



Robinson, S. , Ernst, J., Thomassen, O. J. and Larsen, K. (2021)  
Introduction: taking Bourdieu further into studies of Organizations and  
Management. In: Robinson, S., Ernst, J., Larsen, K. and Thomassen, O. J.  
(eds.) *Pierre Bourdieu in Studies of Organization and Management:  
Societal Change and Transforming Fields*. Routledge: Abingdon, Oxon ;  
New York, NY, pp. 1-20. ISBN 9780367893354 (doi:  
[10.4324/9781003022510-1](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003022510-1))

The material cannot be used for any other purpose without further  
permission of the publisher and is for private use only.

There may be differences between this version and the published version.  
You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from  
it.

<https://eprints.gla.ac.uk/243081/>

Deposited on 01 July 2021

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of  
Glasgow

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

## **Introduction: Taking Bourdieu further into studies of Organizations and Management**

Sarah Robinson, Jette Ernst, Ole Jacob Thomassen, Kristian Larsen

### **Why this book?**

There is increasing academic interest in how Pierre Bourdieu's sociology can be applied to studies of organizations, work and management. To take one example, the idea for this book was conceived at a seminar held in Copenhagen in early 2018 with the aim of exploring what approaches informed by Bourdieu's sociology might further add to the field of Management and Organization Studies (MOS). More specifically, we feel there is still untapped potential to apply Bourdieu's relational sociology, widely cited in a broad range of subject areas from anthropology, ethnography, education, cultural studies to sociology, to the increasingly complex and challenging environment facing organizations and those who work in them. Such challenges include issues resulting from globalization, neoliberalism, austerity and financial crisis, ecological crisis, populism and developing technologies, to name but a few; and now, added to those, a global pandemic.

We argue that due to Bourdieu's focus on the social interweaving of humans, institutions, organizations, sectorial fields and society, his *relational sociology* is particularly well suited to explore the above challenges and complexities in order to arrive at greater understandings of how change, transition and crisis shape present day organizations, workplaces and practices of work and management. Bourdieu's work has the potential to overcome dualisms of agency and structure and of micro and macro levels, and to provide explanations of how complex relations of dominance are embedded within not only social, but also, we argue, organisational fields. This book therefore presents a diverse range of organizational

challenges and developments, having their roots in neoliberalism, globalization, policy change, new modes of public sector governance and climate action. The eleven chapters show a concern with the challenges and opportunities such developments offer to MOS scholars studying these and related phenomena, and to managers and employees in public and private sector organizations. The chapters all lend themselves to Bourdieu's relational analysis as they involve an understanding of positioning and domination within organizations and within and between *fields*, particularly in relation to transnational neoliberalism.

In his later career, Bourdieu publicly engaged in political actions against the dominance of the neoliberal market (Bourdieu, 1998a), while he and his colleagues paid more attention to the genesis of the state as a meta-field or a *bureaucratic field* that dominates other fields by regulation on a political level, in terms, for example, of the value and distribution of *capital* (Bourdieu & Champagne, 2014; Bourdieu, Loic, & Farage, 1994). This further suggests that institutions such as the United Nations (UN) or European Union (EU) or global social movements cannot be understood within national field concepts. Bourdieu's work thus gave inspiration to a growing number of studies that put forward the concept of *transnational fields* (Go & Krause, 2016; Sapiro, 2018) and studies showing how, for example, the European Parliament needs to be understood as part of transnational field (Kauppi, 2018). There are similarities here to education (Grek, 2020), where if, for example, we look at educational systems worldwide they are to a large degree structured, governed or at least inspired by positions outside their national contexts. Applying this logic to MOS, professional fields (Spence et al., 2016; Spence, Voulgaris, & Maclean, 2017) would be an example of such transnational fields that are not (fully) reducible to institutional or organizational structures (Kauppi, 2018).

The transnational theme is addressed in this book, with authors asking, for example, why and how the electricity sector has changed in Norway; how alternative wedding practices emerge and gain traction across national boundaries; and how protest movements occupy space in climate activism. We argue that such questions of interest to MOS scholars, (and many others), can be addressed through the application of Bourdieu's relational sociology. In this book, therefore, Bourdieu's work is used to focus on the development of relations within and between fields as well as within and between organizations, including the structure of power positions and how such internal constellations of positions depend on the structure of power positions in the fields in which they are embedded. Furthermore, organizational phenomena may be traced to relations between fields as well as to '*fields within fields*' in order to foreground issues of power, domination, ideology, competition and struggle. The book's empirical contributions demonstrate the explanatory potential of Bourdieu's intellectual concepts such as *social space*, *field*, *habitus*, *forms of capital*, *symbolic power*, *symbolic violence*, *hysteresis*, *doxa*, and *illusio*, as applied to current, concrete practices and challenges for a variety of organizations and professional fields. Through such applications of Bourdieu's relational focus, the book intends to move the research field of MOS forward and to respond to some of its current methodological and theoretical challenges which we discuss below.

### **The epistemological foundations of Bourdieu's work**

Bourdieu was keenly interested in questions of daily life, and the development of his comprehensive theory had its roots in two ethnographies he conducted in the 1950s and 60s: first, with the Kabyle tribe in colonial Algeria (Bourdieu, 1958) and, second, with the farmers in his home region in southwest France (Bourdieu, 1972). Both ethnographies were concerned

with the way everyday life becomes intelligible to individuals immersed within a given context. It is a core argument of Bourdieu's work that 'practice has a logic which is not that of a logician', practice is fuzzy, irregular and even inconsistent (Bourdieu & Nice, 1990, p. 86). To understand practice and its intelligibility, the researcher must move analytically between the environment and the experiences embedded in an environment in order to capture how the subjective experience of agents, immersed in day-to-day activities, are interlaced with the conditions and history pertaining to the particular context of these day-to-day activities (Wacquant, 2004). Bourdieu (1973, p. 63) explains it further as 'the dialectic of internality and externality, that is, of the internalization of externality and of the externalization of internality' that characterizes all social life. By 'internality' Bourdieu refers to the habitus to which we will return shortly. '*Structural constructivism*' and '*social praxeology*' were the terms chosen by Bourdieu to explicate his belief in the significance of this dialectic and his attempts at bridging structuralism and constructivism.

In this way, Bourdieu wanted to settle the antagonism between subjectivist and objectivist modes of knowledge by overcoming 'the windmills of structuralism, phenomenology, and Marxism' (Wacquant, 2004, p. 391). This led to a rejection of the dichotomies of 'structure and agency' and 'micro and macro', because social and cognitive structures are recursively and structurally linked, and so are constituents of the same story in Bourdieu's conceptualization. His work in continuously developing key concepts such as field, habitus and capital reflects Bourdieu's thinking at different stages of his long career as he moved from *class structure* to *social space*, from *class consciousness* to *habitus*, from *ideology* to *symbolic violence* and from *the ruling class* to *the field of power* (Bourdieu, 1985; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Wacquant, 2013). Bourdieu's approach was synthetic. His sociology emerged from a creative unification of earlier sociologists and especially the thinking and

concepts of Karl Marx (1984), Max Weber (1978) and Emile Durkheim (2013). Thus, having in mind his basic epistemological principles, the actual craft of sociology has other more explicit roots relating to methodology, relations between the researcher and the researched, and the relation between theory, methods and empirical data. According to Broady (1990), Bourdieu's central epistemological foundation was *historical epistemology*, drawing on the work of Gaston Bachelard (1968) and George Canguilhem (1988, 1991) and for his relational thinking, the work of German philosopher Ernst Cassirer (1950). Bourdieu's conception of social life was thus 'relentlessly relational' (Wacquant, 2013, p. 275) in that social life consists of relations between groups and individuals rather than substances, and such orientations are built into Bourdieu's pillar concepts of *field*, *habitus* and *capital* that gain their meaning in their relation to each other, where habitus is the socialised experience in a field, capitals are specific to fields and, conversely, fields are relations of power confined through the distributions of capital.

Inspired by historical epistemology, Bourdieu argues that the most important or fundamental act in research is constructing the object (Bachelard, 1968). The basic idea is that research constructs and, most importantly, everyday definitions of sociological problems including preconstructed data material in public statistics, need reflection and theorisation (Bourdieu 1991a). The researcher constructs a problematic rather than picking up those circulating in fields or in popular parlance (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). The concept of field is an important Bourdieusian tool for this purpose. It involves 'the construction of an ideal-typical model of the space of structural relations among the phenomenal relations' (Bourdieu & Zanotti-Karp, 1968; Vandenberghe, 1999, p. 45). The researcher seeks to identify the forces that structure the field, the capitals at stake and the properties of groups and individuals that point to their positions in the field and the interrelations of all these elements ( Bourdieu &

Wacquant, 1992). This should be done by performing a break with the immediate experience of agents, that is, with a watchful eye on the common sensical of everyday experiences through the principle of objectification. Applying the principle of objectification to the studied object means for the researcher to ‘radically doubt’ its pre-established and naturalized state (Bourdieu, 1991b; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 235) that is, a ‘conquest of the scientific fact against the spontaneous and preconstructed’, performed as an epistemological rupture between doxa and episteme or between the realm of ‘mere opinion’ and knowledge (Vandenberghe, 1999, pp. 42-43). The concepts of field, capital and habitus were developed to make this epistemological break with the apparent and seemingly natural and to effect a move from substance to relations, which is to connect the experiences of everyday life with their structuring forces. For Bourdieu, the social does not consist of individuals or groups but of ‘webs of material and symbolic ties that constitute the proper object of social analysis’ (Wacquant, 2013, p. 275). Today’s pandemic highlights how individual or organisational experiences are deeply interrelated not only to other organisations, but to a global reconfiguration of fields and meta-fields.

### **Putting Bourdieu to work in Management and Organisation Studies**

The building of foundations for a systematic application of Bourdieu’s work in MOS began in 2008 when the journal *Theory and Society* published an issue with a ‘symposium’ of four papers on Bourdieu and organizations. In this issue, Emirbayer and Johnson’s article “Bourdieu & Organizational analysis” (2008) was one of the first to provide a thorough examination of how Bourdieu’s field analysis can be used in intra- and inter-organizational studies, arguing that such analysis can overcome the problem of dualism, present in much organizational studies, by bridging macro and micro-levels. In the same issue Vaughan (2008) shows how field analysis can be conducted empirically by using a qualitative approach, and

Dobbin's (2008) article "The poverty of organizational theory: Comment on "Bourdieu and Organizational Analysis" discusses how a Bourdieusian application might fill a research gap in organizational theory. In reviewing Emirbayer and Johnson's article, Swartz reinforces the importance of incorporating 'all three Bourdieu's master concepts - habitus, capital, and field' into (any) single study, something that, he argues had not been consistently done in American sociology. He also welcomes the application of a relational perspective to the empirical study of organisations (Swartz, 2008, p. 45).

The following year the journal *Organization* published a Special Issue on 'Bourdieu and domination within and between organizations'. The editorial calls for more engagement by organizational scholars with Bourdieu's work, particularly in developing cumulative research on domination within and between organisations. In so doing, they claim that we can 'acquire a panoramic vision of Bourdieusian concepts that have otherwise been tackled separately' (Golsorkhi, Leca, Lounsbury, & Ramirez, 2009, p. 779). Following Bourdieu, they also emphasise the importance for organisational researchers to 'have a moral responsibility to be reflective about our practice' and to use research knowledge to 'inform and direct social change' (ibid). The special issue included examples of Bourdieusian-inspired organizational empirical studies on, for example, the cricket industry (Wright, 2009) and a British cultural affairs organization in post-Soviet Ukraine (Kerr & Robinson, 2009).

In 2015, Tatli, Özbilgin, & Karatas-Özkan (2015b) published their anthology 'Pierre Bourdieu, Organization & Management', which presented empirically based research from a cross-section of organization studies. In this volume, a distinct critical orientation towards the contemporary field of MOS is taken: 'For us, scholars of management and organization studies, scholarship with commitment requires battling the neo-liberal, individualistic and

depoliticizing tendencies in our disciplines' (Tatli, Özbilgin, & Karatas-Özkan, 2015a, p. 1). As such, it includes rich empirical contributions dealing with a wide range of different aspects of organisations and work, including careers as sites of power; migrant workers' subjectivities; power and struggles with organisational fields; representation in pension scheme boards; gender equality in universities; the field of cultural and creative industries; and women managers in sporting organisations.

In his citation analysis of the use of Bourdieu in nine leading management and organization studies journals, Sieweke (2014) investigated how citations of Bourdieu's work have developed over time, in terms of what is being cited and how comprehensively. Looking forward, he discusses how more continued engagement with Bourdieu's habitus concept can help lay a microfoundation for new institutional theory and the development of reflection on academic practice in MOS. His review however focuses on more generalist management and organization journals and so perhaps does not capture a growing presence of Bourdieu-inspired research within some subfields of the wider MOS field, for example leadership or entrepreneurship (see below). Finally, and more recently, in their chapter on 'Bourdieu and Organizations' in *The Oxford Handbook of Pierre Bourdieu*, Hallet and Gougherty (2018), besides providing a thorough introduction to how Bourdieu can be applied to organizational studies, suggest that 'The promise of Bourdieu's work rests in how his concept of habitus and embodied cultural capital help us to think about action in organizations without reverting to methodological individualism and overly utilitarian, rationalistic, actors' (Hallett & Gougherty, 2018, p. 293).

Perhaps inspired by these foundational contributions, a growing number of more empirically oriented, and sometimes historically focused, articles and book chapters have been written

applying Bourdieu to MOS in a wide sense. Some examples from MOS subfields include: Entrepreneurship (De Clercq & Voronov, 2009a, 2009b; Drakopoulou Dodd, Wilson, Bhaird, & Bisignano, 2018; Lee & Shaw, 2016; Tatli, Vassilopoulou, Özbilgin, Forson, & Slutskaya, 2014; Vincent & Pagan, 2019), Leadership (Elliott & Stead, 2018; Kerr & Robinson, 2011; Robinson & Kerr, 2009; Townley, Beech, & McKinlay, 2009), Organisational Governance (Ernst, Hindhede, & Andersen, 2018; McDonough & Polzer, 2012), Diversity and Human Resource Management (Samdanis & Özbilgin, 2020; Sayce, 2006; Seierstad, Tatli, Aldossari, & Huse, 2020; Tatli, 2011; Tatli, Ozturk, & Woo, 2017), Organizational Identity (Ernst & Jensen Schleiter, 2019), Education Management (Börjesson, Broady, Le Roux, Lidegran, & Palme, 2016; Grenfell & James, 2004), Healthcare (Management) (Collyer, 2018; Contandriopoulos, Denis, & Langley, 2004; Ernst & Jensen Schleiter, 2018; Hindhede & Larsen, 2019), Career Studies (Chudzikowski & Mayrhofer, 2011; Schneidhofer, Schiffinger, & Mayrhofer, 2011), Elites (Maclean & Charles, 2019; Maclean, Harvey, & Kling, 2017), The Professions and Professionalization (Carter & Spence, 2014; Ernst, 2019, 2020; Larsen & Harsløf, 2020; Larsen, Hindhede, Larsen, Nicolaisen & Henriksen 2020; Nairz-Wirth & Feldmann, 2019; Schinkel & Noordegraaf, 2011; Spence et al., 2017), Multinational Corporations and Intercultural communication (Bjerregaard & Klitmøller, 2016; Luring, 2011; Levy & Reiche, 2018), CSR (van Aaken, Splitter, & Seidl, 2013) and Management and Organizational History (Kerr, Robinson, & Elliott, 2016; Lyke, 2017; Robinson & Kerr, 2017).

A common assumption in many of the above contributions advocating for more comprehensive usage of Bourdieu's sociology within the field of MOS research, is that this can provide a more 'integrated' approach to organizations, which is required for a better understanding of the complexity of today's organizations. As the 'world of organizations' is

becoming both more standardized due to transnational transformation, but also more complex due to varieties in implementation and adjustments to national and local politics and responses to the many growing crises of this new decade, there is a growing need to understand how organizations both affect and are affected by people, society and culture. The question then is how we put Bourdieu to use in our field of study?

When reading Bourdieu's own texts and his outline of the relational approach, one could get the impression that the foundational 'pillars', the concepts of field, habitus and capital, should be applied together in order to reach a full and integrated analysis of the phenomenon under investigation. This view is also promoted by authors in the MOS field, for example by (Emirbayer & Johnson, 2008). Conversely, Wacquant (2018, pp. 10-11) argues against this view of 'correct theorization' in saying that Bourdieu's concepts should be 'decoupled from each other to ensure that there is a real payoff of their individual usage before they are eventually recombined' and that 'the most fruitful works inspired by Bourdieu have turned out to be those deploying elements of that framework'.

For (Bourdieu, 1999), the researcher's stance in and towards research is pivotal to the quality of the research performed. Overall, he gave clear warnings against dogmatism within the scientific field and welcomed a generative interpretation of his own theoretical framework. He argued that theory is always temporary and theoretical concepts, rather than being seen as 'intellectual totems', should develop and be evaluated in dialogue with empirical data to test and try out their usefulness. In his view, theories should be recognized for what they are, namely constructs put to use by the researcher to enable an understanding of the social world (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Bourdieu (1991b, 2003) is thus keen to underscore the imperative for a constant researcher reflexivity in order to be aware that science is itself a

field of interests, positions, relations of power and unchallenged assumptions. Moreover, he argues against rigid application of theoretical and methodological principles and he urges us to break with the pre-constructed and taken-for-granted and to perform historicized analyses by tracing the phenomena we study backwards in time to understand the emergence of the orientations and ideas that have produced the foundations of the logics and forces that structure fields.

### **Explaining the core concepts**

In the following section we give a brief outline of how Bourdieu understood his core concepts. We do this in order to reduce repetition of the concept definitions within the forthcoming book chapters so as to provide the contributors with space to elaborate their particular empirical case and its uses and developments of Bourdieu's concepts.

#### *Field*

The concept of field was constructed by Bourdieu as a central tool for understanding the social by carrying out dialectical analysis as laid out in structural constructivism. We may use the concept of field to better understand activity within an organization and how this activity is tied to groups, persons, institutions, politics, and so on, both inside and outside the organization. To make sense of what happens in a field the researcher must thus move between multiple levels of reality – between structuring forces and subjective experiences. The concept of field therefore responds to the argument that 'the immediately visible relationships between agents' do not reveal the ways in which agents are informed by something beyond the immediately visible (Bourdieu, 1985, p. 17).

Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 1991a, p. 215) defines a field as ‘a kind of arena in which people play a game which has certain rules, rules which are different from those of the game that is played in the adjacent space’. Fields are characterized by specific stakes and interests that are irreducible to the stakes and interests found in other fields. For a field to exist and to function, ‘there have to be stakes and people prepared to play the game’ (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 72). Those who are involved in a field, Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 73) argues, ‘share a certain number of fundamental interests, namely everything that is linked to the very existence of the field’. The boundaries of fields are dynamic since they are defined by the stake of struggles within the field or, as Bourdieu puts it, ‘an agent or an institution belongs to a field inasmuch as he or it produces an effect on it or suffers effects in it’ (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 232). This emphasises that the delimitation of a field is part of the researcher’s construction of the object and not something naturally given. Fields work as ‘magnetic’ structured spaces of activity through forces of attraction and differentiation, underscoring the relational principle so important for Bourdieu.

Elsewhere, the concept of field has been defined as ‘a set of objective, historical relations between positions anchored in certain forms of power (or capital)’ (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 16). Fields are thus competitive spaces, where agents engage in games of positioning themselves in relation to each other, guided by what is at stake in the field and by the form and amount of valued resources they hold (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Robbins, 2000). These forms of capital create the parameters that regulate the ways individuals behave and interact within a particular field (Bourdieu, 1991a, p. 215). Investments in the game as the accumulation of capital and activities of positioning are related to power and domination, which are central to the work of Bourdieu. Again, it is worth noticing that Bourdieu’s conception of power is non-essentialist. Power and domination in a field are embedded in the

relations of the field. The 'rules of the game' are neither explicit nor codified but are learnt through socialization into the field and the process of acquisition of the right forms of capital (see below).

Fields are dynamic and static at the same time as they are structured by both internal and external developments and will through time develop varying degrees of autonomy from other fields (Bourdieu & Emanuel, 1996) and from what (Bourdieu, 1998b) terms the field of power, which is more or less equivalent with the state, or more precisely, the capital held by the state that works as a form of meta-capital. Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) also argues that fields can have different degrees of self-regulation and thus be more or less autonomous or heteronomous. Heteronomy understood as the extent to which a field's structure and logic is influenced by other fields (Gorski, 2013). Autonomous fields have strong entry requirements and clear rules, whereas in a more heteronomous field rules are less clear and thus arguably give more room for interpretation, where rules should be understood as 'rules of the game' and thus they are embodied by the players of the game. In more autonomous fields established field-specific forms of capital are required, whereas in more a heteronomous field, forms of capital valued in other neighbouring fields may become preferred: as Gorski (2013, p. 340) suggests, 'a bit like a weak currency regime, in which strong foreign currencies are the preferred medium of exchange'.

Finally, fields can also be seen as fields-within-fields (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). This approach, which can be combined with seeing fields as either autonomous or heteronomous, is based on the assumption that dynamics between capitals, habitus and power within a specific or empirical field, are instances or exemplifications of capitals, habitus and power at a more aggregate level. Bourdieu use the metaphor of a 'Russian doll' to illustrate this, where

the empirical field in question represents one layer or section of the field, with potential subfields or meta-fields associated with it.

Bourdieu argued that within fields interpersonal modes of domination operate through two forms of violence: economic or overt violence (Bourdieu, 1980, pp. 217-218) and symbolic violence. Economic/overt violence involves ‘direct, daily, personal work’ of domination, enforcing power relations in an overt way, through physical threat or the threat of economic ruin (Bourdieu, 1976, p. 190). Overt violence is also practiced via repressive state apparatus for example, example via the police or military. However, in terms of establishing domination, this overt form of violence is less ‘efficient’ for the dominant than the ‘softer’, more seductive strategies of symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1976, p. 191; Robinson & Kerr, 2009). The latter can be understood as the imposition and misrecognition of arbitrary power relations as natural and legitimate (Bourdieu, 1976, p. 122).

As previously stated, a field can be compared to a game, which has stakes that are the product of the competition between players who invest in the game – Bourdieu terms this investment *illusio* (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 98). By playing the game, players tacitly agree that the game is worth playing. Bourdieu (Bourdieu & Emanuel, 1996, p. 382) focusing on field crisis, he points out that agents themselves may or may not experience their activity as a game:

It is only exceptionally, especially in moments of crisis, that certain agents may develop a conscious and explicit representation of the game as a game, one which destroys the investment in the game, the *illusio*, by making it appear what it always objectively is (to an observer foreign to the game, indifferent to it) – that is, a historical fiction or, in Durkheim’s terms, a ‘well-founded illusion’.

The game metaphor and the connected concept of *illusio* have been used by management and organisation scholars in the study of higher education (Kalfa & Taksa, 2015), and of a professional occupation (accountancy) (Lupu & Empson, 2015).

### *Habitus*

Habitus is a system of embodied dispositions and a scheme of perception. As a system of dispositions, it accounts for the stability and of social practices: ‘the principle of the continuity and regularity which objectivism sees in social practices without being able to account for it’ (Bourdieu & Nice, 1990, p. 54). It is a product of history and of the past experiences deposited in individuals. As a scheme of perception, thought and action, it tends to guarantee the adequacy of practices and their constancy over time. The habitus is stable but malleable to an extent, bounded by the limits initially set on its invention. It implies a view of human development as a constant dialectic between external determinations and internal representations, rather than as a simple accumulation of experiences (Bronckart & Schurmans, 1999). Habitus allowed Bourdieu to depart simultaneously from structuralism and individualistic and subjective approaches to studying the social because habitus concerns not only the individual agent, but the whole context or milieu in which that habitus was formed. Habitus is, in other words, social through and through. For Bourdieu (1985, p. 13) a focus on habitus was ‘a matter of recalling “the primacy of practical reason”’.

Bourdieu’s concepts of *hexis* (Bourdieu, 1977, 2000) and *doxa* (Bourdieu, 1977) are also closely connected with the concept of habitus. *Hexis* is the embodied part of the habitus where individuals naturally (again through socialisation) fit into the mores and conventions of the field through how they talk, walk, dress and so on (Bourdieu, 1977, 2000), while *doxa*

refers to the assumption that practices in a given field are normal and truths taken for granted due to the socialisation of the habitus so that the social world appears as self-evident (Bourdieu, 1977).

However, as Bourdieu demonstrated in his early ethnographies, fields are not static sometimes a disjuncture starts to appear between an individual's habitus and hexis and their perceptions of doxa, as the field evolves and changes. Bourdieu refers to this phenomenon as hysteresis. As individuals generally succeed in making sense of the world around them, the habitus is normally protected from crisis and challenges. However, the capacity of the habitus to defend or to adapt itself is not always guaranteed. When a field starts to change, the ability of a person's or a group's habitus to keep up with or adapt to the demands of the changing field is brought into question. Bourdieu's concept of the hysteresis effect describes this disjuncture between the field and the habitus – a maladjustment between the practical schemes underpinning action and the new conditions.

In *Pascalian Meditations* (2000), Bourdieu suggests that the concept of hysteresis could be applied more widely to situations of change, and stresses the importance of reflexivity of social actors when 'the coincidence between structure and habitus is increasingly disrupted' (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 263). That is, in a changing field, there is a *dissonance* or disjuncture between the demands of the new, emergent rules of the game and the habitus. During a period of hysteresis, social actors may continue to rely on past behaviours, which effectively '*help to plunge them deeper into failure*' (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 161). However, some actors in the field are able to survive the hysteresis effect by adopting reflective behaviours to identify and acquire the new forms of capital deemed valuable within the changing field, such as knowledge, qualifications and social networks. The concept of hysteresis has been used by

organisation and management scholars to understand the strategies of ‘dominated’ actors in a specific period of social and organisational transition (Kerr & Robinson, 2009) and in understanding public sector workers’ reactions to change e.g. (McDonough & Polzer, 2012) or relatives reactions to change of health care institutions (Roenn-Smidt, Shim, Larsen, & Hindhede, 2020). Ernst and Jensen Schleiter (2019) showed how practitioners employed ‘strategizing moves’ in anticipating what could be expected from the future, informed by their experiences of the past in major organizational change.

### *Capital*

Capital enables social differentiation and the establishment of social hierarchies (Bourdieu, 1991a). Each field defines its own field-specific capital that is recognized as a resource for daily practice. By discovering the nature of the capital that is efficient in a field, we will also have discovered the structuring principles for the groupings of the field since ‘the structure of the distribution of the different types and subtypes of capital at a given moment in time represent the immanent structure of the social world’ (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 15). While each field in this way has its own capitals, (Bourdieu, 1986) distinguishes between generic forms of capital. He identifies four distinct forms of capital: economic (e.g. money, material possessions), cultural (e.g. knowledge, skills, educational qualifications) and social (e.g. the networks a person can draw on as a resource). Symbolic capital is the accumulated prestige or honour one derives from the accumulation of the three primary forms and is significant in distinguishing one’s self within a given field. Symbolic capital is distinctive in the struggles of the field, but the field’s agents fail to appreciate its importance (Bourdieu, 1986). In other words, symbolic capital, as part of the symbolic systems of fields, is constructed in relations of recognition and misrecognition because the social conditions of its ‘acquisition and transmission’ are concealed (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 18).

Agents use their feel for the game and their time and labour for accumulating various forms of capital in order to maintain or improve their positions in fields, and capital is convertible into power and positions in an 'economy of practices' (Bourdieu, 1986, p. 16). While capital conversion may happen in its 'crude' form when economic capital is converted into money and buildings etc., it is not recognised by the field's agents that economic capital lies at the roots of all other capital forms and conversions. Hence, social exchanges between agents thrive on their ambiguity, ensuring that the accumulation and the conversions of capital generated in these exchanges become effective through the misrecognition that economic capital is the foundation for the effects of all other form of capital. Bourdieu, for example, explains that the conversion of economic capital into cultural capital happens through 'an expenditure of time', which is only possible if one has the economic means to invest in the acquisition of cultural capital because cultural capital is characterised by the time it takes to build, its long term pay off and the fact that it in large part 'escapes observation and control' (Bourdieu, 1986, pp. 24-25).

### **The Structure of the book**

The chapters we present in this book study a great variety and range of organizational phenomena. We have therefore divided the book's contributions into three thematic sections. The first is termed 'Neoliberalism, fields and hysteresis'. The chapters in this section concern pressures imposed on managers and staff resulting from the ideological purchase of neoliberal ideas by nation states. Two of the chapters (Koll & Ernst and Thomassen & Ødegaard) use a Bourdieusian conceptualization of temporality and the concept of hysteresis to explain why managers and staff have difficulties adapting to performance pressures and new ideas of quality standards and speed of service delivery. The last chapter in this section (Larsen &

Harsløf) compares new institutions and Bourdieu's field theory. It focuses on the emerging health promotion strategies within work organisations, related to developments in the wider field, which can be associated with improved working conditions and welfare, yet it may also result in bodily performance pressures imposed on staff.

The second section is termed 'Transnational and national movements as sites for competition and symbolic domination'. Two of these chapters (Yang et al. & Robinson & Kerr) analyse how the social and seemingly spontaneous movements of philanthropy and environmental activism are deeply shaped by a struggle over appropriation of capital in these fields, and that, respectively, the establishment of a network of elite actors and struggle over physical space are vital in such struggles. The third chapter (Sayce et al.) analyses the importance of social capital in the form of 'wasta' in the context of the insurance sector in Jordan, as a resource for employment and career advancement. The last chapter (Ydesen) analyses how the field of education is becoming increasingly globalized and standardized, due to influence from supranational institutions (the OECD). This chapter uses Bourdieu's perspective on state-crafting as the lens to analyse how local, national and international fields interact. Although the phenomena analysed in this section are situated in (very) different contexts, they are interlinked in the way they demonstrate how spontaneous and formal organizations are shaped and formed by the fields they are embedded in. Indeed, they demonstrate how symbolic power is at stake in each field and how powerful agents, through their acquisition of specific forms of capital, seek to gain dominance in their respective fields.

The third section, 'The emergence and transformation of professional fields', presents contributions that in different ways, analyse the emergence, transformation and stability of fields in which professions and professionalism is at play. The two first chapters (Nairz-Wirth

& Feldman and Hindhede & Andersen) deal with how professional fields, in change and transition, have become contested due to ongoing struggles over legitimate forms of capital, and the consequences this might have on the habitus of individuals/professionals within the field. The next chapter (Lasalle & Shaw) analyses how a specific professional field (the emerging wedding field as part of the wider entrepreneurial field) develops through different phases and how key agents in the field seek to establish symbolic dominance within it. The last chapter (Schneidhofer et al.), taking the case of midwifery as an example, discusses how a gendered habitus can explain selective recruitment into professional bodies.

In the concluding chapter of the book using Covid-19 as an extreme case of field transformation, we summarise the contribution this book makes to MOS and draw out a future research agenda for the continued application of Bourdieu's work to MOS in our continued complex and challenging times.

## References

- Bachelard, G. (1968). *The philosophy of no: a philosophy of the new scientific mind*. New York: Orion Press.
- Bjerregaard, T., & Klitmøller, A. (2016). Conflictual practice sharing in the MNC: a theory of practice approach. *Organization Studies*, 37(9), 1271-1295. doi:10.1177/0170840616634126
- Bourdieu, P. (1958). *Sociologie de l'Algérie*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Bourdieu, P. (1972). Les stratégies matrimoniales dans le système de reproduction. *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales*, 27(4/5), 1105-1127. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27578159>
- Bourdieu, P. (1973). The three forms of theoretical knowledge. *Social Science Information*, 12(1), 53-80. doi:10.1177/053901847301200103

- Bourdieu, P. (1976). Les modes de domination. *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 2(2), 122-132. doi:10.3406/arss.1976.3456
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1980). *Le sens pratique*. Paris: Minuit.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985). The genesis of the concept of habitus and field. *Sociocriticism*, 2(2), 11 - 27.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241-258). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241 - 255). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991a). *The craft of sociology: epistemological preliminaries*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991b). The peculiar history of scientific reason. *Sociological Forum*, 6(1), 3-26.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998a). *Acts of resistance : against the tyranny of the market*. New York: The New Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998b). *Practical reason: on the theory of action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1999). *The weight of the world: social suffering in contemporary society*: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian meditations*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. (2003). Participant objectivation. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 9(2), 281-294.
- Bourdieu, P., & Champagne, P. (2014). *On the state : lectures at the Collège de France, 1989-1992*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P., & Emanuel, S. (1996). *The rules of art : genesis and structure of the literary field*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Bourdieu, P., Loic, J. D. W., & Farage, S. (1994). Rethinking the State: Genesis and Structure of the Bureaucratic Field. *Sociological Theory*, 12(1), 1-18. doi:10.2307/202032
- Bourdieu, P., & Nice, R. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Zanotti-Karp, A. (1968). Structuralism and theory of sociological knowledge. *Social Research*, 681-706.
- Broady, D. (1990). *Sociologi och epistemologi: om Pierre Bourdieus författarskap och den historiska epistemologi* (2. korrigerade upp. ed.). Stockholm: HLS.
- Bronckart, J.-P., & Schurmans, M.-N. (1999). Pierre Bourdieu - Jean Piaget: Habitus, schèmes et construction du psychologique. In *Le travail sociologique de Pierre Bourdieu; dettes et critiques* (pp. 153-175). Paris: La Découverte.
- Börjesson, M., Broady, D., Le Roux, B., Lidegran, I., & Palme, M. (2016). Cultural capital in the elite subfield of Swedish higher education. *Poetics*, 56, 15-34.  
doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2016.02.004
- Canguilhem, G. (1988). *Ideology and rationality in the history of the life sciences*. Cambridge, Mass., London: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, The MIT Press.
- Canguilhem, G. (1991). *The normal and the pathological* (First American ed.). New York: Zone Books.
- Carter, C., & Spence, C. (2014). Being a successful professional: an exploration of who makes partner in the Big 4. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 31(4), 949-981. doi:10.1111/1911-3846.12059
- Cassirer, E. (1950). *The problem of knowledge: philosophy, science, and history since Hegel*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press.

- Chudzikowski, K., & Mayrhofer, W. (2011). In search of the blue flower? Grand social theories and career research: the case of Bourdieu's theory of practice. *Human Relations*, *64*(1), 19-36.  
doi:10.1177/0018726710384291
- Collyer, F. (2018). Envisaging the healthcare sector as a field: moving from Talcott Parsons to Pierre Bourdieu. *Social Theory & Health*, *16*(2), 111-126. doi:10.1057/s41285-017-0046-1
- Contandriopoulos, D., Denis, J.-L., & Langley, A. (2004). Defining the 'public' in a public healthcare system. *Human Relations*, *57*(12), 1573-1596. doi:10.1177/0018726704049990
- De Clercq, D., & Voronov, M. (2009a). The role of cultural and symbolic capital in entrepreneurs' ability to meet expectations about conformity and innovation. *Journal of Small Business Management*, *47*(3), 398-420. doi:10.1111/j.1540-627X.2009.00276.x
- De Clercq, D., & Voronov, M. (2009b). Toward a practice perspective of entrepreneurship: entrepreneurial legitimacy as habitus. *International Small Business Journal*, *27*(4), 395-419.  
doi:10.1177/0266242609334971
- Dobbin, F. (2008). The poverty of organizational theory: Comment on: "Bourdieu and organizational analysis". *Theory and Society*, *37*(1), 53-63. doi:10.1007/s11186-007-9051-z
- Drakopoulou Dodd, S., Wilson, J., Bhaird, C. M. a., & Bisignano, A. P. (2018). Habitus emerging: the development of hybrid logics and collaborative business models in the Irish craft beer sector. *International Small Business Journal*, *36*(6), 637-661.  
doi:10.1177/0266242617751597
- Durkheim, É. (2013). *The rules of sociological method and selected texts on sociology and its method* (2 ed.). Houndmills: Palgrave MacMillian.
- Elliott, C., & Stead, V. (2018). Constructing women's leadership representation in the UK press during a time of financial crisis: gender capitals and dialectical tensions. *Organization Studies*, *39*(1), 19-45.

- Emirbayer, M., & Johnson, V. (2008). Bourdieu and organizational analysis. *Theory & Society*, 37(1), 1-44. doi:10.1007/s11186-007-9052-y
- Ernst, J. (2019). The curse of bureaucratisation or the blessings of professionalisation? Nurses' engaged adoption of quality management in hybrid managerial positions. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 35(3), 1-11. doi:10.1016/j.scaman.2019.101050
- Ernst, J. (2020). Professional boundary struggles in the context of healthcare change: the relational and symbolic constitution of nursing ethos in the space of possible professionalisation. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 42(7), 1727-1741. doi:10.1111/1467-9566.13161
- Ernst, J., Hindhede, A. L., & Andersen, V. (2018). From theoretical concept to organizational tool for public sector improvement: Janus-faced social capital in a hospital department. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 31(5), 638-652. doi:10.1108/IJPSM-05-2017-0147
- Ernst, J., & Jensen Schleiter, A. (2018). Standardization for patient safety in a hospital department: killing butterflies with a musket? *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, 13(4), 367-383. doi:doi:10.1108/QROM-07-2017-1548
- Ernst, J., & Jensen Schleiter, A. (2019). Organizational identity struggles and reconstruction during organizational change: narratives as symbolic, emotional and practical glue. *Organization Studies*. doi:10.1177/0170840619854484
- Go, J., & Krause, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Fielding transnationalism*. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley Blackwell.
- Golsorkhi, D., Leca, B., Lounsbury, M., & Ramirez, C. (2009). Analysing, accounting for and unmasking domination: On our role as scholars of practice, practitioners of social science and public intellectuals. *Organization*, 16(6), 779-797. doi:10.1177/1350508409343400
- Gorski, P. S. (2013). Bourdieusian Theory and Historical Analysis: Maps, Mechanisms, and Methods. In P. S. Gorski (Ed.), *Bourdieu and Historical Analysis* (pp. 327-366). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Grek, S. (2020). Facing “a tipping point”? The role of the OECD as a boundary organisation in governing education in Sweden. *Education Inquiry*, 11(3), 175-195.  
doi:10.1080/20004508.2019.1701838
- Grenfell, M., & James, D. (2004). Change in the field - changing the field: Bourdieu and the methodological practice of educational research. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(4), 507-524. doi:10.1080/0142569042000236989
- Hallett, T., & Gougherty, M. (2018). Bourdieu and Organizations. In T. Medvetz & J. J. Sallaz (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Pierre Bourdieu* (pp. 273-298). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hindhede, A. L., & Larsen, K. (2019). Prestige hierarchies of diseases and specialities in a field perspective. *Social Theory & Health*, 17(2), 213-230. doi:10.1057/s41285-018-0074-5
- Kalfa, S., & Taksa, L. (2015). Cultural capital in business higher education: reconsidering the graduate attributes movement and the focus on employability. *Studies in Higher Education*, 40(4), 580-595. doi:10.1080/03075079.2013.842210
- Kauppi, N. (2018). Transnational social fields. In T. Medvetz & J. J. Sallaz (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Pierre Bourdieu*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kerr, R., & Robinson, S. (2009). The hysteresis effect as creative adaptation of the habitus: dissent and transition to the 'Corporate' in post-Soviet Ukraine. *Organization*, 16(6), 829-853.  
doi:10.1177/1350508409337581
- Kerr, R., & Robinson, S. (2011). Leadership as an elite field: Scottish banking leaders and the crisis of 2007-2009. *Leadership*, 7(2), 151-173. doi:10.1177/1742715010394735
- Kerr, R., Robinson, S. K., & Elliott, C. (2016). Modernism, Postmodernism, and corporate power: historicizing the architectural typology of the corporate campus. *Management & Organizational History*, 11(2), 123-146. doi:10.1080/17449359.2016.1141690

- Larsen, K., & Harsløf, I. (2020). Chapter Ten: Promoting Health as a Form of Capital: The Transformation of the Danish Healthcare Field as Experienced By Private Healthcare Professionals. In F. Collyer & K. Willis (Eds.), *Navigating Private and Public Healthcare: Experiences of Patients, Doctors and Policy-Makers* (pp. 201-223). Singapore: Springer Singapore.
- Larsen, K., Hindhede, A. L., Larsen, M. H., Nicolaisen, M. H., & Henriksen, F. M. (2020). Bodies need yoga? No plastic surgery! Naturalistic versus instrumental bodies among professions in the Danish healthcare field. *Social Theory & Health*, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41285-020-00151-z>
- Lauring, J. (2011). Intercultural organizational communication: the social organizing of interaction in international encounters. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 48(3), 231-255.  
doi:10.1177/0021943611406500
- Lee, R., & Shaw, E. (2016). Bourdieu's non-material forms of capital: Implications for start-up policy. *Environment and Planning. C, Government & Policy*, 34(8), 1734-1758.  
doi:10.1177/0263774X16638850
- Levy, O., & Reiche, B. S. (2018). The politics of cultural capital: social hierarchy and organizational architecture in the multinational corporation. *Human Relations*, 71(6), 867-894.  
doi:10.1177/0018726717729208
- Lupu, I., & Empson, L. (2015). Illusio and overwork: playing the game in the accounting field. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 28(8), 1310-1340. doi:10.1108/AAAJ-02-2015-1984
- Lyke, A. (2017). Habitus, doxa, and saga: applications of Bourdieu's theory of practice to organizational history. *Management & Organizational History*, 12(2), 163-173.  
doi:10.1080/17449359.2017.1329091

- Maclean, M., & Charles, H. (2019). Pierre Bourdieu and elites: making the hidden visible. In S. Clegg & M. Pina e Cunha (Eds.), *Management, organizations and contemporary social theory* (1 ed., pp. 98-114). London: Routledge.
- Maclean, M., Harvey, C., & Kling, G. (2017). Elite business networks and the field of power: a matter of class? *Theory, Culture & Society*, 34(5-6), 127-151.  
doi:10.1177/0263276417715071
- Marx, K. (1984). *Capital: a critique of political economy. Vol. III. Bk. 3, The process of capitalist production as a whole*. London: London : Lawrence & Wishart, 1959 1984 [printing].
- McDonough, P., & Polzer, J. (2012). Habitus, hysteresis and organizational change in the public sector. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 37(4), 357-380.
- McDonough, P., & Polzer, J. (2012). Habitus, hysteresis, and organizational change in the public sector. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 37(4), 357-380. doi:10.29173/cjs11266
- Nairz-Wirth, E., & Feldmann, K. (2019). Teacher professionalism in a double field structure. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 1-16. doi:10.1080/01425692.2019.1597681
- Robbins, D. (2000). *Bourdieu and culture* (1 ed.). London: SAGE.
- Robinson, S., & Kerr, R. (2017). Women leaders in the political field in Scotland: A socio-historical approach to the emergence of leaders. *Leadership*, 14(6), 662-686.  
doi:10.1177/1742715017710592
- Robinson, S. K., & Kerr, R. (2009). The symbolic violence of leadership: a critical hermeneutic study of leadership and succession in a British organization in the post-Soviet context. *Human Relations*, 62(6), 875-903. doi:10.1177/0018726709104546
- Roenn-Smidt, H., Shim, J. K., Larsen, K., & Hindhede, A. L. (2020). Hysteresis – or the mismatch of expectations and possibilities among relatives in a transforming health care system. *Health Sociology Review*, 29(1), 31-44. doi:10.1080/14461242.2019.1704425

- Samdanis, M., & Özbilgin, M. (2020). The duality of an atypical leader in diversity management: the legitimization and delegitimization of diversity beliefs in organizations. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 22(2), 101-119. doi:10.1111/ijmr.12217
- Sapiro, G. (2018). Field theory from a transnational perspective. In T. Medvetz & J. J. Sallaz (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Pierre Bourdieu*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sayce, S. (2006). Gender change? Locked into industrial relations and Bourdieu. *Employee relations*, 28(5), 468-482. doi:10.1108/01425450610683663
- Schinkel, W., & Noordegraaf, M. (2011). Professionalism as symbolic capital: materials for a Bourdieusian theory of professionalism. *Comparative Sociology*, 10(1), 67-96. doi:10.1163/156913310X514083
- Schneidhofer, T. M., Schiffinger, M., & Mayrhofer, W. (2011). Still a man's world? *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, 31(1), 65-82. doi:10.1108/02610151211199227
- Seierstad, C., Tatli, A., Aldossari, M., & Huse, M. (2020). Broadening of the Field of Corporate Boards and Legitimate Capitals: An Investigation into the Use of Gender Quotas in Corporate Boards in Norway. *Work, employment and society*, 0(0), 0950017019892835. doi:10.1177/0950017019892835
- Sieweke, J. (2014). Pierre Bourdieu in management and organization studies: a citation context analysis and discussion of contributions. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 30(4), 532-543. doi:10.1016/j.scaman.2014.04.004
- Spence, C., Carter, C., Belal, A., Husillos, J., Dambrin, C., & Archel, P. (2016). Tracking habitus across a transnational professional field. *Work, employment and society*, 30(1), 3-20.
- Spence, C., Voulgaris, G., & Maclean, M. (2017). Politics and the professions in a time of crisis. *Journal of Professions and Organization*, 4(3), 261-281. doi:10.1093/jpo/jox001
- Swartz, D. L. (2008). Bringing Bourdieu's master concepts into organizational analysis. *Theory and Society*, 37(1), 45-52. doi:10.1007/s11186-007-9053-x

- Tatli, A. (2011). A multi-layered exploration of the diversity management field: diversity discourses, practices and practitioners in the UK. *British Journal of Management*, 22(2), 238-253.  
doi:10.1111/j.1467-8551.2010.00730.x
- Tatli, A., Ozturk, M. B., & Woo, H. S. (2017). Individualization and Marketization of Responsibility for Gender Equality: The Case of Female Managers in China. *Human Resource Management*, 56(3), 407-430. doi:10.1002/hrm.21776
- Tatli, A., Vassilopoulou, J., Özbilgin, M., Forson, C., & Slutskaya, N. (2014). A Bourdieuan relational perspective for entrepreneurship research. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 52(4), 615-632. doi:10.1111/jsbm.12122
- Tatli, A., Özbilgin, M., & Karatas-Özkan, M. (2015a). Introduction: management and organization studies meet pierre bourdieu. In A. Tatli, M. Özbilgin, & M. Karatas-Özkan (Eds.), *Pierre Bourdieu, organization, and management* (pp. 1-16). New York: Routledge.
- Tatli, A., Özbilgin, M., & Karatas-Özkan, M. (Eds.). (2015b). *Pierre Bourdieu, organisation and management*. Ney York: Routledge.
- Townley, B., Beech, N., & McKinlay, A. (2009). Managing in the creative industries: managing the motley crew. *Human Relations*, 62(7), 939-962. doi:10.1177/0018726709335542
- van Aaken, D., Splitter, V., & Seidl, D. (2013). Why do corporate actors engage in pro-social behaviour? A Bourdieusian perspective on corporate social responsibility. *Organization*, 20(3), 349-371. doi:10.1177/1350508413478312
- Vandenberghe, F. (1999). "The real is relational": an epistemological analysis of Pierre Bourdieu's generative structuralism. *Sociological Theory*, 17(1), 32-67. doi:10.1111/0735-2751.00064
- Vaughan, D. (2008). Bourdieu and organizations: the empirical challenge. *Theory and Society*, 37(1), 65-81. doi:10.1007/s11186-007-9056-7
- Vincent, S., & Pagan, V. (2019). Entrepreneurial agency and field relations: a realist Bourdieusian analysis. *Human Relations*, 72(2), 188-216. doi:10.1177/0018726718767952

- Wacquant, L. (2004). Following Pierre Bourdieu into the field. *Ethnography*, 5(4), 387-414.  
doi:10.1177/1466138104052259
- Wacquant, L. (2013). Symbolic power and group-making: on Pierre Bourdieu's reframing of class. *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 13(2), 274-291. doi:10.1177/1468795X12468737
- Wacquant, L. (2018). Four transversal principles for putting Bourdieu to work. *Anthropological Theory*, 18(1), 3-17. doi:10.1177/1463499617746254
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: an outline of interpretive sociology*. Berkeley, London: University of California Press.
- Wright, A. L. (2009). Domination in organizational fields: it's just not cricket. *Organization*, 16(6), 855-885. doi:10.1177/1350508409337582