2020

Using Bourdieu in Communication and Forensics Research

Stephen P. Hagan
Minnesota State University, Mankato

Follow this and additional works at: https://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/etds

Part of the Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons

Using Bourdieu in Communication and Forensics Research

Stephen P. Hagan

CMST 694- Alternate Plan Paper

Minnesota State University, Mankato

One of the most interesting aspects of college speech competition is there are relatively few actual rules. In place of rules, speech competitors are held to a complex web of unspoken and unofficial norms (Billings, 2002; Cronn-Mills, 1997; Gaer, 2002; Paine, 2005; Ribarsky, 2005). The power of these norms is evident to anyone who has been around competition for any time. Billings (2002) notes the norms are often the first thing new members of a team are given upon joining, which highlights the fact understanding of these norms is vastly considered one of the keys to success. Academic examinations of these norms has taken a variety of paths. Some of the major work has sought to "identify and illuminate" norms (Cronn-Mills, 1997, p.2) or "demystify" them (Paine, 2005, p.79), while others take a more critical approach arguing norms limit creativity (Gaer, 2002; Ribarsky, 2005). Due to the centrality of norms to the community, we need to further examine and understand the role they play and how they are shaped.

Questions in forensics literature exists as to who has the largest role in norm perpetuation. Cronn-Mills (1997) proposes a model of creation which highlights the centrality of all members of the community (competitors, coaches, and judges) in norm creation and maintenance. When norms are perceived to be broken, they are met with sanctions. For speech, sanctions, in the form of the ballot, only come from one place: the judge. Coaches inform students about norms, and are thus central to their replication, but they in many ways are equally subject to judge sanctions. Though any analysis of norms in forensics competition must also account for judge/coach cross over as many times the roles are played by the same people. Further, many alumni return as judges and enforce the unwritten rules under which they competed (Cronn-Mills & Golden, 1997; Outzen, Youngvorst & Cronn-Mills, 2013; Reid, 2015). Cronn-Mills and Golden argue that the same process applies to coaches as well. Thus, while

previous discussion has tried to separate these groups, a better option might to view the norms, enforcement, and resulting communication of the norms as a unified social structure.

The norms of collegiate forensics are communicative. By adhering to the norms competitors communicate to others in the activity they belong and have credibility (Hagan, 2017). Norms create a groundwork for competitive success, but the groundwork is not based on any singular value of good or compelling, instead based on entrenched community perceptions.

> As certain stylistic moves win rounds, and those style preferences are adopted by teams and coached or trained to the team members, other styles of presentation and technique – interpretations that may be equally compelling but do not "win" – fall out of favor. (Tyma, 2008, p. 100)

Outside of competitive success the norms for speech competition also create a lens through which students view themselves and their sense of belonging, possessing credibility, or attempting to be seen as having credibility (Hagan, 2017). While Tyma (2008) calls for a critical interrogation of normalized practices, I suggest the initial problem is a lack of clarity about where the norms even come from in the first place.

The norms are perpetuated by the collective identity of coaches, judges, and students. Thus, our goal in understanding the creation and perpetuation of norms in college speech is one where we seek to better understand a smaller inclusive social structure guided strongly by unwritten norms which are at least perceived to be connected to power structure. Enter Pierre Bourdieu.

While mostly ignored in communication studies, French social theorist Pierre Bourdieu has been heavily influential in sociology and anthropology, and has had growing influence in English, art, and education (Park, 2014). Park argues (and I agree) Bourdieu is vastly applicable

as a theoretical tool to examine questions of communication norms, symbolic power, and the intersections of agency in communication and structures which dictates communication. Bourdieu's interconnecting ideas of habitus, field, and cultural capital address the classical debate of the conflict between individual agency and social structure. Habitus Bourdieu defines as "the durably installed generative principle of regulated improvisations which produce practices" (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 78). Habitus is thus a collection of norms which we do not just adhere to, but we as actors embody. As we embody habitus, we also see habitus as a natural extension of our agency, or as Bourdieu states, habitus is "socialized subjectivity" (Bourdieu & Waacquant, 1992, p. 126). We exist in habitus as second nature and our actions thus reproduce the same norms. Bourdieu argues habitus shapes how we receive messages, how we communicate them, and even how we walk and carry ourselves. For example, in the science fiction film *In Time*, inequality is divided by how long people live and lifespan itself is a commodity. Poor people in the film who literally live hour to hour naturally walk at a faster pace, talk faster, and do not make much small talk. The wealthy in the film who are virtually immortal never rush for anything. The normative structures they live in and embody shape not only how they communicate and act, but the very way they carry themselves.

As norms in the forensics community are often unspoken and have few identifiable starting points, habitus and Bourdieu seems an apt place to begin an analysis. Further, such analysis can serve as a potential case study for broader applications of Bourdieu to communication studies. Thus, my goal is to provide an overview of Bourdieu's work through his interconnecting ideas of habitus, field, and cultural capital and use those concepts to discuss college forensics as a case study of how communicative norms and attitudes are shaped in small

collective social structures such as forensics. Building from that application, I explore ways in which Bourdieu might be used more broadly in communication studies.

Exploring Bourdieu

Though Bourdieu's body of work is both deep and complex, three core ideas underline much of his analysis—habitus, the field, and cultural capital. Existing separate but also working in combination, these three concepts are used by Bourdieu to highlight the ways cultures and social structures reproduce themselves. Important for communication studies though is the fact Bourdieu did not see these structures as all powerful forces looming over individuals. Instead his focus was on the active lived experiences of subjects living in social systems. Bourdieu's concepts focused on praxis and lived practice as opposed to mechanical reaction; meaning though structures restricted movement and predisposed individuals towards action, the structures were not monolithic, but changeable through agency and action (Bourdieu, 1977). In fact, habitus, the earliest of the three concepts was discussed as an attempt to resolve debates of structure-agency, as habitus is both a structure of durable dispositions and series of free-will based actions (Ritzer, 2008; Park, 2014). Further, Bourdieu (1998) asserts in his work that "the real is the relational" (p. 3) meaning all practices exist as an experience forged in communication and relation to others, history, text, and understandings. Likewise, much of Bourdieu's work focuses on the symbolic nature of power and how power is reinforced not through deliberate action or authority, but through communicative action. Thus, for Bourdieu, culture was not mechanistic, but shared and maintained by communication. Park (2014) argues, though Bourdieu can be difficult to force applications to fit any circumstance, his work is broadly applicable to communication studies and the domains communication is typically interested in.

In order to fully examine forensics literature using Bourdieu's framework, I first explore Bourdieu's key concepts themselves, but also to highlight some of the ways they have been utilized in communication studies. These applications highlight the functionality of Bourdieu for examining forensics literature and culture through the lens of Bourdieu. The following section explores Bourdieu's three interlocking concepts of habitus, field, and cultural capital. Following that I examine existing applications of Bourdieu in the areas of public relations, political communication, and media communication.

Habitus

Habitus is best described as an acquired filter through which one views and experiences the world. Both our social history and current social status manifest themselves in our habitus and the filter habitus forms. The filter of habitus is made up of attitudes, perceptions, gut feelings, actions, and even the way one carries themselves physically (Bourdieu, 1977). Habitus is unconscious and acquired and exists at an individual level of practice, but also at a structural level as habitus is passed through socialization within social structures. "Individuals come to think, to feel, to act in certain ways that derive in large part from the structures that shape them, while at the same time these same modes of thought, feelings, and action generate the conditions necessary for the structures to work" (Park, 2014, p. 4). Existing on a mezzo-level, habitus exists at both a cultural and individual level. At the same time the structures of habitus are embodied and recreated through action, simultaneously producing and produced by the social world (Ritzer, 2008).

One might suggest habitus is just a series of values and norms enshrined by a culture, but habitus is far more. The shared understanding of habitus effects how people carry themselves, the language they use, their perceptions of others around them, their habits, tastes, systems of

classification, and situational responses (Bourdieu, 1977). The shared habitus as laid out Bourdieu is both durable and transposable—it is learned, persists over time, and is a culmination of practices in history (Bourdieu, 1977). The durable and transposable nature of habitus means it is often utilized as a filter by which people fit in with groups. Members through their shared habitus understand at a gut level the mutual nature of their past and the similar circumstances of their current position in the structure. Through these two factors habitus also creates potential future paths. The maintenance of the status quo and creation of potential future paths by shared habitus is why Bourdieu suggests habitus is responsible for the reproduction of existing social structures.

Social reproduction is aided by the fact habitus is frequently not discussed or fully realized, instead operating on a gut or unconscious level—thus habitus seems perfectly natural and invisible. The invisible nature of habitus causes most people to never question the attitudes and perceptions they have been raised in. The invisibility is instrumental in reproducing the objective conditions and social structures in any given social system as the norms and filter are rarely questioned and seen as being a natural extension of existence. Thought habitus exists at a broader social class level, much of the practice of habitus is shaped and shapes the existence of Bourdieu's next key concept—the field.

Field

Bourdieu developed the concept of a field to understand smaller relational subsets of interactions within which agents and their respective social positions are located (Bourdieu, 1984). A mezzo-level approach, field focuses on smaller structures than massive societies, but ones which still exist above the individual/micro level. Example fields are journalism, art, academia, law, and film. Each of these fields are arenas where actors compete for resources (who

is rewarded?), struggle to control definitions (what is art?), as well as occupy social positions. A given person's position in a field is a result of their habitus and capital. Thus, a field is "a network, or configuration, of objective relations between positions" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 97). Fields have internal hierarchies such as what is considered an elite university, but also exist in hierarchical relationship to each other (medicine as a field is more respected than law). The field as a structure exists as a "separate social universe having its own laws of functioning independent of those of politics and the economy" (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 162). Beyond the fields own internal logic, each field also dictates informs actors beliefs about the field, what's at stake, and how the field is to be interpreted (Ritzer, 2008).

Capital

Bourdieu discussed capital not simply in economic terms, though he recognized the role economic capital played. For Bourdieu, capital was an accumulation of labor, and the form of capital he was most frequently interested in was cultural capital (Park, 2014). Cultural capital, as defined by Bourdieu, encompasses the non-tangible assets a person has, made up of collections of knowledge and symbolic goods. These knowledges and goods then reinforce and give hierarchical social status. Originally used by Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) in their discussion of academic achievement and the educational system, cultural capital exists in three states: embodied, objectified, and institutionalized (Bourdieu, 1986).

The embodied state of capital is found in the dispositions of mind and body or knowledge. Embedded in our habitus, embodied capital might take the form of mastery over language, knowledge of dinner etiquettes, or appreciation of fine art. Embodied capital can be sought out and acquired, for example by taking a class in wine tasting, or can be passively received through socialization by parents or within a field. Like all capital, embodied capital

exists hierarchically as well, with both those who possess and do not possess said capital understanding their status comparatively (Bourdieu, 1986).

More concrete than the dispositions of embodied capital, objectified cultural capital is made up of cultural goods. Items and property which can be bought with economic profit, but whose content is symbolic. Fine works of art or high-end wines are examples of objectified cultural capital. Note just possessing objectified capital by itself does not mean one possesses cultural capital. I can own very expensive wines, but without the embodied capital allowing me to distinguish between such wine, ownership means little.

Finally, institutional cultural capital exists in the form of credentials or degrees. A Harvard degree has higher level of cultural capital than a degree from a regional state school. Institutional capital provides an easy way for a person to sell their labor by describing their capital to potential buyers (Bourdieu, 1986).

Beyond cultural capital, Bourdieu was interested in social capital, or "the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to membership in a group" and "provides each of its members with the backing of the collectively-owned capital" (Bourdieu, 1986). Considering not just the individual but the individual's connections to people, their group membership, and social networks. Social capital yields both material profits as well as symbolic profits. Capital in all forms can in some ways be exchanged for other capital. If I possess high economic capital, I can purchase classes for myself and children to attain cultural capital or I can buy fine art (objectified cultural capital). Likewise, I can utilize social capital of who I know to get into universities which will give higher levels of institutionalized cultural capital which can then be used to demand more economic capital.

Connecting the Three

Habitus, field, and capital do not exist in a vacuum for Bourdieu's analysis, instead connecting and building upon each other. A given field socializes members and actors with the habitus to understand and navigate the field. Additionally, where one fits with the hierarchy of a field exists in relation to the social capital of the field. For those raised within a given habitus, for example of an elite prep school, embodied cultural capital will be key components of their habitus. For example, Bourdieu and Passeron (1990) highlighted in their examination of the French education system the ways in which linguistic capital taught at elite French schools reproduces the broader culture of inequality. Habitus is the internalized and embodied social structure of a given field in practice. As the habitus of a given field seems natural and is rarely examined, the field and habitus interplay create symbolic violence.

Symbolic violence is "violence which is exercised upon a social agent with his or her complicity" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 167). Both the dominant and dominated in the field adhere to a vision of the field aligning with the habitus. Thus, many adjunct professors, despite their bad pay and support systems, see the process as necessary and as paying dues. The symbolic violence which defines what is valued and what is not valued reinforces the idea that those who are successful are worthy of success and those who are not successful are unworthy (Bourdieu, 1991). Attitudes such as 'paying your dues' reinforce the dominant structure of the field and legitimize the positions of the dominant and dominated.

Positions of dominant and dominated are also reinforced through the possession of capital. Those with embodied cultural capital valued by a field will be more likely to rise in hierarchical status, as will those who have strong social capital in the form of networks. Some fields are easier to access with pre-existing habitus and capital, while others will socialize

neonates into the 'rules of the game.' Fields collectively define what cultural capital is valued within them and gives the capital symbolic meaning. Hierarchical position thus exists in relation to various forms of capital.

It is important to note that within a field, the existence of habitus and capital does not make the field a machine which cannot be affected by agency; remember, Bourdieu was seeking to integrate agency and structure. Actors in a field employ various strategies to safeguard or improve positions and to redefine hierarchy to favor their own cultural production. "The habitus does not negate the possibility of strategic calculation on the part of agents" (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 5). For example, professors in different disciplines might try to tweak understandings of academic activity tenure committees can consider, with art professors wanting to include exhibits over traditional academic publication. Thus, habitus can be utilized within fields to change the fields themselves, highlighting the way in which habitus is both a restraining structure and an embodied sense of action and agency.

Bourdieu and Communication Studies

Though Bourdieu's ideas have been utilized less often in communication studies than in other disciplines, he has not been fully ignored. Various scholars across a variety of subdisciplines have utilized Bourdieu's work at various points, including public relations, political communication, and media communication. Though these three are not an exhaustive list, they offer up a nice sampling of the various ways Bourdieu has been utilized in order to help us understand the utility of his ideas to communication scholarship.

Public Relations

Only a handful of scholars have utilized Bourdieu's work in public relations (Harris, 2005; Ihlen, 2005; Edwards, 2006; Ihlen, 2007; Edwards, 2009; Ihlen 2009). Ihlen makes an

argument for the broader adaptation of Bourdieu's work in public relations because of the way in which Bourdieu focuses both on relationships and dynamic change as actors try to gain and convert capital within fields. Ihlen explains organizations as possessing multiple types of capital including their reputation (symbolic), professional education and informal skills (knowledge/cultural), economic, and social capital. Bourdieu's work does not directly discuss capital for organizations, but Ihlen argues Bourdieu's conception of capital is a good starting place to understand capital in public relations, as public relations is a field designed to help others pursue their interests and accumulate capital; as a field public relations is designed to use the capital of the PR firm to gain capital for others (Ihlen, 2005; Ihlen, 2007). Ihlen thus suggests public relations scholars examining organizations should be asking questions framed around conflict over economic, cultural/knowledge, social, and symbolic capital as well as how much of each a given organization has. "By extending the sociology of Bourdieu to an analysis of public relations, a more realistic perspective of the practice can be achieved and one that is based on a conflict perspective rather than on a consensus perspective of the world" (Ihlen, 2009, p. 62). Edwards (2006) agrees, suggesting public relations scholars should use Bourdieu to understand the power dynamics of public relations to shape popular opinion and gain a greater understand of how power operates. Public relations scholars who utilize Bourdieu can gain understandings of power and the position of various organizations within fields to understand the dynamics of how public relations play out in action.

Political Communication

Bourdieu himself provided extensive work on politics and journalism as fields (Bourdieu, 1991; Bourdieu, 1998; Bourdieu 2005). Shin (2016) notes how much of the work in political communication has focused on intersections of journalism and politics (Benson, 2004; Benson

2006; Benson & Neveu, 2005; Hallin, 2005; Schudson 2005). The focus on interactions between the fields of politics and journalism highlights one of the key reasons Bourdieu is useful for studies of political communication: politicians must navigate the corners of the multiple fields of politics, journalism, and the public. Shin (2016) notes in urban politics many stakeholders make use of multiple forms of public discourses, presenting a public discourse which might be different than their habitus. Bourdieu (1991) argues politician habitus involves acquisition of specialized knowledge and ways of speaking. In illustration I provide the 1992 comedy film *The Distinguished Gentlemen* or any number of other political comedies where a new politician must learn the ropes from those entrenched in the habitus. In the film Eddie Murphy's character learns not only who the players are, but how to talk to the players, to the media, and to the public to become a 'real politician.' In short, he learns the habitus. As habitus is meant to help solve debates between structure-agency, the political field is an ideal case study as the field has structure in the form of government and party institutions, but is also heavily individualistic, as individuals interact with other fields such as business and journalism (Bourdieu, 1991; Thompson, 1991). Craig (2013) notes success in the field is often the result of a politician's ability to navigate the structural limitations within the field, while appealing to those outside the field.

Craig's (2013) examination of Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd's speaking style and interaction with both journalists and publics serves as a good example of how Bourdieu has been utilized in political communication. Craig combines Bourdieu's field, habitus, and capital with critical discourse analysis to highlight how struggles over discourse shape the boundaries of fields. Additionally, he suggests the habitus politicians possess and the resources provided creates a "pre-existing" character by which public figures are judged (Craig, 2013, p. 503).

Finally, Craig concludes success of a politician often depends on performativity of said habitus within the field, but also through interaction with other fields.

Shin (2013; 2014; 2016) uses Bourdieu to draw connections between urban politics and political communication. Urban politics and local community issues, which involve more hands-on activism and meetings between community members and conflicts between them (Shin, 2016). Thus, even more than on a national stage, urban politics and the discussions therein heavily emphasize communicative aspects because the publics have greater levels of access; access which is opposite of the ways in which professional politicians often monopolize political discourses over their constituents (Bourdieu, 1991). Like Craig, Shin examines the ways political communication is shaped by the habitus of the political field and the ways in which they utilize their linguistic habitus to create sense-making frames and navigate symbolic struggles over meaning (which can also lead to symbolic violence). Shin also hints at the ways in which power differentials within field and between the political field and constituents playout via habitus and struggles for meaning, which highlights Bourdieu's argumentation that fields are not monolithic, but instead are places of praxis where struggle can result in transformation (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

Media Studies

As noted in the above section on politics, Bourdieusian thought has been applied frequently in discussion of journalism, even by Bourdieu himself. Thus, media studies are ripe with opportunities to examine Bourdieu's work on the interactions of social structure and agency. Park (2014) provides a thorough and comprehensive overview of the ways which Bourdieu has been and can potentially be used in media communication. Though Bourdieu does not apply to all of media communication, Park argues utilizing his work lends itself to

reinvigorating understandings of key areas, including examining production, audience, symbolic

power, and the field of communication itself.

For example, Park's (2014) points to the potential for Bourdieu in understanding

audience analysis, suggesting our understandings of media audiences deals with not only the

habitus of the field of the media, but also the knowledge and cultural capital of the audience

themselves. The audience is not mechanical, but instead brings to media consumption their own

series of assumptions and habits. Audience habit when combined with Bourdieu's work on

cultural capital and taste highlights the ways in which audiences perceive value or beauty in

something not based on intrinsic characteristics, but instead based on possession of habit,

knowledge, and codes. A "work of art has meaning and interest only for someone who possess

the cultural competence, that is, the code, into which it is encoded" (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 2). These

cultural knowledges are often invisible and seen as natural, they are extensions of the general

habitus of the audience. Beyond broader audience studies, Park suggests using Bourdieu might

benefit media scholars examining production, new media competency, and links between

producers and audiences.

Park's discussion of symbolic power and authority in media reflects the ways in which

political communication scholars have utilized Bourdieu; what is seen as powerful and

authoritative is often reflective of the habitus of the powerful. The ways in which media uses

language is important as the dialect, cadence, and vocabulary serve symbolically as indicators of

power and authority. Language and linguistic practices highlight what language is legitimate and

what is not. Linguistic practices in media and rhetoric thus serve as indicators of symbolic

power. Park uses the symbolic power of language in media to shape knowledge through the

construction of authority. The habitus used in the media field creates and lends an aura of

symbolic authority which perpetuates itself by separating itself into hierarchical statuses and reinforcing the divide between audience and media ("the break") (Park, 2014, pp. 93-95).

The work of Edgar and Toone (2019) serves as an example of the many ways Park (2014) suggests Bourdieu can be utilized to study media and audiences. Edgar and Toone utilize Bourdieusian thought in their study of how audiences engaged and understood race and historical social movements through the lens of popular culture in the form of Beyonce's *Lemonade*. They adapt the work of Sender (2004), noting how habitus structures field, but the field also in turn structures individual habitus, and how habitus creates and polices social boundaries marking those we feel naturally at home in or excluded from. Bourdieu's analysis of these boundaries focused solely on social class, but Edgar and Toone extend the focus to include race and gender, arguing "since cultural, social, and physical locations are always intertwined with identity, Bourdieu's work with habitus and field offers a productive framework for critical audience studies" (Edgar and Toone, 2019, p. 89). Their examination looks at the ways in which media representations contribute to understandings and habitus. Edgar and Toone argue media create habitus by "constant stereotypical representations of how Black women should look, speak, and behave" (p. 89). Conducting in-depth interviews, the authors assert that the creation of interpretive communities surrounding Beyonce's landmark video allowed for participants in those communities to shift the nature of media fields and potentially realign habitus to include ideas of black liberation and social justice.

Bringing it Together

I highlight just three areas in which Bourdieu has been previously utilized by communication scholars. Although Bourdieu is not a one-stop shop for communication studies, his work is broad enough that to offer a variety of tools to understand and explore

communication. For example, Adams (2006) discusses habitus as a tool to understand self-reflexivity and identity. Combining the frameworks of Adams with Edgar and Toone (2019) a scholar could find a potentially fruitful way to explore identity formation and the ways in which habitus shapes the formation of identity. Cargile (2011) further argues Bourdieu's habitus is key to understanding the constraints cultural actors face when studying intercultural communication, and Bock's (year) use of Bourdieu informs her discussion of critical communication pedagogy.

Forensics is at the core a communication subdiscipline. While forensics as a field itself is potentially interdisciplinary, most forensics programs at the college level are housed in communication departments. Due to where they are housed most leaders of programs have advanced degrees in communication studies, performance studies, or similar programs. While there is debate about the disconnect between the discipline of communication and forensics,[1] overall the activity is philosophically built on the foundation of communication literature. As the activity is a subdiscipline of communication, I feet understanding ways Bourdieu can fit into the overall discipline is an important starting point, for if forensics studies as a discipline is to make use of Bourdieu understand the activity, most scholars will want to know how Bourdieu fits into communication as a whole. Now that I have looked at potential understandings of Bourdieu in communication studies, I move forward to examining the forensic studies literature and exploring the ways Bourdieu can assist scholars in understanding the activity and branch of communication studies.

---

[1] See Kelly, Paine, Richardson, and White (2010) in the National Forensics Journal for a full discussion.

Bourdieu, Norms, and Forensics

Research into forensics has clearly documented the primary community guidelines are not rules, but norms (Billings, 2002; Cronn-Mills & Golden, 1997; Gaer, 2002; Paine, 2005; Ribarsky, 2005). Billings (2002) notes competition performance norms are often the first thing new members of a team are given upon joining, which highlights understanding of these norms is seen as a key to success. Speech norms are so pervasive some in the community have difficulty distinguishing what is a norm and what is a rule (Swift, 2006).

A good portion of the work pertaining to unwritten norms in competitive speech has sought to in some way quantify or take account of what norms exist. For example, Cronn-Mills and Golden (1997) sought to "identify and illuminate" (p. 2) these norms while Paine's (2005) stated goal was to "demystify" them (p. 79). Both contend the unwritten rules of speech are pervasive, and approach them from the realm of experience as coaches. Cronn-Mills and Golden (1997) explained they had "no 'hard data' to verify the efficacy of the unwritten rules we contend exist in intercollegiate oral interpretation. We base our findings on more than 23 years of competitive intercollegiate experience" (p. 2). Discussion of unwritten rules has existed at two levels: broader discussions of their existence and focused discussions highlighting specific norms. Paine (2005) argues that unwritten norms dictate nearly every aspect of the forensics community: performance, clothes choices, behavior, and literature choices. These norms include ideas like limiting tournament criticism to "van talk" (McNabb & Cabara, 2006), what performance choices are in good taste (Mills, 1983), appropriate speech suits and jewelry (Paine, 2005), how a speech is constructed (Gaer, 2002; LaMaster, 2005), and how performance literature is chosen (Cronn-Mills & Golden, 1997; Paine, 2005; Swift, 2006), among others. Despite the pervasiveness of such norms, research suggests we need to account for the way the

community enforces unofficial norms instead of rules. As norms, they are guidelines which can be bent or even broken (LaMaster, 2005; Paine, 2005; Swift, 2006). What the extant literature has mostly ignored is ways in which norms are enforced and socialized. While the literature has made references to socialization, judges, coaches, and even peers as enforcement mechanisms, none of the literature to date has included specific mechanisms of the process or the ways in which norms are communicated.

Enforcement of Unwritten Norms

Becker (1963) famously stated "deviant behavior is behavior that people so label" (p. 9). Becker's argument—the central tenant of the interactionist theory of labeling—argues we do not define deviance by what people do, but instead by how we respond. Becker's argument is evident in speech norms (with those who break them in some form being deviant) as the label is not deviant or norm-breaking unless the community identifies the behavior as such. For example, lay judges without knowledge of community norms might reward classic poetry literature which might otherwise be labeled negatively. Becker's work points to the importance of examining norm enforcement by judges, coaches, and to a lesser extent, students.

Judges with the control of the ballot obviously play a large role in the perpetuation of norms. Cronn-Mills and Golden (1997) note in their evolution of norms how skilled students are rewarded by judges for norm breaking because of their skill despite the norm breaking. As the process repeats itself, a new norm is formed, and other judges start expecting the norm and penalize students who fail to perform new norm (p. 3). Further, many alumni return as judges and enforce the unwritten rules they competed with (Cronn-Mills & Golden, 1997; Outzen, Youngvorst & Cronn-Mills, 2013; Reid, 2015).

Where does the bulk of norm enforcement lay? Judges with their ballots, coaches with their teaching, or students who witness and imitate? Outzen et al. (2013) suggest enforcement is spread evenly across these groups, but like much of the work on norms, the suggestion is based on observation and experience instead of "hard data." My criticism does not mean their observations are without merit, but they highlight a potential area for growth in the research. Outzen et al. state competitors returning as coaches and judges, and coaches lacking formal forensics education training, combine to create a system which will continue to perpetuate norms not always linked in educational value. Ultimately, they suggest the enforcement of norms falls on the community. Paine (2005) supports the assertion:

> Judges can only evaluate the performances they see. Thus, unless coaches and students are willing to courageously duel the norms, judges will have no choice but to continue rewarding "the same old thing." (p. 86)

The underlying assumptions Outzen et al. and Paine make are echoed by the work of Gaer (2002):

> . . . we are also responsible for creating and perpetuating the formulaic event because of our competitive nature. At tournaments, especially national competitions, students, coaches, and judges watch out-rounds and attempt to discern why the people advancing did so. They watch these rounds and attempt to emulate what they have seen, or be able to provide "reasons" to their own students as to why they did not advance. (p. 55)

Gaer suggests the competitive nature of speech is to blame as the desire to win inspires competitors to master these various norms.

Interestingly, performance norms are not enforced equally for all competitors. Cronn-Mills and Golden (1997) suggest talented students start new norms and Paine (2005) echoes the

sentiment by suggesting norm breaking is allowed by students who have "proven themselves" (p. 84). The conceptualization of successful students being celebrated for norm breaking reflects the work of Kincaid (2004) on positive deviance. Heckert and Heckert (2002) note all conceptualizations of deviance, positive or negative, have within them a power element: "The same behavior and conditions can result in either positive or negative evaluations, or both simultaneously" (p. 468). The difference in power also applies to teams rather than just individual performers, as Swift (2006) found both students and coaches alike feel judges allow some to break the rules unevenly, and the rule breaking allowances are often based on at least a perception of unequal team power.

Examinations of norms in college speech have several large questions needing answered. Those questions include who enforces norms, where they come from, and questions about differential enforcement. Though these questions have been discussed in a variety of capacities, discussion of community norms has not been addressed in any systematic way or through analytical lenses beyond individual experience. Enter Bourdieu and his framework of field, habitus, and capital. By examining the college forensics community as a field, and those in the community as possessing habitus and capital, I propose forensics research will find an analytical lens which allows norms, norm adherence, and norm breaking in the activity to be more clearly understood.

Forensics Norms and Bourdieu

In order to apply Bourdieusian thought to college forensics we need to understand forensics as an activity where actors (students, coaches, and judges) have both agency and are limited by the structure of the activity. The rules of forensics have almost no restrictions on content, effectively allowing students the agency to be able to perform Dr. Seuss in prose or

perform persuasive speeches calling for increases in gun rights for all Americans. Despite their agency, students rarely choose such performances as the structure and norms of the activity lean heavily against them. The unique combination of both agency and structure makes college forensics a great case study for understanding Bourdieu's formulations of the field, habitus, and capital.

An examination of forensics needs to encompass both the individual choices and interactions between agents in the activity, and also understand the existence of forensics as a crossroads of past choices and a collection of relationships which exist outside of individual actors. An individual competitor, coach, or judge makes decisions based on personal agency but all of the choices are understood within the context of what happened previously, the history of individual teams, and the expectations those histories have created. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) defined fields as being a networked configuration of relationships having unique hierarchies and structures. Forensics has a distinct subset of laws (rules and norms), terms, positions, and governing bodies making it a distinct separate universe. Bourdieu's field thus makes sense as a starting point to examine forensics. By examining speech competition as a field, we are able to see norm creation and reproduction as a result of embodied capital and habitus, a lived experience were norms are mostly not taught through direct teaching, but through unseen lived communication. The following sections flesh out several areas and discussions within forensics literature and frames them using a Bourdieusian analysis.

Competition and Symbolic Capital

The field of forensics exists as a collection of individuals, teams, and organizations in competition over a variety of resources including, but not limited to, recognition (awards), students, and definitions (performance styles). Competition for recognition exists at multiple

levels with students competing with each other for placements, teams competing for awards with which they can highlight their capital to their respective universities, and to a lesser extent coaches competing for awards through end of the year recognitions. Placements in tournaments serves as the main symbolic capital which is competed over. Placement and recognition signals to potential team members the placement within the heirarchical structure of the field. As there are not official seasonal rankings team placements at national tournaments can serve as a proxy. The need of teams and actors to acquire the symbolic capital of team placements can also explain the proliferation of national tournaments (AFA, NFA, PKD, NSC, PCSDL, etc.[2]) as teams will constantly seek means to acquire symbolic capital, even by reshaping competition itself.

The symbolic capital of awards exists in a quasi-state between what Bourdieu refered to as objectified cultural capital and institutional cultural capital, as the recongition is represented by a physical award but mostly is recognized as a credential. Further, like institutional capital the level of the national tournament will ascribe different levels of cultural value to that recognition. At least for those who possess habitus and knowledge of the field, an AFA championship will mean more than a PKD or PCSDL championship. Also, just as Bourdieu noted, capital in forensics can be transformed into other forms of capital; so awards can be translated into funding for teams through administrations or used to help recruit sought-after high school competitors. We can assume students who achieve success at the high school level have a higher chance of transitioning into the habitus of college forensics and are more ready to accumulate capital for the college program. The ability to recruit high capital students potentially hinges on the

---

[2] American Forensics Association, National Forensics Association, Pi Kappa Delta, National Speech Championship, Public Communication Speech & Debate League

scholarships which programs can attain by transitioning their awards into funding from the university (economic capital) or donations from alumni (social capital).

A debate about forensics as shaped by competition versus education of students has long raged in fornesics literature (Dreibelbis & Gullifor, 1992; Gaer, 2002; Burnett, Brand, & Meister, 2003; Hinck, 2003). Burnett, Brand, & Meister have been perhaps the loudest voices decrying the asssertion that winning is everything, stating eductional focus in forensics is a myth. Through a Bourdieusian lens a competition/winning focus makes sense. When we examine forensics as a field we see winning is central to the structure and continued existence of the field as the competitive aspect is central to accumulation of capital. When we examine competition through the lens of Bourdieu's field, we see how a focus on winning is embedded into the nature of the field. The field/competition lens also potentially explains why so many nationals take different shapes, as different groups compete to define competition to suit their needs. In the lead up to the National Forensics Assocation's addition of octofinals to the championship tournament in 2017, discussion centered around questions of whether octofinals would add new opportunity for more programs or if those additional break spots (capital) would just be absorbed by programs who were already high in capital.

Finally, the shape of the field through performance styles is another source of competition. Many times I've heard smaller programs decry schools which they feel just replicate "the AFA style." These claims suggest there is competition for control over the very nature and style of performance within the larger field. Gaer's (2002) discussion of the how he sees competitive drive as stifling creativity through the promotion of formuliac "cookier-cutter stylisms" (p. 54). Gaer's call for students to seek new innovative performance styles and coaches and judges to reward such performances reflects an underlying competition between the habitus

of forensics and those who seek to shake up the status quo. Gaer's call to reward innovation suggests the reward of capital in the form of recognition is essential for getting new styles recongized. A subtheme of Gaer's suggestion is performance styles, whether rewarded or not, are a normative practice and those norms can be shaped and reshaped. My previous respondents suggested similar themes (Hagan, 2017). One respondent stated his own conflict between adhering to styles which win and finding his own.

> Um… so I was working to find what worked for me but would still be competitive in the community and, you know, competing against other norms in the community… and I, in a way I think I kind of lost sight of that especially this year which is a little disheartening for myself, but . . . Um… and you know I try and say that I have a style different than everyone else's, but I slowly find myself morphing more and more as I see the style and the norms more and more I'm kind of adapting to what they are. (Hagan, 2017, p. 13)

If there is competition over what gets defined as ideal styles, and different sections of the field (i.e. different circuits and nationals) have their own distinctive styles, then style itself is a form of capital which can be gained and controlled. The presence of styles suggests a normative practice that for some would need to be acquired and considered, whereas others rich in the capital of the field would simply possess. Such normative practices suggest forensics styles and norms are engrained through a habitus.

Habitus and Norms

My previous research into norms (Hagan, 2017) found the unwritten norms of the community went frequently undiscussed. Respondents suggested even if they were uncomfortable with the norms, the community had a normative sense of "speech nice" which caused the norms not to be addressed. "Speech nice" is a community term utilized to discuss

what many perceive as a fake front of niceness which is normative in the community. The presence of "speech nice" or a pervasive undiscussed attitude agents carry themselves with aligns with Bourdieu's conceptualization of habitus. The habitus possessed by participants in forensics is practiced as invidual embodied action, yet is socialized through the field and extenedd as a structural set of norms and practices well beyond the scope of any single participant. Billings (2002) argues the socialization into norms and the unwritten rules of forensics begins as soon as a new member joins the team. The habitus is socialized and perpetuated into new members, and is carried on through the ways forensic particpants continue in the activity as coaches, judges, and active alumni who act as social capital for programs.

New students are not only socialized into event norms, but also into ways to dress, talk, and act. One of my respondents told me she was not sure if her obsession for suits was something she genuinely liked or if it was due to forensics socialization (Hagan, 2017). Such pervasive and in-depth shaping of personality traits aligns with Bourdieu's perception of habitus as all encompassing in the way it shapes those socialized into it. Enforcement of unwritten dress norms by the college speech community is frequent, with one respondent informing me she was told by a judge to get her suits and sleeves tailored. "It wasn't enough to have the clothes, but I basically needed clothes that were not off the rack" (Hagan, 2017, p. 15). The habitus for clothing and demeanor is so central some students report coaches having to approve their suits, briefcases, and hair styles. When speech competition is viewed as a field and habitus such approvals make more sense. Clothing and personal items exist as concrete objectified cultural capital which highlight who belongs and who does not. Other norms such as how students sign into rooms, approach the performance area, act in awards, talk to each other, speech nice, and conversations with judges serve as embodied capital. Combined, the norms informed by these

two types of capital suggests which students are habituated into the habitus and informs others in

the field their status and location within the hierarchy. One respondent informed me the way

students objectified capital in the form of clothes and bags gave an aura of credibility, further

suggesting he pre-judges students who lack such capital, feeling they mark the round as easier.

> I say, you know, 'oh so-and-so is wearing this,' like, I knew in the round I was going to
>
> be fine. I've not said that specifically, but that's the thought process that I had. And I've
>
> come back to my team before and said, 'oh I think I was fine in my round. I don't think
>
> that people were competitive.' But I never saw their speech. (Hagan, 2017)

Habitus, both embodied and objective, when combined with adherence to performance norms

creates credibility for actors in the field, but as Bourdieu notes, habitus is not monolithic. As

field and habitus go hand in hand, students can challenge norms in a variety of ways including

dress and performance. Students who have greater levels of experience and capital are more able

to effectively challenge and reshape norms (Cronn-Mill & Golden, 1997; Paine, 2005; Swift,

2006; Hagan, 2017).

Paine (2005) suggests students often leave competition due to struggling with norms. If

Paine is correct, we can understand these students as exiting the field being unable to adapt to the

habitus of the activity. Such feelings of being unable to adapt to the habitus were also found in

my research, one respondent stated since they were from a smaller school with less coaching

resources (capital) they would never be able to achieve the levels of polish students from larger

more entrenched programs had (Hagan, 2017). Another respondent stated they were at first very

jaded towards the norms of the community, but over time were able to adapt and overcome their

jaded response. One coach I interviewed discussed a student who quit because he felt to limited

by the structure of the events and his inability to change them. Each of these examples reinforces

the understanding of unwritten rules and norms as more than just a series of ideas, but as part of a greater pattern of habitus which influences how students act, perform, carry themselves, and present themselves to the community.

Again, the habitus does not necessarily go unchallenged. Different communities in forensics have different dress norms, with some regions having far more casual dress norms and some parts of forensics (such as debate) having dress norms aligning with normative school clothing. Different national tournaments might also have different forms of embodied capital such as the way students speak to judges or how students act in rounds. An example from my own observations is the number of students at Pi Kappa Delta nationals I have seen practicing their performances in public hallways or near observers, an act I can never recall seeing at AFA or NFA nationals. Though challenges can and do exist, one of my respondents suggested the normative niceness of the community extends beyond students to all participants and thus there was no legitimate way to address and repair norms as one of the strongest norms was one against protest. A norm against protest suggests the habitus of the field protects itself against challenges that would disrupt that habitus. If such a norm exists, it serves to define habitus, capital, and the field in such a way that those who benefit most from them are consistently entrenched in their positions.

Hierarchy and Social Reproduction

Bourdieu and Wacqaunt (1992) argue fields as a configuration of positions include their own internal hierarchies. Within each field exists a separate universe having rules and positions which exist in relation to each other. Hierarchical positions within fields are based on possession of capital. As discussed in the competition section, a series of struggles exists within the forensics field over multiple forms of capital, including the fact many programs already possess

large amounts of all forms of capital (embodied, objective, symbolic, institutional, and social). Research and essays have suggested schools with greater hierarchical standings have actors who possess more cultural capital and a greater ability to navigate the field and break norms (Hagan, 2017; Paine, 2005; Swift, 2006). Some of the hierarchical power obviously comes from success in the field, as Tyma (2008) suggests norms are frequently shaped and adopted by others based on who wins. But, if the ability to win rounds is partially based on adherence to and immersion in habitus, then the habitus and field have a way of reproducing themselves and protecting the hierarchy of the status quo.

Schools in the upper echelons of the hierarchy will have greater entrenchment and knowledge of the norms that have persisted over time, or as Bourdieu (1977) calls it, a culmination of practices in history. Those same schools also possess a perceived greater level of credibility which allows them to break and change norms (Hagan, 2017). Thus, as Bourdieu suggests, habitus is responsible for the reproduction of itself and the existing social structure. The habitus of forensics, invisible and undiscussed, will almost always begin as the habitus of the teams who sit at the top of the hierarchy, as they produce the larger number of alumni, coaches, and judges who live and embody that habitus. Further, these teams have greater access through their multiple forms of capital to gain new members who either already possess capital or will most easily adapt it (recruitment). High ends teams also have large pools of social capital to pull from in their alumni who serve as institutional memory, having knowledge of what performances and topics have been done before to form coaching knowledge. Possession of greater levels of coaching knowledge combined with institutional cultural capital of a strong reputation means those schools are more likely to win in getting the best recruits, and will

continue to win rounds and establish their performance styles, embodied capital, and general habitus as the baseline for the field.

The power of hierarchy and high-ranking schools' abilities to shape the norms of the field is in some ways acknowledged by speech competitions. Tournaments make use of codes to signify schools which are supposed to stop judges from knowing the school's students are competing for. Though ineffective, just the existence of such a system suggests the activity is aware of power differentials within the field and the potential for those differentials to shape results. As previously noted, challenges to the system will often be negated by the habitus. One of my respondents discussed how she frequently tells her teammates not to blame the big schools or scapegoat them as being all powerful bullies (Hagan, 2017). While my respondents noted one could earn credibility and thus increase one's status in the hierarchy, everyone who discussed hierarchy noted the difficulty in such a task. The hegemony of the hierarchy can be challenged, but one must ask if those challenges can exist long term in the face of habitus and capital those who top the hierarchy possess.

Forensics and Bourdieu: Tying it together

While the forensics literature discusses norms quite a bit, the discussion has centered mostly around identifying norms and discussing their worth. Few attempts have been made to examine how or why the norms and unwritten rules formed, how they are communicated throughout the activity, or how they reproduce themselves. Using Bourdieu as a framework for understanding the activity of college speech allows scholars to understand questions about norms in the activity as well as potentially other areas. For example, I could see examinations of program viability and how programs communicate their place in the national scene to their administrations being informed via Bourdieusian thought, as Bourdieu's work on field accounts

for the communicative interactions between fields. As a field, college forensics being guided by its own rules making bodies (the various organizations) who are in competition for capital offers. Actors within the field are also in competition for resources and through adaption of the habitus of the field they continue to develop strategies which blend the norms of the community with their own agency to survive. Further, through understanding the way competition molds the field and habitus, we might find ways to better communicate college speech to increase recruitment and retention.

Discussion and Conclusion

While Pierre Bourdieu's work has been utilized in various parts of communication studies, the adoption of his work for communication is nowhere near as thorough as in other fields. Bourdieu's ideas, which have been heavily utilized in sociology, anthropology, education, philosophy, and political science among others, provide a useful tool for understanding the ways communication happens at a mezzo-level. His focus on the existence of agency within the confines of structure and how those confines shape our understandings of the world can be of great use to communication scholars who are looking at interpersonal communication, organizational communication, or media studies. This paper has made the case for communication studies adopting the work of Bourdieu by exploring Bourdieu's key concepts, examining a few ways he has previously been utilized by communication studies, and through examining college forensics through a Bourdieusian lens as a case study.

College forensics is an interesting case study in that the activity exists within academic communication departments, has its own body of literature, and most people working in the community are communication scholars. At the same time college forensics and forensics studies exits separate from communication studies as its own entity. When we examine college forensics

as an activity, we are examining something apart of communication, yet at the same time something that exists as its own separate field. I think the unique position of college forensics as both academic and non-academic has at times made the literature and research surrounding it feel disjointed. By exploring forensics with a Bourdieusian analysis I think we can solve of the disjointed nature. Bourdieu's concepts of habitus, field, and capital allows scholars to understand how the activity is shaped through communicative action of actors, yet at the same time those actors are limited by the shape of the history of the activity. Bourdieu's analysis of field can be utilized to understand the shape of forensics as a series of acts of communication which give meaning and structure to the activity. Large questions forensics scholars have grappled with such as the divide between forensics as educational and forensics as competition, how to interact with universities who fund us, the lack of training for new coaches, the function of awards, and of course the dependency on norms/unwritten rules.

I think including his work more broadly in communication studies allows scholars to better explore a variety of topics, or at a minimum as Park (2014) suggests, can invigorate existing areas of thought. Bourdieu himself resisted the label of theorist as he saw theory as self-disclosed and separate from the real world (Park, 2014). Respecting his skepticism I do not suggest communication adapt Bourdieu as theory, instead view his empirical work and ideational framework as a starting point for better understanding the ways in which agency and structure interact in communication.

References

Adams, M. (2006). Hybridizing habitus and reflexivity: Towards an understanding of contemporary identity. *Sociology, 40(*3). 511-528.

Becker, H. S. (1963). *Outsiders; studies in the sociology of deviance*. London: Free Press of Glencoe.

Benson, R. (2004). Bringing the sociology of media back in. *Political Communication, 21*(3), 275–292.

Benson, R. (2006). News media as a "journalistic field": What Bourdieu adds to new institutionalism, and vice versa. *Political Communication, 23*(2), 187–202.

Benson, R., & Neveu, E. (2005). *Bourdieu and the journalistic field*. Malden, MA: Polity.

Billings, A. C. (2002). Assessing forensics in the 21st century: Ten questions individual events programs must address . *National Forensic Journal, 20*(1), 30-37.

Bock, M. (2007). Reducing communicative inequalities. Towards a pedagogy for inclusion. In B. Cammaerts and N. Carpentier *(Ed.) Reclaiming the Media: Communication Rights and Democratic Media Roles (pp.* 66-85). Intellect.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste*. Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1986) The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.) *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education.* Westport, CT: 241-258.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *On television.* New York: New Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power.* Oxford: Polity.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature.* Columbia University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practice reason: On the theory of action.* Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (2005). "The political field, the social science field, and the journalistic field". In Bourdieu and the journalistic field, Edited by: Benson, R. and Neveu, E. 29–47. Cambridge, England: Polity.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture (2nd ed)*. Sage Publications.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. University of Chicago Press.

Burnett, A. K., Brand, J. D., & Meister, M. (2002). Winning is everything. *National Forensic Journal*, *21(*1), 12-23.

Cargile, A. C. (2011). Being mindful of the h*abitus* of culture. *China Media Research, 7*(3). 11-20.

Craig, G. (2013). How does a Prime Minister speak? Kevin Rudd's discourse, habitus, and negotiation of the journalistic and political fields. *Journal of Language and Politics, 12*(4). 485-507.

Cronn-Mills, D., & Golden, A. (1997, November). *The unwritten rules of oral interpretation*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Communication Association: 83rd, Chicago, Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED415553.pdf

Dreibelbis, G.C., & Gullifor, P. (1992). Forensics as a laboratory experience in mass media. *National Forensic Journal*, 10, 77-82.

Edwards, L. (2006). Rethinking power in public relations. *Public Relations Review, 32*(3), 229-231.

Edwards, L. (2009). Symbolic power and public relations practice: Locating individual

      practitioners in their social context. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 21(*3), 251–

      272.

Gaer, D. (2002). Formulaic forensics: When competitive success stifles creativity. *The National*

      Forensic Journal, 20(1), 54-56.

Hagan, S. (2017). Examining the lived experience of norms and unwritten rules in collegiate

      speech competition. Unpublished.

Hallin, D. (2005). Field theory, differentiation theory, and comparative media research. In R.

      Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.), *Bourdieu and the journalistic field* (pp. 224–243).

      Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Harris, R. (2005). When giving means taking: Public relations, sponsorship, and morally

      marginal donors. *Public Relations Review, 31(*4), 486-491.

Heckert, A., & Heckert, D. M. (2002). a new typology of deviance: integrating normative and

      reactivist definitions of deviance. *Deviant Behavior*, *23*(5), 449-479.

Hinck, E. A. (2003). Managing the dialetical tension between competition and education in

      forensics: A response to Burnett, Brand, & Meister. *National Forensic Journal, 21(*2),

      60-76.

Ihlen (2002). Rhetoric and resources: Notes for a new approach to public relations and issues

      management. *Journal of Public Affairs, 2(*4), 259–269.

Ihlen, Ø. (2005). The power of social capital: Adapting Bourdieu to the study of public relations.

      Public Relations Review, 31(4), 492–496

Ihlen, Ø. (2007). Building on Bourdieu: A sociological grasp of public relations. *Public*

      *Relations Review, 33(*3). 269-274.

Ihlen (2009). On Bourdieu. In Ihlen, B. Ruler, & M. Fredriksson (Eds*.). Public relations and social theory: Key figures and concepts* (pp. 62–82). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Kelly, B. B., Paine, R., Richardson, R., & White, L. (2010). What we are trying to teach: Reconnecting collegiate forensics to the communication discipline. *National Forensic Journal. 32(*1). 38-58.

Kincaid, D. L. (2004). From innovation to social norm: Bounded normative influence. *Journal of Health Communication, 9*, 37-57.

LaMaster, G. (2005). Understanding public address events. *National Forensic Journal*, *23*(1), 32-36.

McNabb, N., & Cabara, J.P. (2006). "Bowel quaking pessimism": An ethnographic examination of competence and complaining in the forensics community. *National Forensic Journal*, *24*(1), 17-41.

Mills, N. H. (1983). Judging standards in forensics: Toward a uniform code in the 80's. *National Forensic Journal, 1*(1), 19-31.

Outzen, C.P., Youngvorst, L.J., & Cronn-Mills, D. (2013). The next 50 years of forensics: Acknowledging problems, preparing solutions. *Speaker & Gavel*, *50*(2), 33-45.

Paine, R. E. (2005). Identifying and evaluating the "unwritten rules" of competition. *National Forensic Journal, 23*(1), 79-88.

Park, D.W. (2014). *Pierre Bourdieu: A critical introduction to media and communication theory.* Peter Lang.

Reid, A. (2015). Copycat forensics: How social learning problematizes intercollegiate forensic performances. *Speaker & Gavel*, *52*(2), 4-16.

Ribarsky, E. N. (2005). Analyzing innovation and education in forensics. *National Forensics Journal, 23*(2), 19-31.

Ritzer, G. (2008). *Sociological theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill

Schudson, M. (2005). Autonomy from what. In R. Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.), *Bourdieu and the journalistic field* (pp. 214–223). Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Sender, K. (2004) *Business, not politics: The making of the gay market*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Swift, C.L. (2006). Conflating rules, norms, and ethics in intercollegiate forensics, *Speaker & Gavel*, *43*(1), 46-86.

Swift, C.L. (2009). Rejecting the square peg in a round hole: Expanding arguments in oral interpretation introductions, *Speaker & Gavel*, *46*(1), 25-37.