Changing Power Relations and the Drag Effects of Habitus: Theoretical and Empirical Approaches in the Twenty-First Century; An Introduction

Ernst, Stefanie; Weischer, Christoph; Alikhani, Behrouz

Stefanie Ernst, Christoph Weischer & Behrouz Alikhani:

Changing Power Relations and the Drag Effects of Habitus.
Theoretical and Empirical Approaches in the Twenty-First Century.
An Introduction.

Historical Social Research
Historische Sozialforschung

Changing Power Relations and the Drag Effects of Habitus. Theoretical and Empirical Approaches in the Twenty-First Century. An Introduction

Stefanie Ernst, Christoph Weischer & Behrouz Alikhani [*]

Abstract: *»Wandlungen von Machtbeziehungen und Nachhinkeffekte des Habitus. Theoretische und empirische Ansätze für das 21. Jahrhundert«.* The objectives of this HSR Special Issue is to provide a comparative discussion and further perspectives of the Sociology of Transformation at the macro-, meso-, and micro-sociological levels. We would like to pursue this perspective based on a problem-oriented and comparative approach to the concepts of Norbert Elias and Pierre Bourdieu. Despite all differences in their theoretical concepts such as habitus, social field, and figuration, these two sociologists share a great deal of similarities. Not only their critical reflections on the classical philosophy and their attempt to establish a theoretical-empirical science, but also their synthetic way of sociological reflections, distinguishes them from many of their contemporary sociologists. Both of them criticize the over-specialized approaches in their discipline and its dominant ethnocentric view limited to the present time based on experiences of some highly individualized societies. With the aid of the theoretical concepts of these both sociologists, the authors of this special issue deal with different topics and problems in their own field of sociology such as work, globalization, social conflicts, immigration, democratization, as well as education.

Keywords: Norbert Elias, Pierre Bourdieu, habitus, social habitus, drag effect, hysteresis effect, sociology of transformation.

1. The Relevance of this HSR Special Issue

We find ourselves in a time of rapid social and political transformations and upheavals, happening at the global, national as well as regional levels. We face, for instance, changes in production methods and regulatory systems or changes in the related organizations and institutions. This also includes altered balances

[*] Stefanie Ernst, Institute of Sociology, University of Münster, Scharnhorststraße 121, 48131 Münster, Germany; stefanie.ernst@uni-muenster.de.
Christoph Weischer, Institute of Sociology, University of Münster, Scharnhorststraße 121, 48131 Münster, Germany; christoph.weischer@uni-muenster.de.
Behrouz Alikhani, Institute of Sociology, University of Münster, Scharnhorststraße 121, 48131 Münster, Germany; behrouz.alikhani@uni-muenster.de.

of power or power shifts, pointing to a reduction but also in some eras to an increase in opportunities for social participation.

At the same time, more or less pronounced inertia effects can be noticed at both individual and institutional levels, which can be considered drag effects and adaptive difficulties. In the following, we will collect some examples of what we mean by the concept of drag effect and what are the empirical implications of such a concept: Whilst on the one hand traditional (regular) employment contracts and ways of life are pluralizing, institutions of labour and educational policy and employees hesitate to adapt to the concomitant new possibilities and requirements on the other. Furthermore, increasing immigration and migration are also confronted in differing ways by the respective Western national economies. Increasing inequalities, rather than successful integrational processes, can be found between the regional and national social spaces and are lagging behind forms of conflict regulation at the individual and institutional levels. At the global level, we are facing the drag effect of national institutions behind the global processes of integration with a great potential for social and ecological challenges for the whole of humanity. One of the relevant challenges of the current sociological research is to understand and explain the structure, dynamic, and direction of these relatively long-term transformation processes as well as the problems of asynchronous developments between their various institutional, functional, and habitual dimensions (Alikhani 2014). The objectives of this collected volume, therefore, is to provide a comparative discussion and further perspectives of the Sociology of Transformation at the macro-, meso- and micro-sociological levels. We would like to pursue this perspective based on a problem-oriented and comparative approach to the concepts of Norbert Elias and Pierre Bourdieu.

2. Theoretical Orientation of this HSR Special Issue

In sociology, the range of theories suitable for the explanation of contemporary societal transformation processes or problems is relatively limited. The tendency of over-specialisation and a retreat from the foundations of sociological theory buildings in contemporary times has also strongly contributed to this kind of limitation. However, the theoretical approaches of Norbert Elias and Pierre Bourdieu explain with their social theories, in a special way, the interplay of structural macro-structures and individual scopes of action. Using the concepts of social habitus and the social field, with the analysis of long-term socio- and psychogenetic basics of social development, and the related external and internal constraints, they have also created a basis for an empirical and theoretical grasp of the historic-sociological genesis of contemporary problems. Elias and Bourdieu belong to those sociologists who emancipate themselves from the classical philosophical tradition of sociology by favouring an entan-

glement of theoretical and empirical approaches. There are several attempts in sociology to relate their theories to contemporary transformation processes and problems. However, the strengths of both of these research approaches present themselves firstly in their ability to point out medium- and long-term transformation processes within their societal embedding and ambivalence. Secondly, they are able to name individual adaption requirements using the concepts of habitus or the drag effect. In particular, the interdependent interplay of the institutions' and the individuals' inertia has still not been researched enough. While Elias – outside of the analyses of the 'The Court Society,' his community survey 'The Established and the Outsiders' and recently translated into German, 'The Naval Profession' – focusses primarily on the macro-sociological level and their impact on people involved, Bourdieu (1979, 1982, 2001), using his concept of habitus, focusses on the effects of the permanent interplay between the micro- and the macro-levels. He conceptualizes habitus as the 'hinge' between the macro-structure of a society and the social agency of groups and individuals. For Bourdieu, both the habitus and the hysteresis effect primarily explain societal relations of (in-)equality and for Elias the term 'figuration' is introduced to conceptualize the exact relationship between individuals and their more or less changing webs of interdependence, called 'society.' According to Elias, in order to understand and explain present social development one has to focus on the long-term psycho- and socio-genesis of such development. The highlighting of the connection between three structures is at the core of theory building of Norbert Elias: 1) the structure of state (or survival unit); 2) the structure of society; 3) the structure of personality. In particular, the investigation of the impact of the state structure in the course of state formation processes – from more simple survival units such as clans and tribes to more complex nation-states – on the two latter structures was an innovative perspective of Elias in modern sociology.

From their initial positions as outsiders in the scientific establishment, Elias and Bourdieu mutually influenced each other in their sociological investigations and corresponded and exchanged views on a regular basis (Bourdieu 2002, 27; Ernst 2015). While doing so, they emphasized the similarity of their sociological approaches and repeatedly confirmed their desire for cooperation and dialogue. For decades, Bourdieu attempted to have Norbert Elias's works translated into French (and to then disseminate it in this linguistic world). When asked for his contemporary scientific role models in an interview with the Hessian Broadcasting Corporation in 1983, the 33-years-younger Bourdieu referred to Norbert Elias.

In the case of Elias, the term 'social habitus' relates to the patterns of people's behaviour, feeling, and action in a specific society (Elias 2003; Alikhani 2012). These patterns are passed from one generation to the next via processes of 'social inheritance.' Social habitus simultaneously includes processes of socialization and individualization (Elias 2003, 245). From this process-

sociological perspective, the concept of social habitus refers to a specific and more or less individualised stamp which every single individual shares with other members of his or her society. This stamp is a 'change continuum', which results from the process character of single individuals and their interdependencies (Gholamasad 2001, 617-8).

The balance between transformation and continuity of the social habitus changes in accordance with the society's degree of individualization. Such transformations, according to Elias, generally extend over three to five generations until they are deeply habitually anchored (Elias 1990, 50). In the light of the high functional differentiation of current societies and the development of new units of survival at higher integration levels, social habitus becomes increasingly more complex and multi-layered. Depending on which unit of survival becomes more dominant at the respective level (tribe, region, nation), the related social habitus gains more control over the behaviours, feelings or actions of those people affected (Elias 2003, 293). Social habitus does not always change in harmony with the societal transformations at the functional and institutional level. In particular, in times of upheaval and rapid transformations, constellations have to be expected in which the social habitus is lagging behind these transformations. The concept 'drag effect of social habitus' for Elias (2003, 281) symbolically represents (similar to the 'hysteresis effect' for Bourdieu) this very reality of asynchronous developments at the habitual, institutional, and functional levels (Kuzmics 2013). In this respect, newly emerged institutions and functional connections do not necessarily result in stable integration units which can satisfy as identification units the emotional and 'material' needs of the people affected (Gholamasad 1997, 366). In these cases, the entire patterns of behaviour and feeling of the people can lag behind the real power shifts, because the perception of this new constellation of power and the development of new patterns of behaviour and feeling are relatively slow and tedious processes (Alikhani 2014). The concept of social habitus is more comprehensive than similar concepts such as 'social personality structure' and 'social character.' Accordingly, this concept allows one to grasp both the 'catch-up effect' and 'drag effect' of the social habitus in differently structured societies (Gholamasad 2001, 617). 'Social habitus' for Elias is, as a term of balance, more precise, dynamic, processual and thus empirically more fruitful than related, rather reified terms. Despite this, the concept is often criticized due to the fact that when used for the recording of patterns of people's behaviour, feeling, and action, it is still too general and vague to do justice to the complex and versatile interpersonal relationships (Alikhani 2012). Indeed, some emphasise the importance of situational circumstances and coincidences beyond the frame of the concept of social habitus (Kuzmics 2013, 493).

Pierre Bourdieu defines the concept of habitus differently than Elias. While Elias uses the concept of 'social habitus' to grasp the balance between changing and continuity of social patterns of feeling, conduct and actions of human

beings in a specific society, Bourdieu developed rather an individual concept of 'habitus.' He understands the habitus as

> conditioning that is connected to a certain class of conditions of existence [...] [and] creates forms of habitus as systems of permanent and transferable dispositions, as structured structures, which are predestined to function as structuring structures (Bourdieu 1987, 98).

His premise in his praxis theory (1979) is a "congruence" of habitus and field. Habitus is "the social embodied" (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992, 128). The notion of the social world as society and the assumption that there is a connection superior to the individuals are challenged by Bourdieu in his model of 'social space.' His objective was drafting a social topology, consisting of absolute positions (location/topos at which a human, a collective actor, or an institution is localized) and relative positions (as 'space within an order') – because the space of social position is not only a space of differences but also a space of relationships (objectivity of the first order). Here, not only the current social position of a person is of importance but also their path ('trajectory') in the social space. The particular merit of Bourdieu lies in the conception of a second space, the space of lifestyles or the space of perspectives (objectivity of the second order). In this second space, perceptual and valuation patterns and practices of habitus can be reconstructed. The two spaces are organized in a structure-homologous manner, i.e. the structure of the space of social positions corresponds to that of the space of perspectives. The link between these two spaces is constituted by the habitus.

Habitus represents a unifying principle that mediates between structure and practice as well as between social reality and representation. As a "generative grammar of thinking, feeling, perceiving and acting" (Krais and Gebauer 2002) and as a product of incorporated history, it is equally structured (modus operandi) and structuring structure (opus operatum). With the concept hysteresis effect, which describes the inertia of the habitus in relation to the social change, Bourdieu has often been accused of drawing a static and rigid picture of habitus. (Ebrecht and Hillebrandt 2002).

In contrast, some authors, such as Rehbein (2006), emphasize that habitus cannot be static, since in its status quo it always reflects the internalised history of the experienced social structure and, in the moment of practice, always encounters an already altered structure. If habitus is the product of history, then it is therefore historically changeable. The individual encounters the altered features of the structure and is thus forced to overcome the cognitive dissonances and the lack of orientation possibilities.

Moreover, if it is true that the social structures and relationships shape and form the habitus of an individual, then it can be assumed that the habitus-formative experiences in a modern society are often heterogeneous and of a contradictory nature and do not merge without breaks. Processes of social differentiation ensure that in the habitus of the subjects different ideas of order

and forms of behaviour are created, which can act like explosive devices that question the "doxa" and the self-evidentness of the practices.

Criticism aimed at this model refers to the question of how the cultural transformations and structure homologies of social change are to be explained. According to Bourdieu, processes of change take place when the individual's capital volume or capital structure changes, i.e. when a change of direction occurs in the path ('trajectory'). It can be expected that a change in the areas of the materialist power relations also cause a change of habitus. Bourdieu has often been accused of drawing a static image of the habitus when addressing the hysteresis effect (Ebrecht and Hillebrandt 2002). Rather, there is reason to believe that there exists varying, strata- or class-specific, field- and power-specific as well as gender- and age-specific degrees of inertia at the moment of social change. Transformations of habitus are therefore to be examined field-specifically and praxeologically.

All in all, in numerous studies, Elias as well as Bourdieu, have attempted to break prevalent dichotomies in sociological discourse; for instance, individual versus society, object versus subject, understanding versus explaining, as well as theory versus empiricism. Systematically, they associate the 'individuals' with their needs, social integration, and habitual dispositions within a long-term developed collective context. In doing so, both have provided fundamental contributions to the self-concept of sociology, to the structure and mechanism of power relations as well as to the production and maintenance of social inequality. With the analysis of language and symbols, and of standards of conduct and practices of distinction, they have added to an actor- and conduct-oriented viewpoint, pointing out the perspective of long-term social changes and societal perseverance. Against this background of diverging, and at the same time complementing, concepts, those analytical synergy effects, which are able to fathom the contemporary transformation processes in a habitus-specific manner must now be sought out. Against such theoretical backgrounds, the following collected volume is developed out of the selected papers of the conference *Changing Power Relations and the Drag Effects of Habitus: Theoretical and Empirical Approaches in the Twenty-First Century*, which took place in Münster in September 2016.[1]

3.   Contributions

This HSR Special Issue comprises the following four different, and nevertheless closely interconnected chapters:

3.1   Methodological and Theoretical Approaches

In this chapter, three different contributors will discuss the methodological and theoretical approaches that enables one to comprehend the levels of macro-sociological and individual or group-related changes as interwoven figurational levels. In sociology, processes and phenomena at the micro- and macro-level are frequently considered separately from each other. Mentioning the distinction between understanding, partiality and perspectivity does not only encompass the plural role of the researcher in a sociology that is shaped by detachment and involvement. Furthermore, it asks for the knowledge-guiding interests, the methodical-methodological reflections and the requirements of a research that aims to take on medium- and long-term research of social change, in particular transformation of habitus at micro-, meso-, and macro-sociological levels. Both Bourdieu's and Elias's theoretical tools offer fruitful contributions to this. Current research approaches – combining qualitative and quantitative methods to explore a 'more holistic' picture of contemporary social transformations – will be discussed here. This chapter thus focusses, among other things, on the following questions: what are the problems and requirements in the linking of theory and data from historical sociology and longitudinal research, and how can these be approached.

Nico Wilterdink will deal with the reciprocity of habitus formation and social inequality based on theories of Elias and Bourdieu. The main question of the first part of his paper is about the consequences of developments in power relations in the direction of decreasing or increasing inequality for changes in habitus among the different groups involved. Reading the first part of this paper on increasing social inequality in Europe and the USA, one would expect an 'economic explanation' being pinpointed by the author as being responsible for the rise of 'nationalist populism' in these countries. However, the author rejects this kind of explanation as economic inequality should rather lead to the rise of leftist parties and movements, which generally has not been the case in these countries. Indeed, 'transformations in the class structure' are instead deemed responsible for the rise of 'nationalist populism.' In this respect, this paper is very innovative and the author dares to develop strong theses for further empirical investigation.

Nina Baur's contribution presents the theoretical and methodological proximity that exists between the approaches of Pierre Bourdieu and Norbert Elias. She demonstrates how a research project can be created on this basis. First, three characteristics of the theoretical approach are developed: the interest in

the analysis of macro-structures, the linking of macro- and micro-structures, and finally the investigation of processes of social change. Methodologically, this results in a series of analysis steps, which must be adapted to the questions pursued as well as to the available data. In the second part of the paper, a research project is presented, in which the theoretical and methodological instruments of Bourdieu and Elias based on different levels of investigation and the application of different survey designs were used for a comparison of cities. Finally, the perspectives are shown, which arise from both approaches for comparative and historical research.

In the third and last paper of this chapter, *Sandra Matthäus* shows that Bourdieu's social theory implicitly entails a theory of affects. Firstly, the importance Bourdieu assigns to the categories of perception and recognition in the maintenance of social order is further elaborated, as it is one of central importance. According to Matthäus, particularly in late modern times, these become a central moment of classification and classification struggles. Self-appreciation is also gaining in importance. Starting from the habitus theory and the embodiment of habitus, it is traced that the self/world relationship is always to be understood as one of emotional, affective, and evaluative relationships. Socialization processes, in particular, are understood as transactional processes, which are highly charged with affectivity. Accordingly, processes of habit transformation in life are always associated with changes in the affective and evaluative dimension.

3.2   Work and Globalisation

This chapter makes the extension of 'value chains' in the course of the economic globalisation as well as the transformations in work relation the focus of investigation. In the past decades, life and work conditions in differently structured societies have undergone massive changes. New waves of economic globalization, liberalization, and individualization have caused an increasing pluralization of the traditional working methods and ways of life. Institutions of labour and family policies, like their employees, hesitate to confront the concomitant new needs and requirements. The socio-technological change of the traditional industrial labour and the challenge of 'Industry 4.0' as well as the growing digitalization of the working world not only cause new requirements, for instance with regard to the work, time, and personnel management in the companies and organisations. Furthermore, with the social, spatial, and temporal delimitation, flexibilisation, and hybridisation of work, in particular of knowledge work, an asynchronous subjectivation of labour prevails. If, on the one hand, the 'company becomes the home' and increasing expectations towards a functioning, hierarchically flat, results-driven, and diversity-equitable organisation of work are formulated, then, on the other hand, employees with an evolved capacity for self-organisation are necessary. If labour additionally

undergoes a local and social delimitation, the socio-emotional need for recognition and belonging often stay unfulfilled. The socio-technical change thus entails ambivalent requirements concerning individuals and organisations to reconsider work cultures but also to leave behind the concepts of 'normal' employment histories and to take working lifetime as a basis. Additionally, it remains to get to the bottom of the specific drag effects between technological and social innovation, digital 'asceticism' and 'backwardness,' participative designing and virtual accord, re-Taylorisation and Post-Fordism, delimitation and precarisation, decoupling and integration, sovereignty and diversity as well as, lastly, between adequate work and cultural techniques.

The examination of the structures and directions of these open processes and the examination of the people's personal experiences and the pressure and strain on those who are affected by these relatively rapid changes to the other side of work life has been one of the foci of this chapter in the paper of *Guido Becke*. Subjectivation of work, the internalisation of market constraints and deregulation processes in the private and public sector have become predominant phenomenon in working life in the last 15 to 20 years. Instead of discussing this development as a new and risky form of extended worker's exploitation on the one hand, or as a new kind of freedom via flexibility at the workplace on the other, Becke analyses the *ambivalence* of subjectivation. In his article "Established-Outsider Figurations in the Workplace by Subjectivation of Work" he refers to two examples of his empirical work, Local Mobility Services and Care-Com, respectively public transport and care services, which have undergone exemplar and deep changes in restructuring processes. The reader is led to realise that work councils, or line managers support established or outsider groups. They can play a crucial role in reducing power ratios within figurations. Especially at the organisational level the drag effect between established and outsider groups of the described companies becomes clear.

Bernd Sommer provides an analysis of the unsustainable way the current economy is being run at the global level. According to him, the lengthening and widening of chains of interdependence (the globalised value chains) has at the global level not lead to the lengthening of the scope of identification and accordingly to processes of civilization. Sommer claims that this could be one way of reading and understanding the theory of *The Civilizing Process* developed by Norbert Elias. Taking the perspective of Zygmunt Bauman, however, the lengthening and widening of chains of interdependence does not *necessarily* lead to the lengthening of the scope of identification and accordingly to processes of civilizing. In conclusion, Sommer makes a diagnosis that length and complexity of current value chains as well as a drag effect of habitus hinders members of the 'externalisation society' (the advanced political economies) to become fully aware of their own interconnectedness with other regions of the world which could potentially lead to growing foresight and empathy with every human being independent of their group affiliation.

3.3   Social Conflicts, Immigration and Democratization

Using different case studies, this chapter analyses the socio- and psychogenesis of social conflicts and their possible escalation. This involves both international and domestic conflicts and their corresponding 'double-bind processes' (Elias 2003). In addition to a reconstruction of conflict structures, those questions of what kind of self-images and images of others are being produced in this context, and how the emotional dimensions of tensions and conflicts are to be sociologically comprehended, will be explored.

In the domestic perspective, special attention is paid to the topics of 'migration' and 'integration,' which both have risen in importance, in particular in the context of economic globalization and the improvement of technologies of mobility and communication. The encountering of people from different societies as locals and new arrivals with differing power and status resources (Treibel 2011) and the question of designing interactional spaces arises anew, in particular, in times of transnationalization (Faist 2013; Pries 2010). It can be observed that the social-spatial localization of immigration in a national state also affects the social structure of the state of origin (Weiss and Roos 2010) and that transnational experiences have lasting consequences for the genesis of habitus (Softic 2015). Here the question of what type of tensions and conflicts arise in the struggle over which type of resources (e.g. economic resources or other resources of power and status), is explored. The genesis of right-wing populist movements, in the context of purported 'insecurities' and 'fears of foreign infiltration' is an important question of this chapter (Sommer 2010). Further topics will include the questions of whether and to what extent it is possible to speak of, for instance, a 'crisis of democracy,' of 'disenchantment with politics,' or of 'post-democracy' (Crouch 2008) in democratic societies and what are the medium- and long-term political perspectives and chances in less democratic societies.

In the first paper of this chapter, *Inken Rommel* deals with the long-term development of the social habitus of the German middle class. From a historical sociological perspective, she claims that some layers of the social habitus of these strata could give rise to right-wing populist movements and parties in German society. According to her analysis, many Germans are, in terms of their social habitus and identity, still very bounded to the frame of reference of a nation-state, despite strong opposite processes such as processes of globalisation and European integration. The emergence of movements like PEGIDA and the right wing party AfD are for her, among other things, some indications of drag effect of social habitus of many Germans of middle class origin behind a changing reality. For Rommel, subjective experience of the real loss of economic security on the one hand, and the transformation of identity, on the other hand, can lead to aggressive closing processes among the members of 'bourgeois milieus.'

Far away from central Europe *Stephen Vertigans* places the emphasis on the problems of democratisation of three sub-Saharan African countries, namely South Sudan, Kenya, and Nigeria. With the aid of figurational sociological concepts, such as 'I/We balance' one could understand these problems in a more reality congruent manner. This paper seems to be a critical examination of some post-colonial studies that look rather for 'outside factors' as an explanation of problems of democratization in such countries. The author mentions different 'internal' and 'external factors' as being responsible for such problems in these countries, however, the main focus will be on 'internal factors.' He claims that achieving shifts towards greater democratization and pacification within these three countries requires greater interweaving of competition and cooperation, and power and dependency within wider figurations and more porous 'I/We identifications.' Such processes would lead to an increase in mutual belonging and a decline in mutual suspicion and fear as a kind of presupposition of processes of democratization.

Behrouz Alikhani takes the concept of 'post-democracy' coined by Colin Crouch and translates it into a process-sociological language. Based on a case study of the current development in the US society, he prefers to make use of the processual concept of 'de-democratization' instead of the stationary concept of post-democracy. For the author, there are clear structural similarities between what Crouch conceptualizes as pre- and post-democratic eras. The lack of a comprehensive concept of power hinders Crouch from perceiving such structural similarities. Moreover, for the author, using concepts like 'pre-democratic' and 'post-democratic' forces Crouch to think in non-processual concepts which are reduced to the present time and do not lend themselves to the capacity of long-term investigations. The problem of using post-terms is in their deficiency in adequately describing those times after a post-phenomenon.

John Connolly and *Paddy Dolan* take, in the last paper of this chapter, the examples of hunger strikes to compare the degree of civilization of Irish political activists at the beginning and the end of 20th century. From a figurational sociological perspective, they focus on the relationship between the structure of state development and that of national traditions of behavior and feeling. The reactions and attitudes to death and dying in the different diaries of political activists committing hunger strikes depend on the personality structure and the interwoven social processes which shape this. In that sense, the author's analysis, based on individual experiences of political activists from different time periods, show how the tradition of violence in the form of militant uprisings and self-sacrifice became embedded in their national habitus which, according to them, had been a feature of state development processes in Ireland over many centuries. They highlight various similarities in the experience of dying between Irish political activists of these different periods in the history of Ireland, despite socio-historical variations.

3.4   Education

Institutional inertia effects are paramount to social inequalities. This is the case if, for instance, educational institutions are unable to adapt to changing working life and to the needs of a migration society for a long period of time, or if instructions that regulate labour and secure social needs only partly comply with the changed employment relationships of men and women. These numerous inertia effects affect the (pre-existing) social inequalities *between* regional and national social spaces by – starting from differing resources and frame conditions – successfully and variedly utilizing the opportunities that come with change in favour of an improvement of social situations or for the compensation of negative processes of change. Effects of asynchrony occur *within* the social spaces because several social groups – habitually taught – varyingly succeed in adapting their strategies of qualification, occupation, and reproduction to the changing framework conditions or to the average changes of the other actors. Thus, for instance, substandard qualifications or an adherence to classical breadwinner models could become a poverty risk. As a consequence, there are signs (for Europe) that the inequalities between regionally and nationally demarcated social spaces seem to decrease, while the internal differentiations are seemingly increasing. At the same time the modes of perception of social inequalities have changed: this concerns the question of whether either national or transnational references should be chosen for relational localizations; this concerns concepts of justice (equal opportunities and equal chances, employability vs. distributive justice); this concerns questions of individual or structural attribution of responsibility for social emergencies and related questions of compensatory and regulatory strategies (employability vs. reregulation). Here, too, inertia effects play a central role when individuals, media, and political organisations in differing degrees fall back on old and new interpretations, normal models, and referentializing.

In the first paper of this chapter *Norman Gabriel* focusses on young children's social development. Comparing Norbert Elias, Pierre Bourdieu, and Erich Fromm in his article, Gabriel integrates the insights of psychoanalysis into their sociological perspectives. He states that while Fromm is more concentrated on the economic aspects, Bourdieu seems to have a deterministic concept and Elias as a relational sociologist is more able to "develop highly nuanced concepts that can fully explain the social habitus of young children." Therefore, Gabriel describes the concept of "love and learning relationships" from Elias, after he studied Bourdieu's concept of 'primary' and 'secondary' habitus and the psychoanalytical heritage of the concept. In contrast to Fromm's economic perspective, Elias's conceptual breakthrough consists of the relational perspective, which is best understood in his book *Society of Individuals*. Whether or not young children should eventually grow up through

their own self-regulation is an interesting point of the debate next to the question regarding the role of born impulses, training, education, and so-called 'free will.'

Florence Delmotte, Virginie Van Ingelgom and *Heidi Mercenier* place special emphasis on the importance of feelings and the emotions in sociological research. 35 young people in Brussels were interviewed in order to find out to what extent drag-effects of habitus play a role in processes of identity construction of the youth. What light can be shed on the blind spot of European integration processes in the last years, regarding feelings of belonging? The authors show the difference between intended and non-intended processes of group cohesion and state that "it's not that political leaders, institutions, and policies have absolutely no impact on feelings of belonging; it is more that they cannot 'decide' or make that such feelings or habitus exist nor shape them as they 'want.'" The exemplary Belgian process of forming a 'We-They-Relationship' that has emerged from Norbert Elias, on the one hand validates and on the other hand contradicts the figurational model of group processes. In reconstructing the Sociological turn in European Studies the authors describe the Eliasian perspective. They then discuss the emotional aspects of living and belonging before the so-called 'Euroscepticism' of the youth is dealt with. The different focus groups with diverse young residents illustrate the *relative* importance of an *affective* belonging, while affects and belonging are being increasingly considered in research.

We hope that the different papers of this HSR Special Issue could contribute to a more nuanced understanding of applying the different concepts of theoretical frameworks of *Norbert Elias* and *Pierre Bourdieu* to contemporary non-simultaneous dynamics and their potential consequences at different functional, habitual, and institutional levels.

Special References

Alikhani, Behrouz. 2017. Post-Democracy or Processes of De-Democratization? United States Case Study. *Historical Social Research* 42 (4): 189-206. doi: 10.12759/hsr.42.2017.4.189-206.

Baur, Nina. 2017. Process-Oriented Micro-Macro-Analysis. Methodological Reflections on Elias and Bourdieu. *Historical Social Research* 42 (4): 43-74. doi: 10.12759/hsr.42.2017.4.43-74.

Becke, Guido. 2017. The Subjectivation of Work and Established-Outsider Figurations. *Historical Social Research* 42 (4):93-113. doi: 10.12759/hsr.42.2017.4.93-113.

Connolly, John, and Paddy Dolan. 2017. Habitus, the Writings of Irish Hunger Strikers and Elias's *The Loneliness of the Dying. Historical Social Research* 42 (4): 155-68. doi: 10.12759/hsr.42.2017.4.155-168.

Delmotte, Florence, Heidi Mercenier, and Virginie Van Ingelgom. 2017. Belonging and Indifference to Europe. A Study of Young People in Brussels. *Historical Social Research* 42 (4): 227-49. doi: 10.12759/hsr.42.2017.4.227-249.

Gabriel, Norman. 2017. Growing Up in Society. A Historical Social Psychology of Childhood. *Historical Social Research* 42 (4): 207-26. doi: 10.12759/hsr.42.2017.4. 207-226.

Matthäus, Sandra. 2017. Towards the Role of Self, Worth, and Feelings in (Re-) Producing Social Dominance. Explicating Pierre Bourdieu's Implicit Theory of Affect. *Historical Social Research* 42 (4): 75-92. doi: 10.12759/hsr.42.2017.4.75-92.

Rommel, Inken. 2017. "We Are the People." Refugee-'Crisis,' and the Drag-Effects of Social Habitus in German Society. *Historical Social Research* 42 (4): 133-54. doi: 10.12759/hsr.42.2017.4.133-154.

Sommer, Bernd. 2017. Externalisation, Globalised Value Chains, and the Invisible Consequences of Social Actions. *Historical Social Research* 42 (4):114-32. doi: 10.12759/hsr.42.2017.4.114-132.

Vertigans, Stephen. 2017. Death by 'African' Democracy. Killing Consequences of Western Power Prognosis. *Historical Social Research* 42 (4): 169-88. doi: 10.12759/hsr.42.2017.4.169-188.

Wilterdink, Nico. 2017. The Dynamics of Inequality and Habitus Formation. Elias, Bourdieu, and the Rise of Nationalist Populism. *Historical Social Research* 42 (4): 22-42. doi: 10.12759/hsr.42.2017.4.22-42.

References

Alikhani, Behrouz. 2012. *Institutionelle Entdemokratisierungsprozesse. zum Nachhinkeffekt des sozialen Habitus in Frankreich, Iran und Deutschland*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Alikhani, Behrouz. 2014. Towards a Process-oriented Model of Democratization or De-Democratization. *Human Figurations* 3 (2): <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/spo.11217607.0003.202> (Accessed September 26, 2017).

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1979. *Entwurf einer Theorie der Praxis*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1982. *Die feinen Unterschiede*. Kritik der gesellschaftlichen Urteilskraft. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1987. *Sozialer Sinn. Kritik der theoretischen Vernunft*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2001. *Meditationen. Zur Kritik der scholastischen Vernunft*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2002. *Ein soziologischer Selbstversuch*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loïc J. D. Wacquant, eds. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Crouch, Colin. 2004. *Postdemocracy*. Cambridge: Polity.

Ebrecht, Jörg, and Frank Hillebrandt, eds. 2002. *Bourdieus Theorie der Praxis. Erklärungskraft – Anwendung – Perspektiven*. Opladen/Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Ebrecht, Jörg, Frank Hillebrandt. 2002. *Bourdieus Theorie der Praxis. Erklärungs-kraft - Anwendung - Perspektiven*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Elias, Norbert. 2003. *Die Gesellschaft der Individuen*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Elias, Norbert. 1990. *Studien über die Deutschen. Machtkämpfe und Habitusent-wicklung im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Ernst, Stefanie. 2015. The 'Formation of the Figurational Family': Generational Chains of Process-Sociological Thinking in Europe. *CAMBIO: Rivista sulle tras-formazioni sociali* 05 (9): 65-78. doi: 10.1400/234057.

Faist, Thomas, Tobias Studer, and Erol Yildiz, eds. 2013. *Migration, Familie und Gesellschaft: Beiträge zu Theorie, Kultur und Politik*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Gholamasad, Dawud. 1997. Zu Demokratisierungsproblemen der islamisch gepräg-ten Gesellschaften. *Distanzierte Verstrickungen. Die ambivalente Bindung sozio-logisch Forschender an ihren Gegenstand*, edited by Eva Barlösius et al. Berlin: Sigma, 357-374.

Gholamasad, Dawud. 2001. Zum Umbruch im nachrevolutionären Iran. *Orient* 42: 617-38.

Kuzmics, Helmut, and Sabine A. Haring. 2013. *Emotion, Habitus und Erster Welt-krieg: Soziologische Studien zum militärischen Untergang der Habsburger Mo-narchie*. Göttingen: V&R unipress.

Krais, Beate, and Günter Gebauer. 2002. *Habitus*. Bielefeld: Transcipt.

Pries, Ludger. 2010. *Transnationalisierung: Theorie und Empirie grenzüber-schreitender Vergesellschaftung*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Rehbein, Boike. 2006. *Die Soziologie Pierre Bourdieus*. Konstanz: UVK.

Softic, Damir. 2015. *Migranten in der Politik. Eine empirische Studie zu Bundes-tagsabgeordneten mit Migrationshintergrund*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Sommer, Bernd. 2010. *Prekarisierung und Ressentiments Soziale Unsicherheit und rechtsextreme Einstellungen in Deutschland*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Treibel, Annette. 2011. *Migration in modernen Gesellschaften. Soziale Folgen von Einwanderung, Gastarbeit und Flucht*. Weinheim und München: Beltz Juventa.

Weiss, Karin, and Alfred. Roos, eds. 2010. *Neue Bildungsansätze für die Einwan-derungsgesellschaft. Erfahrungen und Perspektiven aus Ostdeutschland*. Frei-burg: Lambertus.