



University of East London Institutional Repository: <http://roar.uel.ac.uk>

This paper is made available online in accordance with publisher policies. Please scroll down to view the document itself. Please refer to the repository record for this item and our policy information available from the repository home page for further information.

To see the final version of this paper please visit the publisher's website. Access to the published version may require a subscription.

**Author(s):** Robbins, Derek

**Article title:** Practical Engagement

**Year of publication:** 2006

**Citation:** Robbins, D. (2006) 'Practical Engagement' in Robbins, D (2006) On Bourdieu, Education and Society, Oxford: Bardwell Press pp 49-62

**Link to published version:**

[http://www.bardwell-press.co.uk/publications/on\\_bourdieu.htm](http://www.bardwell-press.co.uk/publications/on_bourdieu.htm)

**ISBN 10:** 0-9548683-6-6

**ISBN 13:** 978-0-9548683-6-9

## Practical Engagement

The MA/MSc by Independent Study commenced in 1984. The idea that it offered students the opportunity to negotiate their own programmes of study—which might be vocational or academic in relation to their needs—attracted graduates who saw that it offered something different both from taught Master's degree courses and from PhD research. These were graduates who had not necessarily had any experience of the ways in which independent study operated at diploma and degree level. In order to prevent the structure from simply enabling unreflexive individualism, I took the view that it was necessary to initiate new students into the methodological and philosophical assumptions which underpinned those procedures which were prescribed aspects of the course structure. As for the undergraduate degree, there was a free-standing 'Planning Period' within which students were required to design a detailed personal curriculum. Acceptance of this programme by a registration board was a condition of entry to the course and the registered programme established the elements of the final assessment and the criteria to be applied in that assessment.

In this 'Planning Period' I began, for the first time, to use the work of Bourdieu with students as a way of providing a framework within which they might understand the process which they were undergoing. I used extracts from *The Inheritors* and from *Reproduction in Education, Culture and Society*, both of which, of course, had only relatively recently become available in English (in Bourdieu, 1979 and Bourdieu, 1977 respectively). Most of all, I used the article which Bourdieu had published in French in 1966—"Intellectual Field and Creative Project"—which I had known since reading it in English in *Knowledge and Control* (Young, ed., 1971). I did not then see that this article represented the beginning of Bourdieu's articulation of a post-structuralist position. I simply used the article as a tool to show students that the Master's degree by independent study sought to provide them with an opportunity to negotiate the acceptance of their personal interests or problem identification with reference to the ways in which the institution embodied an intellectual field, compartmented in disciplines and departmental organizations. Independence was not to be seen as an absolute condition. Rather there was a spectrum of degrees of dependence and the course gave them the responsibility to decide what kind of risk to take in securing approval from the registration board, in the same way as Bourdieu, following Valéry, characterised the extremes of potential strategies for creative artists and intellectuals between the purity of expressiveness on the one hand and journalistic subordination to the expectations of readers on the other.

This rudimentary knowledge of the work of Bourdieu and my sense that his thinking about higher education was relevant to my situation and might, indeed, provide me with the conceptual framework which I had tried to construct myself at the LSE, were the factors which combined to stimulate me into applying in 1985 to the ESRC for a short grant to 'assess the contribution of Pierre Bourdieu to the analysis of higher education'. The application was successful. I spent about a month in Paris in April, 1986, as a guest of the Institut de l'Histoire du Temps Présent—a choice of intellectual base which followed from contacts made whilst working on Vichy<sup>1</sup>. During this stay, I worked mainly on the archives in the Institut on the events of May, 1968, and this provided me with a sense of the socio-political context within which Bourdieu and Passeron were analysing student experience in higher education. At the

invitation of Michel Debeauvais<sup>2</sup>, I gave a seminar at the Université of Paris VIII, now at St. Denis, which had been established at Vincennes after the May events of 1968, and this fostered an ongoing interest in comparing the development of Paris VIII with the development of my own institution. Earlier in the Spring of 1986, I had informed Polity Press of my ESRC grant and had inquired whether there would be any interest in publishing an introduction to the work of Bourdieu. Polity Press had been established in 1984. Editorial control was in the hands of Anthony Giddens, David Held and John Thompson. The latter's book on Ideology (Thompson, 1990) had contained some consideration of Bourdieu's work, but there was not yet any indication that Polity would become the leading English publisher of Bourdieu's work. I was told, however, that an introduction to Bourdieu had just been commissioned. In Paris, I had introductory meetings with Monique de Saint Martin and Yvette Delsaut at the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme. Bourdieu had been appointed to the Chair of Sociology at the Collège de France in the autumn of 1981, and I was to appreciate that there were now two bases of Bourdieu's influence. Monique de Saint Martin had succeeded Bourdieu as the Director of the Centre de Sociologie Européenne, located in the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme. Most of the researchers who had worked collectively in the Centre from the early 1960s when Bourdieu had become assistant to Aron there, continued to research and teach in the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales. Bourdieu retained an office in the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, but his principal office was now in the Collège de France in the rue d'Ecoles, where he was assisted by Yvette Delsaut. I attended Bourdieu's lectures at the Collège during my first visit, but I did not meet him. Monique de Saint Martin and Yvette Delsaut recommended that I should write something which could be the basis for a discussion with Bourdieu in the autumn. On their advice, I returned to England with the intention of producing an analysis of the reception of Bourdieu's work in England. They rightly judged that I had not yet read enough of the work of the Centre to provide a critique of that work but that I was uniquely in a position to comment on the way in which Bourdieu's work was being interpreted in the UK.

It was not only the new students commencing on the MA/MSc by Independent Study who were unaware of the ideological struggles that had taken place to establish independent study in the 1970s. As the School expanded, new staff transferred into it from the Faculties of the polytechnic, and these had their own interpretations of the innovation and their own intentions for its future. Few of the original staff who had designed the courses were now involved in running them. I became interested in the problem whether the meaning of the independent study process should, by definition, be the sum total of the perceptions of the participants, or whether the structural framework within which it operated was authoritatively definitive. I discussed this in an article for *Studies in Higher Education* entitled "Structure and meaning in independent study" which was not accepted, but I also began to offer a series of seminars on the history and development of the School for Independent Study which was attended in 1985 and 1986 by students following the DipHE. It was as a result of running these seminars that I had the idea of writing a book on the same subject. On the recommendation of the editor of *Studies in Higher Education*, I approached the Society for Research into Higher Education with a proposal. This proposal was supported by Dr. Robert Murray and I produced a draft text between mid-1986 and mid-1987. In August 1987, I received a contract for the book which was to be co-published by The Society for Research into Higher Education and the Open

University Press in October, 1988, as *The Rise of Independent Study: The politics and the philosophy of an educational innovation, 1970–87* (1988b).

During 1986, therefore, it was not at all clear how my work would develop. I had proposed a book on Bourdieu which had been turned down; I started writing an account of independent study; and I wrote a long essay on the reception of Bourdieu in England. In revised form, this essay was to be published as “Bourdieu in England, 1960–1977” (1989a). It was the basis of my first meeting with Bourdieu in October, 1986. He responded to my text in detail and we then discussed the possibility that I might carry out an analysis of the different kinds of trans-national reception of different thinkers. In particular, he recommended a comparative analysis of the English reception of the work of Foucault and Habermas. We also talked about my continuing interest in analysing the career of D.G. James, but I made the point that my institution had never encouraged academic or scholarly research. Although I was interested in the topics we were discussing, I also had a commitment to carrying out research which would relate specifically to my interest in the potential development of independent study within higher education institutions possessing different structures, functions, and ideologies. In other words, I communicated that I was still wanting to carry out research which would continue my enquiries about the relations between institutional ethos and knowledge content. From the outset, I believe, therefore, that he recognized that I had been a meritocratic beneficiary of the higher education provided in England to the dominant social class, but was, nevertheless, working within an institution which was socially dominated or marginalized. In retrospect, I can suggest that the nature of our conversation related to the thinking contained in his English Preface to *Homo Academicus* (Bourdieu, 1988b); to his preparatory work for *La noblesse d'état* (Bourdieu, 1989a); and to his reflection on the international reputations of Foucault (post-mortem) and Habermas (not long after the lectures given by Habermas at the Collège de France which were to be published as *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity* (Habermas, 1987)).

I followed up my meeting with Bourdieu with two research applications - one on ‘Multi-national knowledge’ to the Nuffield Foundation and the other on “The Influence of Institutional Context on Student Learning in Higher Education” to the ESRC—which reflected the main two aspects of our conversation. By mid-1987, I had heard that both applications had been unsuccessful, but I had nearly completed *The Rise of Independent Study* and, in September, I heard that the original book on Bourdieu which Polity Press had commissioned in April, 1986, was no longer proceeding. John Thompson invited me to submit an outline proposal, which I did at once. I discussed this synopsis with Bourdieu in Paris in November. By mid-1988, however, I heard that Polity had decided not to proceed with a commission. I revised my synopsis to accommodate Bourdieu’s suggestions and submitted the new synopsis for the consideration of the Open University Press. Bourdieu responded in detail to the new synopsis and, shortly after the publication of *The Rise of Independent Study* in October, 1988, I received a contract to write an introduction to the work of Bourdieu for the Open University Press.

There were other significant developments during the second half of the 1980s. The achievements of The School for Independent Study were coming under threat. Within the polytechnic, there emerged a rival DipHE based upon a modular system and within several years this was to become the foundation for a wholly modularised

undergraduate degree provision. The argument was gaining strength that the independent study process was not cost efficient and that the practice was generating studies which were too 'alternative'. Gerry Fowler's position as Director was also under threat and he was forced to resign. It seemed that his support for independent study had become a stick with which he was beaten, and his demise coincided with an institutional decision to disband the School for Independent Study. The pressures were not simply internal. The School was visited by HM Inspectors who produced a hostile report. The view of School staff was that the inspection had been informed by a new, aggressively neo-vocational steer from the government and that the overthrow of the Director was also part of an acquiescence in the new entrepreneurialism on the part of the new Director (who was appointed internally). In accordance with government policy to take polytechnics away from the control of local education authorities, the institution became incorporated in 1989 as the Polytechnic of East London. This was the context in which *The Rise of Independent Study* was published. There were those who thought that its publication contributed to the downfall of the School. I was clear that the DipHE had deteriorated and the book attacked the extent to which the practice of independent study had become associated with 'experiential learning'. The introduction to the first Part of the book described that Part as "an attack on what 'independent study' has mostly come to mean. It is an aggressive salvo and prelude to a more reasoned attempt to reconstruct a meaning which is in decline." (1988b, 11) As this second sentence suggests, however, I was equally clear that, properly understood and implemented, independent study represented an approach to learning and study which was a pioneering achievement which should shape future practice in higher education institutions in a mass democracy. The intellectual influence of Habermas on my argument was stronger than that of Bourdieu. The nightmare scenario envisaged by the book was one in which the encroachment of the 'system-world' on educational institutions was increasing whilst, equally, the 'life-world' was taking refuge in apolitical person-centredness, relinquishing the attempt rationally to modify the tyranny of the bureaucratic and technological system.

The last chapter—"Arresting the 'Great Betrayal'"—was overtly modernist. It portrayed Habermas and Bourdieu as being in alliance against postmodernism and experientialism. Historically, it suggested that the publication of texts by Bourdieu in translation in 1977 came in time to reverse the effects of the decline of the new directions in the sociology of education:

But the emphasis of one strand of *Knowledge and Control* has been revitalized since 1977. That year, for instance, was the year of the appearance in English of both Bourdieu's *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* and his *Outline of a Theory of Practice* both of which are conducive to a defence of communicative rationality against post-modernism. The continuity of Bourdieu's thought into the post-modern period offers a pointer to the way in which the original rationale of the BA/BSc by Independent Study can be brought up to date. (1988b, 174)

The book represented the process whereby the individual intentions of students were registered and approved for study as a microcosm of the function of universities in society, constantly providing an independent social space within which to facilitate dialogue between the interests of the state and its citizens. Written shortly after the

Conservative victory in the General Election of 1987, the final chapter was not optimistic about future trends:

... our society seems to be dividing rapidly between those who are initiated into the technical and practical knowledge necessary to occupy positions of control and those who, helot-like, are allowed to enjoy politically impotent, person-centred self development. The process of registration still holds out some hope that 'independent study' might sustain democratisation and not become socially and epistemologically marginalized. (1988b, 175)

The concluding remarks quoted from one of the last articles written by Raymond Williams in June, 1987<sup>3</sup>, in response to the General Election result, in which he argued that higher education is now 'inescapably public and general' even if there are temporary 'boltholes' through privatisation or through contracts with 'paranational corporations'. I found little grounds for Williams's grass-roots optimism. By contrast, I suggested that:

The 'boltholes', surely, are prevailing. Shortly there may be no such thing as 'society as a whole' but instead a divided society of 'haves' and 'have-nots'. Increasingly the danger is that higher education institutions will either become exclusively the servants of the state or system-world—producing the manpower to maintain the control and the prosperity of the 'haves' or become exclusively the servants of the intellectually disenfranchised majority who inhabit the life-world which has no channel of communication with its systemic oppressor. The signs are that institutions might tacitly become functionally differentiated along these lines. (1988b, 177)

In 1987/8, therefore, I thought that the shift towards the emphasis of experience in independent study had sabotaged the means offered to disadvantaged students by the pedagogical process to alter the objective structures which were framing their life-chances. I was still thinking within the conceptual framework assumed by Bourdieu in an article such as "Systems of education and systems of thought." (Bourdieu, 1967d). This thinking was predicated on the existence of a liberal nation-state apparatus which would guarantee internal processes of communication and representation. My defence of independent study and, more, of universities as institutionalised embodiments of encounter between staff *Lehrheit* and student *Lernheit*, was also dependent on an assumption which Bourdieu seemed to share—that the dispositions of individuals are transmitted inter-generationally in the life-world through the domestic *habitus* and are modified in encounter with the inter-generationally sustained objective structures of the system-world. I was already familiar with the view that there was a relationship between educational content and institutional context and that it was necessary to analyse sociologically the conditions of power under which one form of 'cultural arbitrary' imposes itself over others as nationally or universally valid by a process of 'symbolic violence'. I was not, however, ready to relinquish the notion of dualistic encounter between agents and structures. I still supposed that a recognition of the arbitrariness of structures would be redemptive, that the existing system of institutional and intellectual domination could be adapted to equalise opportunities in society.

The change of the title of the institution from North-East London Polytechnic to the Polytechnic of East London registered the shift away from the state control of the polytechnic sector, through local education authorities, to a market, corporate definition of higher education governance. This was the time of Sir Keith Joseph's re-naming of the Social Science Research Council as the Economic and Social Research Council and of Mrs. Thatcher's famous dictum that there 'is no such thing as society' and of her drive to release the energies of entrepreneurialism from the constraints of state control. Whilst I was trying to save independent study as a mechanism for social reform, the institutional conditions which might have made that reform possible were in the process of being systematically eroded. The social model which juxtaposed life-world and system-world and recommended constructivist dialogue between agents and structures was out of tune with changing social reality. I was not aware of this at the time. I fought for the survival of my ideological interpretation of independent study without quite realising that the closure of the School for Independent Study was symptomatic of the broader, institutional removal of the conditions of its possibility.

Before the guillotine fell on the School for Independent Study, I was promoted to a Reader, commencing in the autumn of 1988. This coincided with the publication of *The Rise of Independent Study* and the commencement of my work on the book which was to be published in 1991 as *The Work of Pierre Bourdieu*. I immediately established a research group of like-minded staff in the School for Independent Study. The Group was committed to an analysis of the independent study process. It was formally approved by the institution's Research Committee on condition that it would accept a broader remit—to consider processes of teaching and learning in general and without partisan attachment to independent study alone. I was pleased to be required to accept this condition and the group was named the Group for Research into Access and Student Programmes (GRASP). Starting from the experience of independent study, the orientation of the Group was to explore the relationship between the kinds of curriculum content followed by the new kinds of students entering higher education and to consider the relationship between that content and the traditional, subject-disciplined, organisation of knowledge in institutions. The Group received internal funding for two research assistants and I supervised one project on "Self-directed learning" with the assistance of Steve Brindle<sup>4</sup>, who had recently graduated with a Sociology degree at the polytechnic. The main members of the Group were John Cocking<sup>3</sup>, a sociologist of education, Phil Bradbury<sup>6</sup>, a social psychologist with a particular interest in the work of Basil Bernstein, and Maggie Humm<sup>7</sup> who was beginning to establish her international reputation in feminist theory. In just a few years we ran seminars to articulate our theoretical and methodological position and produced a series of Working Papers based on our research. For me, this research was coinciding with my systematic reading of Bourdieu's texts for my commissioned introduction to his work. On the one hand, I saw myself as writing an impartial social history of the development of Bourdieu's thought, whilst, on the other, I was beginning to apply what I was learning about that thought to the analysis of student learning. Simultaneously, I was still, as course tutor for the MA/MSc by Independent Study, encouraging students to use Bourdieu's conceptual framework to make sense of the opportunity provided to them by the embodied meaning of the course's structure and procedures. At the same time, I was trying to produce an accurately objective account of Bourdieu's social and intellectual trajectory; to deploy the concepts he had generated within that trajectory pragmatically to assist students in their negotiation of the independent study learning system; and also to deploy those

same concepts analytically to produce a sociologically scientific account of case-studies of cohorts of undergraduate independent study students.

The School for Independent Study was disbanded as from the beginning of 1990/1. Officially, its work was distributed to the Faculties of the institution where the process of independent study was due to continue. Most staff were assigned to Faculties, but a small central co-ordinating unit was retained to oversee the phasing out of central arrangements, and I was assigned to that unit for two years. The Master's degree continued to be run centrally, but everything else was devolved to the Faculties and differently incorporated into the practice of those Faculties. The strongest operation continued in the Faculty of Social Sciences, and in the autumn of 1992 I became a member of staff in that Faculty. In this period of upheaval, the Group produced seven working papers (1990b; 1990c; 1991a [Part II, Ch. 11]), and my *The Work of Pierre Bourdieu: Recognizing Society* was published in June, 1991 (1991b). As I had written early chapters I had referred them to Bourdieu for comment. His comments were always slight, partly, I think, because he did not really think it legitimate to comment and, partly, because he was himself extremely busy. This was the period in which he was engaged in debate and discussion in Chicago, leading subsequently to the publication of *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992); *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives* (Calhoun, LiPuma, & Postone, eds., 1993); and *Social Theory for a Changing Society* (Bourdieu & Coleman, 1989).

Whereas I had at first only known a limited number of Bourdieu's texts in English translation, in the two years leading to the publication of *The Work of Pierre Bourdieu*, in 1991, I systematically followed his intellectual development in chronological sequence—deliberately refusing to allow my understanding of the logic of Bourdieu's progress to be contaminated further than by the preconceptions with which I had embarked on the process. I rigorously followed the sequence of production of his French texts, refusing to allow myself to be diverted in my interpretation by the different logic of the field of reception of the translations of his works into English. This meant that, for the first time, I began to come to terms with the Algerian context of his early work and then with the research on museums and photography which ran alongside the educational research of the 1960s. Monique de Saint Martin expressed the view to me that “Les stratégies de reconversion. Les classes sociales et le système d'enseignement” (Bourdieu, Boltanski & de Saint-Martin, 1973) which she had co-authored with Bourdieu and Boltanski, represented the crucial shift away from the analyses of the 1960s which were still in the genre of the sociology of education towards the social analysis of the social, political, educational, and cultural strategies of agents. It was a Copernican revolution to become aware that Bourdieu and his colleagues were not offering sociological accounts of fixed, ‘out-there’, social realities but were instead sensitising readers to the extent to which sociological understanding is constructed and communicated as a tool to give people the power to modify the life-chances which they inherit. Bourdieu had represented the ‘gentilial democracy’ of Kabyle society not in order to pin down intellectually a kind of social organisation to be advertised inertly alongside others in Social Anthropology textbooks, but in order to articulate the social conditions of possibility of that social organisation in order to encourage the possibility that people might see this social order as a source of inspiration for the radical transformation of the values and structures of Western capitalism. Just as Bourdieu's analyses of the behaviour of Algerian tribespeople constituted his attempt to represent the objective



otherness of a different culture to French society, so it became clear that he was prepared to offer the objectivity of his analytical accounts as itself a form of cultural and conceptual difference. This is the essential meaning of the ‘three forms of theoretical knowledge’ which was separately published as an article in 1973 (Bourdieu, 1973d) and which also belonged critically to the process of intellectual development occurring between *Esquisse d’une théorie de la pratique* (Bourdieu, 1972a) and its ‘translation’ as *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Bourdieu, 1977b). The implication of this revelation was that I began to respond to Bourdieu’s work on two levels. There was the surface response which wanted to recommend Bourdieu’s concepts as instruments for assisting with the understanding of aspects of British society, notably in the field of education. But there was the beginning of a deeper response which faintly understood that Bourdieu was not writing about social structures per se but, instead, writing about them in order to provoke a critical engagement with those structures. I chose ‘Recognizing Society’ as the sub-title to the book. The sub-title sank without trace, but it was crucial in trying to express my inadequate understanding then of the notion that Bourdieu’s work was committed to the notion that we have the power to rethink (re-cognize) our social relations in ways which revive the harmonies of pre-lapsarian behaviour and prepredicative thought. My commitment to the attempt to render Bourdieu’s thinking accurately moved gradually into formal accord with his commitment to the research process in that both were not so much attempts to define the objective truth of what they disclosed as to supply accurately the instruments for encouraging self-understanding and self-determination in respondents.

“Les stratégies de reconversion”(Bourdieu, Boltanski & de Saint- Martin, 1973), alongside “Le titre et le poste” (Bourdieu & Boltanski, 1975), were important articles not only because they manifested a new post-structuralism which would emphasize the constructivist role of social agents but also because they attempted to demonstrate that some potentially strategic actors are oppressed by the dominant power of others to exercise controlling strategic authority. Both articles were by-products of a research enquiry into the ways in which ‘le patronat’—the captains of French industry and commerce—manipulated the processes of ‘meritocratic’ accreditation of the education system in order to maintain their power. The ostensible social function of the education system was to allocate individuals to occupational positions on the basis of impartially tested knowledge and competence established within socially neutral educational institutions. The educational research of the 1960s had questioned these assumptions but the articles argued more forcibly that the educational system had lost its autonomy.

From the beginning of 1991, the polytechnic was in receipt of substantial external funding from the newly established Enterprise Agency to pursue actions which would make the provision of the institution more compatible with an enterprise culture. A member of staff of the School for Independent Study—Mike Laycock<sup>8</sup>—became the head of the institution’s Enterprise Unit and I agreed to become the Local Evaluator for the initiative for one day a week. The compatibility of the ‘enterprise’ development with some aspects of independent study confirmed the dangerous ambivalence of independent study which had been feared at its inception by Marxist staff in the Sociology department. For me, it was further evidence of the extent to which innovative pedagogical practice can be controlled ideologically at a meta-curriculum level by distorting the socio-economic terms of existence of the

institutions within which it occurs. I seized the opportunity to subject the ‘enterprise’ initiative to the kind of scrutiny to which I had subjected the Ecole des cadres in relation to the policies of the Vichy regime. I attempted to be a subversive evaluator even though I was required to be an apologist for neo-vocationalism (see, 1992c and 1993g [Part II, Ch. 15]). I found myself nationally in alliance with Patrick Ainley<sup>9</sup> who was attempting the same strategy as local evaluator at the University of Kent. He had had some involvement with GRASP and his Degrees of Difference (Ainley, 1994) was almost a vicarious realisation of the work for which I had often sought funding—comparing educational provision in institutions across the binary divide. My involvement with the Enterprise initiative also coincided conveniently with an invitation from Monique de Saint Martin to become involved in an international project which she was leading which would compare business and management training across cultures. I gave papers in Paris in 1990 and 1992 (1990d and 1992a) which led to a contribution to a publication (for which Bourdieu wrote a postface, Bourdieu, 1992c) entitled *Les Institutions de Formation des Cadres Dirigeants. Etude comparée*, and, subsequently, in the same research programme, I gave a paper at a conference in Stockholm held in September, 1993, on “Business Studies. The Market of Institutions and the Labour Market. An English Case-Study” (1993e and 1995h [Part II, Ch. 13]). These papers presented the findings of a research project which sought to analyse the development of Business Studies within UK higher education and, in particular, the correlations between the aspirations and performance of students following the Business Studies degree in my institution and their backgrounds in previous study for A-level or HNC/HND qualification. They were the products of a research project (1991–4) which I co-directed with staff in the institution’s Business School. I sought here, and in my evaluations of the introduction of the enterprise culture into the institution, to apply my understanding of Bourdieu’s theoretical position to the analysis of the relationship between the marketisation of higher education institutions and the gradual acceptance within those institutions of the academic legitimacy of courses devoted to the teaching of marketing and commercial skills and organisation. My concern was related to the new political reality of the removal of the ‘binary’ divide between polytechnics and universities within the UK higher education system. From 1992, what had been North East London Polytechnic and, for two years, the Polytechnic of East London, became the University of East London. At once *The Times* began to develop League Tables of university performance to engender competition within the system. This development coincided with the reception of Bourdieu’s *La Noblesse d’Etat* (Bourdieu, 1989a) which attempted to analyse sociologically the strategies deployed by institutions to establish and perpetuate their social distinctiveness. Although Bourdieu’s *La Distinction* (Bourdieu, 1979b) had early been popular with developing Cultural Studies courses in the UK, his parallel analysis of academic distinction, both in *Homo Academicus* (Bourdieu, 1984) and *La Noblesse d’Etat* commanded much less interest. I tried to counter this, writing reviews of both books (1992b and 1993c) and seeking to expose the asociological orientation of the performance criteria of league tables (1993d). At the same period, I translated for the *Times Higher Education* Supplement (1992d) an extract from an interview between Bourdieu and an Algerian youth which was to be published later in *La misère du monde* (1993a) and *Studies in Higher Education* published an article on “The Practical Importance of Bourdieu’s analyses of Higher Education” (1993b [Part II, Ch. 14]). In relation to the work of Bourdieu, I was on the verge of becoming an apologist rather than an exegetist.

## Notes

1. In particular, the Director, François Bédarida, and his staff.
2. See Debeauvais, ed. (1976).
3. See Williams (1987).
4. See Brindle (1996).
5. See Cuba & Cocking (1994).
6. See Bradbury (2000).
7. See Humm (1986).
8. See Laycock (1993).
9. See Ainley (1994).

## References

- Ainley, P. (1994), *Degrees of Difference: Higher Education in the 1990s*, London, Lawrence & Wishart.
- Bourdieu, P., et al. All references to works by Bourdieu are contained in a separate bibliography, pp. 547–94.
- Bradbury, P. (2000), *The Citizen in School: A Survey of School Governor Motivations*, University of East London.
- Brindle, S. (1996), *The Influence of Social Background, Motivations, and the Learning Environment on Mature Students' Experiences of Their Degree Course*, University of Lancaster.
- Calhoun, C., LiPuma, E., Postone, M., eds. (1993), *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*, Oxford: Polity Press.
- Cuba, L. & Cocking, J. (1994), *How to Write About the Social Sciences*, London: Harper Collins.
- Debeauvais, M., ed., (1976), *L'université ouverte: les dossiers de Vincennes*, Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble.
- Habermas, J. (1987), *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*, Oxford: Polity Press.
- Humm, M. (1986), *Feminist Criticism: Women as Contemporary Critics*, Harvester Press.
- Laycock, M. (1993), *Using Learning Contracts in Higher Education*, London.
- Thompson, J.B. (1990), *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication*, Oxford: Polity Press.
- Williams, R. (1987), "Crawling from the Wreckage", *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, June 5, 13.
- Young, M.F.D., ed. (1971), *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education*, London: Collier-Macmillan.