of

these now established young academics. It would be the new young academics who would include him on their reference list.

If the number of new professorships created is an indicator of how the discipline was becoming institutionalised [del Campo 2001], a relatively easy illustration of this is Manuel Sales y Ferrés being given a chair in 1899, which set sociology on the road to institutionalisation. But for many years it was a process lost in the middle of the desert. A tenuous institutional rebirth of sociology linked to the survival of the regime under Franco,<sup>3</sup> came about in the modernising strategy of a dictatorship that with US,<sup>4</sup> aid began to open up to neo-capitalist or corporate reforms, in the words of Professor Ortí [2001, 133]. These were times of a dependent economic development in Spain which clamoured for the help of sociological perspective [Moya 1984a].

In 1962, sociology was a subject offered in Spanish universities. In the first half of the 1970s, the first Faculty of Political Sciences and Sociology opened up at the Complutense University. It must be emphasised that this school, symbolically located at its beginnings next to the Moncloa Palace, the official residence of the Prime Minister of Spain, was the first to produce sociology graduates. Its inauguration was a basic step in the process to institutionalise the subject, and therefore, a specific framework within which to welcome Bourdieu. Also, due to the demand for new teachers in the subject sociology was to be afforded a critical perspective. It is also certain that it was to occupy a very marginal position compared to a dominant conservative, non-critical outlook, even among those who, lacking any analytical capacity, showed themselves unashamedly to be the point of reference for Marxist sociology.<sup>5</sup>

It was in this context of the discipline where a lot of positions had already been taken that Bourdieu came into the field; a field where the *philia* and *phobia* were already embodied because the field structure had entered a period of stability after the institutionalisation of its emergence. Therefore, Bourdieu's reception by the Spanish sociological field has to be analysed starting out from the structure of the field itself. He entered the field when the first steps to institutionalise Spanish sociology had become consolidated and power platforms already established. This explains precisely why he became one of the main points of reference among the least institutionalised sociological tendencies that were seeking a place in that field. To achieve this they would have to confront the anti-Bourdieu phobias of the insti-

<sup>3</sup> The key figures here were Enrique Gómez Arboleya and the conservative Manuel Fraga Iribarne, a minister under General Franco.

<sup>4</sup> Franco's accords with the United States were in 1953. One result of these bilateral relations was the availability of Fulbright Committee scholarships to young Spanish sociologists at the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, as stated by one of the direct beneficiaries [Durán 2001:75].

<sup>5</sup> See José Félix Tezanos' text in del Campo 2001.

tutionalised elements, more mentioned in private than in public. But before examining the use that was made of Bourdieu, it is advisable to take a closer look at what the Spanish process of institutionalising sociology signified in the context of his reception.

At the beginnings of sociology's institutionalisation in Spain, three groups have been outlined. This must be recognised as a simplification, but without straying too far from reality, this system works. What did these groups read beyond the classics, which seem to have been common reading for all? The functionalist group directly followed the American hierarchical line, either the theoretical line (Parsons, Merton), or the empirical methodological line (Lazarsfeld, Blalock) as Hispanic delegations from that science multinational that Bourdieu embodied in Boudon for the French case.<sup>6</sup> This was the dominant group of the first professors. The left-wing group was dominated by Marxist readings, either in the Frankfurt school (Adorno, Horkheimer), or in the structuralist school (Althusser or, above all, Poulantzas), which spread to the theorists of unequal exchange and the analysis of alienation at work (Naville). The group of young academics immersed themselves in the most specialised literature, updating problems of theory and methodology in the discipline, even when written almost exclusively by foreign writers, preferably American ones.

This triad structure permeated every level of the discipline; both the level of specialisation in the different types of sociology (social change, work, communication, etc.), and the level separating theory from methodology. Indeed, Bourdieu was to be most favourably received in the area of epistemological reflection and the influence of his methodology as sociology was becoming institutionalised. Social research techniques developed in the USA were being incorporated, mainly without criticism, and particularly the opinion poll, which was becoming the only authentically empirical approach. At the same time a group of professionals (Ibáñez, de Lucas, Ortí, Zárraga), situated on the very edge of a marginal discipline, undertook a critical work on the methods of applied sociology. This was a reflection that resulted from that marginal, critical stance and that of Spanish universities and their political commitment during the process of institutionalisation; a marginal position that led them to seek recognition – social, economic and professional – in the market, as part of the increasing application of sociology to the analysis of the spread of mass consumption in Spain. Epistemological reflection and the need for alternative ways of approaching

<sup>6</sup> In order to be aware of the extent of subordination to American sociology we need only refer to the anecdote that one of the public merits attributed to one of the first professors in the discipline in Spain was that he was a member of the American Association of Sociology.

social reality in order to satisfy the new capitalist configuration was where Bourdieu would take the stage, led on by Ibáñez.<sup>7</sup>

The subsequent process of institutionalisation undergone by sociology gave rise to one of the main cores of readers of the successive translations of Bourdieu's works. Readers made up of the new generations of sociologists who were a direct product of the faculties of sociology. That is to say, an institutionalised sociology. Having made this statement, it is now advisable to bring this process to an end by examining how the translations of this French writer evolved and most particularly, what use was made of Bourdieu by Spanish sociologists.

The dialogue with other fields is an indicator of institutionalisation since it is a public recognition of the field as authenticated public knowledge [Lamo de Espinosa 2001]. It is recognition through a scientific system.

Promoted by legal experts such as García Inda [1997], Bourdieu took up a significant position in the new Spanish Philosophy of Law, which, above all, would inject a kind of reflexive sociology into legal science, marking out its social basis while going beyond the superficial statistics on legality or victimisation, as people were accustomed to seeing sociology as a simple instrument for interpreting official statistics. Bourdieu was introduced as being particularly anti-formalist if not anti-legalistic. The focus was on how to impose the law, not on the law itself. Another story was anthropology, where the figure of Bourdieu was at least as centre stage as in sociology. Therefore, this was an aid to configuring the field.

### **The Focus on Publishing**

An initial approach to how Bourdieu was accepted in Spain is proposed through the acceptance of his works, either direct ones signed by the writer himself or indirect or collective works, which may be applied to the review *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*. Of the first we have a record of their translations into Spanish by publishers established in Spain or whose titles had a significant circulation in this country. This issue presents some problems as to method since not everything published in Spanish on Bourdieu was distributed in Spain. Thirty years ago few Latin American publishers had any noteworthy circulation: Fondo de Cultura Económica and Siglo XXI, and to a lesser degree, Nueva Visión and Amorrortu.

By taking the translation and publication of a work as an indicator of its acceptance or as an opening up towards a topic or writer, means accepting such a decision

<sup>7</sup> About the production of Spanish readers of Bourdieu thanks to professor Ibáñez, see Moreno Pestaña 2005b.



as a collective decision. As a hypothesis along the lines set by Habermas [1986], it is assumed that what is of public interest gets published. It is the decision of a more or less collective agent who believes that by publishing the work in their own language it will find a minimum guaranteed acceptance and public interest, even when dealing with an expert or specialised public. Moreover, among publishers operating in university circles such a decision tends to be directly assessed by the university itself: by professors who become directly involved in the translation and commit themselves to disseminating the text among their students and colleagues, emphasising its importance in other societies. Thus, they argue that the work has been translated into other languages and if one of the “other languages” is English, then the prestige is even greater. The relatively early translations of Bourdieu need to be looked at inside a specialist framework, that of small committed publishers whose line of thought or at least whose field of intellectual work had a reasonable penetration in active spheres of the academic world, as was the case with *Sociologie de l'Algerie*, *Le Déracinement*, *Les Héritiers* or *Choses dites*. They are translations that were promoted by group of anthropologists, educational sociologists and critical sociologists. In the first group signs of patronage by the Spanish ethnologist Julio Caro Baroja can be perceived. In the second group is the response to the supposed repercussions of some of Bourdieu's works (*Les Étudiants et leurs études*, *Les Héritiers*) in the May 1968 riots which turned into some support. It was not by chance that *Les Héritiers* was introduced by Professor López Aranguren, who had been in Californian universities during the demonstrations by young people.

As can be seen in Table 1, the texts around which the core of Bourdieu's specifically sociological work revolves (*Le métier de sociologue*, *La distinción*, *Le sens pratique*) had to wait between nine and eleven years before being published in translation. The empirical research most focused on the social uses of art (*Un art moyen* and *L'Amour de l'art*), originally published when recognition of the sociologist did not go beyond a very specialised public [Brihuega 1986], were those that took longest to be published in translation, leaving aside those that were still not to be found in Spanish bookshops, as well as those that dealt with the French intellectual field (*Homo academicus*, *Noblesse d'État*).

The most quickly translated works were those that launched Bourdieu to the centre of public attention (*Sur la television*, *Contre-feux* and *La domination masculine*) together with those deriving from his figure becoming generally known due to the interest of the media after his death (*Science de la science et reflexivité*, *Le bal des célibataires* and *Esquisse pour une auto-analyse*), which led to the paradox of publishing specialised works mainly dealing with an exercise in sociological self-reflection for the general public. However, its relatively short length (around 200 pages) and the

importance reached by Bourdieu among informed sectors of society resulted in its publication by a publisher (Anagrama) with access to the mass distribution chains. A small-sized product and a broad context of acceptance twenty years after the original edition led to the publication of works such as *Leçon sur la leçon*.

TAB. 1. Spanish translations of major Pierre Bourdieu's works

Title	Original	Spain	Difference
<i>Sociologie de l'Algerie</i>	1958	1965	7
<i>Le Déracinement</i>	1964	1965	1
<i>Les Étudiants et leurs études</i>	1964	1967	3
<i>Les Héritiers</i>	1964	1967	3
<i>Un art moyen</i>	1965	1979	14
<i>L'Amour de l'art</i>	1966	2003	37
<i>Le Métier de sociologue</i>	1968	1976	9
<i>La Reproduction</i>	1970	1977	7
<i>Esquisse d'une theorie de la pratique</i>	1972	1991	19
<i>La distinction</i>	1979	1988	9
<i>Le Sens pratique</i>	1980	1991	11
<i>Questions de sociologie</i>	1980	-	
<i>Ce que parler veut dire</i>	1982	1985	3
<i>Leçon sur la leçon</i>	1982	2002	10
<i>Homo academicus</i>	1984	-	
<i>Choses dites</i>	1987	1988	1
<i>L'Ontologie politique de Martin Heidegger</i>	1988	1991	3
<i>La Noblesse d'État</i>	1989	-	
<i>Les Règles de l'art</i>	1992	1995	3
<i>Réponses</i>	1992	1995	3
<i>La Misère du monde</i>	1993	1999	6
<i>Raisons pratiques</i>	1994	1997	3
<i>Sur la television</i>	1996	1997	1
<i>Méditations pascaliennes</i>	1997	1999	2
<i>Contre-feux</i>	1998	1999	1
<i>La Domination masculine</i>	1998	2000	2
<i>Les usages sociaux de la science</i>	1998	1999	1
<i>Les Structures sociales de l'economie</i>	2000	2001	1
<i>Contre-feux 2</i>	2001	2001	0
<i>Langage et pouvoir symbolique</i>	2001	-	
<i>Science de la science et réflexivité</i>	2001	2003	2
<i>Le Bal des célibataires</i>	2002	2004	2
<i>Esquisse pour une auto-analyse</i>	2004	2006	2

Little by little, the translation of his works followed the original publications. Publishers were aware that there was sufficient public beyond the tiny academic fields of sociology, anthropology or philosophy. Also, there was coordination between publishers and newspaper groups which would lead to an important presence in these media apart from the fact that his translations were published by Anagrama, the publishing house of the Prisa group, publisher of the *El País* daily newspaper. The reviews of his works in the newspaper were as precise as the translations. These, were accompanied by some interviews<sup>8</sup> and particularly an interest in his excursions into the public domain that crossed the boundaries of specific professional fields. Bourdieu was reconstructed as an intellectual, as a figure more easily accessible to the public than a sociologist. But sociology could be recognised in the writer even when he was not treated as a sociologist but as an agent entering the public domain.

*La Misère du Monde* would take six years to be translated and was published only in part. The cost of the edition given the volume of research explains this relative delay and the passage of time required to publish it in Spanish. This was the time that stretched from Bourdieu the sociologist to the Bourdieu that embodied the stereotype of a committed intellectual, when Bourdieu became a public figure outside France and could therefore be of public interest. He was no longer the writer of a work that was a point of reference for specialists (sociologists: *La distinction* or anthropologists: *Le sens pratique*), he was now a public figure. If we analyse how the translations evolve they seem to follow the logic of a publishing field that sought an ever broader public to consume the merchandise. This, however, was to lead to the recognition of sociology by society as a whole, to the recognition of the word sociology. One of the consequences of this process in line with the very logic of the distinction analysed by Bourdieu was a reluctance to recognise the established sociologists who were put forward as the most specialised of the speciality as Bourdieu gained the recognition of the most general public, the most uninitiated public. The growth of the uninitiated public led to two opposite reactions by the educated public: a distancing from the object which began to be deemed as vulgar or a deepening of worship towards the object.

However, the review *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales* (ARSS) gradually began to find its way into the collection of university journal libraries. Having started out in 1975, in that same year with numbers 5-6, the Faculty of Education of Madrid Autónoma University began to collect it. This is an indicator of a close following of Bourdieu's work, even of the indirect work that was *Actes de la Recherche*. As we

<sup>8</sup> "El sociólogo partero. Conocer las causas del malestar social que no se expresa a la luz del día," *El País*, 5 July 1990, p. 12; "La fuerza de las ideas" in *El País/Babelia*, 30 April 1994, p. 2.

shall see later, placing this periodical publication in the field of Spanish educational research was coherent with the broad acceptance afforded to the French sociologist in this field. It was also coherent with the fact that the first publications to achieve some relative interest in Spain were *La reproduction* and *Les Héritiers*, focused on the field of education.

The faculty of Political Sciences and Sociology of the Complutense University has housed *ARSS* since 1977. That is just after the inauguration of the educational centre and the review. In the wake of the *ARSS* collection in university journal libraries a noticeable leap forward of five years can be observed until we arrive at the Complutense University Faculty of Education in 1982; or a six year leap to the UNED library (National Distance Learning University). A leap in time which, perhaps, should be attributed to the time taken by the graduates of the Faculty of Political Sciences of the Complutense University to become professors in these two institutions, among whom Bourdieu's works would spread.

### **The Gateway to Spanish Sociology**

In 1979 a book on Bourdieu was published, *La cultura: reproducción o cambio. El análisis sociológico de P. Bourdieu*, by Sánchez Horcajo [1979], where religion and culture are treated as one and the same thing and Bourdieu is no longer introduced since he was now quite commonly referred to in the sociology of Spanish education, but where a programme of research based on Bourdieu is proposed. Bourdieu's presence in Spanish sociology was important, even from his initial works. Thus, it cannot be thought an exaggeration to state that he is the writer that together with Habermas has had the greatest influence on Spanish sociology [Lamo de Espinosa 2007]. However, his influence has been very unequal. An analysis of that influence will be attempted herein. To this end, the basic empirical material will be the references to the writer in specialised literature. That is to say, references to the field of sociology: the so-called scientific journals. We have used those that may reasonably be considered reference publications: *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, *Revista Internacional de Sociología* and *Revista Española de Sociología*.

Analysing Bourdieu's presence in Spanish sociological references is to situate him in the specific field of national sociological production, with all its structural, substantial and formal limitations (one cannot speak of any limitation whatsoever).<sup>9</sup> It is the field structure that structures the expression, and in this case, the references.

<sup>9</sup> See, in English, Rodríguez Morató 2006.

Therefore, it is an analysis that has limitations but which, above all, lets the structure of the field itself be observed.

The first time that Bourdieu was quoted in the Spanish sociology journal of reference, the *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, was in 1978 under the shadow of Aron and beside Peter Berger, as a contemporary theoretician of sociology. It was a commentary on the book *Produire ou reproduire? Une sociologie de la vie quotidienne* [Remy, Voyé and Servais 1978; Estruch 1978] that became one of the first indicators of the existence of a sector of Spanish sociology to use Bourdieu as a common reference, thereby recognising his authority. From here on, Bourdieu's presence in references in the field of Spanish sociology were to increase and would become essential in some areas of sociology. Therefore, Bourdieu's two main gateways to Spanish sociology would be in methodological reflection and in the sociology of education. In this latter area, apart from the text referred to by Sánchez Horcajo, which may be taken as a relevant indicator, it should be highlighted how *La reproduction* by Bourdieu and Passeron became a kind of cult title. This work constitutes a central reference for a critical analysis of education by social class and takes up a foremost position in the institutionalisation of the sociology of education and the so-called Institutes of Educational Science (ICE), present in most Spanish universities to train new graduates in the different subjects for them to become teachers of secondary education [Lerena 1976 and 1983]. The text takes a critical position together with Bernstein against the supposed capacity possessed by education to generate social mobility [Alonso Hinojal 1980]. A position that singled out the school as an instrument of social control [Medina 1983] and an instrument of social reproduction, or the mediatory nature of the head of family's job in the structural repercussions of education.

Any reference to Bourdieu among Spanish sociologists writing on education was of the essence in at least a double sense. Firstly, because of his leading role in the important educational reform project that came even before the end of the Franco period and acquired a special vitality during the transition to democracy. Moreover, in the first Government of the Socialist Party, a sociologist (José María Maravall) was placed in charge of education.<sup>10</sup> And secondly because Bourdieu became a common point of reference. Thus, in a text attempting to be a selection of articles on the situation of educational sociology in Spain [Lerena 1987], Bourdieu is the most quoted non-Spanish writer, with sixteen quotes. References that go beyond a single

<sup>10</sup> Before, during the government of Adolfo Suárez, the sociologist González Seara was given charge of the Ministry of Universities, having previously been director of the Institute for Public Opinion, created in 1963.

text – *La reproduction* – since eight works by our author are mentioned, to the fore of the references to works by Bowles (5), Willis (4) or Boudon (3). An influence on the sociology of Spanish education that has spread through the support of those who introduced him right up to the present [Subirats and Tomé 2007]. However, before and after Bourdieu and Passeron's work, French sociology (Durkheim, Althusser, Boudon, Foucault, Baudelot-Establet) has had a special influence on Spanish educational sociology [Varela 1989].

In methodological reflection, *Le métier de sociologue* serves to authenticate the possibility of another type of empirical approach that is different from an opinion poll with a standardised questionnaire and quantitative opinion polls. Jesús Ibáñez situates Bourdieu's book under this strategy in order to defend his discussion group [Ibáñez 1979]. A highly relevant inroad into Spanish methodological reflection since through the figure of this professor he would be able to count on a stream of followers that would spread throughout various Spanish and Latin American universities under the label of critical sociology. From here on, Bourdieu became a banner that grew in importance as news arrived of sociology becoming assimilated as a way of gaining a conflictive presence in society. It was a springboard to pass from methods and techniques to epistemological reflection. Moya [1984b], a recognised teacher of several generations of sociology teachers although more distanced from Bourdieu, practised his own epistemological surveillance, based on Bourdieu, along the same lines as Ibáñez. Nonetheless, Bourdieu became a common reference in the epistemological distance of positivism and in the relations of social science with the power base [Ibáñez 1979; Carrión 1985].

The first major article dedicated exclusively to Bourdieu was in 1987 by Verónica Muñoz Dardé [1987], of French origins on her mother's side and one of Ibáñez's doctoral students. As Alonso would do later, his objective was to research Bourdieu's use of language [Alonso 1988; Alonso 1994]. To achieve this, he introduced the concept of what was symbolic in Bourdieu, like the order that conceals the social order. According to this interpretation, what Bourdieu does when confronting the structuralist epistemological position is to situate the social order above the linguistic order instead of situating the linguistic order above the social order as Saussure or Chomsky would do. That is, he outlines Bourdieu's proposal in the context of the conflicts in the French intellectual field [Callejo 2004]. For Muñoz the purpose of eliminating the enemy in the intellectual field led Bourdieu to characterise his opponents' conceptions of language, to oversimplify the study and presentation of alternative theories. As Muñoz himself points out, Bourdieu tends to make more a sociology of sociology than a sociology of language or social relations. Therefore, this first significant approach to Bourdieu's work is far from mere uncritical assumptions.

It was in the middle of the 1980s (1983-1985) that it could be said that Bourdieu's figure took on greater relevance in Spain. There were now six graduate courses in sociology, but it was also when institutionalising sociology in Spain took the greatest step, when the field of sociology spread, when there was more room for everybody, for both new and old due to the expansion of universities, which included new faculties and departments of Sociology being set up. We can speak of an open market in the field with competition being established from easily differentiable strategies. It was at this time that Bourdieu became a brand name. In 1983 he was now recognised as a maître of French sociology [Moya 1984b].

From 1990, references to Bourdieu were almost as frequent as to Durkheim or Weber, arising in the most varied fields of observation, ranging from an analysis of the roots of nationalism [Gurruchaga 1990] to the sociology of religion [Díaz-Salazar 1990], passing through the sociology of sport [Buñuel 1994] or work [Pérez Rubio 1997; Brunet and Morell 1998]. Thus, linked to a reflection on the epistemological place of sociology, Bourdieu was to be gradually incorporated into an analysis of the sociology of Spanish science [Ibáñez 1979; Beltrán 1979], as one of the major references of the externalist position [Medina 1983; Cotillo et al 1992]. Bourdieu's concept of field played an important role in a growing sociology of Spanish science. It became acceptable to define science as a scientific field, that is as a place of political conflict closely following Bourdieu's paper "La spécificité du champ scientifique et les conditions sociales du progrès de la raison" [Bourdieu 1975]. His works were now recognised in world sociology, even references to his works coming from English translations [Rodríguez 1991]. Bourdieu was now present in every general reflection on sociology and all that was social, but particularly in the scientific status of sociology [López Novo 1994; Fernández Sobrado 1994]. However, it was not until 1993 that the first work of Bourdieu with commentaries appeared in a Spanish sociology review which, in addition, was the oral publication edited by Loic Wacquant [Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992]. Why this relative silence concerning the new publications? During this period, the first half of the 1990s when Bourdieu gained the recognition of academe and began his ascent as a public figure was when the fewest editions in Spanish appeared (see Table 1). The exception was *L'Ontologie Politique de Martin Heidegger*, which apparently had little to do with sociology.

It was in 1996 when the second paper dedicated exclusively to Bourdieu appeared in one of the reviews of reference in the discipline in Spain. It was a text by Álvarez Sousa [1996], who had been in direct contact with Bourdieu and his immediate collaborators in the Centre of European Sociology and in the Collège de France. The text was entitled, "Structuralist constructivism: the theory of social classes by Pierre Bourdieu." At the start it is informative with a summary of the conception

of social class by the writer using highly descriptive language. There is just a short footnote on the Marxist roots of his conception. There is little dialogue with the work of other writers: a forced, distant dialogue with the theory of needs by Maslow or Baudrillard [*ibidem*, 154], with Sorokin's now old-fashioned theory on social mobility [*ibidem*, 159], or with the conception of language in Austin or Habermas. What is striking is that with the exception of a fleeting reference to E.O. Wright and Elster, contemporary analysts of social classes and social structure are not mentioned, in spite of the polemics between the French sociologist and the Norwegian one [Bourdieu 1988]. Also, there is only a slight trace of his classic sources: Marx, Veblen, and Weber. An important change can be seen compared to Muñoz's previous paper: the object of the text is the writer not the social classes; a change that would become more marked.

Two texts dedicated exclusively to Bourdieu's attempt "to put the writer in his place" or position the sociologist within the discipline. These texts were the articles by Rodríguez Ibáñez [1992] and Castón Boyer [1996]. The first is short and clearly distances itself from Bourdieu. The second continues to be a presentation of "Bourdieu's theoretical system," a forced and uncritical review of his concepts: reproduction, social class, and habitus, without taking sides even when relevant criticisms are included (Alexander, Ritzer). The conclusion is that Bourdieu's work is rich and complex. Why does he not take sides? Because this would be to commit himself, it is indicative of having adopted a strategy in the field of sociology. The references in scientific discourse classify and identify those who do so. They become an exercise in distancing or complicity [Bourdieu 1985]; some references more than others. It is not the same to quote Weber or Durkheim or even Simmel, Tarde or Pareto who are all considered classics without any claims to the contrary, while Parsons, Lazarasfeld, Foucault or Bourdieu are another story. A structuring leap is produced in the reference systems of authority: from the generations who appoint the classics of sociology to those who do not do so by covering the gap with writers like Bourdieu.

In his book, *La era del consumo*, Luis Enrique Alonso highlights Bourdieu's relevance – together with Goblots, Barthes or Bauman – in interpreting the current realisation of consumer society, particularly from the concept of habitus, and the use of concepts through which: "Pierre Bourdieu's legacy becomes highly present in the sociology of consumption in Spain" [Alonso and Fernández 2007]. Thus is stated an influence of this speciality of sociology in Spain that began with Ibáñez; an influence that forces this area of specialisation to maintain a constant reflection on methodology.

The number of publications on Bourdieu increased after his death. They were not always of a strict sociological field point of view. They are admiring appraisals, like that by Rodríguez López [2002]; they disseminate his concepts, like the work by



the Argentinian writer Gutiérrez [2002]; hasty analyses, like that compiled by Noya [2003]; or original proposals for reading, as found in Vázquez García's book [2002] or the compilation of papers by Moreno Pestaña and Vázquez García [2006], would be expected from the most original writers who take up greater mental distances, maybe because their ideas have their origins in philosophy, and who look at Bourdieu from Foucault's point of view. At last, the work most embedded in the field of sociology and written as a tribute to Bourdieu's French and Spanish disciples is that published by Alonso, Martín Criado and Moreno Pestaña [2004].

Having reviewed Bourdieu's presence, it is now worth making a minimum reflection on the spaces in which Bourdieu is absent from Spanish sociology. This obviously bears the risk of being seen to have pointed out that he "should be there;" an excessive risk. However, to point out but one risk is his relatively scarce presence among those who devote themselves to analysing social structure, where Anglo-Saxon influence is overwhelming, bar the occasional exception [Beltrán 2001].

### **The Sociological Ways Bourdieu Was Used**

No other sociologist, including the classics of the discipline has enjoyed a presence like Bourdieu in the specialist literature of the profession produced in Spain; three papers exclusively dedicated to Bourdieu in the journal of reference. It may even be said that Bourdieu has become a cult author. What is it that has caused Spanish sociology to take an interest in this French writer? A question charged with Bourdian influence. Can the boundaries of the field of sociology be seen through the interest in the writer of *La distinction*? What is meant by the use of a writer? A question leading as much to how he is used as to why he is used.

There could be few of his followers who were capable of filling this place that we have designated as of cult following. The intensity of his following, which in itself is a sign of distinction, implies that few would be those who shared it. It was thus the reference that helped the sociologists using it to recognise one another, particularly at his beginnings. It was a use that generated distinction, a distinction that became diluted when Bourdieu subsequently became extensively known to the public. For those this distinguished use of Bourdieu was a new reference of authority that proved the writer using it was up-to-date. Hence his frequent appearance in the commentaries in books by other writers where the commentator demonstrates

expertise in a sphere of knowledge.<sup>11</sup> This cult circle explains the initial translations by small publishers; the result of intense loyalties.

Bourdieu gradually became known and more widely used, partly fruit of the proselytising labour of his fervent followers. He thus acquired importance as being identified with sociology. This use takes on a special relevance with the link established by Jesús Ibáñez. This writer led Bourdieu from a tiny circle to a growing audience of sociology students between the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s. He became transformed into a kind of identity of the profession, a way of understanding sociology where the word combat had an important place. Bourdieu, therefore, became a source of arguments for positioning sociology to face up to other ways of understanding the social influence of the discipline and even confront other disciplines. Others would follow, like Zizek or even García Canclini and Bauman; but for a long time, they above all others of this tendency carried aloft the banner bearing the name of Bourdieu. For these, practising sociology meant speaking “like Bourdieu.”<sup>12</sup>

In parallel to this role of *medium* of a sociology for a sector to be found among privileged students and young teachers, Bourdieu found fame in Spain as an authority, and was thus used as such. Bourdieu’s use as an authority spread, as a reference of authority in speeches, like those in the scientific paper aimed at “creating authority” [Bourdieu 1985, 32]. A reference that gave a feeling of security. Using a recognised writer was a search for recognition, a use of an authority that transmitted authority. Compared to the previous kind of use that identified the discipline, Bourdieu became a *sociological canon*. Not only as a reference in specific research for which Bourdieu could be a forerunner but also as an authenticated way of practising sociology. A recognised but not dominant way. Moreover, he was discredited at the slightest opportunity by those who promoted other sociological canons or those who promoted already established canons.

Bourdieu gradually evolved into “theory.” It is true that he did so in the company of other writers like Elias. But above all else he was an authority, a point in the theoretical system. A theoretical point given many adjectives by those who least assumed him, but felt obliged to acknowledge him as part of the theoretical framework, which was one way to describe and classify him. Indeed, the adjectives became more and more, the most frequent being structuralist or neo-Marxist [Gobernado 1996]. Various papers dedicated to him in point-of-reference science journals deal-

<sup>11</sup> For example, in the lengthy commentary that Julio Carabaña [1980], an expert in the sociology of education, makes on the book by Pío Navarro [1980].

<sup>12</sup> As Juan de la Haba Morales does in a bibliographical critique in *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 102, 2003.

ing with sociology and various books dedicated to his works, especially in the 1990s, institutionalised Bourdieu as another classic. He became a living legend for Spanish sociology. One of the few generators of the great new theory, as Lamo de Espinosa [2001] called it, with all the consequences borne by this statement. He was used as a “dead” authority so that nothing could be known about any ripples caused by his political commitment. His use as a patron in order to judge other works<sup>13</sup> demands a certain vacuum in his behaviour as subject.

From his recognition as an authority Bourdieu began to be more and more used as a way of legitimising demands to institutionalise specific areas where sociological knowledge exerted influence. Reference has already been made to the sociology of consumption, an area that was always difficult to include in the study plans of Spanish universities. Precisely because of its position as a recognised source as well as a source of recognition, some uses made of Bourdieu may be qualified as outrageous. Such a use is that following a line that goes from Durkheim to Bourdieu, passing through Mauss, making them the founders of the idea that modern society has a community basis and consequently the nation is the basis of the modern State [Gurruchaga 1990]. However, this was the time when Bourdieu appeared to be a mandatory reference in every work that claimed to be a general reflection on sociology. It was the time when he was used as an agent of the highest order to lay down the rules of the discipline [Fernández Sobrado 1994], particularly in a dialogue with Giddens on dual effort as a way to overcome the dualisms (macro/micro, action/structure, mind/body) in sociology [García Selgas 1994].

Bourdieu was more a fetish in academic rhetoric than an instrument for analysis. Few were those who used Bourdieu’s work as a theoretical battleground, as theoretical reasoning with which to compare the results of their own research. Such a direct debate and discourse with Bourdieu is scarcely visible in the way that Alonso [2002] describes the declarations by de DiMaggio, Collins, Taylor, Honneth, Giroux, Alexander, Cicourel, or Aronowitz, almost all of them enrolled in the American academic area. However, a productive use existed of Bourdieu’s concepts. His main development would be in the already mentioned sociology of Spanish education and in the establishment of an indigenous reflection on the place of qualitative sociology. From this latter point of view, it might be said that the French sociologist was used as a picket of qualitative sociology when it came to methodology. Firstly with Ibáñez, then with Alonso. For the sociologists in Spain closest to Bourdieu, he took on a structuring capacity. This is apparent in the works of Ibáñez [1979], Martín

<sup>13</sup> For example, in Esther López Pascual’s commentary on the book by Andrés Bilbao [1993; López Pascual 1993] or on Leopold von Wiese’s work [Rodríguez-González 1993].

Criado [1998], Moreno Pestaña [2005a] or Callejo [2004], who acquired a considerable productive capacity by taking Bourdieu as their starting point. Such a capacity was developed in the works of Martín Criado [1997], who based the theoretical foundations of the discussion group on Goffman and Bourdieu; on Gómez Bueno [1996], where using facts, he discusses Bourdieu's argument that a devaluation or loss of prestige in a profession is related to its being opened up to women; or in the research coordinated by Sánchez de Horcajo [1997] on the visitors to Madrid's museums which verifies the thesis put forward in *L'Amour de l'art*. These are exceptions in a panorama dominated by use as a source of recognition.

So, there is now a complex panorama that can, nonetheless be ordered if these uses are looked at in depth, and particularly the users, since two meanings can be found in the vast number of references. Through the use of Bourdieu it can be seen how the field was organised. The gateway to the dynamics of the field of institutionalised sociology in Spain was crossed by Bourdieu's followers and his opponents; a battlefield where defining the rules had a strategic position. The rules of those who were in command and those who were demanding new rules. Among his followers were those who supported Bourdieu as the canon simply as a way of opposing the old rules. It was not the concepts that were so important (capital social, habitus, field, practice) but the way reflexive sociology would present a regulated way of practising sociology which would be identified with practising sociology in a strict sense. His following provided the support for the commentaries in new works,<sup>14</sup> which was one of the first showcases in the field and ended up with those who, from the fringe, attempted to burst into the very centre of the institutionalised intellectual system by means of a book; in this case a book on Bourdieu. It is at this stage that we mainly find the books that take stock of Bourdieu after his death. They took advantage of an opportunity to publish in the wake of the media interest in Bourdieu. Tactical manoeuvres in a professional strategy for recognition that required speed. For this reason their books were short. Taking too long could mean missing an opportunity.

Who were those to take Bourdieu as a basic reference? As Lamo de Espinosa [2007] and Moreno Pestaña [2005b] rightly point out, they were young sociologists. Among those who opposed Bourdieu and his works were the most institutionalised professors who had conducted some of their studies in the United States. They mainly criticised how he constructed his texts [Rodríguez Ibáñez 1992]. A critique of Bourdieu's rhetoric that was by no means trivial since rules were set by style, including Bourdieu's rules. A broad spectrum of Spanish academic sociology held Bourdieu

<sup>14</sup> See a commentary on a monograph on a Catholic intellectual, in José Carlos Sainz, in *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 80, 1997, pp. 237-240.

in great esteem, even to the extent of *appropriating* his work, his concepts and above all his person within the field of sociology. A major part of this option lay in the force of his rhetoric. It offered security for positions of insecurity. The homology of how the use of Bourdieu was structured needs to be sought in the structure of the field where such uses occur. A highly regulated structure like an academic one where strategies of assimilation and strategies of exclusion or silence can be observed.

How Bourdieu was used needs to be evaluated through the symbolic benefits he produced in sociology during the period that can be considered as a secondary process of institutionalisation. It was a stage of the process where sociology was too alien and domineering, coming from the academic chair or those aspiring to such who had gone to the United States to “get up-to-date” in order to “get us up-to-date” in an attempt at domination that was barely digestible for the emerging strata that had matured during the final resistance to the Franco regime. The motivation to be open to intellectual propositions that would coordinate criticism and sociology came from *La distinction* as its very author stated. In the face of these institutionalised positions Bourdieu was a source of symbolic efficiency. There was a tendency that saw Pierre Bourdieu as a springboard for reaching a position in the now institutionalised field of Spanish sociology. In fact, this helping role was pointed out by Bourdieu himself as being part of the culture: “The role of culture is to designate writers who can provide possibilities of offering help” [Bourdieu 1988, 39]. At the same time, Bourdieu provided institutional efficiency and ideological efficacy. He provided high returns – almost magical [Bourdieu 1985, 91]. Evoking Bourdieu rang of efficiency.

However, if we are to follow the advice of Rodríguez Victoriano, we need to differentiate between those who question alongside Bourdieu and those who reply using Bourdieu [Rodríguez Victoriano 2004]. For the former, Bourdieu’s work gives rise to productive capital, for the latter it is a kind of trade mark. The argument of double efficacy by accepting Bourdieu compared to the idea that the established strata produce a vacuum, can be contested by indicating that professors like Ibáñez or Alonso continued to assume Bourdieu’s proposals. It can be corroborated in both cases that this stance was adopted before their appointment as professors. They possessed the added value – and the risk – of being innovators who preserved this added value after becoming professors as well as the intellectual influence of a system of what was now structured knowledge penetrated by numerous sources where any references to Bourdieu added significance, but fell short of forming a backbone.

The intense, and widespread welcome afforded to Bourdieu by this second generation of young sociologists, all part of their strategy, was met by silence or criticism by the generations forming the establishment. Even by those who had set themselves up on the edge of the field, which, now practically an institution in itself,

was another kind of establishment. Such was the case of Professor Ortí [2007, 36], who accused Bourdieu of being afflicted with an “appropriating conceptual mania,” a feature of the Parisian cultural market. He was not alone in this accusation [Garrido and Moyano 2002]. Viewed from this perspective, the use of Bourdieu as well as his abuse and misuse would appear to be linked to his position in the field of sociology, and especially to the movements struggling to transform that field.

## Conclusions

After a short introduction to the context of Bourdieu’s acceptance which marked out the Spanish intellectual field, from a general perspective that includes the process of institutionalisation of sociology in Spain, this work has approached Bourdieu’s acceptance in the field of Spanish sociology.

With the purpose of positioning the reader, it has been shown how the translations of Bourdieu into Spanish evolved. An evolution that could be described as a transition from publishing works to publishing a writer. Initially published was what was considered of interest by groups of intellectuals with close ties with the University. This became particularly intense during the final period of the Franco regime and the beginning of the transition to democracy. In the second era, it was the writer that was published, the public figure.

Using Bourdieu’s book, *Ce que parler veut dire*, as a guidebook to theory, it has been attempted to analyse what Spanish sociology really wanted to say when the reference concerning what was said was Bourdieu. A vicious circle that adopted Bourdieu in order to speak about those who spoke about Bourdieu, where the object itself became an analytical viewpoint. For this reason, we have taken what has been said about the French sociologist as well as taking the process of publication of his works in Spain to be a message and indicator of the context of his acceptance.

Initially the question only had a descriptive objective: to know how Bourdieu gained acceptance in Spain. But one quickly discovers his potential as an instrument for analysing the situation and development of the intellectual field, and, to be more specific, for analysing the field of a discipline, in this case, sociology in Spain. Therefore, rather than analysing the sociology of Bourdieu’s sociology in Spain, the work has become an analysis of Bourdieu in Spanish academic sociology.

Bourdieu’s acceptance into Spanish academic sociology, where doctrine is written, cannot be understood without taking account of the university-academic field in which the discipline was structured. It was a field structured hierarchically into categories, some of which by referring to Bourdieu in their process of mobility at-

tempted to extract the maximum symbolic benefit. As Rodríguez Victoriano [2004, 311] points out, it is the structural situation that explains the militant indifference of some and the *philia* of others.

Bourdieu's presence in recent Spanish sociology must be deemed as of an importance that no other writer has enjoyed, even superseding the silence or criticism coming from the sociological community holding the most stable positions. A silence that prevents Spanish sociologists from being superficially classified as pro-Bourdieu or anti-Bourdieu. He occupies an important position, but it can hardly be classified as structuring. However, it is an importance embedded in the structuring process itself of the sociological field, which was attained after a certain generational change. For this reason he had a soft landing in Spanish sociology. Few showed their opposition in public; that is, while he continued to be an object of reference and specific study by the newly arrived, by those who were seeking a place in the academic field of sociology.

Bourdieu has been at the centre of the fringe of recent institutionalised sociology. Beyond the specific results of our analysis, we have recorded how researching the place of a writer in the sociology of one's own country possesses a little of that self-analysis that Bourdieu so loved to perform: to study the field of which one is part, as being determined by history. However, there continue to be unanswered questions. How does one mark out the distance of the writer in respect of what they are writing? This is one of the great problems of sociological writing [Bourdieu 1988, 60], which, as it is a lay science, is constantly condemned to provide explanations.

## References

Abellán, J.L.

1989 *Historia crítica del pensamiento español, tomo 5/II. La crisis contemporánea (1875-1936)*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

Alonso, L.E.

1988 "Entre el pragmatismo y el pansemiologismo. Notas sobre los usos (y abusos) del enfoque cualitativo en sociología." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 43: 157-168.

1994 *La mirada cualitativa*. Madrid: Fundamentos.

2002 "Pierre Bourdieu in Memoriam (1930-2002). Entre la bourdieumanía y la reconstrucción de la sociología europea." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 97: 9-28.

Alonso, L.E., Martín Criado, E., and Moreno Pestaña, J.L.

2004 *Pierre Bourdieu, las herramientas del sociólogo*. Madrid: Fundamentos.

- Alonso L.E. and Fernández Rodríguez, C.J.  
 2007 “Sociología del consumo.” Pp. 468-477 in *La Sociología en España*, edited by M. Pérez Yruela. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.
- Alonso Hinojal, I.  
 1980 “Bernstein en la encrucijada de la sociología de la educación.” *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 11: 55-74.
- Alvarez Sousa, A.  
 1996 “El constructivismo estructuralista: la teoría de las clases sociales de Pierre Bourdieu.” *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 75: 145-172.
- Beltrán, M.  
 1979 *Ciencia y sociología*. Madrid: Tecnos.  
 2001 “Sobre la noción de estructura social.” *Revista Internacional de Sociología* 30: 7-18.
- Bilbao, A.  
 1993 *Obreros y ciudadanos. La desestructuración de la clase obrera*. Madrid: Trotta.
- Bourdieu, P.  
 1975 “La spécificité du champ scientifique et les conditions sociales du progrès de la raison.” *Sociologie et sociétés* 7: 91-118.  
 1980 *Questions de sociologie*. Paris: Minuit.  
 1985 *¿Qué significa hablar?* Madrid: Akal.  
 1988 *Cosas dichas*. Barcelona: Gedisa.  
 2000 *Poder, Derecho y clases sociales*. Bilbao: Desclée de Brower.
- Bourdieu, P., and Wacquant, L.J.D.  
 1992 *Réponses*. París: Seuil.
- Brihuega, J.  
 1986 “La sociología del arte.” In *Historia de las ideas estéticas y de las teorías artísticas contemporáneas*, edited by V. Bozal. Madrid: Visor.
- Brunet Icart, I., and Morell Blanch, A.  
 1998 “Mercado de trabajo y estrategias de valorización.” *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 82: 37-71.
- Buñuel Heras, A.  
 1994 “La construcción social del cuerpo de la mujer en el deporte.” *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 68: 97-117.
- Callejo, J.  
 1999 “La reflexividad empírica: notas para un proyecto,” in *Globalización, riesgo y reflexividad*, edited by R. Ramos and F. García-Selgas. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.  
 2004 “La práctica del consumo en Bourdieu: contra el formalismo y el populismo.” Pp. 185-214 in *Pierre Bourdieu, las herramientas del sociólogo*, edited by L.E. Alonso, E. Martín Criado and J.L. Moreno Pestaña. Madrid: Fundamentos.
- Campo, S. del  
 2001 *Historia de la sociología española*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Carabaña, J.  
 1980 “Book review: *Mecina*.” *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 10.



Carabaña, J., and Arango, J.

1983 "La demanda de educación universitaria en España 1960-2000." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 24: 47-83.

Carrión Gorzarán, A.

1985 "Métodos y técnicas de investigación social: Notas para una bibliografía en castellano: Elementos básicos." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 29: 259-271.

Castón Boyer, P.

1996 "La sociología de Pierre Bourdieu." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 76: 75-97.

Cotillo, A., Iranzo, J.M., Torres, C., and Blanco, R.

1992 "Ciencia, científicos y sociología ¿Por dónde empezar?" Pp. 145-168 in *Escritos de Teoría Sociológica. En homenaje a Luis Rodríguez Zúñiga*. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.

Díaz-Salazar Martín, R.

1990 "Política y religión en la España contemporánea." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 52: 65-83.

Durán, M.A.

2001 "La dimensión internacional de la sociología española." *Revista Española de Sociología* 1: 65-82.

Estruch, J.

1978 "Book review: *Produire ou reproduire?*" *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 4: 211-213.

Fernández Sobrado, J.M.

1994 "La búsqueda del objeto. La eterna cuestión de la sociología." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 67: 109-131.

Fleck, C., and Nowotny, H.

1993 "A Marginal Discipline in the Making: Austrian Sociology in a European Context." Pp. 4-12 in *Sociology in Europe. In Search of Identity*, edited by B. Nedelmann and P. Sztompka. Berlín: Walter de Gruyter.

García Inda, A.

1997 *La violencia de las formas jurídicas: la sociología del poder y el derecho de Pierre Bourdieu*. Madrid: CEDECS.

García Selgas, F.J.

1994 "El 'cuerpo' como base de sentido de la acción." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 68: 41-83.

Garrido, F.E., and Moyano, E.

2002 "Capital social y desarrollo en zonas rurales: un análisis de los programas Leader II y Proder en Andalucía." *Revista Internacional de Sociología* 33: 67-96.

Giner, S., and Moreno, L. (eds.)

1990 *Sociology in Spain*. Madrid: CSIC.

Gobernado Arribas, R.

1996 "El logro ocupacional en España, veinte años después." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 74: 209-224.

- Gómez Bueno, C.  
1996 "El género y el prestigio profesional." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 75: 215-234.
- Gurruchaga, A.  
1990 "La problemática realidad del estado y de la nación." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 49: 102-122.
- Gutiérrez, A.B.  
1989 *Las prácticas sociales: una introducción de Pierre Bourdieu*. Madrid: Tierradenadie.
- Habermas, J.  
1986 *Historia y crítica de la opinión pública burguesa*. Barcelona: Gustavo Gili.
- Ibáñez, J.  
1979 *Más allá de la sociología. Teoría y práctica del grupo de discusión*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.
- Lamo de Espinosa, E.  
2001 "La sociología del siglo XX." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 96: 21-49.  
2007 "La teoría sociológica en España." Pp. 8-21 in *La Sociología en España*, edited by M. Pérez Yruela. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.
- Lerena, C.  
1976 *Escuela, Ideología y Clases Sociales en España*. Barcelona: Ariel.  
1983 *Reprimir y liberar. Crítica sociológica de la educación y de la cultura contemporáneas*. Madrid: Akal.  
1987 *Educación y Sociología en España*. Madrid: Akal.
- Lescourret, M-A.  
2008 *Bourdieu*. París: Flammarion.
- López Novo, J.P.  
1990 "El particularismo reconsiderado. Orientación de la acción y contexto institucional." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 67: 31-63.
- López Pascual, E.  
1993 "Book review: *Obreros y ciudadanos*." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 63: 197-204.
- Martín Criado, E.  
1997 "El grupo de discusión como situación social." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 79: 81-112.  
1998 *Producir la juventud*. Madrid: Istmo.
- Medina, E.  
1983a "Educación, Universidad y Mercado de Trabajo." *Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 24: 7-46.  
1983b "La polémica internalismo/externalismo en la historia y la sociología de la ciencia." *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 23: 53-75.
- Miguel, A. de  
1972 *Sociología o subversión*. Barcelona: Plaza y Janés.

- Moreno Pestaña, J.L.  
2005a “La sociología de la filosofía de Pierre Bourdieu y del Centre de Sociologie Européenne.” *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 112: 13-42.  
2005b “Chercheur, intellectuel consacré, prophète: trois réceptions de Pierre Bourdieu en Espagne.” Pp. 363-376 in *Rencontres avec Pierre Bourdieu*, edited by Gérard Mauger. Brois-sieux: Éditions du Croquant.
- Moreno Pestaña, J.L., and Vázquez García, F.  
2006 *Pierre Bourdieu y la filosofía*. Barcelona: Montesinos.
- Moya, C.  
1984a *Señas de Leviatán*. Madrid: Alianza.  
1984b “Identidad colectiva: un programa de investigación científica.” *Revista Española de In-vestigaciones Sociológicas* 25: 25-84.
- Muños Dardé, V.  
1987 “Bourdieu y su consideración social del lenguaje.” *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 37: 37-87.
- Navarro, P.  
1979 *Mecina*. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.
- Noya, J.  
1991 *Cultura, desigualdad y reflexividad. La sociología de Pierre Bourdieu*. Madrid: La Catarata.
- Ortí, A.  
2001 “En el margen del centro: la formación de la perspectiva sociológica crítica de la generación de 1956.” *Revista Española de Sociología* 1: 121-145.  
2007 “Veinticinco años después: el oficio de sociólogo en la España plural.” *Revista Española de Sociología* 7: 8-43.
- Pérez Rubio, J.A.  
1997 “Motivación y satisfacción laboral: retrospectiva sobre sus formas de análisis.” *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 80: 133-167.
- Remy, J., Voyé, L., and Servais, E.  
1978 *Produire ou reproduire? Une sociologie de la vie quotidienne*. Brussels: Editions Vie Ouv-riere.
- Rodríguez, J.A.  
1991 “Nuevas tendencias en la investigación sociológica,” *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 56: 203-217.
- Rodríguez Ibáñez, J.E.  
1992 “Un antiguo chico de provincias llamado Pierre Bourdieu.” *Revista de Occidente* 137: 183-187.  
2004 “Epílogo.” *Política y Sociedad* 1: 201.
- Rodríguez López, J.  
2002 *Pierre Bourdieu. Sociología y subversión*. Madrid: La Piqueta.
- Rodríguez Morató, A.  
2006 “Spanish Academic Publishing in Sociology: A Critical View.” *International Sociology* 21: 335-348.

Rodríguez Victoriano, J.M.

2004 “El oficio de la reflexividad. Notas en torno a Pierre Bourdieu y la tradición cualitativa en la sociología crítica española.” Pp. 299-316 in *Pierre Bourdieu, las herramientas del sociólogo*, edited by L.E. Alonso, E. Martín Criado and J.L. Moreno Pestaña. Madrid: Fundamentos.

Rodríguez-González, J.

1993 “Lo social y su aprendizaje en la obra de Leopold von Wiese.” *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas* 64: 223-246.

Sánchez de Horcajo, J.J.

1979 *La cultura: reproducción o cambio. El análisis sociológico de P. Bourdieu*. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.

Sánchez Horcajo, J.J. et al.

1997 *Sociología del arte. Los museos madrileños y su público*. Madrid: Libertarias-Prodhufi.

Subirats, M., and Tomé, A.

2007 *Balones fuera: reconstruir los espacios desde la coeducación*. Barcelona: Octaedro.

Varela, J.

1992 “La Sociología Francesa de la Educación. Modelos de Análisis.” In *Manual de Sociología de la Educación*, edited by F. Ortega, E. González García, A. Guerrero and M. Eduvigis Sánchez. Madrid: Visor.

Vázquez García, F.

2002 *Bourdieu. La sociología como crítica de la razón*. Barcelona: Montesinos.

## The Spanish Sociological Field as Seen Through Bourdieu

---

**Abstract:** This paper analyses the use that has been made of Bourdieu's work by Spanish sociology. In order to do this the wake left by the translations of Bourdieu has been followed, particularly the main references to him to be found in monographs and the most important journals of sociology as well as the translations and references that were initially part of the process of institutionalising the discipline in Spain. An analysis that is based on the concepts contributed by Bourdieu himself, such as the concepts of field or symbolic dividends. The paper highlights the fact that it is the structure and the dynamics of the sociological field that explains the way that Bourdieu's work was accepted and used by sociology in Spain. A dynamism that was conscious of the support professed for him by certain positions in the field, to such an extent that it converted Bourdieu into a canon of sociology, into a way of *behaving* in sociology but at the same time conscious of the rejection and criticism coming from other positions.

---

*Keywords: intellectual field, sociology of sociology, institutionalisation of sociology, reflexivity, sociological canon.*

---

**Javier Callejo** holds a PhD in Sociology as well as having a degree in Sociology and Journalism from the Complutense University, Madrid. From 1983 to 1985 he took doctoral courses with Professor Jesús Ibáñez, who was mainly responsible for introducing French intellectual output (Deleuze, Foucault, Lacan, Barthes and, of course, Bourdieu) into Spanish sociology. After a period as a private researcher from 1988 to 1992 in the areas of the sociology of consumption and communication, he obtained his PhD with a thesis on the acceptance of television, published as *The Active Audience (La audiencia activa*, Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas, 1995). He has published various works on qualitative methodology and the media. He is currently a lecturer in sociology at the UNED (Distance Learning University), Madrid.