

1.7

**DOMINANT CONJUNCTION IN
THE STUDY OF STRATIFICATION
ORDERS: POSITIONS
& DISPOSITIONS**

УДК 316.443

Natalia Kovalisko (Lviv)

The article considers social inequality as a certain set of stratification orders that are constantly reproduced in every society. In the study of stratification orders the dominant one is the conjunction of “position & disposition”, which makes it possible to identify and explain the specific behaviour of individuals and communities operating in one way or another because they represent the bearers of a certain habitus (as a set of dispositions). Thus, stratification orders are positions that are hierarchically ordered on the basis of a set of inequality criteria determining which of the agents (individual, group, stratum) occupies the highest and which the lowest place for the social splitting of society. Dispositions are the product of past experience and take place in social agents as patterns of perception, thinking and action. The position of communities in the social structure is formed on the basis of the entire set of stratification orders that are methodologically and methodically substantiated by the researcher within the framework of a certain theoretical paradigm or approach.

Keywords: social inequality, stratification order, conjunction of “position & disposition”.

The social inequality that a sociologist represents in the form of a definite set of stratification orders is constantly reproduced in any society and the character of reproduction is unstable. This is the very circumstance that supports researchers' interest in stratification processes, stimulates the search for new institutional or purely situational grounds for the emergence and approval of new varieties of inequality.

The idea of a class stratification order, that is, the order of prepotency and domination, the reduction of social structure to the class structure is peculiar to Marxism. Nowadays, the empirical study of class inequality is based on the rather strict methodological constructions of E. Wright and J. Goldthorpe. The most intensive conceptual development of the notions of non-class stratification orders took place within the framework of M. Weber's "understanding sociology", as well as structural functionalism, where the necessity and inevitability of stratification are justified and where it is interpreted as an uneven distribution of material wealth and public prestige, which is determined by the functional importance (significance) of the position. In the framework of the functional approach, it is proposed to consider the basic stratification order of positions, where material and symbolic remunerations of different quality and volume are built into the positions themselves. In this case, the individual or community at the same time has different statuses within the various stratification orders (income, age, position, origin, power, education, prestige, etc.). The cumulative status is called the status (stratification) profile. Individuals with similar status profiles form social strata, which are characterized by a certain subculture, more frequent contacts between their members, a similar lifestyle, a way of consumption, social practices and a more or less distinctive distance separating one stratum from the other.

In the study of stratification orders, that is, in the attempts of sociologists to discover and explain the specificity of individual or group behaviour, the unconditional dominant belongs to the conjunction of "position and disposition". Several content strata or measurements can be distinguished within this variety of scientific and intellectual practice. Thus, classical and modern interpretations of the notions of "social space" state the existence of a final set of "places", discrete localities that are not the same in meaning and quality and capable of forming heterogeneous configurations by condensation or, conversely, rarefaction. In fact, here we mean different dimensions of the discreteness of social space, for the definition of which the general term "positions" is used. In other words, stratification orders are hierarchically ordered positions.

K. Davis and W. Moore in their works, which at the time reasonably claimed the status of “stratification theory”, insisted on “embedding” into such positions quantitatively and qualitatively unequal schemes of material and symbolic remuneration. Hence, firstly, individuals starting independent life, allegedly have an objectifiable motivation “before them” to make efforts to achieve higher and better remunerated places of work, and also have greater or lesser chances to take attractive positions for them or are doomed to unattractive. In addition, according to popular opinion, people are given a sense of their own position in the social space to various extents (the ability to define it in terms of “above–below”, “closer–further”, “between”, etc.), and are able to develop an awareness of the limitations and opportunities inherent in their self-localization or attributed to other individuals or institutions of localization.

According to P. Bourdieu, positions are rather constellations of different types and sizes of capital, which, in fact, structure and hierarchically organize the social space as a whole, and individuals are given certain chances to control the individual or group space: “...the ability to dominate in the assigned space, primarily due to the assignment (by material or symbolic way) of those scarce goods, which are distributed there, depends on available capital” [Бурдьё, 1993: с. 43]. Moreover, capital constellations (aggregated position) are incorporated, that is, transformed into a system of personal qualities, intentions and willingness to act in a certain way: the incorporated position he calls habitus (set of dispositions).

In modern literature there is no conceptually convincing description of the process by which positions are “entered into subjectivity” (P. Bourdieu). Probably, it is impossible as a matter of fact – everything is mostly limited by links to the primary and secondary socialization. However, this does not prevent the conjunction of “position & disposition” to be dominant both in the identification and interpretation of stratification orders by themselves, and in explaining the behaviour of individuals and communities acting in a certain way because they are carriers of certain habitus (a set of dispositions).

Let us consider in more detail the content of each component of this pair, although in this case it will not be possible to completely abstract from the conjunctivity. After all, this kind of impossibility is created due to the “nature” of social artifacts. It is worth recalling that, according to Marx, they are “sensually-super-sensitive” formations, and E. Durkheim, for example, insisted that sociology has collective representations, that is, “objectifiable supra-personal subjectivities” as its object.

Positions

As it has already been mentioned, the term “positions” is used as a kind of “umbrella” to define discrete parts of social space differentiated by quality, as well as associations of such parts as results of classification, taxonomy or clustering operations. Since the economy is one of the most important spheres of society, and

employment is a crucial condition for the reproduction of the living conditions of individuals, so far as in sociology under the positions people often understand the position in the existing division of labor. And it means a few things to which the term is appropriate to apply in the singular.

Thus, the smallest position in the division of labor will be the workplace. In economics, it is customary to consider jobs (positions) separately from the people who fill them. According to the criterion of complexity of work in a separate workplace, they all form a stratification order, since they require different content and terms of preparation of applicants for jobs. The characteristics of the workplace are also interpreted as positions: profession as a separate dimension of the division of labor into physical and mental, position in the structure of the authority of the organization or enterprise, industry affiliation of the workplace and, finally, a place in the distribution of property.

In sociology, the researcher assumes that the positions are filled, and he observes individuals on certain positions, then he unites those individuals into definite categories – a number of respondents occupying similar positions in a number of parameters. For sociologists the largest unit that the researcher receives after the aggregation procedure is a class - there are simply no more common generalizations in our discipline. However, the obvious ideological values and meanings that are associated with this concept make the major part of specialists to use the more neutral term “strata”. Indeed, for K. Marx, the founder of the conflicting version of the reproduction of the stratification order of society, the class position is homologous to the class disposition – collective awareness of the life situation and readiness to act with the aim of “redefining” this situation. The class indirectly becomes the subject of social action, uniting into trade unions for the protection of economic rights, and to political parties with a certain program (ideology) for the protection of civil rights. In other words, the structures of justification and substantiation (dispositions) are the immediate basis of social action.

G. Goldthorpe, on the contrary, in his theoretical and empirical works, disregards the conjunctivity of positions and dispositions, fully focusing on the structural inequality of the life chances of those who belong to certain classes. Careful fixation of the characteristics of the position that an individual occupies in the social and technological division of labor, as well as a well-developed technique for grouping similar positions, gives the classes, he distinguishes, a purely classificatory character. These are the positions with which certain inequalities are associated, which are to be established in the course of purposefully planned studies. The subject of observation and study is the structure of inequalities, and not the causes of the actions of individuals or communities.

However, the conjunction “position & disposition” can be easily read in the notion of “status”. The wide variability of values and definitions of the term in modern scientific literature concerns few people today. The epistemological relativism, according to which one can tell about phenomena and processes in different ways (in accordance with the selected conceptual paradigm) is almost universally accepted, and therefore almost no one already denies the instrumental

nature of interpretation. The range is defined by two polar status interpretations: a) as the place of an individual (a group) in the distribution of rights and responsibilities at different levels of society organization (state, enterprise, family, circle of friends); b) as a position on a constructed scale of social recognition, i.e. collective perceptions of prestige, respect, dignity and honour.

The legal interpretation of the individual status, by which its legal position in society is determined, perhaps, has the longest history [Сапов, 1990: с.331]. But the relevance of this interpretation is not lost, since the phenomenon of emigration and temporary work outside nation states are becoming more widespread. Hence the issue of a status as an access to economic, political and civil rights remains pressing and is even focused on in many countries, such as of the European Union. In addition, legitimation, i.e. gaining status (inclusion in an existing stratification order) is also needed for new social movements and communities that were formerly discriminated or even prosecuted. Hence appears the persistence of interest in similar topics and subjects by researchers and governmental structures of national and supranational levels.

In sociology, the most influential one is the tradition laid down by N. Weber in the fragment "Class, Status, Party", which was published in the posthumously published book "Economy and society" [Бебер, 1999]. Influence, however, does not prevent experts from abandoning attempts to reinterpret the ratio of "class" and "status". The fact is that the relationship of the two concepts is mentioned in two other, like the previous one, fragments of the book ("Status Groups and Classes" and "Distribution of Power in the Political Community") that are still unfinished by M. Weber, a new reading and comparison of which can reveal the hidden meanings of the classic interpretation of sociology of the specifics of social as a subject of science [Gane, 2005].

However, the basic provisions are well known and should be recalled. For M. Weber status is an element of the social system, that is, the position in the distribution of honour and glory (in another formulation – prestige). In other words, status is a social, legitimate or authoritative assessment of honour and dignity. At the same time, status groups are real communities ("real groups"), which are based on a clearly conscious sense of belonging – in contrast to the classes, as designed by the researcher of the General position of a certain number of individuals in the labor market with similar chances of obtaining income. In our context, M. Weber's interpretation of the status as "state", as well as the tendency of status groups to "closeness" is not so significant. While the process of reproduction of status groups as elements of social stratification order by cultivating a separate lifestyle (in fact – the relevant practices of consumption and spending free time), on the contrary, is directly related to it.

Those who belong to the status group can clearly perceive its limits, distinguishing between "their" and "strangers": those who have the same status are respectable persons, worthy, friendly. At the same time, the reproduction of one's own status is at the same time the reproduction of a group status, having as its purpose not so much an individual benefit as a collective one. The modern

researcher is sure that G. Merton in his works on the history of science actually considered scientific collectives as status groups [Barnes, 2007].

The majority of textbooks in sociology contain R. Linton's distinction of statuses attributed to social origin, gender, age, marital status and statuses achieved by individual efforts. According to P. Berger and B. Berger, the achieved statuses are objectified goals of ambitious individuals to improve their position in the social hierarchy. In stereotyped ideological interpretation, American society is a society of open opportunities in which all social statuses can be achieved without exception [Бергер, 2004: p. 173].

The basic intuitions and motives concerning the status as position and disposition are also presented in modern sociological literature of Russia. V. Radaev and A. Shkaratan note that the social status is determined by the prestige of a profession, the income level, the duration and quality of education, the scope of authoritative powers and the size of property, i.e. it unites the positional and dispositional components of the conjunction [Радаев, Шкаратан, 1996: с. 28]. According to V. Ilyin, the social status is a combination of rights and duties, social expectations, forms and amounts of material and moral rewards and stable normative forms of behaviour. The status is formed on the basis of law, administrative acts, customs, morality, religion, public opinion etc. [Ильин, 2000]. The author proposes to delimit the real status and status on paper. The totality of rights and obligations existing in formal normative acts but not fulfilled in real public life is a status on paper. The real status is manifested in the form of repeated practices. Both certain individuals and communities behave in the same under similar circumstances regularly reproducing the same-type forms of behaviour – social practices. I recall that M. Weber allowed the existence of identical collective reactions of individuals to the same situation in the labor market – a class response to the general conditions and conventionalities of existence. Although the distinction between formal and real status proposed by V. Ilyin is based on real observations (for example, in the study of small groups the phenomenon of formal and informal leadership has been discovered and described a long time ago), nevertheless it is more useful for propaedeutic purposes but not for organizing the study stratification orders of the society.

If the status represents a structural aspect of the heterogeneity of social space, then its dynamic aspect is represented by the concept of "role" - an essential element of culture, according to R. Linton. This means that statuses are positions in which schemes of expectations and actions are built in routine of everyday situations – a certain amount of cultural samples (attitudes, norms, values, rules of behaviour). Each status corresponds to a role or several roles (role complex), and everyday interaction of a person with others is a permanent change in position and roles [Линтон, 1999: с. 32]. In other words, in this tradition of structural analysis, the "position" is actually recognized as a "status-role complex", which, in fact, determines the behaviour of individuals, which is derived from such a complex in typical everyday domestic and labor situations.

Obviously, such a derivative has a probabilistic character, because there

are always deviations from the norm or the rule – in the coexistence of people's harmony there is not more space left than for disharmonies. From this it is logical to make an almost trivial conclusion that different types of status-role complexes with different rigidity attribute the form and sequence of actions of a specific subject (a set of subjects). Not least as a result of the selective attitude of individuals to the content of prescriptions: they not only make selections, but also add to them, resorting to a kind of social and structural self-activity. However, finding out how this happens requires a separate study. Here it should be reiterated that the status-role complex as a "position" is simultaneously visible and invisible, because without the empirical observation available to the subject, he has to be judged on a limited number of mediated features.

Dispositions

Only in military affairs, the term "disposition" (lat. dispositio – location) mainly refers to objects: this is what they say about the deployment of military formations or about the prepared plan for their deployment on land or at sea. However, here we are talking not only about the structural organization, but also about the readiness and order of possible action. In literary criticism this term is used to describe the organization of a work of art, and in the legal sciences it means part of a legal norm that contains the rights and obligations of the subject of the action. At the beginning of the twentieth century, the term "social orientation", close in meaning and meaning to disposition, is affirmed in sociology and social psychology.

Below, in a brief review of the evolution of this term, I will draw on the materials of G. Andreeva's book "Social Psychology", the first edition of which was published in 1980, and was later reprinted repeatedly [Андреева, 2006: с. 375]. The history of the concept is set forth, beginning with the classical text of W. Thomas and F. Znaniecki "Polish Peasant in Europe and America." In the preface to the first volume, the authors formulate the methodological prerequisites from which they emerge and which will be adhered to in the analysis of the collected empirical material. For them and, accordingly, for sociology as a whole, society is an indivisible unity of everyday situations and conscious or unconscious skills and readiness to act in order to change the situation or adapt to it. The dichotomy "objective – subjective" eliminates such indivisibility, which confirms its obvious harm to discipline.

To characterize the objects forming a particular situation, W. Thomas and F. Znaniecki suggested the term "social value", which denotes the concept where there is no discrepancy between individuals of the same group or between groups in interpretation of the content and value of individual and collective life, and that "defines the situation". Individuals' orientation towards social values, instead, is called "attitudes" (deriving from the English "attitude", which is usually translated as "social setting"). In other words, it is not only a state of consciousness or a psychological state, but also a reaction to the objects of the situation (social values) as a readiness to act in a certain way, in accordance with

the norms, constraints, and behavior patterns acquired and learned in the process of socialization. According to W. Thomas and F. Znaniecki, "attitudes" will remain incomprehensible structures if they are not brought into correlation with situations, where individuals find themselves. At the same time, the situations are not a static state for them, but always and exclusively a state of action. The so-called W. Thomas' "theorem" expresses the inseparable interrelation between values and attitudes in a state of action – what is defined as real has real consequences. The science dealing with this interrelation is called social psychology.

The interaction between the European (F. Znaniecki) and American (W. Thomas) traditions stirred up a wave of research aimed at measurement and empirical study of both "values" and "social attitudes" in the USA. For example, a contemporary researcher suggests that the methodological introduction was written mainly by F. Znaniecki, and the publication of the first volume in English for the first time, perhaps, introduces to American social scientists the issues of values as regulators of social action [Чеснокова, 2008]. In 1935, G. Allport wrote a digest based on reports published in the scientific periodicals and counted 17 definitions of an attitude. Then, developing his own psychological concept of personality, he described an individual as a bearer of certain heterogeneous characteristics, traits, and later called them "dispositions". The latter constituted a sort of hierarchy: cardinal dispositions, central and secondary dispositions, which are formed gradually and change over time. The shift in focus on the structure of identity weakened the interrelation with "situations", but did not deny it completely. Some psychologists (M. Smith) distinguished a cognitive component in the structure of the attitude (realizing the object of the social attitude); an affective component (emotional assessment of the object, the manifestation of feelings of sympathy or antipathy to it); a behavioral (connotative) component (consistent behavior towards the object).

Attitude measurement with the use of scales has become a separate branch of scientific research as well. One of the first scales was proposed by L. Thurstone in 1927 in the article "The Measurement of Attitudes", and two years later in the book (in co-authorship) with the same title. In 1932 R. Likert published the article "Technique for the Measurement of Professional Attitudes" with the schematics of a Likert-type scale. Thurstone's and Likert's scales are quite common in mass surveys, although in their later work they used more complex methods, factor analysis in particular.

According to the textbook by G. Andreeva, the improvement of research techniques on mental and emotional states within the framework of social psychological approach to the personality has resulted in the loss of considerable fragments of social context that could be neither taken into account, nor fully reconstructed during laboratory experiments and tests. However, a wealth of the collected empirical evidence required new theoretical and methodological perspectives. The need of creating a sociological concept of social behavior regulation was increasing. In the Soviet sociology, a corresponding dispositional concept was developed by V. Yadov.

Attitudes, different in quality and content, are organized into a hierarchy: "... the human has a complex system of various dispositional structures that regulate his or her behavior and activity. These dispositions are organized hierarchically, that is, their inferior and superior levels can be distinguished" [ЯДОВ, 1975]. What is virtually the most important point, the sociologist postulates the compliance of the structural composition of situations with the structural composition of a subject. The hierarchy of situations (generalization of a multitude of positions) is formed by four levels, distinguished by the consistency criterion or by the institutionalization degree. The lowest level is represented by the subject situations, which change rapidly and are relatively short. The next level includes the situations of group actions and interactions as a consequence of an individual's belonging to real communities and groups. More sustainable circumstances and schematisms, as well as samples of the activities existing in the sphere of work, leisure, everyday life, form the third level of situations. Finally, the most long-term, institutionalized conditions and conventions of activities are inherent in the situations of an individual's functioning on the level of economic, political and social structures of society.

Each level of situations corresponds to the level of needs: situations both reproduce the needs and serve as resources for their satisfaction. Hence the hierarchy of needs: elementary needs, which are subject-reproducible in the nearest social environment; group needs, which are generated and met in small groups; needs at the level of the spheres of labor, leisure, culture, consumption in the broad sense of the word; needs at the level of generalized structures of society. Dispositions are also formed when there are needs in corresponding situations, which was demonstrated in the laboratory by D. Uznadze [Узнадзе, 1966].

Thus, in the concept of V. Yadov there are four levels of dispositions:

- a) the first level is formed by elementary fixed attitudes that are formed on the basis of vital needs and in simple situations, in the context of the family environment and in the lower "objective situations";
- b) the second level consists of more complex dispositions, which are formed on the basis of a person's need for communication and are realized in a small group, accordingly, social fixed attitudes;
- c) the third level fixes the general orientation of the interests of a person with respect to a specific sphere of social activity, or basic social attitudes;
- d) the fourth, highest level of dispositions is formed by a system of value orientations of the individual that regulate his or her behavior and practices in the most significant situations of his or her social activity.

The hierarchy of dispositional formations performs the function of an individual's behavior regulation. At the first level, the immediate reactions of the subject to the actual subject situation (behavioral act) are formed. The second level of dispositions regulates an act, which is carried out in ordinary, everyday situations. The third level regulates certain systems of actions. Finally, the fourth level regulates the integrity of behavior, that is, an individual's activity itself [ЯДОВ, 1975].

In modern scientific literature, the tradition of understanding the status as a disposition is also reproduced. It is described in detail in the comprehensive

monograph "The Language of Social Status" by V. Karasik [Карасик, 2002]. According to the author, the status is, first of all, public evaluation that establishes a status stratification order. At the same time, status evaluation suggests: a) stratification evaluation – determination of the status in the social stratification system; b) remote evaluation – the status position of a person at a superior, inferior or equal level; c) role evaluation – the correspondence of an individual's behavior to the status norm [Карасик, 2002: p. 70]. Status evaluation (E. Durkheim would say "collective representation") forms certain expectations concerning an individual's possible behavior – a set of dispositions different in content.

However, P. Bourdieu suggests radical reconsideration of the "position & disposition" conjunction in the works, within the framework of his principle of habitus in particular. In the presentation of his point of view, I will rely both on the translations from his works and on their informative article on the habitus in the sociological theory structure by N. Shmatko, an energetic propagandist of the French sociologist's research practices in the post-Soviet area [Шматко, 1998]. The rupture with structuralism – the most influential intellectual movement on the European continent in the 1950s and 1970s – was presented in his works in the form of ideas and statements about the structure of the social world, which were actually extended in a theory. The thesis that individuals' actions and their perception of the situation were conditioned by social structures is known to have been conventional in structuralism. A structuralism proponent viewed the world from the perspective of structures (positions) and interpreted what he saw accordingly: individuals were epiphenomena of the structure. P. Bourdieu proposed to change the observer's location: not from the perspective of structures, but from the perspective of the subject. In that way, the potential of an activist's attitude to the world was returned to the subject, who was no more a puppet of "rules", "models", "structures", and became, according to P. Bourdieu, an agent, an acting substance [Бурдьє, 1994: p. 21-23].

What is important here is the fundamental difference from M. Weber's position: the action is generated and structured by the chances, opportunities, values or goals existing not outside the agent and supposedly presented uniformly to everyone, but initially existing in the agent, organically immanent to him or her by a multitude of operators of activity [Бурдьє, 2001: p. 122-124]. What completely annihilates the passivity of the subject, which turns him into an agent, is called habitus. Then the sociologist's attention is focused not on structures, not on individuals ready for action, but on their practices, intentions or attitudes that are realized in space and time. The first volume of Bourdieu's research "Practical Reason" is called "Critique of Theoretical Sociology" – sociology that abstracts from the practices of social agents (individuals, their groups, classes), from their practical relation to the world.

The habitus, therefore, is a certain set of cognitive and motivational structures. The corresponding quote gives an almost exhaustive definition: "Determinations associated with a special class of the existence conditions produce the habitus – systems of stable and portable dispositions, structured structures that are configured to function as structuring structures. That is, as principles that generate

and organize practices and representations, which can be objectively adapted to their purpose, but do not assume a conscious focus on it and the indispensable mastery of the necessary operations to achieve it. Objectively “following the rules” and “structured”, they are, nevertheless, by no means a product of subordination to the rules and thus, although collectively managed, are not a product of the organizing influence of any conductor” [Бурдье, 2001: p. 102].

Nothing else can be discovered about the structuring of these multiple dispositions because the focus is shifted to another context. In the strictly genetic aspect, people’s practical activity is performed by two objectifications. One of them is in the form of social institutions (more or less general conditions and conventions of coexistence, materialized practices), an external, always present necessity which cannot be ignored or avoided. The other one is in the form of habitus, peculiar individual and collective mental structures with a high energetic potential of action and coercion with respect to individuals. According to P. Bourdieu, there is a correspondence between them: “positions” (in the broad sense) “possess” individuals, and since the structures are built or implemented into subjectivity, the individuals, in their turn, are “agitated” by positions, they react to them.

Conditions of existence (objectified practices) are presented to agents as necessities, but it is not obligatory that individuals think or perceive them as necessities, they are often either not known or not perceived (they are “natural”). What is more important, they set a certain lifestyle. P. Bourdieu says that in France, people who drink champagne are more likely to buy antique furniture, play golf, ride horses, visit theaters than those who drink whiskey or red wine. All these are projections of the habitus to different social fields.

Thus, the habitus is a product of history (of the past experience) and is present in social agents (individuals and their associations) as patterns of perception, thinking and action. It is through them that the history continuity is realized through the past in today’s world and tries to be present in the future. If a multitude of dispositions were purely the incorporated past, the mass “here and now” would be the phenomenon of hysteresis (inertia, delay, archaism, P. Bourdieu provides Don Quixote as an example) [Бурдье, 2001: p. 121].

This seems to be what L. Thévenot meant in one of his interviews. In the retelling close to the original text, his reasoning comes to the following. Among the difficulties that we face when translating French terms into English, there is the translation of the concept of “dispositifs”. It is very difficult to translate (although it was previously used by M. Foucault), it is a very meaningful word in French, since it contains the element “dispos” (“inclination”) and, therefore, has a common root with the term “disposition”. Thus, the French “*vous êtes disposé à faire quelque chose*” means “you are inclined to do something”. Bourdieu proceeded from the reference to the fact that the disposition was incorporated in the individual, tied to him or her for a lifetime. In other words, it is unchanged in all situations and not very dynamic. No doubt, it is a very good idea for the reproduction theory, but it represents the man in a very poor light, because according to this theory, people simply implement the same scheme in all life

situations. L. Thévenot suggests the opposite: in the framework of the same order / dispositif (that is, the situation structure), there is a great variety of dispositions [Тевено, 2006].

However, the authoritative researcher substantially simplifies Bourdieu's position. The latter would have turned out to be a good theoretician if he had charged the habitus with a simple work to reduce new circumstances to the obsolete and invariable schemes of perception, interpretation and reaction! The habitus is actually as much the "art of ingenuity", according to the scientist, as the instance of reproduction [Бурдье, 2001: p. 108]. A multitude of dispositions is extendedly reproduced in the course of interaction with a problem situation revealing spontaneous characteristics of the habitus, which generate modified practices without breaking with the historical tradition. Solutions to the problem situations are being found and the relevant practices are being incorporated – in this way the boundaries of the possible, the impossible and the probable, of what is "for us" and what is not are being transferred and re-established.

Consequently, L. Thévenot either read P. Bourdieu's works inattentively, or forgot his concept. According to the latter, habitus is an open system of dispositions; he mentioned several times that they have a "sense of the game". They play (implement their practices) in real situations and, at the same time, enrich the habitus, adopting the practices. P. Bourdieu's example is a tennis player who, as a result of intensive training in a game with a rival, reaches the ball in time and hits it more often than it could be in a random way. Moreover, the habitus is also a potential of the possible, a system of dispositions that is open not only for the present, but also for the future. It is in this context that it is the "art of ingenuity".

In "Practical Reason", the author claims: "Thus, it is possible to understand what the habitus is only in case of correlation between the social conditions under which it was formed (in the meantime developing the conditions for its formation) and the social conditions under which it was "triggered". In other words, it is necessary to conduct scientific research to determine the connection between the two states of the social world that are realized by the habitus and establish this connection by means of practice and in practice" [Бурдье, 2001: p. 109].

According to P. Bourdieu, agents depend not as much on the external, "objective" circumstances as on the meaning they impart to their past, present and future. Here both the French tradition (E. Durkheim, M. Moss), and F. Znaniecki and W. Thomas's views are completely evident. Continuous activity of the habitus does not leave him any opportunity for hypocrisy, habitus does not "imagine itself any different" (E. Goffman) and does not manipulate the ideas about itself. Objectivism, which interprets the social world as a play, is the theoretical position that P. Bourdieu tries to dissociate himself from as clearly as possible: this is how the third chapter, "Structures, Habitus, Practices", of the book "Practical Reason" begins [Бурдье, 2001: p. 100].

Thus, the differences in the interpretation of some concepts concerning social stratification seem to impart strongly eclectic nature to their whole complex.

However, what is also indisputable is that the diversity of traditions, approaches, trends and schools expands the theoretical and methodological database of the analysis as well as the possibilities of constructing more sophisticated research techniques. As Yadov notes in the preamble to his recent work, “the multiplicity of theoretical approaches is not unprofitability, but the wealth of sociology” [Ядов, 2006]. The latter means that the multivariate analysis in the context of the conceptual triad of “positions & dispositions & practice (activity)” becomes a relevant strategy for the research on stratification orders.

References

Андреева Г. М. Социальная психология [Электронный ресурс] / Г. М. Андреева. – М.: Аспект Пресс, 2006. – Режим доступа : <http://www.vuzlib.net>. [Andreeva G. Social Psychology].

Бергер П. Социология: биографический подход / П. Бергер, Б. Бергер // Личностно-ориентированная социология. – М.: Академ. проект, 2004. – С. 25-396 [Berger P. Sociology: a Biographical Approach].

Бурдьё П. Начала. Choses dites / Бурдьё П. – М. : Socio-Logos, 1994. – 288 с. [Bourdieu P. Beginnings. Choses dites].

Бурдьё П. Практический смысл / Бурдьё П.; [отв. ред. пред. и послесл. Н. А. Шматко]. – СПб. : Алетейя, 2001. – 562 с. [Bourdieu P. Practical Reason].

Бурдьё П. Социология политики / Бурдьё П. [пер. с франц.; под. ред.; сост., общ. ред. и предисл. Н. А. Шматко]. – М.: Socio-Logos, 1993. – 336 с. [Bourdieu P. Sociology of Politics].

Вебер М. Основные понятия стратификации / Вебер М. // Человек и общество : хрестоматия; под. ред. С. А. Макеева – К. : Ин-т социологии НАН Украины, 1999. – С. 85-107 [Weber M. Basic Concepts of Stratification].

Ильин В. Теория социального неравенства (структуралистско-конструктивистская парадигма) [Электронный ресурс] / В. Ильин. – Socnet, 2000. – Режим доступа : <http://www.socnet.narod.ru>. [Ilyin V. Theory of Social Inequality (Structuralist-Constructivist Paradigm)].

Карасик В. И. Язык социального статуса / В. И. Карасик. – М. : ИТДГК “Тнозис”, 2002. – 333 с. [Karasik V. The Language of Social Status].

Линтон Р. “Статус и роль” / Линтон Р. // Человек и общество: хрестоматия / под ред. С. А. Макеева. – К.: Ин-т социологии НАН Украины, 1999. – С. 29-37 [Linton R. Status and Role].

Лоран Тевено. Интервью с Лораном Тевено [Электронный ресурс] // Экономическая социология. – 2006. – Т. 7, 1. – С. 6-14. – Режим доступа к журн. : <http://ecsoc.mses.ru/> [Thévenot L. Interview with Laurent Thévenot].

Радаев В. Социальная стратификация: учеб. пособие / В. Радаев, О. Шкаратан. – М.: Аспект-пресс, 1996. – 318 с. [Radaev V. Social Stratification].

Сапов В. В. Статус социальной теории / Сапов В. В. // Современная западная социология: словарь. – М.: Политиздат, 1990. – С. 331-332 [Sapov V. Status of Social Theory].

Узнадзе Д. И. Экспериментальные основы исследования установки / Узнадзе

Д. И. // Психологические исследования. – М., 1966 [Uznadze D. Experimental Basics of Attitude Research].

Чеснокова В. Ф. Язык социологии [Электронный ресурс]: лекция 8 / В. Ф. Чеснокова // Флориан Знанецкий. Ценности и установки. – 2008. – Режим доступа: www.polit.ru/science/2008/11/10/pol.html [Chesnokova V. Language of Sociology].

Шматко Н. А. “Габитус” в структуре социологической теории / Н. А. Шматко // Журнал социологии и социальной антропологии. – 1998. –Т. I, 2. – С.59-69. [Shmatko N. “Habitus” in the Structure of Sociological Theory].

Ядов В. А. О диспозиционной регуляции социального поведения личности [Электронный ресурс] / В. А. Ядов // Методологические проблемы социальной психологии. – М., 1975. – Режим доступа : <http://www.vuzlib.net/beta3/html/1/25714/25878> [in Russian]. [Yadov V. On the Dispositional Regulation of Social Behavior of an Individual].

Ядов В. А. Современная теоретическая социология как концептуальная база исследования российских трансформаций: курс лекций /В. А. Ядов. – СПб. : Интерсоцис, 2006. – 112 с [in Russian]. [Yadov V. Modern Theoretical Sociology as a Conceptual Base for the Study of Russian Transformations].

Barnes Barry. Catching up with Robert Merton: Scientific Collectives as Status Groups/ Barry Barnes // Journal of Classical Sociology. – 2007. – Vol. 7,2. – P. 179-191.

Gane N. Max Weber as Social Theorist /Nicholas Gane // European Journal of Social Theory. – 2005. – Vol. 8, 2. – P.211-226.