

Masculine domination: investing in gender?

Article (Published Version)

Ashall, Wendy (2004) Masculine domination: investing in gender? *Studies in Social and Political Thought* (9). pp. 21-39. ISSN 2398-3884

This version is available from Sussex Research Online: <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/id/eprint/91979/>

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies and may differ from the published version or from the version of record. If you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the URL above for details on accessing the published version.

Copyright and reuse:

Sussex Research Online is a digital repository of the research output of the University.

Copyright and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable, the material made available in SRO has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Masculine Domination: Investing in Gender?

Wendy Ashall

Abstract

It is my intention in this article to investigate whether Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital, as outlined in *Masculine Domination*, can be said to adequately account for the subordinate position of women and the perpetuation of masculine domination as evidenced in education and the workplace. I will argue that the 'gendered habitus', as outlined by Bourdieu (1930-2002) in *Masculine Domination*, successfully addresses the inferior status of women, providing a useful tool for the analysis of the unequal power relations between the sexes. Further, I will show that Bourdieu's theory of cultural capital may explain why women so often appear to collude in their own subordination; why girls still appear to favour the more 'traditionally feminine' subjects at school and later university, leading them to eventually enter 'traditional' jobs which are invariably of lower status.

It is my contention that it would be more helpful to think about gender as central to habitus and as a form of cultural capital. An understanding of both feminine and masculine habitus, and the symbolic and economic rewards that these do or do not bring, helps us to understand the persistence of gender inequality in contemporary societies. Despite second wave feminisms' assertion that capitalism is gendered (Gottfried, 1998:451), we have some way to go before competently theorising the interplay between class and gender. I have previously argued (Ashall, 1999) that we should seek to study 'gender capital'; parallel concepts such as 'race capital' are also now called for (McRobbie, 2002; Moi 2000). Here I return to this argument following the publication, in English, of *Masculine Domination*. Though Bourdieu says little that is new here (Jenkins, 2002:xi), this book represents the mature embodiment of his thought on gender as the fundamental symbolic classification, the model of social division.

1. First, I will briefly outline Bourdieu's theory, contextualising it in the Marxist and structuralist thought from which it emerged, and then outline the adoption of Bourdieuan theory by, and similarity with, aspects of feminist thought.

2. Next, I will outline the use of 'capital', as discussed by Marx and Bourdieu.

3. Finally I will outline what modifications would enable such theorisation to better explain the persistence of the gender hierarchy.

1. Bourdieu, Class Analysis, Feminisms

Pierre Bourdieu may be regarded as one of the most influential sociologists in recent years; his texts have been widely discussed, dismissed, deconstructed and critiqued. His theory of cultural capital sought to explain the persistence of class inequality, as exemplified by unequal levels of scholastic achievement, arguing that this inequity was due to the education system itself (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1998). He criticised the assumption that unequal achievement was the result of difference in 'natural' ability, believing instead that '...the scholastic yield from educational action depends on the Cultural Capital previously invested by the family' (Bourdieu, 1986b:244).¹

Bourdieu's theory has several key concepts: the different forms of capital 'Cultural, Symbolic, Economic and Social' and the concepts of the 'field', 'symbolic violence' and 'habitus'. Bourdieu described the three forms of cultural capital as 'Embodied',² 'Objectified'³ and 'Institutionalised'.⁴ However, such a form of analysis is problematic, for by prioritising class as the central feature of society one invariably obscures other key factors, such as gender, age and ethnicity. Yet gender is central to Bourdieu's argument; he sought to overturn Levi-Strauss' conception of gender as the fundamental symbolic binary opposition (Levi-Strauss, 1949:24-25), turning the idealist theory into a materialist schema (Bourdieu, 2001:34) in a way not dissimilar to Marx's treatment of Hegel (Jenkins, 2002:37). Further, many feminists have sought to 'appropriate' (Moi, 2000) Bourdieu's theory to explain the subordinate position of women in contemporary western societies, and there are certain affinities between the two schools of thought.

Bourdieu believed that the point of social research was to enable people to better understand their own actions and those of others. This echoes many feminist calls for research to be an empowering process.⁵ Chyun-Fung Shi argues that feminism and Bourdieu share a common focus on body, language and social practice (Shi, 2001:55); further, both concentrate on the way the subject is embedded in power relations (McNay, 1999:111). By revealing the interplay between 'natural' and 'social' reproduction, Bourdieu may help feminism overcome the essentialist/nonessentialist divide (Moi, 2000:316).⁶ Thus, there are many overlaps between aspects of feminist thought and that of Bourdieu. The question remains, however, whether it is necessary to modify the theory to fully explain the subordinate position of women.

2. Habitus and Capital

In Bourdieu's explanation of inequality the habitus is central. The different forms of cultural capital, rooted in the possession of economic capital, interrelate to reproduce social hierarchies and conceal their arbitrary nature. A person's level of education, the cultural capital that they possess, combined with the value of the networks on which it is possible for them to draw and the amount of economic capital at their disposal, gives a person certain advantages or disadvantages that structure their possible occupation and income. Combined, the forms of capital produce a person's 'habitus' or predisposition, a set of prescribed, embodied inclinations.

Bourdieu's use of habitus thus refers to 'the durable and generalised disposition that suffuses a person's action throughout an entire domain of life' (Camic, 2000:328),⁷ reviving the usage of the term by theorists such as Weber and Durkheim (Camic: 333-345).⁸ Thus for Bourdieu, habitus refers to those dispositions that 'generate practices, perceptions and attitudes that are not consciously coordinated or governed by rules, but nonetheless are regular enough to appear consistent' (Greener, 2002:691), being both conformity with norms and their genesis (Camic, 2000:338); mediating between agency and structure as both the pretext for practice and the context for it (Ostrow, 2000:317). It is the 'original presentation of the world for a perceiving body-subject' (Ostrow, 2000: 314-317), or the 'webs of meaning, we ourselves have spun' (Geertz, 1993:5). Habitus then is both a set of embodied predispositions and the mechanism through which power relations may be 'mis-recognised' (Ostrow, 2000:312); it is 'culture' (Jenkins, 2000:151). In this way inequality appears to be naturalised; social inequalities are enacted through the gentle repetition of practice (McNay, 1999:99), shaping consciousness in a way similar to Lukes' third dimension of power.⁹

Bridget Fowler argues that Bourdieu presents us with a fixed analysis of gender domination (Fowler, 2002:2), but this impression may be exacerbated by his use of the Kabyle ethnography, as the fieldwork was conducted in the 1960s. Change is possible within Bourdieu's schema. Moi describes him as 'marxisant', as change is brought about by crises which are a matter of praxis (Moi, 2000:322); thus social change is grounded in practice. This is temporal and therefore dynamic; it is an open system allowing for social change (McNay, 1999:101). Bourdieu is therefore able to find a balance between economic determinism and the agency that is the individual's lived experience. For Bourdieu, individuals are free to make their own choices, but not in circumstances of their own choosing: the amount and quality of cultural, economic and social capital that they possess informs those choices and structures their mode of thought. Habitus is both determining and generative, by virtue of its ability to constitute the field from which it emerges (McNay, 1999:100); it is the 'feel for the game' (Bourdieu, 1990a:52) that reproduces the game.

It is the habitus that Bourdieu, correctly, considers to be gendered; arguing that gender is 'sexually characterised habitus' (Bourdieu, 2001:3), embodied in the bodily hexis (Ostrow, 2000:309). Further, he argues that this is an asymmetrical opposition (Bourdieu, 2001:27); that this is the fundamental dialectic at the heart of our classification and action in the world:

The social order functions as an immense symbolic machine tending to ratify the masculine domination on which it is founded: it is the sexual division of labour (Bourdieu, 2001:9).

Maria Mies (1998) makes a similar point, arguing that the sexual division of labour is the precursor to the capitalist division of labour. Without the division between the public and private realms, and the unpaid labour of the housewife, the free wage labourer is not 'free' to sell his labour. Indeed, she argues that the development of the classes based on appropriation is '...intrinsically interwoven with the establishment of patriarchal control over women, as the main 'producers of life' in its two aspects' (Mies, 1998:66).¹⁰ The sexual division of labour underpins the capitalist division.

Why does Bourdieu not also conceive of gender as a form of capital? His use of capital is both metaphoric and materialistic. Marx used capital to refer to dialectically linked domination and appropriation (Martin & Szélenyi,

2000:284); Bourdieu, in his definition of cultural capital, also uses the term metaphorically. However, Martin & Szélenyi appear mistaken to argue that he 'does not consider it as a source of income' (Martin & Szélenyi, 2000: 284); for Bourdieu, capital is accumulated labour and this process of accumulation takes time and further has '...a potential capacity to produce profits and to reproduce itself in identical or expanded form...' (Bourdieu, 1986b:241). It is this ability of capital to reproduce itself that leads Bourdieu to conclude that it is therefore part of the structure of society that both enables and constrains individuals' lives. For Bourdieu capital is synonymous with power (Bourdieu, 1986b:243), and, following Marx, transferable (Marx, 1867a:1); the three forms of capital are all directly and indirectly convertible both with each other (Bourdieu, 1986b:243) and with economic capital, though they are not reducible to the economic (Beasley-Murray, 2000:2). Thus cultural capital may be indirectly transferable into economic advantage: 'it [cultural capital] is in the last instance always subordinated to the logic of money capital' (Martin & Szélenyi, 2000:286). Though this may be true, it is also correct, I feel, to say that as capital is directly transferable in to economic capital, it would be better to view gender, and indeed race, as a form of capital as the benefits gender and race accrue can also be transferred indirectly into economic gain.

Mies, in her discussion of the 'housewifization' of labour, reveals the double edged nature of the capital with which a third world woman comes to the job market. On the one hand, having been defined as a house-wife by the multinationals her income is regarded as supplementary to that of her husband and so will be low, but her 'nimble fingers' do at least gain her employment whilst her partner may be forced to migrate to the city or abroad in search of work. Thus she becomes the sole 'bread-winner' on a supplementary income (Mies, 1998:118-119). Bourdieu argues that:

Economic theory has allowed to be foisted upon it [capital] a definition of the economy of practices which is the historical invention of capitalism; [...] it has implicitly defined the other forms of exchange as non-economic, and therefore disinterested (Bourdieu, 1986b:242).

By conceptualising gender as both habitus and as a form of capital one is enabled to study the non-economic or 'private' realm in terms that can explain power relations, expanding and contextualising the notion of the economic sphere and echoing many feminists' concentration on the family.

3. Gender as both Capital and Habitus

Gender cuts across all of the forms of capital as discussed by Bourdieu (Egerton, 1997:275): it informs how we all experience life and our sense of self. Our sense of gender is socially constructed and produces a gender differentiated habitus (Bourdieu, 2001:55); studies of children whose gender was 'incorrectly' assigned at birth have helped to reveal the social and cultural construction of gender identities; gender plays an important role in socialisation (Zigler et al, 1982:56); the individual internalises gender appropriate behaviour and external values (McCall, 1992:843). From nursery school onwards, children are more likely to seek company from those of the same gender as themselves (McCandless, 1973:807) and teachers tend to reinforce gender-appropriate activities for children, even when there is no official compulsion to do so (Griffiths, 1977:31). This is borne out by choice of university course: although girls out-perform boys at school, women are concentrated in the social sciences, the arts and humanities, whereas men are in the 'hard' sciences. Invariably, women bring to the labour market qualifications that are of 'less value' and this has important repercussions for their future employment and financial well-being.

Social capital is also heavily influenced by gender, the implications of which include the fact that women are more likely to be promoted to levels where women are already present. This is due in some part to the 'sex-typing' of jobs, but is also connected to same-sex alliances: 'it may be that what is thought of as a glass ceiling is actually a glass door, which can only be opened by women if other women have opened it previously' (Cohen et al 1998:723). Social and cultural capital combine to form a 'gendered habitus' or predisposition which structures men and women's decisions, behaviours and opportunities. Yet, as gender is an 'asymmetrical category' (Krais, 1993:157; Laberge, 1995:133; McCall, 1992:846), society prioritises the masculine over the feminine habitus, affecting also those who adopt feminine behaviour. An example of this might be gay men, who deviate from masculine habitus and are accordingly treated as less than 'real men' (Krais, 1993:171).¹¹ This symbolic hierarchy has material effects: women are placed in an economically vulnerable position; they are concentrated in low-status, low-pay, part-time employment; women and their children constitute the most economically disadvantaged group across the globe (Mies, 1998: 112-144). Lovell argues that women have different opportunities to resist or submit to gender domination

(by 'passing' as men, for example), according to their social class position (Lovell, 2000:18). However, Lovell may be mistakenly optimistic when she states that women 'are not clustered together 'below', with men clustered together 'above'" (Lovell, 2000:21). The experience of being a woman, though felt differently across the classes, is still removed from that of men; many have discussed the 'feminization of poverty' (Feinberg & Knox, 1990; Goldberg & Koemen, 1990) and a similar process may be evidenced with regards to 'race capital'. I do not believe, as does Terry Lovell, that for Bourdieu gender, race or sexuality (or even age) is ultimately secondary to social class (Lovell, 2000:12). He understands gender to be the 'paradigm of symbolic domination' (McNay, 1999:99). Bourdieu's theory allows us to see the connections between the different forms of domination enacted in society. Further, whilst the details of the gendered division of labour may differ cross-culturally, all cultures appear to use gender to structure society in some way (Moore, 1997). Thus 'gendered' cultural capital cuts across all social groupings and classes; it is a prerequisite for all other forms of capital. As the gender capital of men and women is asymmetrically opposed, men find that they are more able to transfer their gender capital into the other forms of capital: social, embodied, institutional and ultimately economic.

In 1974 Ann Oakley showed that women, when incorporated into the labour market, tended to favour careers which serve as an extension of their 'traditional' role as carers, such as nursing, teaching etc (Oakley, 1974:60-90), a trend that continues today. Often low-paid, part time and insecure, these forms of employment have contributed to the feminization of poverty. So why do women continue to favour these roles? If we theorise that women are utilising their gender capital when seeking employment, or making decisions about their education, then it makes sense for them to pursue careers centred on their socially ascribed, internalised and accepted skills.

...while to call a man 'ambitious' is to compliment him, to call a woman 'ambitious' may be to insult her [...] The career woman whose work requires assertive characteristics may meet disapproval from other women as well as from men, who consider her 'sexless' or 'unfeminine'. Fear of such an outcome discourages many women from pursuing 'masculine' careers, and is one of the main reasons why occupational equality shows as yet no signs of being achieved (Oakley, 1974:88-89).

A fear of appearing to be 'un-feminine' – undoing their gender capital and seeking instead to adopt masculine strategies - may prevent women from entering masculine roles and lead them instead to seek to consolidate the attributes ascribed to them by gender ideology. This may be a strategy set within the limits imposed by a gendered world, but it is a strategy nonetheless.

The most obvious way in which 'femininity' may be regarded as a strategy, involving both investment and reward, is through 'beauty'. The ideals of feminine beauty have been problematic to feminisms. On the one hand, many theorists have felt women to be trapped by the need/ desire to appeal to the 'male gaze' (see for example Wolf, 1991); on the other, some have sought the emancipatory aspects of politics through self-presentation (see for example Butler, 1990). Paula Black and Ursula Sharma remind us that men require little maintenance to turn their natural bodies into cultural ones, but that for women 'femininity is a state to be constantly sought' (Black & Sharma, 2001:101). For example, facial hair may be considered a problem for those women who want to look 'normal'. The hair itself may well be 'natural' but for these women to conform to social ideas of femininity requires secret vigilance (Black & Sharma, 2001:107). This investment in their femininity may be regarded as part of their leisure time, as important for their work, or purely to be regarded as 'normal'. Black and Sharma wonder if this is the result of the different institutions' roles in the maintenance of femininity or due to the fact that 'different women [in the salon] invest in their femininity in different arenas' (Black & Sharma, 2001:108). They also tentatively argue that different kinds of beauty treatment, and the different kinds of salon in which they may be found, may appeal to women of different social classes, with those treatments focussing on beauty being less 'middle class' than those which offer 'treatments';

this differing relationship to the body seems to confirm Bourdieu's claim that the working class have an instrumental relationship to their bodies, and that the middle class approach is characterised by seeing the body as an end in itself (Bourdieu, 1984). This differentiation in the types of treatments selected then does not appear to show that only a particular class of women visit salons, but that once in the salon the 'habitus' of the woman leads to different activities (Black & Sharma, 2001:112).

The class of the women interacts with their gender to position them differently with regards to femininity as an 'ideal type' (Black & Sharma, 2001a:114). Other women may instead concentrate on their education or their role within the family; on motherhood.

Bourdieu argues that women play a central role in the family by converting economic capital into symbolic capital through their display of cultural taste (Bourdieu, 2001:98-99). More subtle investments of gender are discussed by Sharma and Black, such as those of 'emotional labour', which refers to the 'active maintenance of the 'objects' emotional state' often through the suppression of one's own emotions' (Sharma & Black, 2001:925). Prevalent in the 'caring' industries and 'invisible or unacknowledged', emotional labour may be seen as an extension of the role of women in the home; as simply intrinsic to womanhood (Sharma & Black, 2001: 928). The beauty therapists interviewed by Black & Sharma stressed the emotional labour inherent in their role, perhaps as a strategy to represent their profession in a more serious light (Sharma & Black, 2001:921). This strategy may be problematic, however, for by stressing skills which are seen as inherently female and not developed through training and qualification, they may undermine their claim to 'professional' status (Sharma & Black, 2001:929). Similarly, Terry Lovell highlights the investment strategies of working class and elite women in their attempt to pass as fighting men (Lovell, 2000:19), showing that they may be similar to the honour strategies of Kabyle men; both are transferable into economic capital via networks, job opportunities etc. Yet as Black and Sharma remind us, the ability of women to transfer their gender capital into economic capital is structured by their class position:

...it is important to note that one woman's leisure is another woman's work. The beauty industry itself, whilst providing the site for carefully packaged and segmented parcels of free time, is also the site of work involving physical labour, emotional work, long hours, low pay, and often poor work conditions for those employed within it (Black & Sharma, 2001:104).

This reminds us that while some women may invest in their gendered identities through recourse to beauty therapy, this service is often provided by women of a different class who are also utilising their own gendered identities. The investment strategies of women in beauty are cross-cut by their social class and racial positions. 'Possibly beauty therapy is – as secretarial

work used to be – a kind of 'feminine' work seen as a realistic aspiration for the working-class girl yet not *infra dig* for the middle-class girl' (Sharma & Black, 2001:916). Women thus have the same possibility of transferring their cultural capital as do men; however their capital is not valued so highly, and is often allied to that of their male partner. It is this aspect of gender that leads me to agree with Laberge, who argues that gender should be seen as part of embodied capital; however, though gender is embodied, it is also transferable: 'gendered dispositions work also as sources of power' (Laberge, 1995:138).

Bourdieu recognises men's masculinity strategies as those of investment, as the games of honour have economic and political effects (Fowler, 2002:4). Excluded from the 'games' of the men, women are in a critical position (Bourdieu, 2001:75); they both recognise the 'silliness' of the games and provide the 'flattering mirror' to them (Bourdieu, 2001:75-80). However, for Bourdieu there is a 'radical dissymmetry between man, the subject, and woman, the object of the exchange; between man, who is responsible for and controls production and reproduction, and woman, the transformed product of this labour' (Bourdieu, 2001:45). By focussing on women as objects of exchange between men, Bourdieu misses the investment strategies of the women themselves (Lovell, 2000:23-24). Femininity, no less than masculinity, may be considered an asset, dependent on context (Gottfried, 1998:461; Moi, 2000:331; Laberge, 1995:142). Indeed, the success of women in education may be related to the high numbers of female teachers and an environment which seeks 'feminine' type characteristics from its pupils; this may be why boys appear to be falling behind and why the British government is now keen to recruit more male teachers. Further, the strategies of middle class feminists that first led to increased education for women and to second wave feminism, may in part be responsible for the reconstitution of the mental/manual divide (Fowler, 2002:10) which restricts working class women to employment centred on their 'traditional' skills.

In this respect, my argument may be considered similar to that of Gouldner (as outlined in Martin & Szelenyi, 2000); however, where he views cultural capital to be a form of economic capital, I would argue that it is analogous to it, but not identical. Cultural capital may be autonomous from the economic sphere, and may even contradict it. One of Bourdieu's strengths is in his ability to show the relative autonomy of gender domination (Bourdieu, 2001:81; Fowler, 2002:1). Gouldner is correct to see the convertibility of

money capital - this is important, for by viewing access to cultural capital as relatively autonomous from the economic sphere, though transferable to it, feminism is able to free Bourdieuan analysis from any economic determinism and thus realise its emancipatory potential.

A problem with a Bourdieuan approach to the interplay between class and gender lies in its failure to integrate gender into a field (McNay, 1999:96-107); similar difficulties may face those studying race as a form of capital. Moi argues that as gender does not have a field of its own; it does not therefore constitute a form of capital (Moi, 2000:330). However, no capital has a 'pure' field, as there is always resistance; the family may be said to be dominated by gender sufficiently to constitute its primary field. For Bourdieu the family is a 'realised category' (Bourdieu, 1996), and 'the family always tends to function as a field, with its physical, economic and, above all, symbolic power relations' (Bourdieu, 1996:22). The family is thus the field in which gender is reproduced and realised. Bourdieu argues that the family is central to the maintenance of the social order (Bourdieu, 2001:85; 1996:23) and that in order to understand masculine domination we should study those institutions central to its reproduction (Bourdieu, 2001: 85). The family has long been studied within feminism as the primary site of gender domination and social reproduction.

'To change the world, one has to change the ways of making the world, that is, the vision of the world and the practical operations by which groups are produced and reproduced' (Bourdieu, 1990b:137). Studies such as those of Greener (2002) and Lovell (2000), are now beginning to focus on the way that the economic context and governmental policy limit and frame life-style, in a manner reminiscent of Polanyi's challenge to view the economy of 'others' as embedded in social relations (Polanyi, 1968), though finally applied to our capitalism. However, it is not enough to view the gendering of levels of capital as limiting life-opportunities; gender itself must be viewed as a capital and as a strategy, with the power to cross fields.

Conclusion

The three forms of capital, as outlined by Bourdieu, interact to structure not only people's life opportunities but also their modes of thought, and gender cuts across all of the three forms of capital. Whilst some have therefore discussed a 'gendered habitus' (McCall, 1992; Laberge, 1995) it seems more real-

istic to advocate the study of a 'Gender Capital', for this capital is imbued before all other forms of capital, structures the way the other forms of capital are actualised, and can itself be transferred indirectly into economic capital. In the same way that patriarchy existed long before the advent of capitalism and so structured its development, so gender capital informs the accumulation of social, cultural and economic capitals. A child is gendered before s/he learns to speak. The gender capital gained as a child has repercussions throughout life. An infant who learns to be a woman will find that her femininity is both a constraint and an enabler; her habitus is gendered, as is her future. By learning to be a woman, she unwittingly reproduces the system that subordinates the feminine. By choosing the forms of education and employment that she does, by adopting the behaviour considered suitable for her sex and teaching this to her daughter, a woman plays an important role in the continuation of the existing social hierarchy.

This social hierarchy is a sociocultural construction: it is not related to biological factors, but is inscribed on the bodies of the agents. It is a hierarchy conceived, constructed and reproduced in the cultural sphere, though it is naturalised to such a degree that biology is often given as the main causal factor. If feminists wish to change the status quo, they must first seek to understand how gender identity is transmitted, and then seek to change the culture that creates such a difference between the expectations and status of men and women. Where Bourdieu concentrates on the durable and reproduced, Judith Butler focuses on the fluid and unstable which 'contrasts at times starkly with the durability of Bourdieu's dispositional subject' (Lovell, 2000:12). Yet surely the unchanging aspects of masculine domination do need to be explained. Bourdieu is correct to say that one cannot liberate the victims of symbolic violence by decree (Bourdieu, 2001:39); indeed it may be when legal restrictions are abolished that the work begins (Krais, 1993:156). Further, Bourdieu is able to articulate identity's 'constructiveness' in a more tangible way than postmodernist theories such as those of Butler (1990). Though we need to be aware of the dangers of symbolic determinism, this does not mean a return to identity politics, but an awareness of the structural limits on identity formation. We need to distinguish between gender-inflected forms of social capital and the advantage inherent in being male.

Further, Bourdieu's conception stresses the damaging effects to men of their having 'to take serious games seriously' (Moi, 2000:326). Men too are ensnared by gender; they are 'also prisoners, and insidiously victims, of the

dominant representation' (Bourdieu, 2001:49; see also Kraus, 1993:171). Women who are 'exceptional agents' (Moi, 2000:326) may perceive the irony, and yet 'women who laugh at male self-importance in university seminars may find themselves constructed not as lucid critics of male ridicule, but as frivolous females incapable of understanding truly serious thought' (Moi, 2000:326).

There is a danger that Bourdieu may 'mean all things to all people' (Jenkins, 2000:149), and that by introducing such terms as 'gender capital' his scheme may lose some specificity or explanatory power, yet concepts such as 'race capital' are also argued for (McRobbie, 2002; Moi 2000). Terry Lovell calls for a study of feminine capital, over time, to illuminate the investment strategies employed by women and their relationship to the strategies of men. By studying the gendered nature of the strategies employed in contemporary society, it may be possible to illuminate not only the ever changing interplay between gender and class (Moi, 2000:329),¹² but also the relationship between patriarchy and capitalism, examining whether they are 'mutually constitutive' (Gottfried, 1998:453); whether these 'forms of difference' are always 'experienced, constructed and mediated in interrelation with each other' (Moore, 1997:196). A theoretical concern faced by feminism as a whole is that of the role of women in their own subordination, and it is in helping us to understand this that Bourdieu's theory may be of most use. Following Lovell, then, I ask for a study of the strategies of women in Bourdieuan terms; 'in terms of the 'capitals' possessed, the composition of that capital, its trajectory over time, and control over its deployment, to see whether these terms allow us to cast new light on femaleness' (Lovell, 2000:22).

Wendy Ashall (wendy.inherhouse@ntlworld.com) (Social Anthropology BA Sussex) is currently working part-time towards an MA in Social and Political Thought at the University of Sussex. She is also a part-time mother, a part-time barmaid, and a part-time editor for Studies in Social and Political Thought.

Bibliography

- Acciaoli, Gregory L 1981** 'Knowing What You're Doing: A Review of Pierre Bourdieu's *Outline of a Theory of Practice*' in Canberra Anthropology, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 23-51.
- Ashall, Wendy 1999** Gender Capital ? Bourdieu and Gender Inequality, unpublished.
- Bates, Thomas R 1975** 'Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony' in The Journal of the History of Ideas, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 351-366.
- Beasley-Murray, Jon 2000** 'Value and Capital in Bourdieu and Marx' available URL: <http://www.art.man.ac.uk/SPANISH/staff/Writings/robbins.html>
- Black, Paula & Sharma, Ursula 2001** 'Men Are Real, Women Are 'Made Up': Beauty Therapy and the Construction of Femininity' in The Sociological Review, vol. 49, pp. 100-116.
- Blackburn, Robert M & Jarman, Jennifer 1993** 'Changing Inequalities in Access to British Universities' in The Oxford Review of Education, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 197-215.
- Bourdieu, Pierre 2001** Masculine Domination, Nice, Richard (trans.), Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1996** 'On the Family as a Realised Category' in Theory, Culture & Society, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 19-26.
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1993** 'Concluding Remarks: For a Sociogenic Understanding of Intellectual Works' in Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives, Postone, Moishe; LiPuma, Edward & Calhoun, Craig (eds.) Cambridge, Polity Press, pp. 263-275.
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1990a** The Logic of Practice, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1990b** 'Social Space and Symbolic Power' in In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology, Adamson, Matthew (trans.), Oxford, Polity Press, pp. 123-139.
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1986a** 'Thinking about Limits' in Theory, Culture & Society, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 37-92.
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1986b** 'The forms of Capital' in Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education, London, Greenwood Press, pp. 241-258.
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1979** 'Symbolic Power' in Critique of Anthropology, vol. 13 & 14, no. 4, pp. 77-85.
- Bourdieu, Pierre & Passeron, Jean-Claude 1977 (1998)** Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture (2nd Edition), London, Sage Publications.
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1977 (1989)** 'Symbolic Capital' in Outline of a Theory of Practice, Richard Nice (trans.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 171-183.
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1977 (1989)** 'Modes of Domination' in Outline of a Theory of Practice, Richard Nice (trans.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 183-233.

- Bourdieu, Pierre & Wacquant, Loïc 1999** 'On the Cunning of Imperialist Reason' in Theory, Culture & Society, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 41-58.
- Brown, Beverley 1978** 'Natural and Social Division of Labour – Engels and the Domestic Labour Debate' in M/E, pp. 25-47.
- Butler, Judith 1990** 'Prohibition, Psychoanalysis, and the Production of the Heterosexual Matrix' in Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity, London, Routledge, pp. 45-100.
- Butler, Judith 1990** 'Conclusion: From Parody to Politics' in Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity, London, Routledge, pp. 181-190.
- Calhoun, Craig & Wacquant, Loïc 2002** In Memoriam available URL: <http://www.theglobalsite.ac.uk/times/202calhoun.htm>
- Camic, Charles 1986 (2000)** 'The Matter of Habit' in Pierre Bourdieu: Volume I, Robbins, Derek (ed.) Sage Publications, London, pp. 323-366.
- Carvel, J 1998** 'Jobs elude women graduates' in The Guardian, Wednesday, November 18th.
- Carvel, J 1999** 'Universities Underpay Women' in The Guardian, Tuesday, May 4th.
- Chandler, Daniel 2000** Semiotics for Beginners available URL: <http://www.aber.ac.uk/media/Documents/S4B/sem07.html>
- Chataway, Teresa 1995** 'Giulia Gramsci: Democracy and 'the Sexual Question' in The Australian Journal of Political Science, vol. 30, pp. 120-136.
- Chodorow, Nancy J 1995** 'Gender as a Personal and Cultural Construction' in Signs, vol. 20, no. 3 pp. 516-544.
- Cohen, L.E; Broschak, J.P & Haveman, H.A 1998** 'And Then There Were More? The Effect of Organisational Sex Composition on the Hiring and Promotion of Managers' in American Sociological Review, vol. 63, no. 5, pp. 711-727.
- Cooper, Barry & Dunne, Máiréad 1998** 'Anyone for tennis? Social class differences in children's responses to national curriculum mathematics testing' in The Sociological Review, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 115-148.
- Egerton, M 1997** 'Occupational Inheritance: The Role of Cultural capital and gender' in Work, Employment & Society, vol. 11, no. 2 pp. 283-311.
- Feinberg, R & Knox, K.E 1990** The Feminization of Poverty In the United States, New York, Garland, .
- Fonow, Mary Magaret & Cook, Judith A. 1991** 'Back to the Future: A Look at the Second Wave of Feminist Epistemology and Methodology' in Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research, Fonow & Cook (eds.) Bloomington, Indiana University Press, pp. 1-15.
- Fontana, Benedetto 2000** 'Logos and Kratos: Gramsci and the Ancients on Hegemony' in The Journal of the History of Ideas, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 305-326.
- Fowler, Bridget 2002** 'Pierre Bourdieu and La Domination Masculine' available

- URL: <http://www.iran-bulletin.org/mascul.htm>
- Fowler, Bridget 2000** 'Pierre Bourdieu' available URL: <http://www.etehadchap.com/bourdieu.html>
- Fung, Anthony & Curtin, Michael 2002** 'The Anomalies of Being Faye (Wong): Gender Politics in Chinese Popular Music' in The International Journal of Cultural Studies, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 263-290.
- Geertz, Clifford 1993 (1973)** The Interpretation of Cultures, London, Fontana Press.
- Goldberg, G.S & Koemen, E 1990** The Feminization of Poverty: Only in America? New York, Praeger.
- Gottfried, H 1998** 'Beyond Patriarchy? Theorising Gender and Class' in Sociology: The Journal of the British Sociological Association, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 451-468.
- Greener, Ian 2002** 'Agency, Social Theory and Social Policy' in Critical Social Policy, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 688-705.
- Griffiths, V 1977** 'Sex Roles in the Secondary School: Problems of Implementing Change' in Teaching Girls to be Women Conference, Essex, April 1977.
- Hill Collins, Patricia 1990** 'The Politics of Black Feminist Thought' in Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment, London, Routledge, pp. 201-219.
- Jenkins, Richard 2002 (1992)** Pierre Bourdieu: Revised Edition, London, Routledge.
- Jenkins, Richard 2000 (1982)** 'Pierre Bourdieu and the Reproduction of Determinism' in Pierre Bourdieu: Volume II, Robbins, Derek (ed.) London, Sage Publications, pp. 148-163.
- Kant, Immanuel 1784** 'An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment?' available URL: <http://www.english.upenn.edu/~mgamer/Etexts/kant.html>
- Kay, F.M & Hagan, J 1998** 'Raising the Bar: The Gender Stratification of law-Firm Capital' in American Sociological Review, vol. 63, no. 5, pp. 728-743.
- Krais, B 1993** 'Gender and Symbolic Violence: Female Oppression in the Light of Pierre Bourdieu's' Theory of Social Practise' in Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives Postone, M, LiPuma, E & Calhoun, Craig (eds.), Cambridge, Polity Press, pp. 156-177.
- Laberge, Suzanne 1995** 'Toward an Integration of Gender into Bourdieu's' Concept of Cultural Capital' in Sociology of Sport Journal, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 132-146.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude 1936** 'Social Structure' in Structural Anthropology, Penguin Press, London, pp. 277-315.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude 1949** 'Nature and Culture' in The Elementary Structures of Kinship, London, Eyre & Spottiswoode, pp. 3-11.
- Levi-Strauss, Claude 1949** 'The Problem of Incest' in The Elementary Structures of Kinship, London, Eyre & Spottiswoode, 12-25.

- Lovell, Terry 2000** 'Thinking Feminism with and against Bourdieu' in Feminist Theory, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 11-32.
- Lukes, Steven 1974** Power: A Radical View, London, Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Maguire, Patricia 1987** Doing Participatory Research: A Feminist Approach, The Centre for International Education, Massachusetts, University of Education, .
- Marx, Karl 1867** 'The General Formula for Capital' in Capital: Volume One available URL: <http://csf.colorado.edu/psn/marx/Archive/1867-C1/Part2/ch04.htm>
- Marx, Karl 1867** 'Contradictions in the General Formula of Capital' in Capital: Volume One available URL: <http://csf.colorado.edu/psn/marx/Archive/1867-C1/Part2/ch04.htm>
- Mahony, Pat & Zmroczek, Christine (eds.) 1997** Class Matters: 'Working-Class' Women's perspectives on Social Class, London, Taylor & Francis.
- Major, L.E 1999** 'Facts of Life' in The Guardian, Tuesday, April 13th.
- Martin, Bill & Ivan Szélenyi 2000 (1987)** 'Beyond Cultural Capital: Toward a Theory of Symbolic Domination' in Pierre Bourdieu: Volume IV, Robbins, Derek (ed.) London, Sage Publications, pp. 276-301.
- McCall, L 1992** 'Does gender fit? Bourdieu, Feminism, and conceptions of social order' in Theory and Society, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 837-867.
- McCandless, B.R 1973** 'Childhood Socialisation' in Handbook of Socialisation Theory and Research, D.A. Goslin (ed) Chicago, Rand McNally College Publishing Company.
- McDowell, L 1983** 'Towards an Understanding of the Gender Division of Urban Space' in Society & Space, vol. 1, pp 59-72.
- McNay, L 1999** 'Gender, habitus and the Field: Pierre Bourdieu and the Limits of Reflexivity' in Theory, Culture & Society, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 95-117.
- McRobbie, Angela 2002** 'A Mixed Bag of Misfortunes? Bourdieu's Weight of the World' in Theory, Culture & Society, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 129-138.
- Mies, Maria 1994** 'Gender and Global Capitalism' in Capitalism and Development, Sklair, Leslie (ed.), London, Routledge, pp. 107-122.
- Mies, Maria 1998 (1986)** Patriarchy & Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour, London, Zed Books.
- Moi, Toril 2000 (1991)** 'Appropriating Bourdieu: Feminist Theory and Pierre Bourdieu's Sociology of Culture' in Pierre Bourdieu: Volume IV, Robbins, Derek (ed.) London, Sage Publications, pp. 314-341.
- Moore, Henrietta L 1988 (1997)** Feminism and Anthropology, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Moseley, Rachel 2001** 'Respectability Sewn Up: Dressmaking and Film Star Style in the Fifties and Sixties' in The European Journal of Cultural Studies, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 473-490.
- Oakley, Ann 1974 (1982)** House-Wife, Middlesex, Penguin Books.
- Ostrow, James M 2000 (1981)** 'Culture as a Fundamental Dimension of

- Experience: A Discussion of Pierre Bourdieu's Theory of Human Habitus' in Pierre Bourdieu: Volume I, Robbins, Derek (ed.) London, Sage Publications, pp. 302-322.
- Parry, J & Bloch, M 1989** 'Introduction: Money and the Morality of Exchange' in Money and the Morality of Exchange, Parry & Bloch (eds.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 1 – 32.
- Polanyi, Karl 1968 (1957)** 'The Economy as Instituted Process', in Economic Anthropology: Readings in Theory and Analysis, LeClair & Schneider (eds.), London, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc. pp. 122 – 143.
- Postone, Moishe, LiPuma, Edward & Calhoun, Craig 1993** 'Introduction: Bourdieu and Social Theory' in Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives, Postone, M, LiPuma, E & Calhoun, C (eds.) Cambridge, Polity Press, pp. 1-13.
- Reay, Diane 2000** 'A Useful extension of Bourdieu's Conceptual framework?: Emotional Capital as a Way of Understanding Mothers' Involvement in their Children's Education' in The Sociological Review, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 568-585.
- Reay, Diane 1997** 'Feminist Theory, Habitus, and Social Class: Disrupting Notions of Classlessness' in Women's Studies International Forum, vol. 20, no. 2, pp 225-233.
- Rocamora, Agnès 2002** 'Fields of Fashion: Critical Insights into Bourdieu's Sociology of Culture' in Journal of Consumer Culture, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 341-362.
- Schubert, J.D 2002** 'Defending Multiculturalism: From hegemony to Symbolic Violence' in American Behavioural Scientist, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 1088-1102.
- Sharma, Ursula & Black, Paula 2001** 'Look Good, Feel Better: Beauty Therapy as Emotional Labour' in Sociology: The Journal of the British Sociological Association, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 913-931.
- Shi, Chyun-Fung 2001** 'Mapping Out Gender Power: A Bourdieuan Approach' in Feminist Media Studies, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 55-59.
- Social Trends 28, 1998** Office for National Statistics, 1998 Edition.
- Wolf, Naomi 1991** The Beauty Myth London, Vintage.
- Wolfreys, Jim 2002** Pierre Bourdieu: Voice of Resistance available URL: <http://pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj94/wolfreys.htm>
- Zigler, Edward F; Lamb, Michael E & Child, Irvin L 1982** 'Socialization' in Socialization and Personality Development, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 10-19.
- Zigler, Edward F; Lamb, Michael E & Child, Irvin L 1982** 'Gender Identity and the Development of Behavioural Sex Differences' in Socialization and Personality Development, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 55-61.

Footnotes

1. See Cooper and Dunne (1998) for a study into the effects of class on education in the UK.
2. Cultural capital imbued during the period of socialisation and historically and socially dependent. Linked to the body and temporal, it represents wealth converted into an integral part of the person (Bourdieu, 1986:244-245).
3. Cultural goods such as paintings, writings or sculptures, transmitted either symbolically or materially; the material wealth needed to possess such items, and the cultural capital needed to 'consume' them (Bourdieu, 1986:246).
4. Academic qualifications, or certificates of competence, which enable comparison, exchange and conversion between cultural and economic capital (Bourdieu, 1986:248).
5. See for example Fonow & Cook (1991); Hill Collins (1990) and Maguire (1987).
6. As discussed by Beverley Brown (1978).
7. Rather than to 'the disposition to perform certain relatively elementary and specific activities' or motor habits, more the concern of psychology (Camic, 2000:327; Ostrow, 2000:311).
8. Like Kant, Bourdieu feels that habit should be overcome; for Kant through the application of reason (Kant, 1784); for Bourdieu through reflexivity.
9. 'A may exercise power over B by getting him to do what he does not want to do, but he also exercises power over him by influencing, shaping or determining his very wants' (Lukes, 1974:23), and in this way prevent conflict from ever occurring.
10. As agricultural producers and as mothers.
11. However, Bourdieu, perhaps surprisingly, feels that the gay community is in a stronger position due to increased levels of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 2001: 123; Fowler, 2001:6).
12. See for example the collection edited by Mahony & Zmroczek (1997).