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ABSTRACT
This paper analyzes the role of symbolic capital to maintain and disrupt the institutional control patterns in the government level. This work uses the discourse’s analysis method to explore modes of power, manipulation mechanism of thought and hidden objectives of political parties that can survive to different ways of pressure and institutional disruption. This analysis will be focused on the government of Nicolas Maduro, Venezuela’s president, after Hugo Chavez’s death in March of 2013 until the critical incidents under his government on February of 2014. The primary reason for the choice of discourse analysis methods in the present work is to explore how socially constructed symbols support the maintenance of institution in Venezuela’s government, which, at the same time, helps political party’s member to maintain their power within the country. Finally, this study shows the way as an institutional control it is not just based on economic power of dominant actors but that has institutional base. Additionally, the symbolic capital used is reflected in the political discourse, which is become in an ideal way to acknowledge that state behavior is not static, but habituable and unstable, whose unique task is to generate meanings that are transmuted by the social context.
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1. Introduction

The role of power has risen in importance within institutional research, in response to criticism that this concept was an overlooked matter in institutional analysis (Perrow, 1985; Lawrence et al., 2009). Efforts to incorporate power into institutions have been focused on the creation of new institutions (Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006). Yet the organisational literature does not offer a deep understanding as to how institutional actors maintain and disrupt institutional patterns of control (Scott, 2001; Simons and Ingram, 2003; Lawrence and Suddaby 2006), with a few exceptions that have emphasised the use of regulative and normative mechanisms to accomplished these processes (Lounsbury, 2001; Goodstein and Velamuri, 2009; Hirsch and Bermiss, 2009). However, too little attention has been paid to cognitive-cultural mechanisms (Levina and Orlikowski, 2009; Maguire and Hardy, 2009; Zilber, 2009; Maclean et al., 2010).

The purpose of this explorative study is to understand the process through which power relations are maintained in an organisational field. To do so, in the belief of the authors, significant attention needs to be paid to the role of symbolic capital as a mechanism for the maintenance and disruption of institutions in general, and as part of the discursive practices of organisations to maintain their power in particular. The specific focus of this research addresses how power relations survive the shifting of institutions? This is divided into two elements: i) disruptive events, and the question as to how changes in an institutional context affected power dynamics of Chavismo and the Opposition?; ii) institutional maintenance and disruption, and the question as to the role played by symbolic capital in these processes.

The present study draws on institutional theory, specifically the forms of institutional work (Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006; Lawrence et al., 2009) employed to understand the symbolic maintenance and disruption of the Chavismo and the Opposition as political institutions, and their power dynamics between 2013 and 2014, specifically, since Hugo Chavez’s death and the last critical situation caused by insecurity, high inflation and shortages of basic commodities. The research builds on Bourdieu’s (1977) notion of symbolic capital because, according to him, the capacity for dominant agents to impose
their symbolic productions plays an essential role in the reproduction and maintenance of social relationships.

In developing this argument, this research makes three contributions: First, it highlights the role of symbolic capital in the maintenance and disruption of institutions and patterns of control in a political field. In order to examine this, the study focuses on a cultural-cognitive mechanism, which has previously been overlooked in the study of these institutional processes (Scott, 2001; Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006). Second, the study is based in a context in which the institutions and political organizations have been challenged by critical events. This provides the opportunity to illustrate how political organisations use institutional forms of work to reinforce and reduce their power in a political context. Finally, in looking at the forms of institutional work, the study links micro elements of the dominant actors with the macro elements of institutions. While institutional approaches have traditionally focused attention solely on the macro elements of social transformation (Lawrence et al., 2009).

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Institutions and institutional work

Institutional approaches to organization studies focus attention on both the relationships between organizations, and the fields in which they operate. Traditionally these studies have focused on the role of formal structures in enabling and constraining organizational behaviour, in order to explain organizational similarity or isomorphism effects (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983; Scott and Meyer, 1983). However, a new emphasis has emerged in institutional studies centred on understanding the role of actors in effecting, transforming and maintaining institutions (Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006). Recent studies have attempted to understand how new institutions are created (Scott, 2001; Simons and Ingram, 2003; Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006). The issue of how institutions are maintained and disrupted by actors in organizational fields has, however, received significantly less attention to date (Scott, 2001; Dacin et al., 2010).
Institutions, as social constructions, require ongoing interactions among their actors to maintain the institutional stability (Berger and Luckmann, 1967; Barley and Tolbert, 1997) by supporting, correcting or recreating the mechanisms that guarantee social compliance with it (Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006). Institutional mechanisms are “cultural-cognitive, normative and regulative elements that, together with associated activities and resources, provide stability and meaning to social life” (Scott, 2001, p. 48). Scott (2001) suggests that the regulative elements appear when institutions impose rules on the actors to constrain and regulate the behaviour. Organisations accede to regulations for reasons of convenience, and prefer not to suffer from penalties and sanctions that would be imposed for non-compliance with these rules. Normative elements are introduced when institutions produce guidelines concerning norms and values, which help to define the goals to attain and describe how they may be reached. The ability of normative elements of institutions to guide organisational actions and beliefs comes from social obligation or professionalization. Cultural-cognitive elements embody symbols (words, signs, gestures, images), as well as cultural rules, which promote the sharing of meaning and the internalisation of behaviour; organizations will often accept them without conscious thought (Hoffman, 1999).

Lawrence and Suddaby (2006) identify rules and symbols as mechanisms for institutional maintenance. Rules are defined as techniques and general procedures that are applied in the disruption/ transformation of social practices (Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006). They are related to the regulative and normative elements of institutions, and their maintenance requires disciplinary actions to maintain their systems of rewards and punishments (Zilber, 2009). Symbols are related to the cultural-cognitive elements of institutions, and their maintenance involves the effort at making sense of the institutional order and reproducing its values and meanings (Zilber, 2009).

Institutional mechanisms are the result of a series of actions through which institutions affect organisations, and organisations affect the institutional arrangements within which they operate (Greenwood and Suddaby, 2006; Lawrence et al., 2009). These actions, or forms of work, are highlighted in the institutional work approach, which focuses on the relationships between institutions and the actors who populate them (Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006; Lawrence et al., 2009). However, these forms of work not only affect the
relationship between institutions and the actors, but the power dynamics within the institution, changing the resources available to organisations (Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006).

Table 1. Institutional work and Institutional Mechanisms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Forms of Institutional Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulative mechanisms</td>
<td>Vesting: The creation of rule structures that confer property rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative mechanisms</td>
<td>Constructing normative networks: construction of inter-organizational connections through which practices become normatively sanctioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural-cognitive mechanisms</td>
<td>Mimicry: association of new practices with existing sets of taken-for-granted practices, technologies and rules in order to ease their adoption</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance</th>
<th>Regulative mechanisms/ Normative mechanisms</th>
<th>Deterring: establishing coercive barriers to institutional change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enabling: the creation of rules that facilitate, supplement and support the existence of institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policing: ensuring compliance through enforcement, auditing and monitoring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Routinizing: actively infusing the normative foundations into day to day routines and organisational practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural-cognitive mechanisms</td>
<td>Mythologizing: preserving the normative underpinning through the creation and sustaining of myths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valorising and demonizing: providing for public consumption positive and negative examples that illustrates the normative foundations of an institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disruption</th>
<th>Regulative mechanisms/ Normative mechanisms</th>
<th>Disconnection sanctions: disconnect rewards and sanctions from some set of practices, technologies or rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural-cognitive mechanisms</td>
<td>Undermining assumptions: increasing the perceived risk by undermining core assumptions and beliefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Lawrence and Suddaby (2006)

2.2 Power and Discourse

“Institutional transformations are simultaneously material and symbolic transformation of the world” (Friedland and Alford, 1991, p. 246). They involve not only a shift in the
structure of power, but in the definition of power (*ibíd*.). Therefore, to examine the power dynamics in an organisational field, it is necessary to understand the concept of power and how it has been examined within the field of organisational studies.

In its most generic sense, power is the capacity, or ability, to direct or influence the behaviour of others or the course of events. Bourdieu (1977) defines power as a practical social action and identifies four forms of capital that can be used as source of power in order to pursue different objectives; these are economic, social, cultural and symbolic capital. Bourdieu (1977) claims that symbolic capital is the connection between the other three types of capital; although, economic capital is the ultimate basis of power, it can only be used to maintain the delimitation of power when used in the form of symbolic capital. Bourdieu (1977) defines symbolic capital as the resources available to an individual or organisation that become visible in the form of prestige, recognition, status, reputation, and titles, among others (Levina and Orlikowski, 2009). Organisations use this type of capital to exert power and make it durable (Bourdieu, 1977).

Power relations are a form of social structure that are produced, reproduced and transformed through everyday life (Clegg, 1989). Power relations are, legitimised through the reproduction of habitus, in which individuals come to accept the given social order as naturally pre-ordained, taking for granted the existing relations of domination in a specific context or field (Levina and Orlikowski, 2009; Maclean, 2010). These fields are defined by Bourdieu (1996) as the diverse and nested systems of structured social relations within which actors carry out their everyday practices. Such nested systems of social relations may be understood as institutions.

Organisational theorists have illustrated the value of focusing on discursive practices and their transformation as a means of understanding power relations within an institution (Hardy and Clegg, 1996; Hardy and Phillips, 2004; Levina and Orlikowski, 2009). Discourse is defined as an interrelated set of texts that brings an object into being (Munir and Phillips, 2005), and may be spoken, written, pictorial and/or symbolic, but is always
grounded in specific context and power relations (Clegg, 1989, Fairclough, 1992, Phillips et al., 2004).

Bourdieu and Thompson claim that the power to produce discourse constitutes symbolic capital and affords an important means of shaping social reality (Bourdieu and Thompson, 1991). Other authors, such as Hardy and Phillips (2004), have also identified the important relationship between power and discourse, which they define as mutually constitutive, emphasizing that discourse “constitutes power relations by holding in place meanings associated with concepts, objects, and subjects positions, which distribute power and privileges among actors” (Ibid., 2004, p. 300). Power dynamics that characterize a particular context determine, at least partly, how and why certain actors are able to influence the processes of production of text and their consumption, leading to new texts that transform, modify or reinforce discourse. At the same time, the distribution of power among actors, the forms which actors can draw, and the types of actor that may exercise power in a given situation, are constituted by discourse and are fixed at any given moment in time (Hardy and Phillips, 2004).

3. Methodology

This research is exploratory in nature and aims to describe the maintenance of the Chavismo and the struggle of the Opposition as institutions, between 2013 and 2014, in order to understand how the power relations of each institution were maintain or disrupt in Venezuela. A qualitative study was selected for this purpose, employing discourse analysis as the interpretative methodology (Phillips and Hardy, 2002; Phillips et al., 2004; Munir and Phillips, 2005).

Discourse analysis involves the systematic study of texts, in order to explore the relationship between discourse and social reality (Phillips et al., 2004). It also provides a method for exploring how linguistic and symbolic practices create and maintain objects associated with social controls that gradually institutionalize them (Munir and Phillips, 2005; Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006). Critical discourse analysis focuses on the role of
discursive activity in constituting and sustaining power relations (Fairclough, 1992; Phillips and Hardy, 2002; Dick, 2004), linking “the micro-level (text) with the macro-level power structures (sociocultural practice)” (Thomson, 2002, p. 352). The term ‘text’ is understood not only as written transcriptions but as any kind of symbolic expression that requires a physical representation, such as pictures or artwork (Phillips et al., 2004).

The primary reason for the choice of discourse analysis methods in the present research is to explore how socially constructed symbols support the maintenance or disruption of the Chavismo and the Opposition as political institutions in Venezuela, which, at the same time, helps the first one to maintain its power within society (see figure 1).

Figure 1. Dimensions of the discourse analysis
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The present study is on qualitative data, which are employed to account for the symbols used by the Chavismo and the Opposition to maintain its institutional stability and power dynamics, through use of diverse forms of institutional work (Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006).

3.1 Data sources
The information for this research was obtained from various sources of "texts", one of them were transcripts from speeches of the new “Chavista” leader and now president of Venezuela, Nicolás Maduro; these transcripts were obtained from the web page beersandpolitics.com. Discourse analysis of the Opposition, was performed directly observing the recorded videos of the discourses of the opposition leader Henrique Capriles, and making the transcription in a text format.

The three disruptive events that were analyzed are: the death of Hugo Chavez; the election of Nicolas Maduro as president of Venezuela following Hugo Chavez´s death; and the social and economic crisis in early 2014 caused by insecurity, rising inflation and shortages of basic consumer goods.

The Opposition discourses were obtained from several videos located in news web pages with the Henrique Capriles´ speeches, leader of Venezuela´s opposition. The first video, with the speech about Hugo Chavez's death, was obtained from Globovision. The second video, with the speech in response to the election of Nicolas Maduro as president of Venezuela, was obtained from Cable News Channel. The third video, with the speech about the insecurity situation and deficit of products in Venezuela, was obtained from channel capriles.tv.

The benefits of using a variety of independent sources of data on which to base this analysis lies in the added credibility gained from their corroborating evidence (Jick, 1979).

3.2 Data analysis

In the analysis, discourse is identified from text using a “semi-grounded” approach. Data are separated into first and second order concepts (Van Maanen and Barley, 1985; Orlikowski, 1993; Thomson, 2002), and arranged in chronological order (Garud and Rappa, 1994).

In the first part of the analysis, qualitative data in form of text are described; these data around the symbolic capital created to maintain or disrupt The Chavismo and The
Opposition. The descriptions are used to identify relevant concepts in the data and group them into categories or first-order concepts. At the same time, the descriptions are linked to the forms work (Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006) used to maintain or disrupt the Chavismo and the Opposition, by identifying the discourses that challenge or defend their legitimacy. Next, the relationships between and among the first-order concepts in the text are identified, and these are brought together into second-order concepts or forms of symbolic capital.

4. Findings

The study was commenced in order to address the question as to how power relationships survive the shifting of institutions. For the purpose of the research, this is examined in two parts: i) disruptive events, and ii) institutional maintenance and disruption. In this section, findings concerning the survival of power relationships in each of the dominant institutions –The Chavismo and The Opposite- will be presented.

The struggle of the institutions is divided into three moments which correspond to the emergence of disruptive events, noted as important in historical accounts. Figures 2 and 3 present the significant events, forms of work and symbolic capital for each institution.
Figure 2. Disruptive events, forms of work and symbolic capital – Chavismo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disruptive Event 1</th>
<th>Disruptive Event 2</th>
<th>Disruptive Event 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(03/2013)</td>
<td>(04/2013)</td>
<td>(02/2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugo Chavez’ Death</td>
<td>Nicolas Maduro elected as president</td>
<td>Social Protests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forms of Work</strong></td>
<td><strong>Forms of Work</strong></td>
<td><strong>Forms of Work</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Pie Chart 1]</td>
<td>![Pie Chart 2]</td>
<td>![Pie Chart 3]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Source: Prepared by the authors
Figure 3. Disruptive events, forms of work and symbolic capital – Opposition

Source: Prepared by the authors
4.1 Institutional forms of work and symbolic capital in The Chavismo

On one hand, valorising, demonizing, mythologizing and deterring were found to be the principal forms used by the Chavismo to maintain their symbolic capital and political power. The Figure 4 illustrates the final data structure, and presents a description of the texts used by the Chavismo (at the micro-level) and the symbolic capital (of the macro-level), with forms of work employed as mediators between them.

Figure 4. Dimensions of analysis -Chavismo

In general, the Chavismo used valorising as the main form of work, which was carried out by providing discourses that promoted the recognition, legitimacy, socialist values and democracy as part of the Revolution of Chavismo. In addition, the chavistas tried to de-
legitimize the Opposition, associating them with fascism, war and violence, and calling them the enemy. Finally, after Hugo Chavez’s death, the Chavismo create a myth proclaiming Chavez as a national hero, to promote loyalty to the revolution and its leaders.

4.2 Institutional forms of work and symbolic capital in The Opposition

On the other hand, valorising and demonizing were found to be the principal forms used by the Opposition to maintain their symbolic capital. In addition, the undermining of core assumptions was used to disrupt the institution of Chavismo. The Figure 5 illustrates the final data structure, and presents a description of the texts used by the Opposition (at the micro-level) and the symbolic capital (of the macro-level), with forms of work employed as mediators between them.

Figure 5. Dimensions of analysis -Opposition

Source: Prepared by the authors
During the period of study, the principal discourse of the opposition was centred on the future of Venezuela, which promoted inclusion and change for the country. The opposition acknowledged the importance of respecting the memory of Hugo Chavez, while demonizing the Maduro´s government relating it to illegitimacy, anarchy and fear.

5. Discussion

5.1 Power dynamics in the Chavismo and the Opposition

Despite the multiple challenges that the Chavismo undergone during Chavez´ government and after his death, and contrary to the expected changes that these challenges might generate in the power of the political actors, the power dynamics and structure of the government have remained the same.

President Nicolas Maduro, the principal representative of the Chavismo, have mainly used valorising the revolution, demonizing the opposition and mythologizing Chavez, as forms of work to maintain the symbolic system of the institution of Chavismo. This illustrates that use of such institutional symbols can be manipulated, and their meaning and behavioural implications controlled, by dominant actors in the organisational field (Berger and Luckmann, 1967; Friedland and Alford, 1991), helping them to maintain their power over time. The present study also demonstrates that other actors, such the Opposition, have contested those cognitive and cultural elements of Chavismo, mainly by valorising democracy as the future of Venezuela and demonizing Maduro´s government, which has affected the legitimacy of the institution (Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006).

5.2 Evolution of the symbolic system of The Chavismo and The Opposition

Disruptive event 1: Hugo Chavez´s death

Hugo Chavez won the presidency of Venezuela in 1998, and after that he changed the constitution, which went to the polls and the changes were accepted with 71,78% of the votes. With this new constitution the Socialism of the XXI century become the rule of
Venezuela’s State, this gave president Chavez the possibility to win 4 presidential elections and a series of referendums in his country, and expand his policies to various leftist’s countries of the region.

Finishing his third and fourth terms, President Chavez was extremely sick with cancer, which obligated him to travel to Cuba to get medical treatments. In this period, almost all the powers of the state were given to Nicolás Maduro, his right hand, who continued the forth presidential term when Chavez died the fifth of March 2013.

The dead of Chavez is considered a disruptive event because the socialism of the XXI century was embodied in the charismatic figure of Hugo Chavez and the predecessor, Maduro, didn’t have the charisma or ability of his mentor and former president.

Also, the national constitution explicitly prohibited that the vice president take power after the dead of the president, in which case the president of the national assembly was supposed to take control over the government, and also the person mandated to be president before new elections could not be a candidate in the new presidential elections. All these laws were overlooked by Maduro and the national assembly in order to continue with the last wish of Chavez: Maduro as his predecessor.

Examples of the discourse used by Chavismo during this period, mythologizing Chavez as a national hero included discourses as "Commander, wherever you are, thank you, a thousand times thank you from these people that you protected, that you loved and you never failed to". "Therein lies a love and a big recognition to whom developed in life the most beautiful and humanists project that have been known for decades of history of our region, that struggle for independence and humanity in peace"; and promoting loyalty to his (Chavista) revolution "And we, your colleagues, civil and military, assume, Commander Hugo Chávez, your heritage, the challenges of this revolution, it’s project. Together with the accompanying and support of all the people, your flags will be raised with honor and with dignity ",," the deeper the greatest ideals of peace, democracy and patriotism that Commander President Hugo Chavez respect ".

At the same time, the Opposition valorized their position in the future of Venezuela after the death of Chaves. The discourse of Capriles, the opposition leader said “the president Chavez and I were never enemies, we were adversaries”, “also we have had disagreements with the government team, that are known, but one thing is the person and other their positions or actions, and this isn´t the time to stress what separate us”. Also, in order to have a conciliatory voice “it´s the time of the union, the time of the compromise, the time to demonstrate the deep love for this land that´s call Venezuela”.

Disruptive event 2: Nicolas Maduro elected as president

As described before the presidential election in which Maduro won, Venezuela had a big debate about the legal possibilities of Maduro to be a candidate after being the vice president and have the presidency mandate before the new elections.

This election were also a test for the Chavismo, because it was the first time since 1998 that Venezuela´s people went to the polls without the presence of Chavez, their charismatic leader, and with the figure of Maduro as the continuation of Chavez legacy. At the end, Maduro won the election with 50,61% of the total voting, showing a big polarization in the political views for the country. One left, the Chavismo now represented by Maduro, and other toward the capitalism, the opposition in the head of Capriles.

Examples of the discourse used by Chavismo during this period, valorizing Chavez and the chavismo´s fight to legitimize Maduro´s government included “looking at the people from this balcony (the presidential house) after eighteen elections, we have come here seventeen times with seventeen victories of the people”, “we are winning with almost 300.000 votes in the middle of a war. The first time that the giant is not here, but he left his son (Maduro)!. And now his son is going to be the president and he is going to demonstrate what he is capable to do for this country. To build a country in peace, prosperity, love and union for everyone”, and speaking of the legacy that Chavez wasn´t able to finish because of his death, “you (the youth) are not going to go through this experience. The day that we
left this life we are going to give to you a free country, an independent country, a democratic country, a prosper country. We swear before you, boys and girls. That’s, thank you all … as a tribute to the president Chavez. Live Hugo Chavez!”.

Examples of the discourse used by the opposition in this moment of time, demonized Maduro’s government highlighting its illegitimacy: “I start this statement addressing about Maduro’s speech, because I have heard a speech from the palace of Miraflores, speaking of an alleged pact. I don’t pact with illegitimacy least with those I think are not legitimate. Those who have obtained a result that the National Electoral Council announced on the basis of all these incidents of the day today”. About the results, “We're talking about a different process, a different process and I say this again to Venezuela with full responsibility, I am a convinced democrat, I am a fighter and I have always respected the will of our people and therefore I make this declaration in these terms”, ending this discourse, “I do not feel defeated and so I say to our Venezuela. The government is defeated, they are defeated, we have here in our hearts and feeling and the taste of victory of our people, a victory that sooner rather than later will be an institutional reality. A country where we have independence, balanced powers and where justice reign. Good night to Venezuela. God bless our people.”

**Disruptive event 3: Social protests**

The main discourse used by Maduro to defend the legitimacy of his government in early 2014, when Venezuela was overwhelmed with a social and economic crisis caused by insecurity, rising inflation and shortages of basic consumer goods, was based in the demonization of the opposition, calling fascist the opposition, their allies and everything that they related with capitalism: “So it will be. We cannot have one millimeter of weakness, not a second of hesitation because we have to defeat a fascist stream that wants to end the country, the peace, and the independence that we have today; and with us, they will not have men and women with weaknesses to confront violence, crime, lawlessness and everything that stands for fascism”, “Peace will never emerge from the hatred, peace
will never emerge from intolerance, ever. Peace never emerge of racism, fascism, capitalism”.

In the other hand, the Opposition valorized the right to protest, the right to ask for a change: “The government cannot demonize or have the right to demonize or suppress a peaceful protest to which we are entitled by the constitution, and the owner of the constitution is not the government or the opposition, we are all”, “The government needs to divert attention from the problems that we are experiencing, they (government) need not to talk about the problems, not to put the focus, that the media do not focus on where there is a social protest every day, last year were almost 5000 (social protests)”, and demonized the violence as an instrument of change: “The message gets to where it should go, if it becomes violent, the message does not arrive, that is why there are sectors interested in a violent message, and today after four days, it is as obvious that it is the government, because who is responsible of the crisis, here if there is no food the government's response is that we eat too much, if there is violence the answer is that the opposition generated violence, if the power goes out is that an iguana bit the cables, if the dollars are finished is because there raspacucos and many people traveling, and when the government will take responsibility”.

6. Conclusions

6.1 Contributions to the literature

This research makes three contributions to the study of institutional theory. First, it provides an account of the symbolic aspects of power used by dominant actors to maintain institutional patterns of control, in a context in which the institution have been challenged by critical events. At the same time, it illustrates the efforts of other actors to change the meanings and practices of the institution in order to gain political power.

Institutional theorists have principally examined the creation of institutions (Lawrence and Suddaby, 2006) and much less attention has been paid to the process of institutional maintenance and disruption (Scott, 2001). The few exceptions to this in the literature have
emphasised regulative and normative institutional mechanisms (Lounsbury, 2001; Goodstein and Velamuri, 2009; Hirsch and Bermiss, 2009), and have overlooked the cognitive-cultural mechanisms behind the maintenance of institutions, such as the use of symbols (Zilber, 2009).

Second, in looking at the institutional forms of work, the present study links the micro elements (the texts) of the dominant actors with the macro elements (the symbolic system, and power relations) of institutions. Traditionally, attention in institutional studies has been focused on the macro elements of social transformation, while institutional work attends more closely to the actions that affect the relationships between the actors and the institution (Lawrence et al., 2009).

6.2 Limitations

Qualitative data were used to identify the discursive practices used to create and maintain symbolic capital, allowing The Chavismo keeps control over Venezuela. However, as with all historical studies, the limitations of this study include data availability (Jones, 2001); for example, not all videos or transcriptions of discourses were available to develop an extended research over the period of study.

Similarly, it should be acknowledged that the exercise of identification and refinement of recurrent categories inevitably involves subjective judgments on part of the researchers, because of the social constructivist epistemology of the discourse methods, which is the base used for this study.

6.3 Directions for future research

This study has some implications for future research. First, this study is a first approach to the analysis of contemporary institutions that are in constantly struggle for political power in Venezuela, however, these same institutions could be analysed in a longer period of time.
to include all disruptive events that have occurred since the Chavismo was created in early 1999.

Likewise, the analysis could be extended to some national and international organisations, since the creation of Chavismo, which have positively and negatively intervened on the construction of symbolic capital for the creation, maintenance or disruption of Chavismo as an institution.

Other field for future research is to make a comparative discourse analysis between the development policies of presidents that have been reelected, comparing the discourses, forms of work, and symbolic capital created in the different periods of government.

Finally, the study considers symbols as a central mechanism for institutional maintenance and disruption, but other mechanisms such as cultural rules (Hoffman, 1999) and myths (Dancin et al., 2010) may also play a key role in maintaining and disrupting a particular system of meanings and beliefs.

In conclusion, this research is a contribution to broadening the understanding of the role of symbols as mechanisms for the maintenance or disruption of institutions in general, and as part of discursive practices of institution to maintain their power in particular.
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