

PIERRE-FELIX BOURDIEU'S PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS IN LITERARY STUDIES

Melania Shinta Harendika

harendika@gmail.com
Universitas Gadjah Mada, Universitas Brawijaya
Yogyakarta, Malang, Indonesia

Abstract: The concepts of Pierre-Felix Bourdieu regarding capital, habitus, and fields are often found in literary studies. However, only a few studies examine the basic assumptions behind these concepts. This study discusses Bourdieu's assumptions about individuals, society, authors, literary works, and literary studies to be accepted entirely. This study adopts the perspective put forward by Ahimsa-Putra. A literature review, used as a research method, helps the author describe these basic assumptions comprehensively. This study reveals that individuals have strengths and perspectives that determine their strategy in social life. This strategy is required to survive because Bourdieu said society is a game. In this case, the game also influences literary works. Bourdieu created two poles: autonomous and heteronomous between intellectuals and authors. Therefore, the literature study requires in-depth observation methods to describe it clearly.

Keywords: concept; perspective; habitus; field; Bourdieu; literature

INTRODUCTION

Pierre-Felix Bourdieu is a renowned French philosopher, sociologist, and anthropologist of the second half of the 20th century. In his debut in the 1960s, Bourdieu offered various perspectives on the development of humanities studies until he died in 2002. Regarding literary studies, he introduced several concepts that became critical subjects in his thought, including capital, habitus, and field, later known as the formula $[(\text{habitus})(\text{capital})] + \text{area} = \text{practice}$ (Ahearne & Speller, 2012; Bourdieu & Znaniecki, 1968; Harker et al., 2009; Speller, 2011). These concepts do not stand alone but intertwine with symbolic violence, doxa, and ministry concepts (Boschetti, 2006; Hurtado, 2010; Takwin, 2009).

After Bourdieu's debut, it took about 20 years for his studies to be global, until in the 1980s, his thoughts became the most widely referenced by US researchers and made him a well-known French social scientist (Eastwood, 2007; Sallaz & Zavisca, 2007). It indicated that his concept could answer problems related to

generally sociocultural sciences and particularly literature. He came up with these concepts with a philosophical basis behind his thinking. This philosophical foundation is a basic assumption defined by Ahimsa-Putra (2009) as "a view of something (an object, knowledge, goal of a scientific discipline, Etc.) whose truth is not questionable or accepted".

Many studies explored Bourdieu's thoughts and theories. Krisdinanto (2014) stated that practice based on Bourdieu's thinking refers to the product of habitus and domain relations about stakes, strengths, people with capital, and people who do not have. In his research, he wrote that Bourdieu criticized and considered the atmosphere of social science as an effect of the polarization between objectivity and subjectivity as flawed. Thus, the concept of a generative formulation of social practice emerged. He concluded that a person's personality is formed and forms a structure that underlies and operates in a field.

Siregar (2016) conducted a study about the mixed theory of Bourdieu. Siregar

explained that the structure or rules influenced a subject in daily life. It is the result of structural internalization of the social world. This theory became one of Bourdieu's famous theories. Another study that used this theory is Farid (2021). Farid studied the implementation of Bourdieu's thought to protect cultural heritage in a district in Central Java. He revealed how the agreed norms and values to save the legacy of Sunan Muria. He concluded that there was a positive domain aspect, the doxa of an internal philosophy that raises tradition with cultural awareness. It made the social life of the Piji Wetan Culture village community prosperous and minimal inequalities due to the *handarbeni* attitude to care for traditions and life together.

Bourdieu has put forward many theories and views that have become a reference for researchers in developing or studying a problem. All these things he got with the much effort he has put through his life. He was born on August 1, 1930, in the village of Denguin, Pyrenees Atlantiques district in southwest France. His father was a rural postal worker, and his grandfather was a sharecropper (Sallaz & Zavisca, 2007; Speller, 2011). His first high school was in Pau, and halfway through his studies, he transferred to *Louis-le-Grand* Middle School in Paris (Speller, 2011). After graduating, he was accepted into the *Ecole Normale Supérieure* and became a classmate of Jacques Derrida. In higher education, he began studying philosophy with Louis Althusser (Harker et al., 2009).

Bourdieu became a high school teacher in Moulins in 1955. After that, he joined the army for military service and placed in Algeria for two years. Bourdieu taught at the University of Algeria in 1958 after his military assistance. During his stay, he was interested in studying the clash between Algerian society and French colonialism. It was written in the book *Sociologie de l'Algerie* (Sallaz & Zavisca, 2007). In 1960, Bourdieu returned to Paris and taught at the University of Paris from 1962 to 1964 and at the University of Lille in the same year. He joined the *Ecoles des Hautes Etudes en Science Sociales* and founded the Center for Sociology of Education and Culture in 1964. Moreover, in 1968, Bourdieu became the director of the *Center de Sociologie Européenne* (Speller, 2011). His academic writing career matured in 1975. He launched

the journal *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, which he co-authored with Luc Boltanski (Speller, 2011).

Many experiences gave Bourdieu the sensitivity to observe the power of social structures and social changes that occur in society and immortalize them in his research and writing (Sallaz & Zavisca, 2007). Bourdieu was also a political activist. In 1989, he presented his ideas in Turin as the beginning of his political activities (Speller, 2011). Then, in 1990, Bourdieu joined several activities outside the academic environment. In 1996, he co-founded the publishing company *Liber' Raisons d'Agir*. In the same year, his study entitled *Television* became one of the most controversial studies because he conveyed his criticism of television programs that not only report realities that exist in daily life but construct reality by adjusting the publication needs (2001). He did not only point out in publication but also the academic system.

In the education sector, he concerned many things, such as students should not only passively receive knowledge in the classroom but also obtain exercise as creators or inventors through logic, experimentation, discovery, practice, and theory (Bourdieu, 2007). Then, it became a reference throughout the world. In addition, he also conveyed scathing criticism of the world of education by stating that schools became a place in the reproduction of social inequality (Harker, 2009). He argued that the culture embraced by the dominant group has the power to dominate the economic, social, and political resources prevailing in society (Bourdieu, 1984). As a result, students become more similar despite their diverse backgrounds. Thus, power dominated small groups. He named a symbolic power as social inequality reproduction (Harker, 2009). Bourdieu died at 71 due to cancer on January 23, 2002, at Saint-Antoine Paris Hospital (Harker et al., 2009; Sallaz & Zavisca, 2007; Speller, 2011). After his death, his thoughts are still a reference for other scientists today. It is due to the many works he produced before he died.

Literary production particularly attracted Bourdieu's attention. In Europe, especially France, where Bourdieu lived, authors had prestige guaranteed by various institutions (Dubois, 2000). In the French tradition, the most prestigious intellectual

figures were not academics or scientists but authors of literary works (Boschetti, 2006). Bourdieu studied occurred events in France in the 19th century and wrote about them in his book, *The Rules of Art*. The book underlined the situation in France at the end of the 19th century and introduced the concept of autonomy as opposed to the heteronomous field (Boschetti, 2006).

Bourdieu's attention to literary production stemmed from the basic assumptions that underlie it. According to Cuff and Payne in Ahimsa-Putra (2008), in sociocultural science, a perspective refers to its assumptions about the object, problem, concepts, methods, and theories. This study will focus on the basic assumptions of Pierre-Felix Bourdieu regarding literary studies.

According to Ahimsa-Putra (2009), the basic assumptions are similar to the scientists' ideology and form the basis of a frame of mind. The essential basic assumptions are usually related to the nature of science, sociocultural science, and sociocultural phenomena. Bourdieu's basic assumptions about individuals, society, literary works, and authors arose from beliefs that literary works were born from the thoughts of the authors who were a part of society.

This study is a literature review to describe the philosophical basis of Pierre-Felix Bourdieu in literary studies. This study contains various literature sources, such as books and journals about Bourdieu's concept in literary studies. Then, the researcher analyzed these sources using a systematic study method by observing and recording how philosophical basis emerged and influenced literary studies and conveyed the results to fulfill the primary objective of writing this study: to discuss Bourdieu's philosophical basis in literary studies. The researcher will discuss the Ahimsa-Putra paradigm concept and describes Bourdieu's views on individuals, society, literary works, and authors.

BOURDIEU'S VIEW ON THE INDIVIDUALS

Each Individual Has Different Strengths

According to Bourdieu, individuals in society have different strengths. No individual has the same strength as other individuals. This argument is the difference between one

individual and another. The position of an individual lies in the social space, which is not only determined by class but also by the amount of capital. Moreover, social class is not specified solely by gender, origin, ethnicity, income, or education level but constructed by the structure of relationships among them (Bourdieu, 1984). Bourdieu divides this strength with the terminology or the concept of capital into several categories, including economic, cultural, and social (Bourdieu, 1989; Hurtado, 2010; Sallaz & Zavisca, 2007).

Economic, cultural, and social capital distinguish individuals in society. Economic capital consists of financial income, wealth, and ownership of productive assets. Besides, there is cultural and social capital. Cultural capital refers to formal certificates from educational institutions and cultural goods holding. Meanwhile, social capital is a network in which a person can mobilize power and resources, such as prestige, status, and authority. Social capital can also mean mobility through connections, social networks, and membership in certain groups, as well as symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1989; Peillon, 1998; Sallaz & Zavisca, 2007).

In essence, all capital is a resource that can produce power. With different strengths, each individual's social position would also be different. Someone with more finances will be 'stronger' than someone with less. Alternatively, someone with higher education has a higher chance of success compared to other individuals who do not have an education. For example, an author, as an individual, also has different advantages from one another. This author's capital will differentiate his position in society. With more capital will give him a better chance to survive.

Cultural Unconsciousness Influences Individuals

Bourdieu stated that every individual has a different perspective in responding to social phenomena that exist in society. This perspective emerges when individuals are born and internalize information from things around them, such as family, school, or other environments (Bourdieu, 1989; Dubois, 2000). It is passed down from generation to generation and enters the body and mind of the individual unconsciously. It shapes the

way the individual thinks and acts. Bourdieu calls this perspective 'habitus'. The habitus of each individual is different, depending on the socioeconomic or structural position that influences the individual (Bourdieu & Zanotti-Karp, 1968). Thus, habitus is a subjective structure formed from individual experiences related to other individuals in a social space unconsciously internalized. This habitus is not natural or genetically carried since individuals are born into the world but the result of historical influences that are considered natural (Bourdieu, 1985; Takwin, 2009). Hence, this habitus is a cognitive structure that mediates between individuals and social reality. Throughout their life, human has a set of internalized schemes. Through these schemes, they see, appreciate, understand, and evaluate social reality (Bourdieu, 1989; Takwin, 2009). In the internalization process, habitus takes a long time to change one's life (Mahar et al., 2009).

This concept helps to understand the form of individual orientation (Eastwood, 2007) because habitus greatly influences cultural consumption patterns, practices, strategies, and choices. This perspective will determine how a person can survive social phenomena. As stated by Bourdieu, habitus is also a weapon for survival in games that exist in society (Dubois, 2000; Sallaz & Zavisca, 2007). Bourdieu's basic assumptions regarding individual perspectives were needed to understand how the author sees and responds to social phenomena in literary studies. In addition, the concept of habitus is to obtain a comprehensive view of the cultural unconscious inherent in literary works.

Each Individual Needs a Strategy

Each individual needs a strategy to maintain and improve their position in dealing with social phenomena (Bourdieu, 1989; Mahar et al., 2009). This strategy relates to the perspective of each individual. In addition, this strategy can also be influenced by creativity and improvisation (Hurtado, 2010) because of the social symptoms faced by individuals not encountered before and who do not have the proper perspective to deal with them. An individual needs creativity or improvisation as maneuverability to deal with this social phenomenon. Therefore, capital and habitus correlate with a strategy to deal with social

phenomena. If someone has power or capital but needs a proper perspective on social phenomena, they cannot formulate a strategy to deal with it.

The basic assumptions in this literary study are the basis for researchers to realize that creative writing results from interactions between capital and habitus through specific strategies. Hence, it is significant for placing agents in society. If the agent implements it well, the agent can survive in art. Strategies between agents can be different depending on agent creativity related to various factors. In the creative field, an agent must be varied. To attract public intention, he must think and act differently to produce works of art that are new and different from previous products.

BOURDIEU'S VIEW ON SOCIETY

Society is a Game that Has Rules and Values

Society consists of individuals called 'agents.' Each of these agents has a course of action that he chooses due to the interplay between strengths, perspectives, and strategies. In addition to being influenced by internal factors, external pressures also influence individuals. Thus, no individual acts without consideration arising from circumstances outside.

Using this basic assumption, Bourdieu analogized society to a game with rules and values (Bourdieu, 1990; Sallaz & Zavisca, 2007). This basic assumption inspired Bourdieu to create a concept known as the 'field.' In the game analogy, he stated that every individual or agent in society must have a "sense of the game" (Bourdieu, 1990; King, 2016) since every community consists of various fields with their structures and strengths placed in different fields. Therefore, a society has several fields based on their interests, such as economics, politics, education, and others, with different rules. Bourdieu considered this field as a game. There are bets in power involved in the game that requires different strategies from one field to another according to the needs (Bourdieu, 1990). Consequently, all sociocultural phenomena are a form of struggle for capital (Takwin, 2009). In this competition, there is an interaction between individuals and a dialectical process between structures where individuals unconsciously internalize their goals related to social

conditions that rise to the right feeling (King, 2016). This process instinctively occurs because individuals are controlled unconsciously in realizing their social strategies (Bourdieu, 1989).

Considering that society is a game field, a researcher should have the sensitivity to contemplate that an author of a literary work must do his best to win the game by practicing his habitus, capital, and strategy. A successful author who survives with his literary works proves that he, as an agent, can play well in writing creatively. Still, a researcher must also consider that this does not mean that if the agent has the best strategy, the agent can achieve the best results. According to Bourdieu, external factors also significantly influence the results action of the agent. A researcher should also analyze these conditions that determine the failure or success of an agent in this game of creative writing based on the rules.

The Society Produces Classifications and Differences

People who mobilize relevant resources can participate in this field. However, it is often found an unfair distribution of capital (Peillon, 1998). In addition, everyone should realize that each individual has a position in a field (Bourdieu, 1990) determined by the type and amount of capital owned. This position also directs the strategy or way of playing each individual or agent involved and is influenced by external factors through habitus (Bourdieu & Zanutti-Karp, 1968; Peillon, 1998). Society continuously produces forms of classification and differences translated as domination. The domination-related characteristics generally have a basis in economic activity but then develop into a symbolic stage (Dubois, 2000). The classification and differences in society are affected by differences in capital owned by each individual. In this case, it concluded that capital is the basis of domination (Bourdieu, 1989; Eastwood, 2007; Mahar et al., 2009; Takwin, 2009). It raises the existence of differences in the class of each individual.

However, a class transfer is still possible; for example, a person has a property that causes him to change class position or special qualifications that allow the class to change. This movement could have occurred

towards a better social class or vice versa. This intersection is called a trajectory (Bourdieu, 1984). These basic assumptions about domination and trajectory are critical in literary studies because specific literary genres, certain authors, or certain literary communities dominate the field of literature in this world. Consequently, by understanding this basic assumption, the researcher will put the position correctly as an observer of domination and trajectory in literary works.

BOURDIEU'S VIEW ON LITERARY WORKS Literary Works Influence and Are Influenced by Society

Bourdieu analogized literature as a nebula in space that influences and is influenced by the social conditions of society. Although literature is only a tiny part of society, literature can represent what is happening (Bourdieu, 1983, 1984). In literature, there are also functions and rules. Thus, the practice of literature is an action that has meaning in its interaction with the actor. In the study of literary works, this basic assumption makes researchers aware that the rules that exist in society are also related to the literary works they produce.

Literary Works Have Similarities with Scientific Works

In Bourdieu's study entitled *La Regle de L'art*, he introduced a complete method of literary analysis which was widely debated by academics and authors because he placed literary texts on a par with scientific texts. Most authors considered that Bourdieu's argument tarnishes the sacredness of literary texts (Speller, 2011). The similarity between literary texts and scientific texts, according to Bourdieu, is that scientific texts and literary texts imitate social and psychological structures originating from the experiences of daily human life. Literary texts do not merely refer to the reality of human life and are often the opposite of real life. On the other hand, scientific texts represent the existing reality accurately. However, according to Bourdieu (Speller, 2011), this literary text can describe the social structure uniquely. Bourdieu's opinion drew criticism from the authors because he was considered not to know the artistic value of literary works. Nevertheless, Bourdieu emphatically stated that the purpose

of this opinion was not to damage the artistic value of literary works and bother literary connoisseurs but to understand the position of literature in society (Speller, 2011).

BOURDIEU'S VIEW ON AUTHORS

The Author Wants Symbolic Gain

The basic assumption that an author wants symbolic gain is closely related to the notion that society is a game. In a game, the author, as one of the players, certainly wants to win. Bourdieu called it a symbolic advantage (Bourdieu, 1989). Besides, Bourdieu stated that literary activity is also a field for power struggles to control resources as in other social phenomena (Sallaz & Zavisca, 2007). He believed there is a relationship between agents or institutions with the capital needed to occupy a dominant position (Speller, 2011). The assumption is necessary for someone who will conduct a literary study. For example, the author targets symbolic advantages. Consequently, he wants to influence many people or express certain things through his writing.

The Author Needs Strategy and Strength to Survive

Bourdieu believed that an author or creator of works of art needs strength to survive because he is part of society. In a literary battle, an author as an individual needs to have capital that is measurable from (i) The ability of the author to survive or ignore external demands such as religion, politics, or commercials; and (ii) The ability of the author to convey his norms and values (e. g truth, justice, beauty, idealism, Etc.). Therefore, the author is free to exert all these capabilities. It is also related to the rules in the society where he lives. This basic assumption directs sensitivity in literary works to the author's power to produce such a way by strategies.

An author needs a strategy in writing literature because writing literature is part of a social activity that contains the meaning of confrontation and agreement (Bourdieu, 1989). Literary authors must use tricks to ensure their supremacy or career continuity (Dubois, 2000). This basic assumption regarding the author's strategy is very helpful in literary studies to examine the writing

process and realize this process as a response and way for every social phenomenon.

The Author Has Two Poles: Autonomous or Heteronomous

There are two types of authors: autonomous and heteronomous. The history of literature in France influenced Bourdieu's thoughts on autonomous and heteronomous. In the history of literature in France, literary power is a long process of accumulation of symbolic capital divided into three phases (Bourdieu, 1989). In these phases, there were changes in the realm of power, especially in literature. The first phase was the phase in which the evolution of world literature emerged, namely before 1830. In this phase, literary works became the pride of society. Society assumed authors were independent if they had lovers. His literary works were widely published and read by the public. This condition resulted in competition between the authors. The competition motivated them to use a variety of writing styles to attract broader public interest and earn recognition from their lovers. This phase evoked competition for rules and standards because more authors appeared with different streams and wanted public recognition.

The second phase was when literary authors compared art and money. In this phase, mental structures and principles were growing. This phase took place in France from 1830 to 1880. In this phase, the author of literary works became a profession and did not only write for pleasure but also as a livelihood. Each author had lovers. It also sparked a group of readers who ruthlessly criticized a work that did not meet their expectations. As a result, an author produced a literary work following the demands of society as the market. Ultimately, the author needed clarification on originality and independence (Speller, 2011). As time flew, the author entered the third phase. The author restarted to be open and less rigid toward the commercialization of literature (Speller, 2011).

These phases showed that the realm of power in literary works is flexible and can change along with developments, the demands of the times, and the conditions of society that prevailed at that time. Literature is a symbolic capital. There will be a

celebration when an author succeeds. For example, when many people read a literary work, it will be a tribute to the author. In addition, recognition and discussions can strengthen the symbolic capital of an author. This accomplishment became a positive representation in the world of literature and made them strong in the realm of power because of the recognition they received (Speller, 2011). Apart from these phases, Bourdieu's understanding of autonomy and heteronomy was affected by Gustave Flaubert.

Flaubert conveyed the concept of social space in creating a power field (Bourdieu, 1989; Eastwood, 2007). Flaubert was one of Bourdieu's idols and an example of the purity of an author because he was very dedicated to writing. He decided not to marry and spent his entire life writing. In addition, he is known as a perfectionist (Speller, 2011). Learning from Flaubert, Bourdieu believed that the artistic value of someone's writing depends on how long it takes to write. This understanding was quite naive and not entirely correct because all works of art can last a long time, and the duration of works of art is only sometimes proportional to how the objects of art are produced (Speller, 2011).

Many things influenced Bourdieu in understanding the author's autonomy and heteronomy. Bourdieu divided it into two poles of literary authors. The first pole is the 'best seller' authors, also called by Bourdieu 'heteronomous.' The success of the author category is the number of books sold and the popularity of the work they produce. The more books sold, the more popular the literary work was. The more popular the work was, the more influential the ideas spread through the work will be. Therefore, according to Bourdieu, authors from this pole have the advantage of influencing society because of their popularity and being the center of literary text standards. The dominant position at this pole is the author serving the dominant fixation of the public and receiving financial rewards.

Meanwhile, at the other pole, they are referred to as 'pure authors' or 'autonomous' authors who do not care about the judgment of anyone other than their colleagues in their community. Bourdieu refers to them as actual authors or 'ordained authors' because their primary purpose was simply to write.

Although these sacred authors are less famous than best-selling authors, they do not depend on new norms and literature trends, despite their financial and commercial implications (Speller, 2011).

The Author Can Be Influenced by the Threat of Market Demand

In the concept of autonomy, Bourdieu observed that popularity, market demand, and financial gain can threaten the purity of literary works. Besides that, another threat is the emergence of homogeneity of cultural products, one of which is uniform television programs that are only to satisfy market tastes. To anticipate this, Bourdieu recommended to the state that works of art and culture not only need a market but that the state can be present to meet the needs of cultural actors through facilities that everyone can access freely.

BOURDIEU'S VIEW ON LITERARY AND CULTURAL STUDIES

Literary and Cultural Studies Require In-Depth Observation Methods

Literature and culture are challenges from a sociological perspective based on existing concepts. For example, the study of cultural sociology examines the production process but has yet to discuss how society receives literary work and the literary work contributes value. Thus, Bourdieu said that literary theory needs development to overcome the limitations of existing theories. In addition, Bourdieu emphasized that cultural phenomena were products of society. Hence, in studying it, everyone has to pay attention to the relationship between individuals as part of the cultural society. The meaning and function of this relationship are affected by the condition and social class position of the individuals involved in cultural phenomena (Bourdieu & Zanotti-Karp, 1968; Speller, 2011).

Bourdieu stated that studying cultural phenomena such as language, myths, rituals, and social formations can lead to different interpretations. Tradition and the experience of observers greatly influenced this interpretation. The true meaning of a cultural phenomenon can be concealed. Therefore, authors need an accurate observation method so that reading these cultural phenomena can

produce a valid interpretation (Bourdieu & Zanotti-Karp, 1968). In interpreting cultural phenomena, authors cannot simply present statistical evidence because various facts determine the validity of cultural phenomena. Therefore, theories, facts, and experiences are necessary to analyze the structure of symbols in cultural phenomena. A suitable hypothesis is required to study these social objects and conditions because each social circumstance represents a conscious or unconscious value associated with the social order.

Literary Studies Need to Observe the Workspace, the Space of Possibility, and the Space of World Literature

Furthermore, researchers of literary works who want to use Bourdieu's concept of thought should understand the workspace, the space for possibilities, and the space for world literature. An author has a workspace to produce literary works. Literary works are a social expression intertwined with the author's life history. Therefore, researchers need to study both of these things. The researchers can discover what makes the work important by identifying the social and historical position of the author. Besides, we can also obey the basic action patterns resulting from the author's habitus. The action results of social history conveyed the space of possibilities. In studying the workspace of a literary author, a researcher needs to read the author's biography, which is necessary to comprehend a literary production to see the logical process behind the subject's actions in a field (Bourdieu, 1990; Dubois, 2000).

In the space of possibility, the text is considered a compromising formation produced by the configuration of social power and its relationship with the author. Bourdieu stated that this possibility space is the things carried out in a literary work. For example, literary works are a response to social life. Thus, researchers in the field of literature must be able to develop sensitivity to the process of writing and the possibilities that arise. The possibility space underlines the production of texts that go through several process stages. An author involves the act of choice and reflects on the style and habitus that will become the identity and characteristics of an author in the space of

possibility. Bourdieu termed these choices as a possibility space (Dubois, 2000).

The last space is the space for world literature. In one of Bourdieu's studies, he compared French and Belgian literature. Bourdieu concluded something quite controversial and surprising: Belgian literature never existed. According to his research, Belgian literature has many similarities with French literature characteristics. Therefore, he said that Belgian literature is a sub of French literature. Bourdieu said that studying literature and the influence of literary culture across countries is very important. Cultural influences will determine the author's perceptions and strategies. It will form different spaces. These spaces are social spaces consisting of interrelated domains. To understand this space, a researcher needs to make empirical observations (Mahar et al., 2009).

CONCLUSION

There still needs to be more research discussing Bourdieu's basic assumptions regarding literary studies. Thus, this study is an applicable reference for researchers. Bourdieu argued that each individual has strengths and points of view that influence his strategy to become the basis for thinking of literary researchers to be detached from within the shell of only discussing the author and his work but also analyzing interrelated factors, both inside and outside the author. Therefore, the sensitivity of researchers is required to underline. Realizing that each actor has various strengths requires literary researchers to have sensitivity in examining the stakes of capital in literary production and studying significant modals. It aims to maintain the authors' position and works in literacy and society. Culture and literary works are helpful as guides to identify and understand conflicts and various interests related to literary works production. The novelty of Bourdieu's thought is a social structure that instills a mental structure in each individual. It reproduces and changes social structures (Sallaz & Zavisca, 2007).

The purpose of the method established by Bourdieu is to relate the analysis of literary texts both at the internal and external levels. Bourdieu realized that the problem of methodology is controlling for subjective

biases in the production of knowledge. In this 'field' concept, observation and empirical data will help to internalize the data, which be processed in practice. Bourdieu humbly said that he accepted his theory to be improved and developed (Boschetti, 2006).

Bourdieu's recommendation has equipped researchers who will study virtual literary communities, especially authors. Bourdieu's basic assumptions about literature will help the author comprehend the habitus practiced by the community members. In addition, the perspective offered by Bourdieu will help the author examine the struggle for capital between agents in the community and the strategies carried out by the community to maintain its existence in the field of Indonesian literature. Due to the limitations, the researcher only explicitly studies some of what Bourdieu discloses in his books. In some of his writings, the researcher found that Bourdieu also discussed several things that

the researcher had not provided in this study because of Bourdieu's broad views. The researcher can only convey some of them in one study. Therefore, the researcher suggests that further researchers examine Bourdieu's perspective regarding the law of reciprocity that influences the dynamics of literature in Indonesia.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This paper is a paper in the Philosophy and Paradigms of Humanities course taken by the author in the Doctoral Program in Humanities Sciences, Gadjah Mada University, which Pusat Layanan Pembiayaan Pendidikan Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset dan Teknologi and Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan funded. This paper is part of the author's dissertation with Dr. Aprinus Salam, M. Hum. as the Promotor, and Dr. Sudibyo, M. Hum. as the Co-Promotor.

REFERENCES

- Ahearne, J., & Speller, J. (2012). Introduction: Bourdieu and the literary field. *Paragraph* 35(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3366/para.2012.0038>
- Ahimsa-Putra, H. S. (2008). Paradigma Dan Revolusi Ilmu Dalam Antropologi Budaya - Sketsa Beberapa Episode -. *Speech in Professor Inauguration in Faculty of Cultural Science Gadjah Mada University, Delivered in Open Meeting of Professor Gajah Mada University*, 1–26.
- Ahimsa-Putra, H. S. (2009). *Paradigma Ilmu Sosial-Budaya (Sebuah Pandangan)*.
- Boschetti, A. (2006). Bourdieu's Work on Literature: Contexts, Stakes and Perspectives. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 23(6), 135–155. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276406069779>
- Bourdieu, P. (1983). The field of cultural production, or: The economic world reversed. *Poetics*, 12(4–5), pp. 311–356. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-422X\(83\)90012-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-422X(83)90012-8)
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (Translated by Richard Nice). In *Harvard University Press*. Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985). *The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups Author (s): Pierre Bourdieu Published by : Springer*. 14(6), 723–744.
- Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social Space and Symbolic Power. *Sociological Theory*, 7(1), 14–25.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). The Scholastic Point of View. *Cultural Anthropology*, 5(4), 380–391.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). Television. *European Review*, 9(3), 245–256. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1017/S108933260000303X>

- Bourdieu, P. (2007). The Role of Intellectuals Today. *Theoria*, 49(99), 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.3167/004058102782485466>
- Bourdieu, P., & Znaniecki, R. (1968). STRUCTURALISM AND THEORY OF SOCIOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE. *Social Research*, 35(4), 681–706.
- Dubois, J. (2000). Pierre Bourdieu and Literature. *Substance*, 29(3), 84–102.
- Eastwood, J. (2007). Bourdieu, Flaubert, and the Sociology of Literature. *Sociological Theory*, 25(2), 149–169.
- Farid, M. (2021). *Implementasi Teori Bourdieu dalam Upaya Menjaga Warisan Budaya Sunan Muria pada Masyarakat Piji Wetan Desa Lau Kabupaten Kudus*. Jurnal Penelitian. Vol. 15
- Harker, R. (2009). Bourdieu-Pendidikan dan Reproduksi. In R. Harker, C. Mahar, & C. Wilkes (Eds.), *(HabitusxModal)+Ranah=Praktik: Pengantar Paling Komprehensif kepada Pemikiran Pierre Bourdieu* (pp. 109–138). Jalasutra.
- Harker, R., Mahar, C., & Wilkes, C. (Eds.). (2009). *(Habitus x Modal) + Ranah = Praktik: Pengantar Paling Komprehensif kepada Pemikiran Pierre Bourdieu*. Jalasutra.
- Hurtado, P. S. (2010). Assessing the use of Bourdieu's key concepts in the strategy-as-practice field. *Competitiveness Review*, 20(1), 52–61. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10595421011019975>
- King, A. (2016). Thinking with Bourdieu against Bourdieu : A 'Practical' Critique of the Habitus. *American Sociological Association*, 18(3), 417–433.
- Krisdinanto, N. (2014). Pierre Bourdieu, Sang Juru Damai. *KANAL: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 2(2), 189-206.
- Mahar, C., Harker, R., & Wilkes, C. (2009). Posisi Teoretis Dasar. In R. Harker, C. Mahar, & C. Wilkes (Eds.), *(HabitusxModal)+Ranah=Praktik: Pengantar Paling Komprehensif kepada Pemikiran Pierre Bourdieu* (pp. 1–32). Jalasutra.
- Peillon, M. (1998). Bourdieu's field and the sociology of welfare. *Journal of Social Policy*, 27(2), 213–229. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047279498005273>
- Sallaz, J. J., & Zavisca, J. (2007). Bourdieu in American sociology, 1980-2004. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 33, 21–41. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.33.040406.131627>
- Siregar, M. (2016). Teori “Gado-gado” Pierre-Felix Bourdieu. *An1image Jurnal Studi Kultural*, 1, 84-87.
- Speller, J. R. W. (2011). *Bourdieu and Literature*. Open Book Publishers.
- Takwin, B. (2009). Proyek Intelektual Pierre Bourdieu: Melacak Asal-usul Masyarakat, Melampaui Oposisi Biner dalam Ilmu Sosial. In R. Harker, C. Mahar, & C. Wilkes (Eds.), *(HabitusxModal)+Ranah=Praktik: Pengantar Paling Komprehensif kepada Pemikiran Pierre Bourdieu* (pp. xv–xxv). Jalasutra.