Revista TOMO, São Cristóvão, v. 44, e23671, 2025
DOI:10.21669/tomo.v44.23671
Special Issue - Coastal Squeeze: Beaches under Socio-Economic and Ecological Pressure
E-ISSN:2318-9010 / ISSN:1517-4549

REVIEW REPORT (B)

ID number: 23671
Completed on: 2025-09-22 09:34 AM
Decision: Revisions Required

The article Selling Paradise: A Bourdieusian Analysis of Gated Condominium Development in the Ecological Route of the Miracles, Alagoas, Brazil presents a relevant sociological approach to a social space undergoing transformation: the urbanization of the São Miguel dos Milagres region, associated with so-called "luxury" coastal development. As an exploratory and analytical contribution to this regional process, the text proves highly pertinent for publication. Moreover, the theoretical–methodological alignment focused on the legitimizing agents of coastal occupation is fully consistent with the aims of TOMO's special issue. Therefore, the article has merit for publication. However, for this purpose, I recommend several substantive revisions.

1 – Sociological practice: The article adopts a critical sociological perspective, which calls for certain precautions.

A) Denaturalizing the social:
Given the article's main theoretical grounding—according to which the sociologist's role is to show that what appears "natural" or "self-evident" is in fact socially and historically constructed—this dimension could be further emphasized throughout the text. Doing so would strengthen the idea that coastal occupation and the social uses of the beach are dynamic and mediated by power relations.

In the introduction, the authors mobilize the category of "miracle" as immanent to the empirical field and as an outcome of luxury real-estate occupation, amplified by the former mayor. This category deserves special attention. The process of objectifying agents and apprehending legitimate discourses already points toward the denaturalization of this "miracle." However, I suggest that the authors revisit this category in the final considerations to show that the work of objectification carried out throughout the article effectively "disenchants" and denaturalizes this discourse.

2 – Conceptual clarification and operationalization

The article coherently applies sociological practice when analyzing the supply side of real-estate development through developers' profiles, capital, and legitimizing narratives—or sociodicées. Nonetheless, a few points require clarification:

A) Coastal economic field of the REM:
The operationalization of the Bourdieusian framework is well-structured, but the theoretical scaffolding should be more explicitly articulated to avoid a metaphorical interpretation of the field logic. As the authors note: "We use the term coastal economic field rather than coastal market to challenge the notion of markets as ahistorical systems governed by an invisible hand (p.8)."

This choice opens space to develop the notion of social topology: a space of positions differentiated through the unequal distribution of scarce resources, which varies according to the nature and degree of autonomization of the field. It would therefore be valuable to emphasize that a field is constituted precisely through relations of force and struggle—both symbolic and material—among agents. It is not enough to state that luxury gated condominiums are "winning" the battle; it is necessary to show that they belong to a competitive universe in which their victory depended on specific competencies (capitals), while other agents lacked such resources.

B) Partial appropriation of the concept of economic field:
To some extent, the authors already take this step, as seen in the capitals selected for analysis. However, this appropriation is not always made explicit. Highlighting this point would help demonstrate that applying the concept involves choices that go beyond simply reproducing the Bourdieusian "model." This would also soften the theoretical transposition to the Brazilian and regional empirical context, where fields have a different degree of autonomy than in French society.

C) Concept of capital:
The concept of capital is not introduced beforehand. I recommend an explicit theoretical grounding linking capital to the field concept before categorizing developers. Although fields produce their own specific forms of capital, there is a fundamental conceptual relationship in Bourdieu's work that deserves clarification. This would reinforce the coherence of the adopted framework.

3 – Methodological complexity is acknowledged, but its presentation is not fully clear or convincing.

To categorize the supply, the authors classify 17 developers using a capital-based framework:

Geographical capital (location of headquarters)

Ownership capital (ownership structure)

Creation-Entry capital (year of creation and year of first launch in the REM)

Organizational capital (geographical scope of developments)

Commercial capital (institutional slogans/taglines)

A) Justification of selected capitals:
There is no prior or explicit justification for choosing these variables and how they help map "who claims and controls access to the beach" in the REM. The authors do not theoretically articulate, based on Bourdieu, the function of capitals within the economic field. Bourdieu discusses the weight and relationships among resources such as financial, cultural, technological, legal, organizational, commercial, and symbolic capital. These categories seem to inspire the authors' selections, but it is essential to explain in greater detail why the chosen capitals are pertinent to the REM case, given that their significance is not self-evident. For example, the sociological relevance of Geographical capital requires stronger grounding.

B) Relevance of Creation-Entry capital:
Another point requiring development is the importance of Creation-Entry capital and the reasons for using it as the main criterion to classify developers into "pioneer specialists, specialists, and established broad-based firms." To what extent is entry timing decisive for structuring the economic field? How does this temporal marker relate to position-taking and capital consolidation? These questions should be addressed more explicitly.

C) Data visualization:
The use of a word cloud adds little analytical value or visual clarity. It does not significantly aid understanding of the developers' discourse and could be replaced or complemented by more robust textual analysis tools.

4 – Dialogue with the literature

The article presents little or no engagement with the theoretical debate surrounding one of its own empirical findings: capital reconversion and its broader sociological implications. This debate could be developed using both empirical references—preferably from Brazilian studies—and conceptual contributions such as Saint Martin (2022, Towards a dynamic approach to reconversions, Estud. Sociol., Araraquara, v. 27). Engaging this literature would help situate the article's findings and strengthen its sociological contribution.

5 – Textual structure

A) The "Final Considerations" section is lengthy and includes dense empirical descriptions—company names, rental return percentages, campaign details. I recommend moving part of this material to the analysis section, allowing the final considerations to focus on synthesis, interpretation, and implications. Currently, the section introduces new analytical paths not fully developed earlier, which may diffuse the central argument.