Interaction and Integration of Civil Society Elites: Analytical Framework and Research Design

Malin Arvidson & Anders Uhlin

April 2019

A note to the reader: this is an abbreviated version of a longer paper. We hope this version communicates the essence of the concepts, ideas and theories that this research theme builds on, and we look forward to critical comments regarding the way we have interpreted research and theoretical concepts, as well as the rationale and feasibility of the four studies that we have outlined.

1 Introduction and research problem

The social sciences has since long shown a fascination with how power, status and domination structure societies. This interest is epitomized in a range of classical studies of elites of both late and more recent date (e.g. Pareto 1935; Mosca 1961; Mills 1956/2000; Bourdieu 1996). Elite studies focus on individuals or small, relatively cohesive, stable groups with disproportionate power (cf. Best and Higley 2017: 3). The concept of elite has proven versatile as it is used to distinguish between different groups of elites (old and new, global and local) that are dominating different societal fields such as cultural, political, economic and academic elites (Khan 2012; Korom 2015). The scarcity of studies that explore the concentration of power in elites within the field of *civil society* is, however, striking: should we not assume a concentration of power also in this societal sphere? Elite scholars appear not to consider civil society actors to be powerful enough to merit attention. Civil society scholars, on the other hand, have neglected the idea of 'civil society elites', possibly as an elite per se can be seen as antithetical to the ideals of civil society as representing a community of equals outside the ruling classes. But as governments raise expectations that civil society organizations are partners in solving increasingly complex societal challenges at local and global levels, certain civil society actors gain access to exclusive policy-making processes and arenas for deliberations, and are thereby attributed positions of power.

A well-established theme within elite-studies concerns elite *integration.* Elite integration refers to cohesion based on for example socio-economic background, education, work experiences and shared values between different elite groups. It is also related to the networking between and within elite groups, where frequent interaction is interpreted as groups being integrated (Engelstad 2017; Larsen and Ellersgaard 2017). In other words, integration is seen as both a prerequisite for and a consequence of interactions. The theme of elite interaction-integration is highly applicable to our understanding of civil society elites. While not conceptualized as elite studies as such, some recent research suggest that leaders of civil society organizations frequently interact across sectoral fields. Miller-Stevens et al (2018) illustrate how interactions between non-profit and for-profit organizations result in high value-cohesion among individuals in leading positions, which sets this group apart from other employees. Lewis (2008a, 2008b, 2012) explore how careers involve frequent crossing of boundaries between public sector and NGOs. Interviewees describe how they develop in-depth understanding of value-differences between the sectors and being able to manage this becomes a 'powerful tool for influencing change' (Lewis 2008b: 572), which suggests that interaction leads to valuable experiences and strengthens capacity to influence, but it does not necessarily lead to value-integration. Anecdotal evidence from two resource rich and high-profile CSOs in the Swedish context manifest patterns of boundary-crossing, i.e. interaction between civil society, public sector and business, by those in leading organizational positions. The concepts of interaction and integration as used in elite studies are, we argue, well suited to explore the characteristics and experiences of civil society elites. Hence, we propose the following two research questions that will guide this project:

- To what extent, how, and with what consequences do civil society leaders interact with other elite groups?
- To what extent, how, and with what consequences are elite groups in civil society integrated with other elite groups?

The purpose of this paper is to review literature on elite interaction and integration, with the view to identify how these concepts may be translated to and operationalised in the context of civil society elites. Furthermore, and drawing on a relational approach to studying elites, we outline a theoretical framework based on Bourdieu's concepts habitus, capital and field. Finally, we outline the empirical studies planned for this project with the view to integrate some key points from the elite-literature and the key theoretical concepts.

2 Interaction and integration of elites

Some of the classic elite theorists argued that a society has only one relatively cohesive elite. This idea is evident in the writings of Mosca (1961) and Pareto (1935), and especially in C. Wright Mills' study of the American power elite (Mills 1956). Mills argued that economic, political, and military elites constituted one cohesive power elite. Dahl (1963), however, maintained that there are several different elites with quite distinct power bases and values. Contemporary elite researchers tend to agree with Dahl in that several distinct elite groups co-exist. As pointed out by Gulbrandsen (2018: 32), this is a question for empirical research, as the degree of elite unity presumably varies between different countries.

The relations between different elite groups and the extent to which they are cohesive and united are often analysed in terms of elite *integration* (Mills 1956; Putnam 1976; Higley et al 1991). Within literature on elite integration we identify three main approaches to how the concept is understood. Firstly, studies explore elite integration based on *indicators* linked to individuals, such as educational background, class background, training, and the like (Gulbrandsen 2012). Indicators may also involve geographical location and the operation in similar industries (Burris 2005). This approach suggests that common denominators linked to the individual constitute the basis for elite integration. Individuals are assumed to share values and norms, as they are socialized in similar ways through shared background and education (Bourdieu 1996; Mangset 2017). Secondly, research explore how *interaction* is an expression of integration. This perspective moves the basis for integration from the past – shared background – to the present as its key elements are ongoing relations, communications, collaborations between individuals. Although shared background and experiences may play a role, the empirical focus is directed to actions undertaken by individuals. For example, Edling et al. (2014) explore the role of pursuing relations based on friendship, rather than relations purely based on professional and positional aspects of the individual, in creating elite integration. The same authors point to how a surrounding political context characterised by stability may facilitate interaction, and thereby enhance elite integration. In other words, interactions need to be specified and contextualized. Others suggest that research focus on face-to-face interaction, such that takes place through participation in meetings, in order to assess linkages, and possible integration, between elites of the economic and political fields (Buhlman et al. 2012). The concept of 'interlocking directorates' captures interaction between individuals occupying multiple organizational memberships. Elite individuals share organizational memberships with other elites, and the experiences gained through interaction that takes place

as a consequence of such interlockings constitute an important basis for elite individuals developing shared values and perspectives (ibid.).

A third approach defines integration as shared values and behaviour. This can also be seen as a *consequence of interaction*. Studies seek to trace how interaction between individuals 'helps foster a community of like-minded people' (Dolan and Moore xx). Gulbrandsen (2012) explores linkages between background variables and ideological consensus within an elite group, using political behaviour (voting) as an indicator of integration. The results suggest a combination of shared background variables and active relations as contributing to the formation of common value-basis. Research also reveal how there can be integration, understood as value consensus, on some levels between elite groups, while there are deep seated differences and conflicting interests between the very same groups at another level. Higley et al. (1991) for example describe how elite settlements, or elite pacts, are formed as elites put aside disputes for the sake of political stability. Integration is based on consensus around informal rules of the game and a joint interest in maintaining a particular form of governance. Whereas members of elite groups may share general 'orientations, attitudes, and social views' (Engelstad 2017: 441), cohesion may also be based on a single interest to remain in power, shared across groups. This highlights agency, as individual behaviour is seen as strategic and intentionally driving elite integration, as actors may have different motivations for elite integration or cohesion, at different points in time (Hoffmann-Lange 2017).

As pointed out by Gulbrandsen (2018: 41), a problem in this literature is that several factors may be seen as both causes and effects of integration: social background indicators are considered manifestations of elite integration and as well as factors that promote integration. Gulbrandsen (2018: 43) usefully distinguishes between elites that have a high and low degree of social similarity and elites that are closely or marginally related. Based on a fourfold typology, we get four structural situations: 1) socially similar and highly interrelated elites; 2) socially similar, but weakly interrelated elites; 3) elites with low social similarity, but highly interrelated; and 4) elites with low degree of social similarity and only marginally interrelated. The first situation should constitute the most facilitating condition for elite integration whereas we would not expect much (long-term) integration in the fourth case.

The topic of interaction and its effect in the form of value integration relates to central research questions among scholars of CSOs, albeit on organizational rather than individual level. The issue of value-congruence between elite groups of different origin bear similarities with studies exploring the effect on CSOs interacting closely with public institutions. Interactions are characterized by power asymmetries and involve a threat towards

organizational autonomy (Verschuere & de Corte 2014) and may lead to organizational isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell 1983). With increased interaction at organizational levels also civil society leaders become assimilated; they come to share values and loyalties, with business and/or political elites (Miller-Stevens et al 2018). This result is particularly interesting as a similar value-congruence does not appear amongst employees in general (ibid.), which suggests that elite groups may become segregated from other groups (members, employees, volunteers) engaged with civil society organizations. The effect of interaction may however have very different results than isomorphic, as being faced with conflicting interests and values may encourage a 'reflecting capacity' of actors (Battilana and D'Aunno 2009) that in turn lead to a consolidation of sector-specific values rather than an erosion of the very same.

In sum, the different theoretical analyses underpinning elite interaction and integration as used in elite research, could well be applied to a civil society context and more specifically that of civil society elites. In particular, it speaks to discussions about civil society leaders' possible assimilation to political and/or business elites as an outcome of interaction across social spheres. In the following we outline a theoretical framework that highlights what we see are the core issues in research on civil society elites, that is how relations of different kinds form status and values within a group.

3 Theory: Field, capital, and habitus

Much social theory conceives of the social world as consisting primarily in substances and static 'things'. An alternative relational approach, by contrast, understands social reality in 'dynamic, continuous, and processual terms' (Emirbayer 1997: 281). The works by Bourdieu are prominent here, and widely used in elite studies. Following a bourdieusian approach, we must move beyond a focus on roles, functions and fixed resources of individuals to one which captures how context, relations and negotiations form social status. Based on Bourdieu's concepts of capital, habitus and field, we outline a theoretical framework that can be used when analysing the interaction and integration of civil society elites.

Bourdieu's field theory (Bourdieu 1993; see also Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992) has inspired studies of business and political elites (Kahn 2012) as well as broader studies of class, to which the concept of elite is related (Savage 2015). Fields, according to Bourdieu (1993: 72), are 'structured spaces of positions (or posts) whose properties depend on their position within these spaces and which can be analysed independently of the characteristics of

their occupants (which are partly determined by them)'. Inherent to any field are relationships of inequality and struggles for power (Thomson 2012) and in order to understand these dynamics we need to grasp different dimensions of relations. Hence, an empirical study of fields requires an investigation of; underlying structures (history) of the field and the position of a field in relation to a so called field of power; of interactions within the field; and of the acquired habitus of actors, of different status, within the field, although not necessarily in this order (Emirbayer and Johnson 2008; Thomson 2012). Crucially, the exact boundaries and characteristics of a field cannot be determined prior to empirical research but are understood through an iterative research process. The boundaries of the field extend so far as the power relations that constitute the field and analysing these power relations is a major focus of empirical research (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992: 100; Emirbayer and Johnson 2008: 7, 24). This relational approach defines elites as those 'who occupy a dominant position within social relations' (Khan 2012: 362). Actors within a field engage in continuous struggles to gain control over resources considered essential to that field. Bourdieu's field theory offers a means of understanding the elite as defined by relations and interactions characterised by both conflict and cooperation. Validation of and struggles over capital is different depending on field as fields have different standards or expectations regarding elite attributes and behaviour. Field theory supports a process-oriented view on the emergence and reproduction of elite groups as interactions may involve collaboration as well as contestation over legitimacy. Any definition of elites must reflect the field specific attributes related to how different forms of capital are valued and dispersed among actors (Swartz 1997).

Bourdieu (1996) identifies three main forms of capital: economic capital (money, property etc.), cultural capital (education, cultural knowledge, symbolic codes, etc.), and social capital (networks). Others have also analysed political and knowledge capital as distinct forms of capital (Khan 2012). Control of these forms of capital enables actors to exercise power. At the same time, 'to construct the forms of specific capital one must know the specific logic of the field' (Emirbayer and Johnson 2008: 11). Capital is fundamentally relational. 'The very value of economic or social capital is constituted by its past and present uses, by the structure of the field(s) in which it is deployed, and by its specific differences vis-à-vis other forms of capital' (Emirbayer and Johnson 2008: 3).

In addition to the concepts of field and capital, habitus is an essential part of Bourdieu's field theory. Habitus refers to 'the relatively durable principles of judgement and practice generated by an actor's early life-experiences and modified (to a greater or lesser degree) later in life' (Emirbayer and Johnson 2008: 4). Hence, habitus 'links past fields to

present fields through the individual actors who move from one to the next' (ibid.). Habitus can be attributed an individual as well and an organization (Emirbayer and Johnson 2008: 19), and determines which position-takings are possible and also structures some as more appropriate and desirable than others (ibid.). The concepts of habitus and capital are essential for understanding Bourdieu's field theory. It is the habitus that determines an actor's perception of possible and desirable position-takings within a field, and the actor's power to enforce her position-taking on others depends on the volume, form and value of her capital, that is her position in the field (Emirbayer and Johnson 2008: 28). The relationship between the three concepts is described as follows: 'one's practice results from relations between one's disposition (habitus) and one's position in the field (capital), within the current state of play of that social arena (field)' (Maton 2012: 50).

To sum up, from Bourdieu's field theory we take the following points: (1) Elite status is about social relations within a field. (2) The boundaries of a specific field cannot be determined prior to empirical research. (3) Relations within a field are characterized by competition as well as cooperation. (4) An important focus for the analysis is how different forms of capital are used and gained in elite interaction. (5) Habitus, understood as a set of dispositions based on previous field experiences, determines an actor's perception of possible and desirable position-takings within a field. This relational theory offers a suitable basis for an investigation that aims at understanding the different dimensions of relations (over-time, between fields, between actors). The theory is furthermore closely linked to empirical investigations, which is particularly valuable as we approach a sparsely researched area. By elaborating on relations from both a theoretical and empirical perspective we facilitate a refinement of the theories regarding interaction and integration of elites that although they place relations at the core, its different meanings and dimensions remain rather unexplored.

In the following we turn to a description of the different sub-studies to be carried out with the view to explore our core research questions i.e. *to what extent, how, and with what consequences do civil society leaders interact with other elite groups?* and; *To what extent, how, and with what consequences are elite groups in civil society integrated with other elite groups?*

4 Research design

Having outlined the main theoretical building-blocs of our relational approach to interaction and integration of civil society elites, drawing on previous research on elite integration as well as the field theory of Bourdieu, we now turn to how we operationalize this. We propose a mixture of methods applied through four studies.

4.1 Mapping interaction and integration: a quantitative analysis

The first study, also considered preparatory work for the ensuing studies, is aimed at exploring interaction and integration of civil society elites based on quantitative data. As indicated above, there are three major themes to be considered in the analysis of elite integration: individual background indicators, social networks, and values. The study encompasses two lines of inquiries, based on two sets of data. First, we draw on a collection of data on identified people in leading positions (including chairpersons, Director Generals, board members) within a sample of core CSOs representing different policy fields in England, Italy, Poland, Sweden, and on the EU-level (carried out within TS1). This will provide us with a set of background indicators of civil society leaders (such as class, gender, age, education, previous career etc.) allowing us to analyse to what extent civil society leaders have a similar background. Moreover, by pooling this data with datasets on political elites (e.g. lists of parliamentarians, government officials) and business elites (e.g. lists of board members of major corporations) we will be able to identify overlapping memberships and get an indication of the social networks of elites. Second, data related to all three themes will be collected through the survey questionnaire (see TS1) which will include questions on background biographical data, questions aimed at mapping social networks in which respondents are involved, and questions concerning values held by respondents. The latter set of questions concern political ideology, and views on the disposition and distribution of power in society (see Gulbrandsen 2005), as well as values related to leadership-ideals and organizational principles, such as integrity, trust, effectiveness, accountability, generosity, equity, justice (see Miller-Stevens et al 2018).

This kind of quantitative analysis will give us an important overview of the extent and nature of elite interaction and integration within and beyond civil societies. It might give us some first indications of what forms of capital are valued within different fields and tell us something about overarching patterns of interaction and social networking. However, in order

to properly understand the field dynamics that according to our relational approach are at the core of elite interaction and integration, we will also conduct qualitative studies.

4.2 Exploring interaction over time: boundary-crossers

In the second study we aim at examining capital, habitus and the boundaries of fields, from the perspective of individual elites moving between social spheres. We take inspiration from the biographical studies of so called boundary-crossers conducted by David Lewis (2008a; 2008b; 2012). The aim of this study is to explore interaction/integration as experienced along a chronological time-trajectory, aiming to understand how interaction across civil society and political/business sectors is enabled and enabling: what has spurred these individuals to cross sectoral boundaries? What has the individual gained or risked in relation to status within civil society as a consequence? Interviews will explore personal and professional perspectives on motivations and values, and experiences from engaging with different fields. In analysing these interviews, complemented with written material when available, we aim at identifying different types of boundary-crossers, their habitus, and the convertibility (or not) of capital as they move across boundaries of fields. The methodological approach must be understood as key to this study: while the interview guides will initially focus on individual career-trajectories, we view these interviews as narrative stories that, through a presentation of individual's identities and actions in relation to different fields and actors, we can grasp how perceptions on power, elite status and the boundaries of fields are formed in a relational context (Mangset 2015; see also Gubrium & Holstein 2009 on narrative methodology).

The individuals interviewed will be those in leading positions in CSOs who have previously held leading positions in business and/or politics. We will also identify individuals who have crossed boundaries in the other direction, i.e. moving from leading positions within civil society to take up influential positions in politics, business or other social spheres. To give some examples, CEOs and GDs of late of the two large and resource-rich organizations the Red Cross and Save the Children in Sweden, have held positions in politics (party leader, MP), business (head of Telia Marketing), international development organizations (Sida, OECD). We find similar patterns among leading civil society organizations in Italy and the UK. In selecting interviewees, we aim at diversity in gender, age, civil society sector etc. We plan to conduct 25 biographical interviews with boundary-crossers: 5 in each country (Italy, Poland, Sweden, UK) and 5 on the EU level.

4.3 Spaces for elite interaction and integration: Institutional arenas and events

While the previous study takes the perspective of individual elites and relations *over time*, this study is concerned with *social space* in which elite interaction takes place. We conceptualize this space as arenas where civil society leaders meet elites from other sectors (which is different from mundane and everyday communications, see below). One definition of arena suggested by the Cambridge Dictionary is 'a particular area of activity, especially one that is competitive and attracts a lot of attention'. This is close to what we have in mind. The institutional arenas that we will focus on can be defined as areas or spheres of activity, which implies that they are limited in space, although not necessarily as completely closed areas. The concept arena also has the connotation of a stage for some kind of performance surrounded by seats for spectators. Although this is a too narrow metaphor for our purpose, the performance analogy with backstage as well as frontstage interaction (Goffman 1999) is useful as it offers the researcher an opportunity to observe elite interaction as drama.

For practical reasons it is necessary to also limit the study of elite interaction in time. Interaction at institutional arenas can be specified in time, focusing on interactions that are staged and formalized through planned meetings that can be considered events, i.e. a special happening. We suggest that observing specific events taking place within the institutional arena is the most feasible approach for ethnographic research on elite interaction.

To exemplify what arenas and events imply, we may refer to the increasingly common consultations and deliberations arranged by political and business elites, where also civil society elites are invited. Many international organizations have opened up for the participation of civil society and other non-state actors in global policy processes (Tallberg et al 2013). The organizers of the World Economic Forum have invited prominent civil society leaders to take part in their deliberations. In the context of the European Union, the European Social and Economic Committee, bringing together representatives of employers, workers and other civil society groups, organizes a number of events allowing civil society representatives to interact with political and business elites. Similar exclusive arenas for interaction between political, business and civil society elites can be found at the national level, e.g. Krynica Economic Forum in Poland, and the Public Policy Exchange in the UK. In Sweden "Almedalsveckan", which brings together people in leading positions from politics, business, media, research, and civil society is another example.

The examples provided above are events that are circumscribed by formal structures and choreographed interaction between chosen individuals, with a particular outcome in mind. But these events involve processes behind the scenes, i.e. informal negotiations, position-taking, and expressions of power, domination, as well as challenges to established norms concerning debates involving these actors. Based on ethnographic approaches (cf Shore and Nugent 2002; Abbink and Salverda 2013) we aim to identify and describe relations and social spaces, or fields, of different types that reflect the theoretical framework outlined above. We suggest that there are four major analytical dimensions that should be considered when studying elite interaction at institutional arenas and events. First, the structural dimension, which refers to the institutional context and how an event is structured in terms of location, physical placement of actors etc. Here, the intention is to explore field positions. Second, the temporal dimension, which intends to capture how events are linked over time and what kind of agenda-setting etc. has occurred prior to the event being studied, hence enabling us to analyse field dynamics over time. Third, the process dimension, which focuses on the nature and praxis of interaction as observed by the researcher. Here, we are interested in position-takings that can be observed and how these reflect the use of different kinds of capital. Fourth, the cognitive dimension, which explores the subjective perceptions and values of the participating actors. The core analytical concerns here are the habitus of actors and how different kinds of capital are valued.

Table 1 provides an overview of methods for data collection and specific questions addressed within the four analytical dimensions that we highlight when studying elite interaction at specific events and institutional arenas. The empirical work required for this study involves an in-depth engagement with the context, and bearing in mind that the program has a comparative ambition, a structured approach such as the one outlined here will be of great importance.

Table 1. Analytical dimensions in the study of elite interaction at specific events and institutional arenas.

Analytical dimension	Methods for data collection	Specific focus/questions/concepts?
Structural dimension (context)	Observations and documents to capture "objective" structuring of events.	How is the event regulated? What is the broader institutional context like? How can the arena be characterized? How are actors placed in relation to each other (in terms of gender, age etc.)? What field positions can be identified?
Temporal dimension (linkages over time)	Documents and interviews to capture temporal linkages of events	How does the observed event fit into a larger chronological order of events? What kind of agenda-setting has been made prior to the event in focus?
Process dimension (praxis)	Observations to capture the nature of interactions	What position-takings can be observed? (How do people interact? What procedures and rituals are followed? Who speaks? Who does not speak? What topics are discussed? What topics are not discussed? Central/peripheral actors? Are interactions consensus based/ conflictual, formal/informal, inclusive/exclusive, etc.?) What kinds of capital are used?
Cognitive dimension (perceptions, values)	Interviews to capture subjective perceptions	How do participants perceive the processes of interaction? How do they view friendship, strategic relations, elite status etc.? How do they value different types of capital? How can their habitus be characterized?

4.4 Everyday interactions: shadowing leaders of influential civil society organizations

Whereas the focus on specific events at certain arenas allows us to study prominent forms of elite interaction across civil society, political and business sectors, we assume that there are many other more mundane forms of interaction that are relevant for our understanding of the interaction and integration of civil society elites. By only focusing on the experiences of a few prominent individual boundary crossers and interaction taking place at certain exclusive arenas and events, we risk missing everyday elite interaction integral to leadership positions. Hence, we propose a fourth kind of study that will take the organization as the point of departure. Based on the quantitative data referred to above (TS1), we will identify a small number of influential CSOs and the top leaders of these organizations. Using an ethnographic approach, we will 'shadow' individual leaders and learn about their everyday activities. Shadowing involves following an individual closely for a period of time with the view to observe interactions with leaders from other organizations and sectors (politics and business). The shadowing will be combined with interviews with and diary-based notes from these individuals. The aim of this approach is to gain a rich understanding of the nature of interactions (what emotions and meanings do actors involved ascribe the interaction?), i.e. an understanding that goes beyond qualities such as concentration and frequency as obtained through network analysis. We have as yet to decide on the scale of this study as it may not only be time-consuming but also present us with challenges concerning access.

5 Concluding remarks

In this paper we have outlined an analytical framework for the study of civil society elite's interaction and integration with other elites. We argue that elite integration can be analysed both in terms of shared values stemming from a set of similar background indicators and from actual interactions in social networks. Elite interaction may or may not result in elite integration, understood as similar political behaviour and shared values. We further argue that a relational field approach is well-suited for the analysis of elite interaction and integration. We will use Bourdieu's field theory, including the central concepts of capital and habitus. Part of the analysis will be based on quantitative data on individual characteristics and social networks of people in leading positons within civil society as well as survey questions. A major part of the analysis will take the form of qualitative (comparative) case studies. More specifically, we

suggest that field politics (elite interactions) are played out in the external relations of leaders of influential CSOs, in specific institutional arenas and events, and from the perspective of individual boundary crossers moving across social spheres. Hence, the main methods for data-collections will be observations, qualitative interviews, and document analysis in relation to selected civil society organizations and individual leaders as well as institutional arenas and events.

The rationale behind the four studies is an ambition to incorporate different dimensions of relations: between fields; between actors; between types of capital; as cumulative, over time; as concentrated during formalized and exclusive events; as everyday activities; and including subjective experiences and observed qualities of these relations. Incorporating such a wide range of relational dimensions supports analyses that address the theoretical concepts (habitus, capital, and field) as well as the connection between elite interaction and elite integration. While the four studies are outlined as relatively separate, they will jointly contribute to our understanding of the concepts of interaction and integration in the context of civil society elites. There are, obviously, great challenges of practical, analytical and theoretical kinds involved, not the least considering the complexities of Bourdieu's field theory. As a research team we foresee that the combined experiences of working with the four studies will lay the foundation for valuable contributions to debates within elite-studies, civil society research, as well as discussions that concern the way field, capital and habitus are operationalised in empirical research.

References

Abbink, Jan and Tijo Salverda (eds) (2013) *The Anthropology of Elites: Power, Culture, and the Complexities of Distinction*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Battilana, Julie and Thomas D'Aunno (2009) "Institutional Work and the Paradox of Embedded Agency" pp 31-58 in T. Lawrence, R. Suddaby and B. Leca (eds) *Institutional Work: Actors and Agency in Institutional Studies of Organizations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Best, Heinrich and John Higley (2017) "The Palgrave Handbook of Political Elites: Introduction", pp 1-6 in Heinrich Best and John Higley (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Political Elites*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1993) *Sociology in Question*, London: Sage.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1996) *The State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Field of Power*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Loic J. D. Wacquant (1992) *Invitation to a Reflexive Sociology,* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bühlmann, Felix, Thomas David and André Mach (2012) "Political and Economic Elites in Switzerland: Personal Interchange, Interactional Relations and Structural Homology", *European Societies* 14, 5: 727-754.

Burris (2005)

Dahl, Robert (1963) *Who Governs?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Di Maggio, Paul J. and Walter W. Powell (1983) "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields", *American Sociological Review* 48: 147-160.

Dolan and Moore

Edling, Christofer, Gergei M. Farkas and Jens Rydgren (2014) "Integration of the Swedish Local Elite: The Role of Professional and Private Networks", *Scandinavian Political Studies* 38, 1: 49-74.

Emirbayer, Mustafa (1997) "Manifesto for a Relational Sociology", *American Journal of Sociology* 103, 2: 281-317.

Emirbayer, Mustafa, and Victoria Johnson (2008) "Bourdieu and Organizational Analysis", *Theory and Society* 37: 1-44.

Engelstad, Fredrik (2017) "Models of Elite Integration", pp 439-457 in Heinrich Best and John Higley (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Political Elites*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Goffman, Erving (1990) *Stigma: Notes on a Management of Spoiled Identity,* London: Penguin Books.

Gubrium, Jaber F. and James A. Holstein (2009) *Analyzing Narrative Reality,* London: Sage.

Gulbrandsen, Trygve (2012)

Gulbrandsen, Trygve (2018) *Elites in an Egalitarian Society: Support for the Nordic Model,* Palgrave Macmillan.

Higley, John, Ursula Hoffmann-Lange, Charles Kadushin and Gwen Moore (1991) "Elite Integration in Stable Democracies: A Reconsideration", *European Sociological Review* 7, 1: 35-53.

Hoffmann-Lange, Ursula (2017) "Theory-Based Typologies of Political Elites", pp 53-68 in Heinrich Best and John Higley (eds) *The Palgrave Handbook of Political Elites*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Khan, Shamus Rahman (2012) "The Sociology of Elites." *Annual Review of Sociology* 38: 361-77.

Korom, Philipp (2015) "Elites: History of the Concept", pp 390-395 in J. D. Wright (ed.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences,* Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Larsen, Anton Grau and Christoph Houman Ellersgaard (2017) "Identifying Power Elites-K-Cores in Heterogeneous Affiliation Networks", *Social Networks* 50: 55-69.

Lewis, David (2008a) "Crossing the Boundaries between 'Third Sector' and State: Life-work Histories form the Philippines, Bangladesh and the UK", *Third World Quarterly* 29, 1: 125-141.

Lewis, David (2008b) "Using Life Histories in Social Policy Research: The Case of Third Sector/Public Sector Boundary Crossing." *Journal of Social Policy* 37, 4: 559-578.

Lewis, David (2012) "Across the Little Divide? Life Histories of Public and Third Sector 'Boundary Crossers'", *Journal of Organizational Ethnography* 1, 2: 158-177.

Mangset, Marte (2015) "What does it mean to be part of the elite? Comparing Norwegian, French and British top bureaucrats' understandings of the elite concept when applied to themselves", *Comparative Sociology* 14, 2: 274–299.

Mangset, Marte (2017) "Elite Circulation and the Convertibility of Knowledge: Comparing Different Types and Forms of Knowledge and Degrees of Elite Circulation in Europe", *Journal of Education and Work* 30, 2: 129-144.

Maton, Karl (2012) "Habitus", pp 48-64 in Michael Grenfell (ed.) *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts,* London and New York: Routledge.

Miller-Stevens, K., Taylor, J. A., Morris, J. C., & Lanivich, S. E. (2018) "Assessing Value Differences Between Leaders of Two Social Venture Types: Benefit Corporations and Nonprofit Organizations", *Voluntas* 29, 5: 1–13.

Mills, C. Wright (1956/2000) *The Power Elite,* New York: Oxford University Press.

Mosca, Gaetano (1961) "On the Ruling Class", in Talcott Parsons (ed.) *Theories of Society: Foundation of Modern Social Theory*,

Pareto, Vilfredo (1935) *The Mind and Society*, vol III-IV, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Putnam, Robert D. (1976) *The Comparative Study of Elites,* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Savage, Mike (2015) *Social Class in the 21st Century,* GB: Penguin Books.

Shore, Chris and Stephen Nugent (eds) (2002) *Elite Cultures: Anthropological Perspectives*, London and New York: Routledge.

Swartz, David (1997) *Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tallberg, Jonas, Thomas Sommerer, Theresa Squatrito, and Christer Jönsson (2013) *The Opening Up of International Organizations: Transnational Access in Global Governance.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomson, Patricia (2012) "Field", pp 65-80 in Michael Grenfell (ed.) *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts,* London and New York: Routledge.

Verscheure, Bram and Joris de Corte (2014)