



Pierre Bourdieu's Theory of Social Practice: Understanding Habitus, Capital, and the Arena in Social Life

Darmawan¹

¹UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: Darmawan

E-mail: darmawan@uinsby.ac.id



Article Info

Article history:

Received 26 June 2024

Received in revised form 22

July 2024

Accepted 13 November 2024

Keywords:

Pierre Bourdieu

Social Practice Theory

Habitus

Capital

Social Structure

Abstract

Pierre Bourdieu, a prominent sociologist, developed a theory of social practice that highlights the concepts of habitus, capital, and field as a framework for understanding the dynamics of social life. Habitus refers to cognitive and behavioral dispositions formed through an individual's social experiences, while capital encompasses various forms of economic, social, cultural, and symbolic capital that determine one's position in society. The concept of field describes the social space in which individuals and groups compete to acquire and maintain capital. The interaction between these three concepts explains how social structures reproduce inequality and how individuals can change their social positions. This article aims to outline the main concepts in Bourdieu's theory and their relevance in analyzing social practices in various spheres of life, such as education, politics, and economics.

Introduction

Pierre Bourdieu is one of the significant sociologists who made numerous contributions in the creation of cultural sociology and reflective sociology, or sociological analysis that deeply examines the way in which social structures influence personal behaviors and how personal behavior, in its turn, recreates or disrupts these structures (Mustikasari et al., 2023). The currently available theory of Pierre Bourdieu represents an in-depth look into social dynamics shaping the life and the lives of the people in general and how different social classes, cultures, and power relations can interact and influence developments to form social structure that may eventually change or stay the same (Wolniak & Houston, 2023). According to Bourdieu, the relationship between habitus, capital and field cannot be overemphasized such that: By habitus, were meant the durably installed generative principles that through their embodying of past experiences enable the appearing of the new event; the distinctively-formed products, structures, outcomes of that past; in a word, that which produces practices; capital, as the form taken by practical interests; the pure products of past performances, that is to say, the objective conditions of present performances, and as universal directed at universal, that which is itself directed at the imaginary construction of the new and is

The concepts depicted by Bourdieu such as habitus and field and their effects over the avenues of education, particularly professional and technological fields underscore the correlation between social injustice and internal strata inside educational institutions. Freta (2024) elucidates that the task requirements accompanied by the impact of COVID-19 placed the consortium in a disadvantaged position. The theory of social practice formulated by Bourdieu is based on such concepts as the definer of a certain disposition inherited as habitus and capital as a resource with which one can influence the social dynamics, and finally on social fields where the specified elements interact and form the culture, preferences of the individuals and media scenes. The theory of social practice by Pierre Bourdieu is a complex unity of the very concepts of habitus, capital, and field, which allows one to scheme the social dynamics and

2175

comprehend them (Sharlamanov et al., 2024). Habitus can be defined as the crystallized habits, abilities and stances that have been influenced by social setting and capital as resources such as economical, cultural, social and symbolic capital can be used by an individual in a number of social domains or fields of social existence (Riza et al., 2024).

This interaction is crucial for analyzing how social practices are shaped and maintained. This approach makes his contributions invaluable and relevant to a variety of disciplines, such as education, which examines how school systems reproduce social inequality; social work, which focuses on community empowerment strategies to address inequality and improve social well-being; and cultural studies, which examines how cultural and symbolic practices contribute to the formation of identities and social hierarchies (de Oliveira Côrrea Filho & da Paixão, 2024). Thus, Bourdieu's theory not only provides profound theoretical insights into social dynamics but also offers a set of analytical tools that can be used to understand complex social issues in modern society.

Bourdieu lends insight as to how a person is constrained by social organization alongside the way an individual can replicate or challenge this structure and these processes through such concepts as habitus, capital, and field. This theory gains a significant relevance in the aspect of studying the social inequity, cultural subjugation and the processes of social reproduction that are mostly made unaware of the people involved. By examining the interaction of the different types of capital, economic, social, cultural and symbolic, as they manifest themselves in day to day life, strategies of social intervention can be identified where injustices are present and designed to counteract them. Thus, the theory by Bourdieu is not only academic but it also has practical importance which may be implemented in different surrounding, whether education and public policy or even social activism in an effort to make a more reasonable and equal society.

Social Practice Theory (SPT) lays stress on how the interaction between material arrangements and practices helps a society to evolve in an effective manner, and how social change is the resultant effect of the chain of actions. It embraces the notion of complexity and otherness, implying that social order and individuality are achieved due to situated, observable and meaningful practices (Tessarolo, 2024). Sharing common attitudes toward action are what constitute obligations as social constructs. But it does not pay sufficient attention to the role of normative factors, and it indicates a mixed or hybrid view, on which social practices determine obligations, and non-social norms give them their force (Stavropoulos, 2024). It is in this understanding that a social practice theory places great emphasis on collective patterns of human activity as the popular unit of analysis in sustainability transitions. It focuses on practices, (infra)structures and behaviours and their interaction with each other, and provides insights into social dynamics and supports innovative sustainable change (Laakso et al., 2024).

Meanwhile, some discuss the dynamic factors influencing household demand. This critiques the individual behaviour change approach, advocating collaborative strategies that consider materiality, diversity, and inequality in water management and consumption practices (Cahill et al., 2024). From the opinions above, it can be concluded that Social Practice Theory (SPT) explains that social change depends not only on individual actions, but also on the interaction between social practices, materiality (physical resources and technology), and broader social structures. This approach highlights that phenomena such as obligations, sustainability, and consumption patterns are not simply the result of individual decisions but are influenced by collective patterns that have formed within society. Thus, social change must be understood as the result of the dynamic relationship between individuals, social practices, and the material and structural conditions that shape habits and patterns of daily life.

The relevance of various theories in understanding social dynamics is significant, as they provide a framework for analyzing complex interactions within society. The integration of sociophysics, social dynamic response theory, and socioeconomic dynamics offers diverse perspectives on how social structures develop and respond to change. Sociophysics provides insights into social dynamics by applying mathematical and computational techniques to analyze complex systems, optimize decision-making processes, and improve understanding of information dissemination, ultimately contributing to the social goals of justice and equality through informed interactions (Öktem et al., 2024).

response theory is relevant in understanding social dynamics because it highlights how increasing gender inequality can lead to reduced participation in institutions, increase inter-gender conflict, and ultimately threaten public health, social cohesion, and the overall social climate (Marshall, 2024). Socio-economic dynamic theories are particularly important during global crises, explaining structural changes and survival strategies in societies. They highlight the emergence of dynamic processes and the challenges in predicting social transformations (Vasin, 2023). These theories are relevant because they explain critical structural changes in societies during global events, highlight patterns of transformation in socioeconomic systems, and overcome the obstacles in predicting unforeseen crises, thereby enhancing understanding of social dynamics and their complexities.

From the various theories discussed, it can be concluded that social structure and change in society cannot be understood solely from an individual perspective, but must be seen as the result of a complex interaction between social practices, individual capital, and broader material and structural factors. Pierre Bourdieu's theory provides a deep understanding of how habitus, capital, and fields interact to shape social dynamics, particularly in the context of social inequality, education, and power relations. Habitus, as an ingrained disposition within an individual, is influenced by previous social experiences, while capital, whether economic, social, cultural, or symbolic, determines an individual's position within a social field. Thus, this theory explains how social inequality continues to be reproduced in various aspects of life, including education and the workplace.

Furthermore, Social Practice Theory (SPT) highlights that social change is influenced not only by individual decisions or actions, but also by the interaction between social practices embedded in society, materialities such as technology and infrastructure, and larger social structures. This approach provides important insights into understanding how existing social practices can be maintained or transformed, for example in the context of sustainability, household consumption, and resource distribution. By understanding these patterns of social practice, more effective strategies can be developed to promote more inclusive and sustainable social change.

Furthermore, various other theories such as sociophysics, social dynamic response theory, and socio-economic dynamics enrich our understanding of how societies develop and respond to change. Sociophysics uses mathematical and computational approaches to analyze complex social dynamics, such as the spread of information and collective decision-making, which contribute to the creation of more equitable social systems. Social dynamic response theory highlights how social inequality, including gender inequality, can affect social cohesion and the stability of a society as a whole, suggesting that social change is not only individual but also collective. Meanwhile, socio-economic dynamics theory highlights how structural changes in society occur, especially in the face of global crises and economic challenges, thus providing a deeper understanding of long-term social transformation.

By understanding these various perspectives, we can see that society is not a static entity, but rather a constant state of change influenced by various social, economic, cultural, and technological factors. Analyzing these social dynamics allows us to identify existing challenges and design more effective strategies for creating more equitable, sustainable, and inclusive social change for all levels of society.

Methods

The research design used in this study is descriptive-analytical and qualitative. It is the nature of a qualitative method that justifies its selection, with the keen interest to offer a detailed narrative and comprehensive picture of a sociological phenomenon, especially in studying ways in which theoretical constructs are showing in the real lives of people. The descriptive-analytical design enables the study to eliminate the narration characteristic of the social practices to interpret and critically analyse them through the prism of Pierre Bourdieu theory of social practice.

The main theoretical categorization of this study is the trias of habitus-capital-field proposed by Bourdieu. These three connected notions are the core of comprehending the method of formation and reproduction of social practices in people everyday life. Habitus is understood as the internalized schemes of knowledge and patterns of an individual to guide the behaviors of the individual, capital has got various forms (economic, cultural, social, and symbolic) and this is the resource mobilized by individuals or a group, and field is the structured arenas of interaction attended. By placing these ideas in the empirical observation, the study aims at identifying how persons and groups bargain their space, strategies and practice in varied social cultures.

The qualitative methodology will also allow this study to perceive the dynamic interrelationships between the subjective experiences and the structures. Descriptive and analytical interpretation of the research highlights the fact that not only are the concepts proposed by Bourdieu theoretically relevant, but also that they are manifested in a concrete manner in the ways individuals and groups interact in their day-to-day lives. By doing so, the method can make the study firmly anchored to factual realities and yet very theoretically consistent hence producing an impressive insight into how social practices are formed and structured by the interplay of the three social dimensions, i.e., habitus, capital, and field.

Results and Discussion

Key Concepts in Social Practice Theory

Habitus

Habitus is a set of dispositions coined out of societal experiences and hence guiding how individuals in society perceive and act within society as well as how they think. Habitus means a collection of internal predispositions that are formed through social life and social contacts with the social forms. It shapes human way of thinking, their values and preferences, and thus ultimately determines their ways of life and social identity in a given social context (Hisyam et al., 2024). Habitus is described as a dispositional system also molded by the social experiences and is the representation of objective and subjective conditions of social groups. It helps to reproduce power relations, whether it is through the theorization of Pierre Bourdieu and Norbert Elias (Sharlamanov et al., 2024).

Habitus can be interpreted as the basic individual mental education, the universal grid and psychodynamic pattern that is formed by the social experience, affects the socialization process, role internalization as well as serves as the central element in the processes of human activity and behavior (Khairulin, 2023). Habitus is the system of dispositions, which is a system

of dispositions installed in the atmosphere of family life, which begins to manifest itself as a consequence of being thrown into a world of repeated social relations and practices presenting the context, within which they are formed.

And based on the explanation above it can be stated that a habitus is a disposition system that is created by the effects of social experiences and interaction with social structures. This notion determines the way of thinking, values, behavior of a person, which also depends upon the social context in which he/she grows. Moreover, habitus contributes to moving power relations, social identities and to the socialization and the incorporation of positions in society.

Habitus as a concept invented by Pierre Bourdieu plays a crucial role in shaping the way people think, act and speak by equipping them with social/cultural inclinations that have been acquired through experiences and interactions. These interiorized frames of reference dictate behavior, perception, lifestyle choice and therefore their social identity. The way habitus plays out in this dimension is described below Habitus constitutes a mental paradigm that affects the way people interpret experiences, react to situations and decisions they make in their day-to-day life. This model corresponds to the socioeconomic background and educational experiences of the person, which formulates his thinking, value, and ambitions (Hisyam et al., 2024).

Thus, people can differ by habitus across social groups explaining the variability of way of thinking, preferences, and actions which represent wider society dynamics. Habituated tendencies determine the actions in different situations, locking the social values and expectations into the actions. To illustrate, the habitus of a student in an academic context can affect their engagement within their academic classroom, the way they relate with teachers, peers and the intensity with which they engage with academic exercises and practices, which in the end determine their performance and achievement level (Lynch, 2017). Language use and communication styles also come as a by-product of a habitus as people practice elements of language use that would fit in their social place.

This may be in different levels of formality, jargon, or even dialects, which shows not only a social identification, and group belongingness but also underlines that same status in the social structure. Although habitus offers an explanation of an individual behavior, it can also be depicted as confining, and thus inhibiting the agency of individuals and amounting to augmented support of existing positions of power in society (Elgindy & Sanchez, 2024). Concrete examples of habitus in everyday life can be found in family routines, educational practices, and workplace behavior, where individuals navigate social norms and expectations shaped by their historical experiences (Suesse, 2019).

This has an effect on their perceptions, behaviors as well as their interactions in certain social circles. Another example of habitus manifestation is including the safety rituals practiced by individuals, which include not going in specific places, dressing decently, or keeping away contact with men (Fleetwood, 2019) in the context of security. The lifestyles and identities of college students are also the product of habitus, based on the social economic backgrounds and social relationships. This affects their eating habits as well as their culture and tastes, which also represents the internalized types of value held by their own social groups (Hisyam et al., 2024). They are modes of adaptation to the existence of sexual violence against women and eventually define how the experts control their bodily her activity in the daily environment (Fleetwood, 2019). Although habitus offers a form of explanation of behavior, it should be noted that individuals are capable of pushing back against their habitus and reforming it based on novelty and interactions in social environments, a demonstration of the interplay between agency and structure. In summary, habitus is a dispositional pattern established by social experiences and someone based on interactions with the environment which is affiliated with

the social structures. It explains this idea because the way a person thinks, managerial values and behavior is not something that develops independently but rather it is a response to the incorporation of the existing norms and practices within a given social group. Habitus does not only enable people to comprehend the world but also to act according to the situations they face regularly. Habitus, therefore, influences the social identity of an individual in terms of the way he or she talks, dresses, or interplays with other people. The process is unconscious and it further develops with time through the different social experiences an individual gains throughout his childhood to the adulthood stage.

A mechanism capable of reproducing extant power relations in the social life is the habitus. The form of habitus which enables them to gain access to more resources be that in the form of economical, cultural, social, or symbolic, is more likely found in individuals who are of more dominant social environments. In their turn, members of less advantaged social groups will have a habitus that will reflect low access to opportunities and resources. Through this means, habitus has a key role when it comes to perpetuating the social stratification and inequality within the society.

Habitus also plays a part in dynamics of social interaction concerning different sectors of life e.g., in education, work, and culture. Academically, the habitus of a student will greatly shape the way he/she will react to the learning environment based on their family background. The student with highly educated families usually has a habitus that suits academic value, thus, easily assimilating to the strictures of the formal education system. On the other hand, those students whose families have less educated backgrounds might also have difficulty meeting the academic demands since they do not have as well-suited habitus regarding their school/college setting. This illustrates that habitus would enable or impede the social mobility of an individual in the context of education.

Moreover, habitus is a factor that also determines a person in language usage and communication style. When people are in various social situations, language variation means that different people can take a style of talking that is agreeable to their group. People with an upper-middle-class habitus, as an example, are more likely to employ more formal and academic speech in everyday discussions, whereas individuals belonging to the lower social classes will have a closer relationship to an informal and direct manner of communication. These disparities do not only represent the social background of a person but also lead to the reinforcement of differences in the social status within the society. The authority of communicating and corresponding among different persons in the workplace can determine to what extent the individual can be recognized or accepted within a given professional setting.

Habitus has great influence over the lifestyle and cultural preferences of an individual. The foods, clothes, music, and an individual look at experiences of entertainment etc. depict values and norms that one has exercised living at childhood. To illustrate, people brought up in more art-preferring families are likely to like classical music, literature and fine arts, whereas those trained in more practical and popular end up enjoying such entertainment. Such preferences are not spontaneous but are acquired a very lengthy innerization process due to social experience and interactions with the immediate environment.

Habitus is also relevant in terms of security and social awareness as it determines individual actions and strategies when it comes to responding to different situations. To illustrate, women who mature in an environment where sexual violence is prevalent may acquire a habitus of how to prevent danger, which may include dressing in a certain way, or avoiding certain places or eye contact with strange men. Such actions cannot be seen as personal choices, because they have been formed by a kind of habitus which has been created due to the given social

circumstances. In this way, habitus can be viewed as an adaptive mechanism allowing individuals to cope with the issues and threats that occur in the constant interaction with their environment.

Habitus can provide guidelines with respect to knowing and moving around in the social world but we should not forget that habitus cannot remain the same at all times. Person can transform his/her habitus by means of new experiences, social interactions. This process is possible when a person transfers to another social environment, obtains higher education, or gets involved in another social group than the initial one. That is, habitus may influence the way people think and behave; however, people have the freedom to change or readjust their habitus in the long-run.

An example of this would be that an underprivileged person, one with a lower socioeconomic status, might have a habitus that would at first be in accord with the norms and practices of a higher academic establishment. Based on socialization and the experience of learning, they may acquire a new habitus that can enable them to adjust and succeed in that setting. This shows that it is not impossible to change habits, but it may be essential to put a lot of effort in and to maintain contact to new social structures.

Therefore, the issues that may be inferred on the basis of the habitus theory belong to the fact that the social experiences ever had since childhood become decisive in shaping the behavior of people, their way of thinking, and their lifestyle. Habitus is a kind of agent which assists people to maneuver in the social world, although it can amplify the already existing lopsidedness and social stratification. Although habitus can curtail the agency of individuals, it is not fixed, since people could modify and redefine their habitus through their interactions and through any new experience in being. As such, the concept of habitus can lead to more accurate forms of determining how people are able to adjust to different social settings, how social structures have a hand in influencing individual identities and life experiences.

Capital

Capital does not only refer to economic, but also to cultural, social and symbolic capital. These ideas are employed to give a meaning as to how individuals and groups will vary in their position in the social structure. Economic capital can be described as resources that a person or a group has, both material and financial resources. Economic capital is the most material form of capital, one which can quite easily be transformed into a different form of capitals, such as cultural and social capital. Economic capital enables one to receive good education, health care, and gain access to the economy in general. Economic capital is the money or funds and property accorded to a person or organization.

This capital has a direct effect on access to various opportunities, education and healthcare which contributes to social mobility. Moreover, economic capital has the capability of increasing social capital in that one can join networks and activities that promote acquiring social relationships (Mudd et al., 2023). In different works economic capital tends to be regarded as one of the important determinants of the social status of an individual. Cultural capital entails knowledge and skills, education and other cultural aspects that are shared within a certain social environment.

Bourdieu classifies cultural capital into three major categories: (a) embodied state, the knowledge and skills encoded in an individual, like the way he/she speaks, dresses or thinks. The objectified state, or the physical embodiment of culture as in books, paintings, musical instruments, or works of art. Institutionalized state, formal acknowledgment of cultural capital, in the form of academic degrees and professional certification. The cultural capital is prominent

in shaping the social stratification framework as those with high cultural resources can be given high status in society.

Cultural capital refers to the non financial assets like education, skills and cultural information. The cultural capital is important in influencing individual tastes and preferences which then determines how they interact and their social standing in the society (Mudd et al., 2023).

Social capital suggests networks or the relationships that offer people social support along with access to a variety of resources. The good social capital can raise the engagement in the community and promote the collective action that eventually leads to better health outcomes. Moreover, social capital intersects with economic capital with high levels of social capital boosting the advantages of economic resources that are within the same resource (Mudd et al., 2023). The Phenomenon of symbolic capital is defined as the understanding and acknowledgement along with admiration of individuals or groups in the society. Symbolic capital forms a basis on the other types of capital and may be exchanged into economic, cultural, or social capital.

Symbolic capital refers to prestige and recognition of the individuals or groups based on their social practices and cultural capital. Such huge amount of capital is very instrumental in creating social perceptions and identities as it shapes hierarchies and power structures (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2013). Moreover, symbolic capital may be seen as an arrangement of senses that are comprehended and negotiated through the habitus and ultimately determine the social status and degree of agency of the individual . The most common examples are academic degrees that would earn a person higher social status or awards that would make a person be accorded high levels of credibility in any specific field. Bourdieu stated that as far as social dominance is concerned, symbolic capital is important in the processes of symbolic power.

Capital interplay in social practice in the Bourdieu theory is the relation that is two way. Parties or individuals with heavy capital-economic levels gain easy access to cultural and social capital that is further transformable into symbolic capital. On the other hand, people with high cultural capital are able to convert them to economic capital (academics may use their talents into getting better job offers). In analysing the social structure, conversion of capital is important in revealing ways social reproduction and inequality work. This capital is obtainable not only through efforts of an individual but also through family and social groups. Moreover, it is also possible to exchange capital; i.e., economic capital can be traded to gain the ability to gain education (cultural capital), and then gain better social position.

Based on how Bourdieu conceptualizes the idea of capital, one can conclude that the four forms of capital, namely economic, cultural, social and symbolic capital relate to others to place an individual within the social hierarchy. Economic capital opens the door to material resources to be transformed into other kinds of capital, like education or social networks, which in their turn affect the social position of a person. Cultural capital is made up of knowledge, skills and institutional recognition that is highly important to determine tastes, preferences and social legitimacy. In the meantime, there is social capital, network and interpersonal relations that offer individuals a chance to acquire support and to access some resources.

Symbolic capital as a capital constraint anchored in other degrees of capital is a means through which legitimacy and prestige are awarded within the society. The interplay of these diverse forms of capital will form a social reproduction mechanism where more individuals positioned in different classes of capital will stand a better opportunity of switching to a better or retaining the same status. Although this theory is useful in showing how social inequality is reproduced, generation after generation, Bourdieu also shows how people can still change because of the transformation of capital and the experiences that an individual may have that transform his or

her habitus. Thus, understanding capital in Bourdieu's theory not only helps explain existing social stratification but also provides insight into opportunities for social mobility within society.

Arena (Field)

The view of the field as a social space in the Theory of Social Practice of Pierre Bourdieu underlines the rivalrous relations among individuals and groups in the different fields of the society. This framework of Bourdieu helps to determine how these fields are organized with regards to different forms of capital thereby causing power struggles and social cruelties. The essential points of this concept are mentioned in the following section. Social fields and capital In social fields and capital, social fields are the area where individuals or agents battle it out over resources and recognition, with the capital they hold as an influence in these competitions it decides whether they will win, with the capital being of the economic, cultural, social, and the symbolic. The allocation of such capital defines the place occupied by them in the field and the interactions and strategies they employ in competition (Glevarec, 2023).

Bourdieu in the view of the ideological field reflects how ideologies struggle over hegemony with agents aiming at amassing the ideological capital in a wider social contest. This rivalry is an aspect of the conflict of legitimacy and the powers in the social space and represents the clash of different ideologies in the fight to gain hegemony. The concept of agency in Bourdieu means that individuals have the ability to negotiate and manoeuvre within the social systems they find themselves in and seemingly that is a major cause of collective action towards an external force. This situation of trust, identity, and power in this arena illustrates how social practices are formulated because of the dynamics between the individual and the collective agency (Marchi, 2024).

The field as a concept of Pierre Bourdieu theory of social practice explains how social space turns into a competition granting to individual actors and groups of resources, influence and legitimacy. Every field has its different groupings of forms of capital, both economic, cultural, social and symbolic, which define where individuals or groups sit and how they will place themselves on the dynamics of social operation. The people with more capital have an advantage in a specific area in which it will remain or rise in their social status and positions, whereas those with less capital have a challenge of recognition and accessibility of resources. Moreover, the ideological field of the theory of Bourdieu demonstrates that ideas and beliefs along with material resources are also the sphere of struggle. Such competition of ideologies is key in constructing the discourse of social change, as well as strengthening political forces with great ideological capital in the society.

Although Bourdieu theory emphasizes that social structures are more likely to reproduce the domination of the minority group rather than subvert it, the individual agency as the means of dominating their social condition is also a key concept of the theory. Agency enables people to adopt a resourceful approach to the deployment of the resources they have in the quest to attain a superior status within a specific environment. In other instances, the poor could simply transform their capital wealth to other forms so that they could elevate their status. As an example, an individual who possesses lots of cultural capital (i.e. education and intellectual capabilities) will be able to use this to secure a better job, thus gaining economic and social capital in result. Moreover, the complex relationship between trust, identity and power in an arena shows that social practices are not only restricted to the structures in place, but also further defined by how the subjects and groups react to social patterns they are facing.

Generally, the notion of the field in the theory of social practice with Bourdieu shows a phenomenal explanation of how social inequality has been perpetuated through processes of

competition and sharing of capital on different domains of living. However, this concept also opens up space for social change, especially when certain individuals or groups successfully challenge and redefine the rules of the game within the arena they occupy. Thus, this theory provides a rich framework for analyzing social dynamics, power, and the potential for transformation in society, while also emphasizing that structure and agency always interact in shaping social reality.

The Interaction between Habitus, Capital, and Arena

The connection between habitus, capital, and field is a quasi-constitutive element in the sociological theory of Pierre Bourdieu, which posits the way social practices are instituted by types of predisposition or dispositions, means available to individuals, and the milieu within which individuals act. This exchange is manifested in sectors such as religious groups, social media and in higher academic institutions. In a habitual approach to habitus, the term habitus describes the habits, skills and dispositions that people acquire in their lifetime to feel, respond, and behave in certain ways within the social world (Riza et al., 2024).

Habitus plays a significant role in the manner in which individuals interact in the different realms of society because their perceptions, values, and behaviors are shaped by their social background, schooling and their experiences. In this regard, habitus plays a registration role as a system of predispositions that directs people to feel, react and engage with the different situations they find themselves in society. This is a concept proposed by Pierre Bourdieu who believed that the manner in which an individual interprets his or her social environment and how to negotiate in the society is influenced by social structures and previous experiences which lead to a difference in the manner in which they engage, be it in terms of participation, formation of identity, or adaptation to existing social norms.

Habitus plays a paramount role in influencing perceptions of engagement in relation to individuals who belong to different socioeconomic backgrounds this is because it determines how these individuals will approach their values, behaviors and relations with their social structures. This is a notion based on the theory of Bourdieu, where he argues that people internalize their social circumstances and this acts as a determinant of their degree of participation in educational and civic life. Social economic issues affect people with different socioeconomic backgrounds implying that habitus affects the degree of participation (Wilson & McGuire, 2022). To illustrate, working-class mothers can be estranged by the educational institutions because the habitus forms their perception of interaction with school. Members with less privilege in terms of social-economic status acquire a habitus of distrustfulness to institutions, and so, they stop getting involved in the learning institutions because they are not offered access, support or feeling attached to the values of the institution. On the other hand, people with higher socioeconomic backgrounds are more apt to have a typecast that promotes activism, where learning facilities are considered as a resource and pathway in enhancing their social status. Thus, they will more actively engage in different dimensions of the academic and social life within them.

The patterns of cultural consumption are also determined by cultural preference within the habitus, which affects the manner in which individuals get involved in societal activities and community events as portrayed by lifestyle choices of college students (Hisyam et al., 2024). The concept of civic habitus indicates the way the construction of power relations and historical circumstances influences the degree of participation of a person in the civic exercise. The social norm of marginalized representatives mostly suggests that people tend to be oppressed and restricted in carrying out any actions (Petit, 2016). Such an impression of participation is often supported by a tacit willingness toward these norms, which can eventually become a circle of

apathy and lack of action among depressed segments, restoring the existing social status quo (Marchi, 2024).

The knowledge of the concept of habitus can assist in the design of an educational institution that would better respond to the needs of students whose socioeconomic background differs. By taking into consideration the fact that everyone comes with habits, values or mindsets informed by their social background, schools can come up with mechanisms that seek to consciously close these divides. As an example, educational institutions can develop more adaptive support programmes, measure their guidance to be sensitive to pupils of such a nature and develop a more open and receptive environment to the alienated students of the educational system. Using this strategy, the schools promote wider participation but also help decrease the inequality in accessibility and participation in education.

To this effect, capital can also be described as encompassing other resources owned by an individual, which are economic, cultural, social, and symbolic capital and in the context of YouTube they are used by the content creators to have visibility and power and thus reveal the role of capital in establishing success in the competitive environment (Stavropoulos, 2024). At the same time, regarding the arena, the arena is a space of social interaction with its rules and relations of power, where interaction and resource distribution takes place. As an example, in the newspaper business, journalists employ their cultural capital to establish newsworthiness, which displays the affecting sectors of the arena on the allocation of power and resources (Suesse, 2019).

Although habitus, capital and arena are interlinked, they can build the barriers as well. To use another example, people in underprivileged backgrounds may find themselves ineffective in these processes of interaction, and this is compounded by the fact that such social mobility and resource availability are intertwined in a very complicated way.

Conclusion

According to Pierre Bourdieu, human beings are never ready to do anything and as such, their actions are always anchored in social structures which work based on three important concepts; the habitus, capital and field. Habitus is a result of social experiences seen through childhood and the personality that later develops in life and influences the way one thinks, his/her likes and dislikes and also the manner one behaves in different context. Habitus re invents the structures that already exist, this is not necessarily deterministic and it can shift through new social interactions, through various life experiences or by being exposed to different environments. Social position is also determined by Capital which is the economic, cultural, social and symbolic. It is not only material wealth but also knowledge, skills, networks of relationships, and recognition or prestige that can empower an individual within the society.

The notion of field in the Bourdieu theory denotes the social space where individuals and groups struggle to see their share of resources, power and popularity, as in education, economics, politics, in the arts or in the media. In every discipline, people that are more endowed have an easier time securing success in comparison with the less fortunate. The interrelation of habitus, capital, and field reveals that social practices do not merely occur as a result of individual preferences but also by the influence of social constructs further on. This theory emphasizes the reproduction of social inequality on the intergenerational level via apparently natural processes but at the same time making room of social change. New capital and the development of a more flexible habitus enable the individual to change his or her position on the social ladder and even cause wider changes in social arrangements.

References

- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (2013). Symbolic capital and social classes. *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 13(2), 292–302.
- Cahill, J., Hoolohan, C., & Browne, A. L. (2024). Social practice theory and household water demand: A review of literature and research evidence. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water*, 11(3), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wat2.1719>
- de Oliveira Côrrea Filho, I., & da Paixão, J. A. (2024). A operacionalização das noções bourdieusianas de habitus e campo na educação profissional e tecnológica. *Revista Ponto de Vista*, 13(1), 01-20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.47328/rpv.v13i1.16356>
- Elgindy, A., & Sanchez, M. T. (2024). Habitus Entrapment: The Constrictive, Deterministic Habitus of Peter the Venerable. *AWEJ for Translation & Literary Studies*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol8no1.1>
- Fleetwood, J. (2019). Everyday self-defence: Hollaback narratives, habitus and resisting street harassment. *The British Journal Of Sociology*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12699>
- Glevarec, H. (2023). Social space as a theory of society: Scientific arguments regarding the figuration of the social in Bourdieu's Distinction. *Sociology*, 57(1), 96–119. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00380385221094771>
- Hisyam, C. J., Darmawan, G. S., Prayogo, M. D. A., & Pratama, R. A. (2024). Habitus Mempengaruhi Gaya Hidup Dan Identitas Sosial Mahasiswa Universitas Negeri Jakarta Menurut Perspektif Bourdieu. *Jurnal Motivasi Pendidikan Dan Bahasa*, 2(2), 80-92. <https://doi.org/10.59581/jmpb-widyakarya.v2i2.3378>
- Khairulin. (2023). HABITUS AS A SUBJECT MATRIX OF A SOCIAL GAME. *Psihologiâ i Suspil'stvo*, 01.
- Laakso, S., Keller, M., & Backhaus, J. (2024). *Social Practice Theories and Sustainability Transitions Studies*. 1–13.
- Lynch, J. (2017). *Practice Theory and Education: Diffractive Readings in Professional Practice*. New York: University of Oxford.
- Marchi, L. (2024). Bourdieuan Perspectives On Social Power Production: Understanding The Eu And Member States'harmonised Responses To Russia's 2022 Incursion Into Ukraine. *MJIR| Malaysian Journal of International Relations*, 12(1), 18–34. <https://doi.org/10.22452/mjir.vol12no1.2>
- Marshall, J. (2024). Social Dynamic Response Theory: Examining the Impact of the Pandemic-era Reduction in Women's Rights on the Social Climate in the U.S. *OSF Preprint*. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/m5kyw>
- Mudd, A. L., Oude Groeniger, J., Bal, M., Verra, S. E., van Lenthe, F. J., & Kamphuis, C. B. M. (2023). Testing conditionality with Bourdieu's capital theory: How economic, social, and embodied cultural capital are associated with diet and physical activity in the Netherlands. *SSM - Population Health*, 22(August 2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssmph.2023.101401>
- Mustikasari, M., Arlin, A., & Kamaruddin, S. A. (2023). Pemikiran Pierre Bourdieu dalam Memahami Realitas Sosial. *Kaganga:Jurnal Pendidikan Sejarah Dan Riset Sosial Humaniora*, 6(1), 9–14. <https://doi.org/10.31539/kaganga.v6i1.5089>

- Öktem, Y., Tuncer, E. P., & Akyüz, A. Ö. (2024). Physical Analysis of Social Dynamics: a Sociophysics Perspective. *Scientific Journal of Mehmet Akif Ersoy University*, 7(1), 44–56. <https://doi.org/10.70030/sjmakeu.1483649>
- Pettit, J. (2016). *Why citizens don't engage—Power, poverty and civic habitus*. Institute of Development Studies. <https://doi.org/10.19088/1968-2016.169>
- Riza, R. M., Imronudin, I., & Fatchiatuzzahro, F. (2024). Analisis Habitus dan Kapital Khawārij Perspektif Pierre Bourdieu dalam Strategi Kekuasaan. *MAGHZA: Jurnal Ilmu Al-Qur'an Dan Tafsir*, 9(2), 270–291. <https://doi.org/10.24090/maghza.v9i2.11317>
- Sharlamanov, K., Jovanoski, A., & Kostovska, M. (2024). Social inequalities as a context for the formation of habitus. *Discover Global Society*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44282-024-00125-w>
- Stavropoulos, N. (2024). *The Practice Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Suesse, N. (2019). *Caught Between the Clocks: Everyday Family Politics Between Work, Education, and Care in Cologne, Germany*. London: King's College London.
- Tessarolo, M. (2024). Towards a new linguistic and social paradigm: from individual creativity to community of practice. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brasov. Series IV: Philology and Cultural Studies*, 17(1), 95–102. <https://doi.org/10.31926/but.pcs.2024.66.17.1.7>
- Vasin, S. M. (2023). A Theoretical Review of Socio-Economic Dynamics and Structural Transformation of Society: Traits and Constraints in Validating Response Processes Due to Unpredictable Factors. *Economies*, 11(7). <https://doi.org/10.3390/economies11070187>
- Wilson, S., & McGuire, K. (2022). 'You feel a bit lost': a case study interpreting white, working-class mothers' engagement through habitus. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 43(2), 314–331. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2022.2026762>
- Wolniak, M., & Houston, S. (2023). A sociologist in the field of social work: Pierre Bourdieu's theory and its relevance for social work practice. *Critical and Radical Social Work*, 11(2), 183–198. <https://doi.org/10.1332/204986021X16455445960144>