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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to explore the nature of the social field as described by Pierre Bourdieu as well as to explore the possibility of creating a more focused and tailored set of conditions in the form of a model to repurpose the field theory to more clearly be applicable to bilateral negotiations.

The methodological approach is conceptual analysis based on the epistemology of critical realism. The supporting theories for the approach are a combination of systemic, chaos and complexity theory while the fundamentals for the implementation of the methodological approach are the four main concepts in Bourdieu’s theory of the social field: *the field, habitus, illusio* and *symbolic capital*. One of the main points of repurposing this specific dynamic is to explicitly allow for deliberate human agency within the field.

Analytical data consists purely of the secondary type. This essay is not empirically based but rather theoretical and abstract. The paper is founded on the basic principles of macrosociology and presumes social agency where appropriate.

This paper focuses on creating a tentative framework model based on repurposed concepts derived from Bourdieu. The results are arguably interesting but are mostly limited to affecting further development of this tentative model and prefacing application of it through attempting to implement it in an analytical manner on empirical data.
PREFACE

To know by oneself
Is like being lost
In the middle of the forest,
Or like a blind man
Left to himself, who sets out on his way
With no one to take his hand.
And when he looks for the path
He never finds it,
But wanders into the forest instead
Because he has learned things by himself
With no one to take his hand.¹

During my time as a university student I have continuously been drawn towards Bourdieu’s field theory ever since being introduced to it. I have attempted to apply it in a wide variety of contexts, papers and discussions both in its native habitat, the sociological discipline, as well as others such as political science and rhetorical studies.

While the manner in which I have applied the theory may seem shallow and insufficient, I always had the ambition to accurately describe its complexity while simultaneously presenting an intuitive and easy to understand dynamic. At this point, I suspect that my interpretation and presentation of its application is perhaps intuitive for a fairly limited number of readers and listeners, but it was decidedly ungainly and more often than not required improvised explanations that had the unfortunate effect of further complicating the application of Bourdieu’s theory about the dynamics of the social field.

Now I am here to do it again, though hopefully with greater success of actually presenting a paper with a coherent and intuitive base model of an interpreted adaptation of the dynamics and systemic complexity of the Bourdieuean field.

Is there adequate motivation for this, then? I will naturally argue that there is.

Throughout history, mankind has seen conflict and approached it from a multitude of angles. Methods have ranged from face to face brawling to phone calls across the globe in an effort to settle disputes and conflicts of interest. As the methods of approaching conflict evolve and change, the need to understand the underlying processes stays relevant. Negotiations are a key factor in our current

existence, present in many aspects of our lives and discernable from the highest macro level down to the most intimate micro interaction.

To address a figurative elephant in the room: why was Bourdieu’s concepts chosen over other, perhaps more fitting concepts? I can at best offer a rationalisation. The main reason why I opted for Bourdieu in this paper is because of the perceived simplicity and intuitiveness of the dynamics of the field theory. What I find especially appealing in the field theory is the ability to refine a focused model from a more general ditto, applicable to a very specific area: the deliberate baseline for formulating strategy based on human social agency in the context of inter-state negotiation. This is not a dismissal of other sociological theories and concepts but rather a rationalisation of my choice, as initially stated. I will not rule out drawing on the theories of others in the future. For the initial framework that is the ambition of this paper, the field theory will however be more than sufficient.

My approach to negotiation in this case is decidedly macro oriented. Negotiations between states are near constant, with both governmental and non-governmental organisations jockeying for position to further their particular agenda. There is a very real need to approach this from a sociological standpoint because of one key point: deliberate agency. The act of becoming aware of how a position within a particular context affects available options allows for both reasonably accurate predictions and relatively certain retroactive review of an interaction based on conflict.

For every conflict, multiple conditions controlling the characteristics of the situation emerge. This presents an opportunity to attempt to convert said conditions into a workable abstract model, in order to further our understanding of macro-sociological phenomena surrounding attempts to solve conflicts.

As I have been perusing various articles pertaining to negotiation related to Bourdieu, I have noted a distinct lack of them being directly tied to macrosociology and bilateral negotiations between states. This paper will attempt to begin filling this niche. Of course, I do not claim to have seen all the possibly relevant articles and there is naturally a possibility of a very similar piece of work already existing that I have not yet found. Should that be the case, I will argue for this paper’s pedagogic and methodological value even if the results might thereby decrease in originality.

At this point, I would first like to thank my previous mentor Satu Heikkinen for her patience with my insistence on dragging this paper out over a fairly long time.
Next up is Daniel Persson Thunqvist who has elevated the paper’s quality through his expertise and input. It is always a pleasure to discuss the theoretically abstract with someone so knowledgeable.

Naturally I want to thank my family, Joachim Smith, Johanna Kildén Smith Berg, Maria Kildén and Stefan Nordeng and my friends for being very supportive and understanding of my endeavour even though they may not be overly interested in its contents.

I should also like to take this opportunity to also send my regards to my aunt Beata, always a pleasure conversing.

Special regards to Arturius. I really hope I spelled it right... And you better become a sir when you grow up!

With that, I implore you to enter the chaotic exploration and wish you a pleasant read.

Oh and Google, I am not a robot. Stop asking.

Sincerely
Martin Kildén Smith
# Table of contents

1. INTRODUCTION
   1.2 The research problem
   1.3 Aim and queries
   1.4 Core concepts
   1.5 Scope
   1.6 Notes on disposition

2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATION
   2.1 Macrosociology
   2.2 Concepts and complications
   2.3 The field
   2.4 Symbolic capital
   2.5 Habitus
   2.6 Illusio
   2.7 Exemplification and conclusion
   2.8 On bilateral negotiation

3. METHOD
   3.1 On metatheory
   3.2 Analytical procedure
   3.3 A brief explanation of Systems-, Chaos- and Complexity theory
      3.3.1 Systems theory
      3.3.2 Chaos and complexity theory
   3.4 Ethical considerations
   3.5 Quality criteria and discussion

4. ANALYSIS
   4.1 Conceptualisation
      4.1.1 The new fields
      4.1.2 Habitus and illusio
      4.1.3 Symbolic capital or perceived power
   4.2 Illustration of concepts and variables, the new framework

5. RESULTS
1. INTRODUCTION

This paper sets out to explore the nature of the social field as described by Pierre Bourdieu as well as to explore the possibility of creating a more focused and tailored set of conditions in the form of a model to repurpose the field theory to more clearly be applicable to bilateral negotiations. In line with tradition in theoretical sociology based on critical realism, the bottom line consists of a re-contextualisation of a theory. In the case of this paper however, the process is not complete, as the goal of the paper is a framework that illustrates a part of, but not complete, re-contextualisation. The paper re-focuses Bourdieu’s concepts to be applied to bilateral negotiations to an extent limited to theoretical reasoning. The re-contextualisation is not based on empirical tests; instead the analysis resides on a conceptual level.

The methodological approach is structural/conceptual analysis with an ontological and epistemological base in critical realism. This method was chosen due to the nature of Bourdieu’s concepts as well as the particular aim of this paper, which is to delve into and explore the nature and characteristics of Bourdieu’s theory on a conceptual level. The supporting theories for the methodological approach are a combination of systems-, chaos- and complexity theory. This combination emerged through the analytical tool that was used while attempting to map out and characterise Bourdieu’s concepts. The fundamentals for the implementation of the methodological approach are the four main concepts in Bourdieu’s theory of the social field: the field, habitus, illusio and symbolic capital. One of the main points of repurposing this specific dynamic is to explicitly allow for deliberate human agency within the field. In other words: to strategise using known dynamics and boundaries. Naturally, there are other parts that should prove interesting, such as the actual conclusion of the theorising as well as the possibilities of future application of a finished model. Personally I am looking forward to seeing it handle temporal analysis, but I digress.

Data in this paper consists purely of the secondary type. Bourdieu’s concepts are my main source of data, collected through Bourdieu’s own works as well as those of others who have interpreted his theory. This is not an empirically based essay but rather theoretical and abstract. The paper is founded on the basic principles of macrosociology and presumes social agency where appropriate.

One sentence summary: This paper focuses on creating a tentative framework model based on repurposed concepts heavily derived from Bourdieu.

---

3 ibid
1.2 The research problem

During the data collection process, it was noted that Bourdieu’s concepts were not very prevalent in the published papers regarding bilateral negotiations. What was found often included interdisciplinary studies\(^4\), roots in economic theory\(^5\), or an extension or case specific reshaping of Bourdieu’s concepts.\(^6\) Upon finding the tendency of re-shaping the concepts to fit a specific context, the need to explore the theoretical parts arose. Bourdieu himself left a legacy of applying his concepts differently over the course of developing his grand theory.\(^7\) Therefore, it is not strange to note the lack of a uniform application of his concepts. This paper seeks to solidify a set application of those concepts by re-contextualising them on a theoretically abstract level.

One of the main problems that I see, and that I feel legitimises this paper, is that Bourdieu’s theory and concepts possess a complexity to the point of being a hindrance rather than help for many aspiring sociologists. I was hard pressed to find two articles that applied the concepts in a similar enough manner to facilitate comparison based on the applied theory. I also found that in some cases, the concepts were modified to fit the context, further undermining the possibility of comparative analysis.\(^8\) This is problematic for someone who wants to use the dynamic in Bourdieu’s concepts as a baseline for both comparative and temporal analysis, which is why I have chosen to attempt a framework built for a specific purpose. Another reason for creating the framework in the context of bilateral negotiations is to focus the conceptual analysis toward a specific area in order to establish a base for the reasoning connected to the analysis.

This is not a paper based on the tradition of the interpretive paradigm, where empirical data are used to confirm or falsify the theory in question.\(^9\) Instead, it is based on the logic of the relation between the described function of the theory and its capacity to accurately describe its intended phenomena or dynamic.\(^10\) This tradition generally functions through abstraction of concepts in order to explain and investigate the theory itself.\(^11\) The key difference between these traditions is their usage and reliance on empirical data, where the interpretive tradition relies more heavily on empirical data than the conceptual analysis.

---


\(^6\) Howes & Ford, 2011

\(^7\) Broady, D, *Sociologi och epistemology: Om Pierre Bourdieus författarskap och den historiska epistemologin*, 1991, HLS Förlag

\(^8\) Howes & Ford, 2011

\(^9\) Danemark et al, 2003

\(^10\) ibid

\(^11\) ibid
This paper takes the first few steps towards an analytical tool, based on Bourdieu’s concepts by exploring and performing a conceptual analysis on the intra-field interaction as well as presenting conclusions and recommendations for the continued work towards the end product that lies beyond this paper. In order for such an analytical tool to become reality, two things working together are needed: A framework for inter-field interaction and a framework for intra-field interaction. This paper is focused on the latter of the two, intra-field interaction. Motivation for developing this kind of analytical tool is found in the ability to compare its application of the concepts through the framework between papers without first establishing how exactly the concepts were interpreted and implemented as well as identifying any modifications to the concepts that may or may not be part of the analysis. The inner workings will be complex, but ideally the final model will be intuitive and user friendly.

1.3 Aim and queries

The purpose of this essay is to explore the possibility and viability of repurposing Bourdieu’s field theory into an abstract theoretical tool potentially useful for estimating, analysing and reviewing the conditions of the climate in situations based on conflict, where different approaches on negotiation are predicted to occur. Furthermore, this essay aims to create a theoretical framework from which a fully fledged model could be developed.

We can extract the following queries from the aim of the paper:

- Are the systemic concepts present in the field theory suitable for being repurposed for use in and around bilateral negotiations?

- Are the concepts derived from the field theory precise enough to accurately identify and describe discernible patterns in order to facilitate analysis?

- How could the model from the converted field theory be implemented to be relevant in practical as well as academic contexts concerning bilateral negotiations?
1.4 Core concepts

The concepts presented here are tied to this paper, and should not be mixed up with or compared to similar or identically named concepts.

*The field* is one of the distinguishing concepts of Pierre Bourdieu, often called the social field. In this paper, it will simply be referred to as the field.

*Deliberate agency* is a concept that will prove to be of utmost importance to the relevance and legitimacy of an abstract model such as the one being developed in this paper. The concept is based on a relation between knowledge and ability to manipulate, strategise and act. Basically it means that the actors in the field can devise strategy and tactics based on prior knowledge of the dynamics of the field and thus gain agency in the field.

*The dormant field* is an extension of the field with specific characteristics assigned to it. In short it is an abstract space that former participants can enter and expect to have a well developed understanding of, prior to becoming part of it again.

*The emergent field* is not quite the opposite of the dormant field; it is defined by emerging through an illusio being created by one or more social entities looking to achieve a specific objective.

*Estimation of position* ties into deliberate agency and is defined as the act of identifying and understanding participation in a specific field.

*Symbolic capital* is the consolidated term for the resources used to alter one’s position in the field.

*Habitus* is also one of the main concepts of Bourdieu. In this paper it will mostly be referred to as a discernable pattern meant to reinforce the deliberate human agency, but that does not mean its value as a slightly different form of symbolic capital is diminished.

*Illusio* marks the concept that guides participants in the field toward overarching goals, specific to each field as well as to each participant. It is a concept tied to motivation and has a strong connection to the values of symbolic capital.

*Estimation of value and application of symbolic capital* are tied to manoeuvring within a field through amassing and taxing symbolic capital to chase the field specific illusio and being aware of what a certain sum of symbolic capital corre-
sponds to within the field. This concept will commonly be referred to as intra-field interaction in this paper.

*Entities* in this paper are interchangeable with terms such as social beings and social entities and symbolize the power of agency of a sovereign state within the field. An entity is in most cases a participant representing a state in the discussed field.

As an addendum, the term *original theory* will be used extensively through this paper, and will always symbolise Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of the social field.

1.5 Scope

The scope of this essay is limited to explaining and exploring the possible repurposing of Bourdieu’s field theory in an abstract bilateral sense with states as participants. I have chosen to focus on intra-field interaction to get a narrow and clear scope. Naturally inter-field interaction will be mentioned but it will at no point be the centre of attention in this paper.

1.6 Notes on disposition

In order to facilitate readability I will supply a short guide on the disposition of the rest of the paper with a quick explanation of each main chapter.

Chapter 1 introduces the essay as a whole, what it contains and what to expect. The paper is legitimised and described in this chapter.

Chapter 2 establishes the theoretical foundation for the paper, introducing the absolute core concepts: *the field*, *habitus*, *illusio* and *symbolic capital*. It also contains an overview and description of research done in regards to the more general field of bilateral negotiation.

Chapter 3 details the methodological approach. Things like metatheoretical perspective and considerations regarding validity and reliability are also found in Chapter 3. A comprehensive description of the analytical process is found in this chapter.

In Chapter 4 I work with the framework in two scenarios. They are constructed by me in order to facilitate and illustrate the actual process of repurposing Bourdieu’s theory. There is a third scenario in Chapter 5 that is an actual historical conflict where I attempt to implement the framework model, both to test it and to seek theoretical conclusions from the attempt. I bring it up here in an ef-
fort to pre-empt potential bewilderment from finding another scenario in Chapter 5.

In Chapter 5 the queries of the paper are brought in and the results from Chapter 4 attempt to answer them. As previously noted, I attempt to implement and tentatively test the framework on a third scenario, the Falklands War.

Chapter 6 is devoted to bringing coherent closure to the paper through discussing the results and comparing them with Bourdieu’s original theory as well as doing some musings on how to proceed beyond this paper.
2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

After a relatively extensive perusal of Bourdieu’s works as well as some secondary literature, I have satisfied a rough application of Blooms taxonomy in order to establish knowledge relevant to this paper.\textsuperscript{12,13} Here I will describe the base concepts from P. Bourdieu, in an attempt to describe their relation to each other and how they work together to form a very malleable and dynamic foundation suited to be adapted to a multitude of contexts. I will also introduce some fairly well cited works that utilize Bourdieuenean theory in relation to international relations.

2.1 Macrosociology

The macro perspective in sociology views the social world from a highly elevated point, seeking to understand and describe phenomena on a scale above that of microsociology, its counterpart. Sufficient to say, this is a very broad area of interest.

While I am presuming a certain degree of orientation within the sociological field, this addition is intended to guide you into a specific interpretative perspective.

Systems theory in the context of this paper is reserved as a methodological approach in conjunction with chaos and complexity theory as outlined in Chapter 3. In other words: it is not used as a part of the theoretical framework.

I am going to preface the introduction of Bourdieu’s field theory by paraphrasing\textsuperscript{14} Donald Broady and the way he summarizes the concepts I am describing:

They are not concepts of the sort that enables the labelling of phenomena possible to observe. They instead work as tools ready for use on the immediately observed and can even be used as theoretical weapons, meant to pierce the veil of the conventional and the sufficient appearances.\textsuperscript{15}

One last note: the concepts involved in the field theory have naturally evolved and changed over time, something that leads to certain difficulties when attempting to give a concise overview. This is yet another reason to consolidate and re-purpose it for specific use.

\textsuperscript{13} The main objectives of satisfying Bloom’s taxonomy are: Remembering, Understanding, Applying, Analyzing, Evaluating and Creating.
\textsuperscript{14} Translated from Swedish into English by the author.
\textsuperscript{15} Broady. 1991, p. 167
2.2 Concepts and complications

As noted in Chapter 1, a driving factor behind developing this specific framework is the understanding that Bourdieu’s concepts have been rather fluidly applied over the years, and due to that, have become somewhat unwieldy in its application, necessitating further explanation of just what version of the concept(s) are being used. For example:

Capital may be viewed as the specific cultural or social (rather than economic) assets that are invested with value in the field which, when possessed, enables membership to the field. The type of capital operating in the field of university education is an institutionalized form of cultural capital that has generally been termed ‘academic’ capital. In some instances, Bourdieu distinguishes between two forms of capital: ‘academic capital’, which is linked to power over the instruments of reproduction of the university body; and ‘intellectual’ or ‘scientific capital’, which is linked to scientific authority or intellectual renown. In other instances, however, the two definitions appear to merge and ‘academic capital’ is defined as an institutionalized form of cultural capital based on properties such as prior educational achievement, a ‘disposition’ to be academic (seen, for example, in manner of speech and writing), and specially designated competencies. It is in this second sense that ‘academic capital’ is used in this paper.¹⁶

This quote is taken from the context of a paper deliberating Bourdieu’s concepts through analysing its capability of extension to explain more in-depth the relationship of higher education and society. What we can see in the quote at a glance, is that it presents two ways to view academic capital as a theoretical concept. The quote also settles on one way, for the purpose of consistency throughout the article.

The former quote from Naidoo is by no means an isolated case in regards to papers implementing or analysing Bourdieu’s concepts while also noting the metaphorical flavour of the concepts.

If we look at another example, we are presented with the same symptomatic phenomena in regards to utilising Bourdieu’s theory:

In this way, symbolic power moves from being a merely local power (the power to construct this statement, or make this work of art) to being a general power, what Bourdieu once called a ‘power of constructing [social] reality’ It is the second, strong definition of symbolic power that Bourdieu presumably has in mind when he talks of the symbolic power of television.¹⁷

¹⁷Couldry. N, Media meta-capital: extending the range of Bourdieu's field theory, 2003, Theory and society, 32 (5-6), pp. 653-677, p. 19
This quote is from an article discussing symbolic power in relation to media in the social world. Note how the author adds “[...]that Bourdieu presumable has in mind[...]” during the latter part of the quote. This indicates an understanding that needs to be re-examined each time Bourdieu’s concepts are brought in. It also ties in to a more general feel of unwieldiness in regards to implementing Bourdieu’s theory into analytical practice.

To put this problematic symptom in perspective, we can take a look at when Bourdieu introduced the concept of habitus. It was in 1962, but it was not until 1972 that it was thoroughly explained what the concept actually entailed. His works during the sixties often included terms and concepts that pointed toward habitus, but the concept itself was rarely utilised until the latter part of the sixties and beginning of the seventies, when it was formally presented. During the course of this, and onward toward our time, the concept of habitus evolved to flow between being a form of capital, related to other symbolic capital in a more direct manner, to being a more explicit concept relating to the mannerism and unconscious behavioural quirks that exist within fields.

By now, it should be apparent that any application of Bourdieu’s theory and concepts need to be accompanied by a set of constraints, defining what they mean in direct relation to the paper at hand. This, in itself, indicates a need to reconceptualise the theory in order to strengthen its contextual explanatory and analytical efficiency.

2.3 The field

The field in the case of being a part of Bourdieu’s works is described as an abstract area of conflict. It is a battlefield of sorts, with the essence of conflict being the driving force legitimising the existence of the field. The field can be described as an area of conflict where individual position is determined by taxing different kinds of resources that are weighed against the habitus and illusio within the current field and a corresponding position is thusly earned.

An interesting note is that the field is not only an antagonistic arena where enemies gather. This means that the field itself is not solely based on conflict, but rather on a combination of conflict and commonly shared interests.

\[^{18}\text{Ibid p. 19}\]
\[^{19}\text{Broady, 1991}\]
\[^{20}\text{ibid}\]
\[^{21}\text{ibid}\]
\[^{23}\text{ibid}\]
\[^{24}\text{Broady, 1991}\]
The field itself exists through its participants. This means that while the field can be viewed as a separate analytical concept in a more categorising manner, it retains its reliance on the concepts of illusio and symbolic capital due to their defining characteristics in conjunction with the field. This perspective of Bourdieu’s concepts is exemplified in Chapter 2.6.

Within fields exists a hierarchal order based on position. This position is based on accumulation and application of symbolic capital as well as conscious or subconscious knowledge of habitus. A field is an entity of its own, and can interact with other fields, sometimes overlapping other fields or assimilating another field, creating a new one. This naturally varies, depending on the strength of the field, so it is logical that some fields do retain their autonomy.

The field represents borders for the social logic that resides within it as well as defining where the conceptual borders are drawn. In other words, fields can display different degrees of autonomy through their specific nature. A field with weak autonomy is more susceptible to inter-field influence while a field with stronger autonomy is more resistant and will maintain its internal structure more closely related to its participants and to fields more directly connected to it.

Discussing the fields and their autonomy is important in order to gain a basic grasp of the vastness of the concept, as it can encompass any group that corresponds to the basic criterion defining the field. The catch here is that discussing the field as a solitary concept moves us toward inter-field dynamics, where fields affect other fields, sub-fields emerge and a whole host of interesting phenomena appears, tied to such a dynamic. This lands us in the space of inter-field dynamics, meaning it is outside the scope of this paper and thusly will not be pursued in great detail.

In order for a field to emerge, there must be social participants acting with or against each other toward a field-specific agenda. The field can however go dormant if its participants leave it, but as long as habitus and illusio persist it can be re-entered. To exemplify: a courthouse can be vacated due to a number of reasons, its participants can disappear and the particular field (arguably sub-field) goes into hibernation. If the courthouse is later populated with a set of participants that act in accordance to the dormant field’s logic, the same field re-emerges. This means that while the field exists through its participants, the participants do not necessarily constitute a constant or a single defining factor.

---

25 ibid
26 Bourdieu, 1977
27 ibid
28 Bourdieu, 1977
This is a visualisation of a field of lifestyles from *Practical Reason*:

The picture depicts the structure of a field by defining different characteristics corresponding to their respective area. This structuring enables the field to be viewed, considered and manipulated.

The field works as a map, and symbolic capitals are separated and counted, in the abstract process, and through the sum of the different capitals, the owner of the actual capitals can find itself somewhere on this map. The symbolic capital works in the same manner as coordinates, defining the position within the field through their values.

For example, if a participant is a rich senior executive, it would be in the upper parts of the field due to its economic capital. If this participant also enjoys a fine whisky and a game of chess, her combined cultural and economic capital would give us a top-left position in the field. That is the essence of the field as it is used in this paper: a set of borders and criteria that enables a visualisation of positions.

---

The description and nature of the field lends itself to adaptation without major alteration, meaning that it fits well to be used as a core concept while being re-purposed to fit a different approach.

2.4 Symbolic capital

Symbolic capital, sometimes only called capital in this paper, is the resource that is commonly accepted within a field and is categorised in three different ways that symbolize their respective characteristics. Bourdieu himself did try out sub categories as well, and from what I have gathered, they were used to further increase the descriptive fidelity of the concept, symbolic capital.³⁰

Symbolic capital is also the common denominator that ties together the different kinds of resources used to gain a position within the field. In Bourdieu’s base theory, symbolic capital is categorized as economic, cultural and social capital. These categories are relevant but arbitrary in the systemic sense, making them well suited to conversion.³¹

It is worth considering that symbolic capital is a relational term and works in a systemic fashion, but Bourdieu himself did not explicitly build a system as much as he built relational concepts that may or may not be systemic.³²

Cultural capital resembles habitus in certain ways, but the core of this resource lies in how it is measured and valued based on cultural context. One example could be the manner of using language in a field, not to be confused with rhetoric. Instead, a correct and collectively approved use of a specific discourse can confer added value to the cultural capital.

Economic capital is a mostly materialistic resource that deals with possessions that carry symbolic representative value, such as money and property. Economic knowledge is also included here as it suggests capability to maximise the economic capital through trade or market manipulation.

Social capital is not easily defined, but in essence it conveys the value of social interaction within the field, how connections and knowledge of social conventions can transfer into symbolic capital. Social capital can be said to have a supportive role to the more precisely defined symbolic capitals. Its value is often wholly dependent on the social network of the participant. This is not exclusive to social capital but it is more pronounced. For example, knowing someone with

³⁰ Broady, 1991
³¹ ibid
³² ibid
authoritative knowledge of field-appropriate cultural behaviour can enhance one’s cultural capital through taxation of social capital.

It is noteworthy that the three different capitals themselves have distinct anthropological characteristics as well as sociological, closely tied to cultural values in specific contexts. It is worth considering the origin of these categories and its ties to cultural theorising, something that is relevant to this paper. Bourdieu was seemingly fond of the notion of inherited behaviour, something that indicated structural agency. This is a key point, not only for symbolic capital but also for the dynamic of the concepts of the field theory.

There is also an economic aspect that feels natural when considering the name symbolic capital, and the fundamental way of approach is exchange rates for different capitals when social beings move between fields.

2.5 Habitus

The behavioural patterns and mannerisms within fields are called habitus. Habitus plays a large part in making a field recognisable through the behaviour of the participants of the field. Habitus is often directed by illusio. Bourdieu makes a point of describing habitus as something subtle, being subconsciously known to participants of the field. I will allow myself to infer that habitus is likely discernable to an outside observer if said observer is aware of the illusio and if the value of the possession of different kinds of symbolic capital is known.33

Habitus can in a sense be equated to capital, in the context of Bourdieu’s theorising, and is said to be another existential form of capital: its embodied form, as opposed to institutionalised or objectified capital.34

So, have we described habitus accurately? If we allow for some selectiveness, we can use a quote from Distinction and question that accuracy:

The habitus is both the generative principle of objectively classifiable judgements and the system of classification (principium divisionis) of these practices. It is in the relationship between the two capacities which define the habitus, the capacity to produce classifiable practices and works, and the capacity to differentiate and appreciate these practices and products (taste), that the represented social world, i.e., the space of life-styles, is constituted.35

33 Bourdieu, 1977
34 Broady, 1991
Clearly defining habitus is evidently not something that can be done without temporal anchoring when considering that Bourdieu himself evolved the concept through his works. For the purpose of this paper I will view habitus as more of a descriptive concept related to discernable behavioural patterns, as it is described in earlier less anthropological works of Bourdieu. Its relational and systemic characteristics make it a malleable and useful concept as well as a tool for agency. It is quite apparent that habitus acts as a key factor in defining a field and its characteristics and is part of the interdependent system of the field theory.

2.6 Illusio

Illusio is the call, engaging existing members of its field and beckoning entities outside it to enter and participate within the field if there is a convergence of an agent’s ambition and the characteristics of a field. It is a concept that corresponds to the common interest of its participants, in contrast to the conflicting interests that exist within the field when manouevring for position. Illusio within a field is what participants strive for and functions as a beacon, directing the habitus of the field. It is also a form of belief in, or acknowledgement of, the worth and meaning of participation in a specific field.\(^{36}\)

2.7 Exemplification and conclusion

Here, I would like to present a typical description of the field theory and how the four main concepts interact to create the fundamental reasoning.

A field is created through common interest of conflict and abstract hierarchy, and thus an illusio is born. Through illusio, habitus makes the field discernable and in the dynamic between habitus and illusio, the value of the different kinds of symbolic capital becomes known and positions are taken corresponding to the combined value of capital for each participant. The field is now an entity capable of interaction within itself as well as with other fields.

Exemplification and a note on agency

A comparison to the modus operandi of a military operation is relevant to illustrate the process. In order for a military operation to gain legitimacy of existence, an objective is necessary. Let us say that the objective is to take a piece of land. Once the objective is established, criteria for success and failure are defined. In this example, success means complete control of the piece of land, while a failure means being completely repelled from that same piece of land.

Illusio is what is at work here by defining what constitutes success and what does not, but it does not dictate and define the different outcomes. Instead illusio is what motivates those definitions of success or failure by representing the ambitions shared by the participants.

Even in the planning phase, observations can be made regarding the behavioural patterns of the operation’s participants. In other words, a distinct habitus is displayed and visible to anyone with viewing access and the necessary knowledge required to identifying the pattern. As the operation gets underway, the logistics of the operation play the role of symbolic capital through its application. Boots on the ground, vehicles, camps and means to rearm and refuel are all different resources; *symbolic capital*, with value corresponding to the illusio, being taxed to gain a favourable position on the battlefield. Noteworthy is that the logistical components of the operation are still relevant even if there is no opposition. What changes is the necessary total value of symbolic capital needed to gain the desired position. Once the operation is commenced, a field is fully created, ready for interaction.

An important conclusion one can reach by this example is that the agents are social beings, humans that are fully aware of their participation and conduct deliberate actions. Given the conclusion that social beings are the acting entities within fields, it is reasonable to also conclude that the field is something that can be manipulated through deliberate strategy and tactics as well as on a purely theoretical level.

2.8 On bilateral negotiation

To gain insight and knowledge of the field of bilateral negotiation, international research texts written in English were consulted. I perused several Journals and went through papers such as: *Globalizing policy sociology in education: working with Bourdieu*, *The Global Negotiator*, *Negotiation in social conflict* and *Handbook of Global and Multicultural Negotiation*.

From the significant amount of research that exists regarding the general subject of bilateral negotiations, I chose a few to highlight what I am discussing in this paper: the repurposing of Bourdieu’s concepts, as well as works that highlight what I interpret as core characteristics in relation to negotiations. One such pa-
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per is the economics-based *The winners curse in bilateral negotiations*. While providing useful information and even some systemic similarities to the field theory, it is not based on sociological principles making it less interesting to incorporate into the work I am doing. It does bring forth concepts such as the idea of the mutually beneficial agreement, but the conditions prefacing such an agreement presupposes an ever-present ambition to make monetary profit directly or indirectly from such an agreement. The research is also focused onto market reasoning, making it less apt for this paper. Furthermore, there has been experiment based research such as the one performed in *Coercive power and Concession making in bilateral negotiation* and although possibly useful at a future point in time, its focus on micro-level interaction renders it marginal for the purpose of this essay. It is brought up mainly due to the author’s methodological approach, which inspired me to include a similar approach when making recommendations for further research, development and application of the possible conclusions of this paper.

Since my paper is based around re-contextualising Bourdieu’s concepts, I found an article in the book series *Higher Education Dynamics* using Bourdieu in a way that also theorised towards a similar but not identical purpose. This allowed me to incorporate some of their thoughts to my own reasoning.

They bring forth the social field of Bourdieu and its inherent inequality:

> A field is a structured social place…. It contains people who dominate and people who are dominated. Constant, permanent relationships of inequality operate inside this space, which at the same time becomes a space in which the various actors struggle for the transformation or preservation of the field. All the individuals in this universe bring to the competition all the (relative) power at their disposal. It is this power that defines their position in the field and, as a result, their strategies.

The quoted article is also contains a significant interpretation of Bourdieu’s field, cited from another interesting article by Lingard et al:

> A Bourdieuan concept of a ‘field’ is, therefore, a metaphor for a “social rather than geographical space”.

What struck me as particularly interesting in Howard & Ford’s article was how they approached Bourdieu’s theorising through interpretative extension.

---
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While Bourdieu’s focus was on the dispositions that are the result of inculcation into ways of behaving from childhood, we extend the meaning here as a useful way of interpreting the action of individuals as they develop a feel for the new rules of the game that have been introduced by globalization.\textsuperscript{48}

The former quote highlights their theoretical process, and while it differs from mine, it is significant in the way it describes the more general theme of adjusting Bourdieu’s concepts, something that accentuates the importance of establishing a tool for comparative analysis using his concepts and thus enabling my own work to be legitimate and useful.

One last quote highlights the interesting point of understanding fields as unmoving while their participants are less restricted or even completely free to move around in the social world:

> The fact that texts circulate without their context, that…they don’t bring with them the field of production of which they are a product, and the fact that recipients, who are themselves in a different field of production, re-interpret the texts in accordance with the structure of the field of reception, are facts that generate some formidable misunderstandings and that can have good or bad consequences.\textsuperscript{49}

As is evident, there have been previous attempts to extend and re-purpose Bourdieu’s concepts. As far as I have gone into the subject though, there is little to no unison in the application, even in specific fields, leading me to believe there is adequate room for additions to works such as the ones quoted and cited above. There also seems to be ample room to theorise based on strategic agency through a macro-perspective by presupposing a systemic dynamic within Bourdieu’s theory.

In addition to research done using Bourdieu, there are of course many others, though mainly focusing on the micro level of agency and interaction. One such example is focused on the strategy and tactics used by the negotiators in professional contexts, and while the context is defined as multilateral and not bilateral, the reasoning carries over. A key point I would like to highlight:

> Never forget that you, as well as the other delegates, are first and foremost human beings! [...] However, neglecting personal feelings and emotions, sympathy or antipathy, as well as individual ambitions of the negotiators involved, will dramatically reduce your ability to influence both the course and the outcome of the negotiation.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{48}Howes & Ford, 2011 p.164  
\textsuperscript{49}Lingard et al. 2005  
\textsuperscript{50}Auer & Jérôme, 2005
What this point underlines, is deliberate human agency and the thought that strategy and tactics are very important factors to consider when it comes to theorising about negotiations on a bi- or multilateral basis.
3. METHOD

This chapter will present the methodological approach of this paper. The chosen approach is motivated by its flexibility and ability to handle conceptual analysis that would facilitate the creation of a new theoretically sound framework based on the fundamentals of Chapter 2. The foundation in Chapter 2 is made up of systematically chosen texts in order to complement and sometimes correct my own reasoning. The literary data was gathered based on Bloom’s taxonomy.51

The use of Bloom’s taxonomy as a systematic basis in this paper means satisfying its objectives: remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating and creating. The taxonomy was used as a guideline in regards to absorbing literary works and incorporating or converting them into usable research data.

3.1 On metatheory

This paper and its analysis are ontologically and epistemologically based on critical realism52. Most of the basic reasoning stems from the exhaustive overview by Danemark et al.53 The core of the reasoning is based on the dynamic between transitive concepts and intransitive mechanics. On a more practical methodological level, critical realism lends us tools to conceptually analyse a theory, in contrast to merely testing it on empirical data.54

In convergence with the nature of a theoretical paper based on critical realism, abstraction is used as an explanatory tool by dividing the levels of reality into the transitive and the intransitive. The transitive part is a form of operationalisation of the perceived. For example, Bourdieu’s concepts exist on the transitive level because they attempt to explain mechanics that would exist with or without the existence of said concepts.55

When something is intransitive, on the other hand, it is a fundamental mechanic that exists with or without human awareness. The result of this dynamic is that we get transitive concepts that attempt to describe the intransitive mechanics that exist independently of a working conceptual apparatus surrounding it. Sometimes the transitive concepts are accurate and sometimes they are not. The purpose of theorising through this line of reasoning is to allow for theoretical
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experimentation that in turn can generate knowledge of the intransitive mechanics that make up reality according to critical realism.56

To frame the methodology in this paper within the concepts of critical realism: it is a structural-conceptual analysis using a critical pluralistic approach.57 This means that critical realism acts as metatheory while multiple supporting theories act in different ways to facilitate the theorising. In the case of this paper, the used theories are as follows:

- Metatheory: critical realism58
- Supporting methodological theories: systems-, chaos- and complexity theory59
- Transitive concepts: Bourdieu’s field theory60

The critical pluralistic approach was adopted through practical emergence and convergence with the abstractions used to study the concepts on a transitive level. The concepts of Bourdieu are subjects of what is called intensive study, while also being attributed as having symmetrical dependence. Symmetrical dependence essentially means that no part is worth more than another and can only act descriptively when functioning as part of a complete conceptual system.61

A note on the supporting theories: Systems-, chaos- and complexity theory utilized at a methodological level. These theories are not used to describe the core concepts of Bourdieu’s theorising. Instead, they are used to guide the reasoning and logical process that provide the basis for the characterisation and plausible abstract connections present in my analysis. They are instrumental by providing guidance and focus to the process through their respective view of intransitive mechanics and phenomena. Naturally, this ties directly into my choice of anchoring my overall approach in critical realism. Key functionalities rationalising the choice of supporting theories are found in Chapter 3.3.

In the forthcoming explanation of the analytical process, Chapter 3.2, core concepts are defined as transitive, explained through abstraction and naturally framed within the chosen theory, namely Bourdieu’s. The mechanics described by those core concepts are presumed to be intransitive and emergent in relevant social situations.

The way I have utilised this kind of method is that I have attempted to create logical connections between concepts using an abstract process on a blank slate
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basis by attributing interpretations of the original concepts to them while retaining a systemic connection.

3.2 Analytical procedure

Chapter 1.4 has a list of concepts used as a core for the reasoning in the analysis, and they are equally central in the analytical procedure described here.

In the process of searching for supportive data and orientating myself within the Bourdieuean field of research, I mainly used various combinations of the following keywords: *Converting, conversion, Bourdieu, international, relations, bilateral, sociology, macro, field, social, conflict and theory*

A few examples of search queries as follows:
Converting the social field,
Bourdieu in international relations,
negotiations and macrosociology

As stated in Chapter 3.1, critical realism is my chosen metatheory, supplying the necessary epistemological concepts as well as assisting in upholding methodological transparency. The analytical process is retroductive, as it seeks to reduce and reassemble the transitive concepts. The goal of this approach is to achieve a descriptive theory, capable of accurately portraying the intransitive mechanics of the bilateral negotiation through Bourdieu’s transitive concepts.

I will exemplify the process through a specifically made image, independent of the actual analysis. The picture is an example of how the analytical process is structured and should also highlight the fact that I am using an abstraction of the transitive concepts defined by Bourdieu in order to gain a descriptive overview. The abstraction can maintain a chaotic manner while preserving a high level of complexity and symmetrical dependence. In other words, the system remains intact while being malleable through attribution of characteristics.
Picture 2 depicts the overarching approach of the analysis, where the core concepts are surrounded by defining characteristics while staying connected to each other.

In the process, each concept gets defining characteristics attached to it while maintaining relevant connections between dependencies. The characteristics are attributed through describing their respective concept through abstract explanation. For example, the field can be described as an area of conflict as well as a place of shared interest. This means those two descriptions can be attached to the field in the analytical model. During the process, abstract connections between both characteristics and concepts are put into place and experimented with. In order to actually perceive relevant features in the abstraction, an ordering of connected characteristics needs to exist, but since it is not hierarchal it maintains a chaotic nature that is dependent on both the visual form of the characteristics as well as its placement within the system. The transitive concepts are then considered through their interdependency and the characteristics attributed to them, dictating logical conclusions in the analysis. Further process exemplification will follow this paragraph.
The example picture above illustrates a crude exemplification of how the analytical process is structured. As described previously, the core concepts are matched with defining characteristics. Through that process, the mechanics of the system that those core concepts describe, are tentatively laid bare at an abstract level, facilitating the repurposing process. The structural hub represents a point to which all core transitive concepts must connect at all times in order to retain their functionality. The structural hub specifically represents analytical structure, nothing else. In its essence, it is what it is called: a hub. That naturally means it is an abstraction within the analytical process and it symbolises the perpetual interdependence between the core concepts. As long as the core concepts stay connected to the structural hub, they can never be viewed as independent and the same can be said for their function as transitive concepts. In fewer words: the structural hub is an analytical anchor and an abstraction.

To summarise the analytical process: core transitive concepts are laid out on a nearly limitless virtual whiteboard and then attributed with defining characteristics. By attempting to separate core concepts from each other, they are found to be interdependent, forming a dynamic used to describe a specific kind of social
interaction. This dynamic can be attributed the term intransitive, even if the describing transitive concepts may describe it inaccurately. The mechanics appear to operate on a systemic level according to the core concepts and the transitive descriptions can therefore be adjusted to fit specific analytical needs, in particular retroactive and temporal analysis in the context of bilateral negotiations.

3.3 A brief explanation of Systems-, Chaos- and Complexity theory

I chose to combine characteristics of systems-, chaos- and complexity theory due to the nature of my work with this paper in accordance with the critical pluralistic approach. The approach appears natural and fitting when considering the abstract nature of the paper: working with theoretical mechanics at a transitive level.

I saw no adequate reason to rephrase the writings of Patton and I have therefore opted to quote and comment instead. The process is simple; the quote comes first, followed by a comment.

3.3.1 Systems theory

“How and why does this system function as it does?”

As is hopefully apparent throughout this paper, I am very interested in the question quoted above. I certainly view the world seen through the perspective of the field theory as systemic with more or less known checks and balances working invisibly to the naked eye.

“It is important to note at the outset that the term systems has many and varied meanings. In the digital age, systems analysis often means looking at the interface between hardware and software, or the connectivity of various networks.”

The above quote is worthy of mentioning since it is intended to help guide you into looking for a contextually fitting perspective of systems related to this paper. In essence, the system in this case corresponds to the field and the dynamics surrounding it in the social world.

I want to call to the readers’ attention three points: (1) A systems perspective is becoming increasingly important in dealing with and understanding real-world complexities, viewing things as whole entities embedded in context and still larger wholes; (2) some approaches to systems research lead directly to and depend heavily on qualitative inquiry; and (3) a systems orientation can be very helpful in framing questions and, later, making sense out of qualitative data.
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The three points seen in the prior quote not only legitimize the use of systems theory in this paper and abstract work in general, they also accurately describe a healthy interpretative approach that can be applied to macrosociology: entities embedded in context and part of a greater whole. There is a distinct similarity to my view of the field, its participants and its surroundings in the above quote.

Holistic thinking is central to a systems perspective. A system is a whole that is both greater than and different from its parts. Indeed, a system cannot validly be divided into independent parts as discrete entities of inquiry because the effects of the behavior of the parts on the whole depend on what is happening to the other parts.\(^{65}\)

This approach agrees with how I envision the dynamics of the field. You can look at the parts, but once you start trying to push and pull and attempt to separate them, the connection between the parts makes sure that the system itself will not allow itself to be disassembled without significantly altering its characteristics and behaviour to the point of losing its identity.

Since critical realism\(^ {66}\) is my chosen metatheory, it should come as no surprise that I have attempted to establish a connection between the systemic way of thinking and the method used to craft a theoretical framework through R. K. Sawyer\(^ {67}\). It is worth considering that systems theory beyond methodological application is not part of this paper and it is through the methodological perspective that I view systems theory. That said, I do find a certain epistemological attraction to the basics of Sawyer’s bold statement:

> By concerning itself with the foundational processes of social emergence, sociology would be at the core of the social sciences.\(^ {68}\)

The above quote is in essence what this paper attempts, with a reservation against explicitly making a hierarchy out of the social sciences. By identifying and describing the field theory as systemic and simultaneously recognizing the human as an agent within such a system, the connection can be made that Bourdieu’s field theory is an emergent theoretical framework. Furthermore, it is the process itself that has led to both the conclusion of the field theory being chaotic and systemic in its nature and that social agency plays a major role in how the framework of this paper functions.

\(^{65}\) ibid p.120
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3.3.2 Chaos and complexity theory

“What is the underlying order, if any, of disorderly phenomena?”

I will argue that this part of the methodological approach is most closely related to how symbolic capital is envisioned. Of course, as was recently mentioned, this symbolic capital cannot be completely disconnected from the field, habitus and illusio without being altered beyond recognition and essentially causing the system to be warped involuntarily. More to the point, is there internal order in a hierarchical or linear manner when it comes to field dynamics? This is something that sadly lands miles outside the scope of this paper, but it’s too interesting to ignore. I will lightly address the nature of the existence of the field in this paper, since I find it interesting to consider what happens to a field without participants and how does it retain its characteristics if no social entities are present, something that is required for the concept of a field to function dynamically. Whether the field theory constitutes a disorderly phenomenon I will sadly not be able to address here.

The concepts of system and complexity are often closely related. For example, the self-organization of systems, as premised by complexity theory, implies maintenance of a certain level of organization or the improvement of the systems.

This is a key section, since it validates my choice in this paper of using the previously mentioned methods together.

At this point, complexity theory offers, perhaps more than anything else, a new set of metaphors for thinking about what we observe, how we observe and what we know of our observations. Chaos theory challenges our need for order and prediction, even as it offers new ways to fulfil those needs.

The above, to me, is yet another point of validation for my approach. This line of thinking facilitates the re-examination of past conclusions in a chaotic manner with only a faint idea as a guiding beacon. It is not a hermeneutical approach though, as one can be very set on trying to find something specific, although that specific could very well to turn out to be a small cog, impossible to separate from a greater machine, meaning that you will have to be ready to backtrack in the theoretical maze in order to gain insight of just what this cog you found does and how and when it exists.

---
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It’s like walking through a maze whose walls rearrange themselves with every step you take.\textsuperscript{72}

This quote may not shed any new light onto my approach in this paper, but it accurately portrays the feeling experienced when working with and delving into abstract social systems such as the field theory. It is also highly relevant to the comment I made in the previous comment paragraph regarding the chaotic analytical approach that almost dictates hands-on experimentation once an abstract representation of the system has been established.

\section*{3.4 Ethical considerations}

Considerations pertaining to the ethical nature have been made in accordance with the Swedish Council of Human and Social Sciences and guidelines.\textsuperscript{73}

The four main requirements concern: information, confidentiality, consent and use.

I have not used empirical data in this paper, meaning the requirements of information and confidentiality are covered. The secondary data I have used have been carefully selected to be published and available to public use, covering the requirements of consent and use.

Another consideration to take into account is that of consequence in a political sense.\textsuperscript{74} At this point, I can safely claim neutrality, as this paper and its contents are not aimed at any particular political power. The objective of the paper is clear: theoretical gains in the macrosociological field. Naturally, the future is always in motion, and I cannot predict exactly where or how my results are applied, so there is a risk, however miniscule it may appear, that the knowledge produced in this paper leads to a change in the power-hierarchy down the line. This would however hinge on application of the results, not on the analytical work, and it is farfetched to anticipate a major impact on the balance of power based on this paper in its finished state.

\textsuperscript{72} Patton, 2002 p.124

\textsuperscript{73} Humanistiska- Samhällsvetenskapliga Forskningsrådet, Forskningsetiska principer i humanistisk-samhällsvetenskaplig forskning, 1990/1999, contents verified: 2014-05-20

\textsuperscript{74} Bryman. A, Social Research Methods, 2012, Oxford University Press
3.5 Quality criteria and discussion

Since the paper at hand is on a strictly theoretical level, validity needs to be looked at from the perspective of testability as well as the usage of relevant literature. In regard to the literary data, Chapter 2 is dedicated to exactly that and is presented as both a guiding and correcting frame for the analytical reasoning. For the more practical part of the paper, the analysis leading up to the framework model is the central point. This means that the conclusions of the theoretical work need to stand up to being applied onto the targeted area. In other words: do the results align with the approach of the paper? I will discuss the validity of the paper as it is not crystal clear how to approach this criterion in the context of a theoretical framework.

A point of contention is the question of the legitimacy of a framework so closely related to Bourdieu’s theory and there are some important factors to consider in a case such as this one. First, the framework is not intended to replace anything foundational in Bourdieu’s reasoning but instead to bring its mechanics to a focused area and expand its analytical power. Second, the framework cannot be properly applied and therefore compared to Bourdieu’s original theory. This is made apparent in the conclusions of the paper by noting that pure intra-field interaction is inadequate to properly implement the created framework model. Naturally, a model incapable of properly explaining what it is designed for loses some validity, but the loss is countered by accounting for the theoretical gains that are made by the discovery of missing parts.

The term reliability in conjunction with theoretical work can easily be translated into transparency of the methodological process and the analysis. Detailing the analytical procedure as well as presenting an in depth account of the reasoning leading to presented conclusions are necessary parts to uphold the requisite transparency and through it, reliability.

Throughout the process of putting thoughts to paper, different approaches meant to facilitate mainly the reliability of the paper through transparency have been employed with varying degrees of success. In order to maintain high transparency, Chapter 3 is focused on establishing my ‘logical anchors’, starting with critical realism as the overarching ontological and epistemological perspective and followed by the supporting theories: systems- chaos- and complexity- applied through “critical methodological pluralism”. Chapter 4 is made up of the analytical process described in Chapter 3, supported by tailored visualisations to display the actual work with abstract transitive mechanics.

---
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In Chapter 5, we are seeing another dimension of validity. By describing the results from the analysis and applying those onto a scenario that a finished model ideally could handle, conclusions regarding the strength of the current framework model can be reached. This goes well in line with how validity is described within the epistemology of critical realism.\textsuperscript{78} Chapter 6 further reinforces the claim to possess adequate validity by discussing the results through the perspective of the queries derived from the overall approach of the paper.

\textsuperscript{78} Danemark et al, 2003
4. ANALYSIS

This chapter will attempt to illustrate the process of the conversion from Bourdieu’s original theory into a tentative new framework.

I chose the field theory due to its intuitive simplicity with room for incredible depth. It is the core of the theory that will be put to use according to the methodological approach described in Chapter 3. Since this essay will not go further than establishing a tentative framework, claims to crafting a fully-fledged theory cannot be made. The work done is purely theoretical and no empirical data are being used, such as observations, interviews or surveys.

Especially relevant parts of the field theory have been disassembled without being disconnected from each other and repurposed in a process meant to highlight relevant factors legitimising the conversion. It is noteworthy to consider that it is the author’s interpretation of the field theory that constitutes the backbone of the reasoning, coupled with the chosen methodological approach.

For purposes of illustration and peer examination, I have constructed two simple scenarios meant to exemplify how the adaptation of the field theory could be used as well as how the converted framework is applied. Neutral parties are exempt in both scenarios due to a strictly bilateral scope. Names of states are purely fictional and any similarities with real world states are purely coincidental.

Scenario 1

Humania has invaded Tragedina and claimed a piece of land through physical force. Peace negotiations between them are about to commence. Representatives from the respective parties meet on neutral ground. Humania is in possession of a vast military and economic might, as well as a self-appointed sense of entitlement. It is a state characterised as culturally aggressive and it has annexed several regions during a drawn out offensive against its neighbours. Tragedina is an economically poor country but its people are generally known to show hospitality and welcome immigrants. It is rich with natural resources, mainly wood and iron but lack the ability to capitalise on these resources locally.

The negotiation is over quickly and the treaty signed is heavily in favour of Humania. It annexes the Tragedinian territory that it has occupied and thus expands its borders.
The foundation for both scenarios is basic conflict, in this case in the form of a non-consensual act of aggression with the intent of conquest from a clear aggressor, Humania.

Military and economic strength can easily be classified as strong symbolic capitals while the sense of entitlement and being historically aggressive points towards more nuanced and possibly weaker symbolic capitals. This speaks in favour for Humania initially but mainly because of inter-field interaction where symbolic capital exchange rates need to be carefully considered. This is noteworthy but outside the scope.

*The field* in this case is the negotiation between Humania and Tragedina, emerged from a mutual wish to end the current conflict.

*Illusio* is identified as the general ambition to exit the field with the most beneficial agreement possible. What constitutes beneficial differs between the participants.

*Habitus* dictates how the symbolic capitals can be taxed in order to maneuver for position.

Excluding inter-field interaction, the symbolic capital attributed to Humania and Tragedina respectively can be interpreted as fairly even, although asymmetrical. Since Tragedina is rich in natural resources it can turn this into a strong symbolic capital if it understands its worth to Humania. Humania on the other hand is in control of a piece of territory belonging to Tragedina, which is another strong symbolic capital ready to be taxed.

Tragedina’s (variable Y) application of symbolic capital seems to have been largely ineffective as is evident by the results of the negotiations. It could be argued that its agency within the field was crippled, or that it was ignorant of how to tax its available symbolic capital effectively. The results in the scenario showed us that Humania gained a significant positional advantage over Tragedina. The value of knowing about the converted field theory would be limited to retrospective analysis.
Scenario 2 is identical to scenario 1 except for the last paragraph. The last paragraph in scenario 1 is replaced by this:

The final treaty stipulates the withdrawal of Humanian troops from Tragedinian soil and paves the way for a series of trade agreements as well as an open border treaty.

As we can see, a different result was garnered from the same initial scenario. This is attributed mostly to Tragedinas more effective application of its symbolic capital giving it stronger agency during the negotiations. Due to this, Humania and Tragedina are more closely clustered together within the field. In other words, their positions are roughly equal within the field due to their respective taxation of symbolic capital.

In this case, the value of the converted field theory to Tragedina can be claimed to have had proactive worth, presupposing its negotiators had knowledge of it. The converted framework’s analytical prowess regarding retrospect is theoretically unchanged.

In both scenarios we can conclude that applying and manoeuvring using symbolic capital is critical during the interaction between the two states.

4.1 Conceptualisation

Here I will attempt to illustrate the process of conversion and explain the reasoning behind.

4.1.1 The new fields

As was established in Chapter 2, the field is an entity in and of itself. This, however, lands outside the scope of this essay due to it possessing its own interacational processes through inter-field interaction in contrast to intra-field interaction, which is the focus I have chosen.

Two types of fields can be extrapolated from Bourdieu’s theory: one is the emergent field and the other the dormant field. This is a kind of categorisation is relevant due to its relation to human agency in intra-field interaction. When entering an emergent field, estimations of the value of symbolic capital are more difficult and rely heavily on the participants’ knowledge of the nature of habitus within the field. A dormant field, on the other hand, can receive returning participants, meaning that it is reasonable to presume that habitus is well known, and thus it follows that the value of symbolic capital is easier to estimate.
A key factor that is changed from Bourdieu’s description of fields is the clause regarding how the existence within the field is characterised through dominating others. It is no longer necessary to push someone else down the hierarchy when gaining a position, because while the illusio will be shared, the habitus within fields with asymmetrical symbolic capital will allow for equal positions gained through applying a wider range of symbolic capital that can have equal worth in a vertical hierarchy. This facilitates the attainment of a mutually beneficial outcome without being bound to economic or game theory. Since there is room for equal positioning through lateral movement within Bourdieu’s field, a clarification is necessary:

The “old” field has lateral movement because of its three predefined symbolic capitals, while the new fields have lateral movement based on one common denominator, symbolic capital. This means that the field can expand in depth and accommodate a vast amount of different symbolic capitals while retaining its conditions and definitions for relative positions.

In the analytical process, the field is disassembled through describing characteristics while still being connected to its habitus, illusio and symbolic capital. Disassembly is an unfortunate term since, although applicable, it is not very descriptive. The process involves, as stated in Chapter 3, the attachment of characteristics to the transitive concept and through that process, the intransitive mechanic is tentatively identified. The field is also viewed as a part of a system based on interdependency, meaning that it must stay attached to its other parts or lose its functionality.
Below is an exemplifying visual illustration:

Picture 4, the process of converting the field: The process is defined through branching characteristics attached to the field-concept, while maintaining overall connections with the three other main concepts.

Please note that the full visual analysis is not being shown here, since it is too large and unwieldy. As explained in Chapter 3.2, the structural hub acts as an analytical anchor, maintaining interdependency between all four of the core concepts. The purpose of visualisation in this manner is to illustrate how connections are being made and how the analysis is based upon abstraction of transitive concepts.

A sharp eye might note an attempt at symmetry in the visualisation. This is a purely aesthetic decision and symmetry is not considered important outside of the systemic interdependence of the core concepts.
This is how I roughly visualise the new field. Note the z-axis, symbolising depth.

One of the most apparent changes from the original field is the move to a three dimensional space when visualising the field. The z-axis, symbolising depth, acts as both an added vector of movement and a way to facilitate the convergence of positions while avoiding conflict. What it means is that multiple participants can deliberately ally themselves with each other in an effort to coexist in the same positional space within the field. The z-axis can likely both represent allied participants’ relative position as well as their level of convergence by accurately mapping them out in the three dimensional field. In short, the z-axis allows the model to map out participants that for some reason do not wish to usurp another participant’s position while occupying the same space in the field.

This carries into both strategic and tactical reasoning based on negotiating agents with different rationalisations for their chosen strategy. It is also an important consideration for bilateral negotiations, where mutual benefit is often viewed as a best-case scenario. Deliberate action is a focal point for this line of reasoning.
4.1.2 Habitus and illusio

At first, I had an idea of merging habitus and illusio, but that notion was swiftly crushed as it proved to be severely limiting for the continued process of conversion. Again, the systemic nature of the field is displayed and needs to be accounted for.

The base concepts, habitus being the mannerisms and a key identifying factor for its specific field and illusio existing as the abstract vision of ultimate attainment, can be used as they are already explained in Chapter 2. The core of these concepts is personal knowledge of the basic dynamics that dictate the ebb and flow of interaction within the field, be it dormant or emergent.

Illusio needs to be understood as the determining factor ultimately deciding what is accepted as symbolic capital by the participants, and what is not. This becomes relevant mostly in inter-field interaction. Since this paper presupposes that participants have already entered the field, illusio has already been established in the exemplifying scenarios.

Below is a picture displaying the process surrounding habitus and illusio and how they were established as vitally important in the new framework with little to no alteration depending on general interpretation of Bourdieu’s works.

![Picture 6, examining habitus and illusio: By assigning characteristics in a connected, branching manner and also keeping it tied to the conceptual whole through the hub, illusio and habitus can be characterised and identified as systemic, intransitive parts of the field theory, and thusly manipulated.](image-url)
4.1.3 Symbolic capital or perceived power

In determining position, symbolic capital and the application of it is the determining factor when establishing oneself in a favourable position in accordance with illusio. Symbolic capital is an apt term, and can be interchanged with a concept of perceived power. The main objective of the new term is to frame the concept in an abstract, explanatory fashion. In short, perceived power is how other participants interpret the sum of your applied symbolic capitals. In essence, they are the same and the difference is found in how it is viewed, from a first or third person perspective. Power within a field is the value of the sum of symbolic capital brought into the field and converging with illusio. The method of applying symbolic capital is, as we know by now, governed by knowledge of habitus within the field.

As was noted in 4.1.1, regarding the new fields, symbolic capital is no longer bound to Bourdieu’s predetermined categories and allows for more contextually specific definitions of symbolic capital while still working as a common denominator for available power within the field. This ties in with both systems theory and chaos- and complexity theory as the symbolic capital can easily be classified as a disorderly concept. All three of the other connected core concepts are necessary to bring order to the symbolic capital. There is a clear interdependency made all the more important once the original categories of symbolic capital are stripped from it. This may or may not be an important factor as to why they were assigned their respective designations in the first place by Bourdieu. It could be an attempt to bring in some artificial structure to something notoriously hard to define. An exemplifying picture follows on page 39.
Picture 7, symbolic capital: Same kind of branching, connected characterisation is being conducted here, methodologically identical to picture 6. Anchored to the structural hub, symbolic capital is identified as another systemic part through its interconnection as well as its function.
4.2 Illustration of concepts and variables, the new framework

Below is a rough concept describing how two entities can interact with each other and use their symbolic capital to reposition themselves within a field. The illustration is not a mathematical formula but rather a visualisation using improvised means.

![Diagram of intra-field interaction]

Position decided by sum of capitals in a manner resembling coordinates.

- Flow of symbolic capital aka Battle for position
- Mustering
- Show of force
- Attaining a position
- Phase movement

Phases

Human agency. Moving deliberately between phases

Field recognition and identification.

Respective position within field
Symbolic capital weighed against illusio
Considering own and others sum of symbolic capital

Xf vs Yf = relative earned position corresponding to the sum of applied capital.

Xm and Ym = Sum of possible capital brought into the field and available for application.

Xf compared to Yf = Pre-entry assessment and prediction, estimated force (f), Alt. Mid or post-confrontation within field.

X, Y: variables = field participants

Picture 8, conceptualization of the intra-field interaction: Note the arrows leading from one phase to another. These phases are displayed in the top right and are meant to be an abstract interaction between participants in the field.
The basic model for how to apply knowledge of field dynamics can be summarised into:

– The flow of symbolic capital or the battle for position
  This is the intra-field interaction as a whole.

– Mustering\textsuperscript{79}
  This symbolizes the gathering and amassing of symbolic capital meant to be used to gain a favourable position. In other words, it is conceptually comparable to the mustering of an armed force in a military setting.

– Show of force
  The show of force is a temporal concept that describes the point in time when symbolic capital is taxed and weighed against illusio in accordance with the local habitus. At this point, position is in a flux. This concept relates heavily to perceived power and symbolic capital as described in 4.1.

– Attainment of position
  This is the result of one or more entities applying their respective symbolic capital.

– Phase movement
  Moving between the phases is a necessity to facilitate a dynamic within the field. Without it being conceptualized, the field could easily be referred to as static.

As visualised in Picture 8, participants, force and the mustering of the latter are described as variables. This means that they are subject to field specific circumstances. For example, we can exchange variable X with Humania and Y with Tragedina from my earlier scenarios. The only actually new concept introduced is human agency, which is the lynchpin of this attempt at conversion. With it, the illustration has a definitive anchor from which to gauge its worth. Without it, the whole repurposed concept becomes an exercise in deterministic behaviour.

The two main driving forces behind the human agency are that fields have discernable patterns through habitus and that position can be manipulated through knowledge.

\textsuperscript{79} Terminology pending
5. RESULTS

In this chapter, I will attempt to concisely highlight what the presented conversion has led to in relation to the overarching approach and queries of the paper. This is done by connecting to each one of the queries from Chapter 1 and presenting results relevant to one query at a time.

5.1 Repurposed concepts

Are the concepts in the field theory suitable for being re-purposed for use in bilateral negotiations?

Yes, in the sense that the field, habitus, illusio and symbolic capital form a dynamic and systemic process, capable of illustrating interaction mainly based on conflict.

However, there is a distinct advantage to disconnecting oneself from the predefined categories that make up the symbolic capitals put into play during the intra-field interaction between Humania and Tragedina. This facilitates peer estimation through past actions and assets taken more at face value, paving way for more accurate estimations regarding the value of symbolic capital instead of locking oneself into translating actions into predefined categories corresponding to the three original symbolic capitals.

As can be seen in Chapter 4, tentatively applying concepts onto my sketched scenarios gives us a frame of reference acting as a guide, essentially suggesting how to apply the same concepts on a real world situation. This framing is in line with the methodological approach of this paper as well enabling potential for practical use.

Still lacking in this paper’s theorising is an in-depth explanation of inter-field interaction in general and the dynamics of the selection process of symbolic capital brought into the field. As I have covered the scope and focus of the paper earlier, I will not delve deeper into the inter-field aspect, though it is important to acknowledge that inter-field interaction likely has a vital role to play on a systemic level, beyond the scope of this paper.
5.2 Analytical precision

Are the concepts derived from the field theory precise enough to accurately identify and describe discernible patterns in order to facilitate analysis?

When assessing this query, I mainly considered the nature of the ad-hoc analysis in Chapter 4 in conjunction with how the re-purposed concepts are described in Chapter 4.1 as well as the illustration of the process of interaction in Picture 8, Chapter 4.2.

It is likely that we are seeing interactions in an emergent field in the scenarios presented. It is however not impossible that it is a dormant field, although that would suggest that Humania has made similar forays into Tragedina with similar motivations preceding the presented incident. It could also suggest a great many similar scenarios with small variations between them, but that would call into question Tragedinas ineffective application of symbolic capital in scenario 1. Naturally there can be factors affecting this negotiation that are outside the scope of this paper. However, attempting to account for them would only serve to dull the focus.

But are the concepts precise enough, then? I will argue that they are, at the very least if the context is viewed in a sociological-systemic perspective, as is the approach of this paper.

Presented as a determining factor in both scenarios is human agency, which is the only concept not native to Bourdieus original theory. With human agency being deliberate, possibilities open up to exploit one’s own strengths as well as others’ weaknesses when jockeying for position using symbolic capital in a deliberate fashion.

5.3 Theoretical implementation

How would the model from the converted field theory be implemented to be relevant in practical as well as academic contexts concerning bilateral negotiations?

The current strong point of the model is its ability to retroactively analyze outcomes following negotiations. To illustrate in a metaphorical fashion: by allowing for such analysis via the ability to go through recorded material as well as reports and experiences from involved entities relating to the interaction, and looking for behaviour akin to fighting on an abstract battlefield, a great deal of clarity can likely be found and used.
What was the overarching goal of the negotiation, what resources were used to gain leverage and what was the outcome? These are all questions a converted field model would be capable of answering if provided with enough relevant data.

This is of course a more detailed take on the ancient titan of knowledge application: hindsight. The trick is to assign relevant concepts in order to focus on specifics, since hindsight itself is a very broad term. This means that at this stage of the model, Picture 8, the usefulness would be primarily academic with the purpose of further development of said model.

In scenario 2 however, I suggest that the converted field theory could have had a proactive effect with the motivation that Tragedina’s knowledge of the converted theory furnished them with a stronger agency. It is reasonable to conclude that such knowledge also enabled them to predict the worth of their symbolic capital better than in scenario 1, where they seem to be lacking knowledge of effective application of their symbolic capital.

5.4 The Falklands War

This scenario is included to illustrate two main points: first, how the converted framework is applied in a retrospective manner on a real conflict. Second, as an example of the potential value that conclusions from an analysis based on the created framework would benefit those who apply it and how it could lead into the concept deliberate human agency, specifically for negotiations.

Please note that the implementation clearly differs from the constructed scenarios. This is because the author is no longer in control of the data, something that is a major pitfall for constructed scenarios and is being accounted for by introducing a concrete example from recent history. Another reason that signifies the difference is the nature of this paper, a theory in its framework form can give useful information by application outside of its comfort zone, especially when it has chaotic tendencies.
Summary of the conflict:

Fought in 1982, the Falklands War was the result of the Argentine invasion of the British-owned Falkland Islands. Located in the South Atlantic, Argentina had long claimed these islands as part of its territory. On April 2, 1982, Argentine forces landed in the Falklands, capturing the islands two days later. In response, the British dispatched a naval and amphibious task force to the area. The initial phases of the conflict occurred mainly at sea between elements of the Royal Navy and the Argentine Air Force. On May 21, British troops landed and by June 14 had compelled the Argentine occupiers to surrender.

In Argentina, the defeat led to the removal of Pres. Galtieri three days after the fall of Port Stanley. His downfall spelled the end for the military junta that had been ruling the country and paved the way for the restoration of democracy. For Britain, the victory provided a much needed boost to its national confidence, reaffirmed its international position, and assured victory for the Thatcher Government in the 1983 elections.80

I will now attempt to apply the converted framework to this scenario and perform a tentative analysis, beginning by identifying the core systemic parts.

The field
This is an example of a classic military conflict, and the field is easy to discern by identifying the two participants, the states of Argentina and United Kingdom. The conflict is centred on the invasion and defence of the Falkland Islands. In order to define the conflict as intra-field, the field must be considered as emergent, encompassing the conflict between the two states and consisting of Argentina and the United Kingdom as participants represented by military personnel.

Habitus
Military movement and action carries with it a distinct pattern, especially known among other members of military fields, and is to be expected in armed conflict between states, such as the War of the Falklands. This also establishes the main symbolic capital used to gain position in the field.

Symbolic capital
In order to keep things at a manageable and illustrative level, the symbolic capital used in the conflict can be consolidated into one: military capital, consisting of the military personnel committed to the conflict by the respective side. This is a simplification that does not alter the conclusions since the outcome and aftermath of this particular conflict is known.

Illusio
This could be thought as the ambition of both Argentina and the United Kingdom: to be able to claim the geographical territory as part of their respective state. This reflects the one-dimensional nature of the conflict established by the consolidation of symbolic capital. But, since the characteristics of illusio include being impossible to fully realise, we must conclude that illusio is something more elusive, no pun intended. Illusio, in this case can be defined as an ambition to display might and through it legitimise one’s own state and its strength on the international arena.

A note on human agency
In order to enable any military effort, two elements are necessary: military resources and strategy; both involve very direct actions by human beings. This does not connect to my converted model per se, but since I have previously used a military reference when presenting my reasoning, it fits the context and hopefully clarifies my thought process.

Post-conflict analysis
A point prefacing the analysis: this is a retroactive analysis covering the aftermath and its implications for negotiations between Argentina and the United Kingdom, not the war itself. This is due to the framework not being designed for in-depth military analysis, as is apparent by the scope of this paper.

The analysis is however not covering actual post-conflict negotiations either. This is due to the nature of the data used: we can conclude that more than military capital would likely play a role in the negotiations following the conclusion of the conflict. Another aspect of note is that in the actual negotiations, we are not looking at the same field, meaning that we must limit our reasoning to the data input and context used and extrapolate likely consequences.

When considering the aftermath, we approach intra-field interaction in a fairly straight-forward attempt to utilise symbolic capital in order to either cover weaknesses in, or lack of, other symbolic capital. This is directly connected to attaining or retaining a desired position and that is where we commence the application of the framework model as seen in Chapter 4.2.

We have the participants, Argentina and the United Kingdom, and with the available data we can make a rough estimation of symbolic capital in the form of the consolidated military capital at the participants’ disposal. In the framework it looks like this:

---

81 Hickman, contents verified: 2014-05-21
UK f vs ARG f = relative earned position corresponding to the sum of applied capital.

UK f = 29k vs ARG 17k

UK m and ARG m = Sum of symbolic capital brought into the field and available for application.

UK m = 30k and ARG m = 30k

UK f compared to ARG f = post-confrontation within field.

The $f$ variable is reached by subtracting official losses on both sides and has been rounded to the nearest thousand and based on reported participating personnel and casualties.\(^\text{82}\)

Worth considering is that these numerical values do not necessarily reflect the actual relative strength of the participants’ applied capital in the military conflict.

In order to refine the sum of symbolic capital in a more precise manner, one would need to consider factors such as available military technology, training, morale, military strategy and tactics employed while quantifying them as numerical values.

Since the main symbolic capital used has been determined as military force, and this is a purely retroactive analysis, the pre-entry assessment is disregarded. This can be done due to having access to arbitrary yet presumably correct numbers pertaining to armed personnel involved in the conflict. Furthermore, since the conflict is concluded, the variable $f$ is used to measure the sum of symbolic capital in a post-confrontation perspective.

Now, the variable data does not present itself very well in text, which is why I will follow up with how this looks in the model.

---

\(^{82}\) Battle Atlas of the Falklands War 1982
BRITISH AND ARGENTINE UNITS TAKING PART (Parts 7-16)
Part 7. ARGENTINE ARMED FORCES
As we have now attached data to the framework, we need to know what to look for in the model in order to map out the positions of the participants. Since we consolidated and established \( f \) as military capital, this is what we compare, because it is a post-confrontation scenario. Seen in the model is the line: UK \( f = 29k \) vs ARG 17k, where \( k \) stands for one thousand units. This is the outcome of the conflict and signifies a clear UK victory. This, in turn, leads us towards plausible conclusions based on the outcome of the conflict.
The post-conflict field is only working along one axis because we only have one form of symbolic capital, and we will use the x-axis within the field to determine that the UK attained the more favourable position.

In future interactions between the two states that were involved, the outcome of the Falkland conflict will likely affect the available symbolic capital as well as its value. This is our most important conclusion, since it would enable a savvy representative or negotiator to adjust his or her strategy prior to entering a field.

It can be seen, both in the framework and scenario description, that Argentina attempted to tax its available symbolic capital in an effort to surpass the position of the UK in the field created around the conflict, but was matched by the UK with an equal amount and through its application, the UK retained its higher position. The United Kingdom also saw an increase in value of multiple symbolic capitals in the aftermath, since the stakes of the conflict were high as well as tangible and the conflict had a definitive conclusion. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that related symbolic capital of the victor saw an increase in value in direct relation to taxed capitals and their effect on the victor’s position within the field. This guides us toward exploring the inter-field interaction, which is still outside the scope of this paper.

The value of this kind of analysis comes in the estimation of the change in value and how to react to the change in value when assessing relative strength going into either a dormant or an emergent field.
By my reasoning, I will argue that we are led to the conclusion that the intra-field analysis works as a fundamental building-block for framing and conceptualising inter-field interaction.

Throughout this reasoning runs the concept of deliberate human agency and it suggests that the results of this kind of analysis could be used to construct a strategy to exploit or alleviate the change in available symbolic capital. Naturally, to implement such a strategy, sentient social beings, humans, need to be able to act in a deliberate manner in order to manipulate the system they are a part of. Being able to conceptualise and visualise such a system goes a long way toward acting with a clear direction.

5.5 Conclusion

There are a number of conclusions we can draw from the results. It seems likely that even in its incipient framework form, the model created from the repurposed field theory appears reasonably capable of handling basic conflict in the context of negotiation between states. It does remain to be seen though, since this is a tentative model with progressive theoretical value set as primary focus at the current stage. While it means that it is not quite validated through its application in this paper, but the model has taken steps toward its place as a cog in a larger theoretical context.

Human agency is critical for the model to be effective beyond retroactive analysis. But there is a caveat to the human agency: it needs to be deliberate in order to maintain a continuously advantageous proactive effect.

The model for capital flow shown in Picture 8, Chapter 4 and the new visualisation of the field in Picture 5, also Chapter 4, are the most obvious and perhaps useful results spawned through my chosen methodological approach. While it is still a highly complex system, I would argue that it is an intuitive way of considering the dynamics of field interaction and, for this paper specifically, intra-field interaction.

An important note moving forward from this analysis would be the emergent negotiatory field that is a plausible part of the aftermath of a conflict such as the Falklands example. In that field, Argentina could make use of the z-axis in the field and, through non-antagonistic manoeuvring, could theoretically reclaim a position rivalling that of the UK. A move toward strengthening its position would however require at least one more participant in the field, since the UK would be unlikely to accept an alliance that enables Argentina to achieve an equivalent position to the UK when it comes to military capital. Argentina could however attempt to gather symbolic capital through other fields that do not di-
rectly involve the UK as a military opponent and could possibly use capital exchange rates to later match the position of the UK in the negotiatory field. This last consideration does presuppose a functioning model regarding inter-field interaction, though.
6. DISCUSSION

The discussion part of this paper will compare the results presented in Chapter 5 with how they could be interpreted using Bourdieu’s original theory instead of the converted concepts.

6.1 The old and the new

When comparing the results presented in 5.1, we can see conjecture claiming that with the new fields, extended interpretation of habitus and illusio and a removal of the original categories within symbolic capital will ultimately be advantageous for gaining awareness of how to approach intra-field interaction. There is, of course, a major question looming over this result: Could this be done more easily with Bourdieu’s original field dynamics, most importantly using the original field and categories of symbolic capital?

So, let us compare using a similarly shallow analysis of the same scenarios that the converted concepts were applied to.

Scenario 1

Humania has invaded Tragedina and claimed a piece of land through physical force. Peace negotiations between them are about to commence. Representatives from the respective parties meet on neutral ground. Humania is in possession of a vast military and economic might, as well as a self-appointed sense of entitlement. It is a state characterised as culturally aggressive and it has annexed several regions during a drawn out offensive against its neighbours. Tragedina is an economically poor country but its people are generally known to show hospitality and welcome immigrants. It is rich with natural resources, mainly wood and iron but lack the ability to capitalise on these resources locally.

The negotiation is over quickly and the treaty signed is heavily in favour of Humania. It annexes the Tragedinian territory that it has occupied and thus expands its borders.

As is apparent in this scenario, Humania is described as economically rich, while Tragedina is poor. This means that the economic part of the symbolic capital heavily favours Humania, putting them vertically miles above Tragedina in the traditional Bourdieuean model of the field.
As mentioned in 2.1 and 2.3, the inherent inequality in Bourdieu’s field leads to there being finite space for positions corresponding to the number of participants. This means that Tragedina cannot reach a favourable position since it lacks the ability to turn its natural resources into actual economic capital. It could be argued that it likely possesses strong cultural and social capital, but the same can be argued for Humania, meaning that the only symbolic capital available to distinguish the two entities is the economic one.

Compared to the re-purposed field and symbolic capital, this is a significant reduction in available analytical depth, and here is why:

*The basis for the nature of the analysis in the case of the original theory is the sum of available predetermined symbolic capital, while the deliberate application of a more nuanced set of symbolic capitals is in focus using the re-purposed concepts.*

The slight variation of the original concepts and the differing approach of the intra-field interaction underline the malleability and depth of the original concepts and they do indeed seem to fit together even after being re-purposed. This is possibly a result of the methodological systemic approach, as the concepts were never really disconnected from each other.

This is made more apparent in scenario 2, which is identical to scenario 1 except for the last paragraph:

**Scenario 2**

The final treaty stipulates the withdrawal of Humanian troops from Tragedinian soil and paves way for a series of trade-agreements as well as an open border treaty.

In this scenario, we will note that Humania still has a vastly superior position through its economic capital. In order to explain the outcome, we must therefore assume a skilful application of social or cultural capital through experience and strategy by the entity representing Tragedina. This naturally leads us to defining the field as dormant, since this would enable previous knowledge of habitus and thus facilitating effective application of available symbolic capital. This in turn points us toward the conclusion that the original field is adequate but that the added definition enables easier grasp of how to understand skilful manoeuvring in intra-field interaction.
6.2 Analytical implications of human agency

In Chapter 5.2 I put forth the following:

Presented as a determining factor in both scenarios is human agency, which is the only concept not native to Bourdieu’s original theory. With human agency being deliberate, possibilities open up to exploit one’s own strengths as well as others’ weaknesses when jockeying for position using symbolic capital in a deliberate fashion.

This agrees with what is discussed in 5.1 and highlights the difference between an original and a tailored approach to intra-field interaction. But what does it say about precision?

Again, a comparison between the approaches is appropriate:

Presumptions of skill and strategy versus retroactive review of observed data would be a key difference here. That is not to say that using the vanilla field theory is solely based on presumptions or that the new one does not, but the way I have applied it is indeed founded on presupposition. This could be a matter of available data or even deliberate choice by the reviewing party. Noteworthy is that I do use presumptions while doing the initial analysis from the perspective of the converted model when presenting conclusions of said analysis. The major difference in how presumptions are utilised is what they are presuming. In the case of the first analysis, conclusions are made in regard to how knowledge of the converted model enabled effective use of symbolic capital, while in the case of the original model, presumptions of agency due to knowledge of habitus is made. Awareness is the key here, since in the original theory, habitus is most generally attributed as being subconscious. From this, we can conclude that the quality of the available data is critical to gauge precision and effectiveness of the two approaches and that the two models differ in perspective and will naturally differ in conclusion through analysis. In essence, there is on the side of the original model a presumption of mastery of habitus, while on the side of the converted model a presumption of awareness of the system.

I will say this, though, allowing for a wider range of symbolic capital as is done in the converted concept would naturally increase analytical precision due to being able to stay in the macro field of view instead of changing perspective down to micro-agency, as would be necessary in order to find out the characteristics of the intra-field interaction in the original theory in the case of bilateral negotiations. Bourdieu did this on occasion, and I can see why, the caveat being that the categories need to be well defined and preferably tested in a temporal manner to assure their precision and accuracy.
6.3 Differences in implementation

In Chapter 5.3 I claimed that the framework model extrapolated from Bourdieu’s concepts would be capable of answering the following questions in relation to the constructed scenarios given appropriate data:

- What was the overarching goal of the negotiation?
- What resources were used to gain leverage?
- What was the outcome?

A reasonable objection against such a claim might be: could not these questions be answered in an adequate manner by the original theory?

The answer to that question is yes, they could, though not in the same manner as the framework model and concepts would.

As is hopefully apparent at this point, the different approaches differ in how they utilise data, even though they are both fairly abstract in their nature and share some dynamics, most notably how habitus and illusio work with each other.

Attempting to concisely illustrate the difference between the two approaches, I will compare how I would interpret them answering the three questions posed earlier in this chapter related to the constructed scenarios.

- What was the overarching goal of the negotiation?

Original theory:
The overarching goal in any field, apart from illusio which is more connected to habitus, is to apply the sum of your symbolic capital in order to gain a position through domination, meaning that Humania would be motivated primarily by the desire to achieve a hierarchical advantage over Tragedina.
Converted model:
The goal of the negotiation would more closely correspond to a shared illusio. But, while the vision of illusio would be shared, the practical result of striving towards the current illusio is asymmetrical, meaning there was a significant potential for a mutually beneficial outcome for the participating entities Humania and Tragedina. The z-axis in the new field comes to mind, which could accommodate for a convergence of interests without necessitating conflict when occupying a shared position.

What resources were used to gain leverage?

Original theory:
The resources used were the predefined symbolic capitals; economic, cultural and social capital.

Converted model:
The resources used were a wide range of symbolic capital, with Tragedina lacking knowledge of the combined value of theirs in one scenario and being acutely aware of it in the other. Examples of capitals used include symbolic capital in the form of economic power, natural resources, cultural tradition and inter-state behaviour. In short, no real deviation from the original theory.

What was the outcome?

Original theory:
Humania saw a clear victory in scenario 1 and made no disadvantageous concessions in scenario 2, maintaining its dominant position. It could be argued that Tragedina gained the dominant position in scenario 2, but given the symbolic capital available to Humania, economic capital to be specific, it seems unlikely even though Tragedina could potentially gain a strong position in the field of the original theory through competent application of its natural resources translated into economic capital.

Converted model:
Humania clearly had superior knowledge of the process of negotiating using their perceived power in an effective manner in scenario 1 but lost their knowledge superiority in scenario 2, enabling Tragedina to position itself vertically at the same level as Humania while differing in a depth-lateral sense in the new field, facilitating a mutually beneficial agreement.

As we can see, the implementation of the two approaches does differ, but are not always mutually exclusive. The main point of contention would be how to de-
fine symbolic capital. Other than that it would seem the two could be used in conjunction with each other.

6.4 Conclusions

Based on the reasoning in this paper, it would seem not only possible, but arguably advantageous to implement a converted model into primarily analytical situations and, with further development, practical contexts concerning bilateral negotiations. There are few apparent negative sides in utilising the converted model, in conjunction with other supporting models and theories or as a separate tool.

One inconvenience that has become apparent is the way symbolic capital is handled, which could be argued to be slanted towards an ambivalent direction and would mean that the model cannot be effectively applied without first creating categories for what constitutes symbolic capital in and around the field being examined. The new definition of symbolic capital is intentionally left as a defined blank slate in order to facilitate a case-by-case categorisation that would go beyond the capability of original theory due to leaving the option open to omit the three core symbolic capitals of Bourdieu. This would also facilitate contextual standardisation of symbolic capital which would allow for better accuracy over time.

There may be some confusion about the difference in movement within a field when comparing Bourdieu’s field with the proposed new fields. I explained the proposed z-axis in Chapter 4, but there is more to it. In order to facilitate the way symbolic capital is handled in the converted model, the new fields need to be viewed as having depth as well as lateral dimensions as mentioned in Chapter 4.1. This means that multiple entities, when viewed from a two dimensional perspective, can occupy the same space but, with the third dimension present, they are revealed to occupy the same position only in lateral senses, while occupying different spaces when looking at the depth perspective. This has both analytical and theoretical consequences. On one hand, we have the converging positions that come as a result of an alliance, on the other hand we have the need to accommodate more contextually specific symbolic capital that potentially shape the abstract form of the field.

The trick to this is scalability, since making the field scalable in a third dimension that is not hierarchical means it can accommodate infinite participants and categories of symbolic capital as long as the capitals convert well into what is established as dominant capitals. The worth of the symbolic capital will still need to be discovered, though, and to make it intuitive, the two most valuable symbolic capitals would occupy the vertical and horizontal axis respectively.
Now, the movement is different because the hierarchy within a field is based on the sum of symbolic capital which has not changed, but since the field no longer contains predetermined categories for symbolic capital, it should be possible to actually determine the shape of the field based on the display and interpretation of different forms of symbolic capital. This, for example, could mean that a field could have room for *more or less* lateral movement depending on what kinds of symbolic capital are present and how they are taxed. Depth movement would need to be included to illustrate the room for non-antagonistic movement. This in turn means that moving a long way to the left or right within a specific field could be extremely taxing or cheap depending on how much horizontal space is available. In the depth dimension, the available space within the field would also be defined, possibly to show finite room for converging positions, meaning that it could represent an increase or decrease in the value and availability of pursuing alliances.

The reason that I am portraying this more as an aside is because it goes beyond the scope of this paper, since I have focused on creating a tentative framework, not a fully fleshed out model. This is obviously an area that needs to be addressed further, proper illustrations need to be constructed and rules for how symbolic capitals gain precedence over each other need to be put in place. My instinctive reaction is that inter-field interaction would play a significant role in this process. I will however argue that this kind of consideration is highly relevant in the kind of methodological approach I am utilising.

To properly and concisely conclude, the converted model should sufficiently illustrate the flow of capital in the process of intra-field interaction between two state entities in a single field. The model is fairly compatible with the original theory besides what has already been mentioned and is different enough from the original theory to distinguish itself as possessing legitimate existence on its own.

6.5 Methodological discussion

This discussion will contain both methodological considerations, as well as critical thoughts regarding the results of this paper based on the method utilised.

At the outset of the paper, I knew the approach would be theoretical and abstract, with a long-term goal of generating a theory based on Bourdieu’s ditto. This made the choice of basing the paper on literary study a simple one, as opposed to utilising mainly empirical data. Clearly this is a pragmatic and practical way of choosing methodological approach. What should be noted, is that the formal pluralistic method of actually handling the data was emergent. At one
point, I was attempting to employ grounded theory as a practical method. The attempt proved unsuccessful, as it was not feasible to employ onto an existing theory, namely Bourdieu’s. Grounded theory is also closer connected to the utilisation of empirical data and a longer iterative process. While I had a substantial amount of time to write the paper, I found that the level of reconceptualisation I was aiming for did not align well with my approach. Since the aim of this paper never was to actually create a fully fledged repurposed theory, I discarded grounded theory in favour of a pluralistic approach based on critical realism.

The framework of critical realism, with transitive and intransitive concepts fit into the paper according to my understanding of it. Since the paper aims to create a part of a framework meant to lead to a theory, I found that critical realism allowed me to cherry pick parts of Bourdieu’s theory and reconceptualise that, while keeping its descriptive power largely intact. This approach also allowed me to utilise systemic and chaos theory as practical supportive perspectives, enabling the analytical process I have described earlier, in Chapter 3 and 4.

Looking back at the methodological approach, I will argue that it was sound, although time consuming and coupled with some problematic parts. Most important is the transparency issue. In a practical manner, the chosen method worked very well, but conveying it in a sufficient manner proved a tough nut to crack. To this day, I cannot claim to have conveyed it in a completely adequate manner. The documents containing the analytical data are very large and unwieldy, does not fit at all in a paper such as this, and explaining them in depth consumes more space than can be reasonably expected. This hurts the paper as a whole, and must be accounted for in the design phase for future projects of a similar nature.

I will argue that the results derived from this methodological approach are of value and that a critical pluralistic approach fit well into the overall design and approach of this paper. The actual act of reshaping concepts on an abstract level felt natural and intuitive. Systems theory gave a valuable perspective that acted in a guiding manner, defining how to manipulate Bourdieu’s theory, while chaos theory enabled it to function as a non-hierarchical whole. Chaos theory also opened up a manner of iterative logic, where concepts were repurposed, fit into the system and then considered and reconsidered in no particular order, besides keeping the relationships between concepts intact. This allowed me to tailor it towards the specific functions I sought to reach while also maintaining a freedom of experimentation.

Moving forward, the most important lesson I intend to take to heart is to design for transparency from the ground up. I have been called a methodological wild-
ling in the past, this is true. I am a firm believer of utilitarian approaches. Practical needs should not be underestimated. Should I find an opportunity to continue developing this framework, I would likely use a similar method, though with a more critical eye towards presenting a more easily penetrated analytical process.

6.6 Suggestions for continued research and development

I am going to go ahead with a scatter shot approach here, to attempt to include as much as possible without presenting an impenetrable wall of text.

What needs to happen next?

As we saw in Chapter 6.4, the new fields need to be properly illustrated. Commencing the exploration of the nature of inter-field interaction should be able to pave way for a reasonable process, detailing how to attach categories and value to symbolic capital when they exist or are introduced to the proposed new kind of fields.

The thought of exponential growth in participation within a single field is noteworthy. As more entities enter and establish themselves in the field, illusio could potentially change, and with it the value of symbolic capital. This is again tied to inter-field interaction or at the very least connected to a new or returning participant’s influence on the characteristics of the field.

Empirical research needs to happen in order to test and potentially validate the converted model and its usability in both academic and practical contexts. I would argue for committing to both large scale surveys and more in-depth qualitative projects such as open and/or participating observation, interviews and possibly voluntary experiments.

The converted model should be disassembled and reassembled at least one more time in its current form, preferably by someone else than the author. One can rarely be certain of the value of a creation without subjecting it to critical review, naturally.

Should the model at some point gain traction, people who know and understand it will hopefully make themselves available to facilitate the transition from purely theoretical to practical application.
6.7 Reflections

I would say that my immediate reaction after finishing this paper is that to me, it does feel quite focused, considering its long gestation. I feel that the base model that was created could serve as a basis for a fairly large and fruitful endeavour that could actually culminate in a proper theory spawned from Bourdieu’s ditto.

During my forays into Bourdieu’s theory, I was continually amazed at its depth and, to me, intuitiveness, forcing me to go back and revise parts that I had thought was not included in the original theory. I have no illusions of being in the clear and pioneering new ground even now, but there is sadly a finite amount of time to devote to such research no matter how interesting and useful the findings may be. I will refer back to the initial Cambodian poem and to my own desire to (re)discover the dynamics of the field and its components.
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