Gender and the Construction of Place in Everyday Practices of the Refuge

Kristine Peta Jerome
Queensland University of Technology*

This paper demonstrates how staff, from a particular kind of institution, use 'gender' as a way to manage daily practices and maintain a commonsense world. It does this by exploring conversational data from a woman's refuge, and utilizing Bourdieu's notions of habitus and social capital. This provides an opportunity to describe the mechanisms that prevent some staff from achieving competency in this social institution. Findings from this paper illustrate how everyday practices are underpinned by 'gender' in order to discipline and regulate refuge members. The information presented here is from a more comprehensive study that uses a case of the refuge to explore the way social and spatial relations construct social order.

Keywords: Gender, place, habitus, language, domestic violence, women's refuges, social capital.

This paper describes the way staff achieve 'a sense of place' in the refuge (Bourdieu, 1989:19). In order to explain this relationship this paper begins by exploring Bourdieu's concept of habitus. This is followed by a brief outline of the history of refuges. This outline highlights the way daily practices of the refuge are informed by gender. This sets the scene for the remainder of this paper. A segment of refuge talk and a detailed analysis of its contents follow. The analysis demonstrates the way linguistic strategies are embedded in daily practices of the refuge and that the management of these strategies is seen to be a prerequisite in the acquisition of social capital. This acquisition is presented as a key constituent in achieving 'a sense of place' in the refuge and subsequently attaining refuge membership (Bourdieu, 1989). It is then argued that gender underpins the 'routine, methodical, and recurring accomplishment' of achieving this relationship (West and Zimmerman, 1987). Thus, gender is presented as a crucial component in attaining and sustaining 'a sense of place' in the refuge (Bourdieu, 1989). Overall this paper demonstrates the way 'a sense of place' is constructed in the refuge and the significance of gender in this relationship. This process is made explicit through an examination of refuge talk.

* School of Architecture, Interior and Industrial Design, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane 4001, Queensland, Australia. E-mail: k.jerome@qut.edu.au

THE CONCEPT OF HABITUS

During the 1950s Bourdieu conducted an ethnographic study of an Algerian tribe, known as the Kabyle. Because he investigated the everyday routines of this culture and did not overlook seemingly insignificant details, he was able to demonstrate the way gendered practices were deeply embedded in the daily rituals of the Kabyle. Furthermore, he was able to illustrate that space was an effective means of exercising this kind of power and maintaining relations of domination.

As a consequence of this study Bourdieu developed the concept of habitus. This concept provided him with a way to describe why gendered practices, exemplified at the site of the Kabyle house, were perceived as legitimate everyday activities by tribal members. Habitus provided a means to understand why Kabyle members engaged in daily practices, which largely reproduced relations of domination, without radically transforming them. It also afforded an opportunity for Bourdieu to explain why the spatial domain of the Kabyle house was a significant constituent in the reproduction of these relations. Specifically, it provided a way to unravel how biographical histories influenced the way Kabyle members participated in daily interaction and maintained a commonsense world (Bourdieu, 1977b).

The concept of habitus is conceived by Bourdieu as:

> ...a product of history, [which] produces individual and collective practices—more history—in accordance with the schemes generated by history. It ensures the active presence of past experiences, which, deposited in each organism in the form of schemes of perception, thought and action, tend to guarantee the 'correctness' of practices and their constancy over time, more reliably than all formal rules and explicit norms. This system of dispositions—a present past that tends to perpetuate itself into the future by reactivation in similarly structured practices...is what enables the institution to attain full realization (Bourdieu, 1990:54–57).

In the case of the Kabyle, gendered practices were deeply embedded in the dispositions of tribal members, and these were re-enacted on a daily basis in order to produce a 'sense of place' (Bourdieu, 1989). In the case of this paper, the concept of habitus is used as a means to explain why some refuge staff achieve 'a sense of place' and some achieve 'a sense of place of others'. At this point it is now important to *set the scene.*

THE INSTITUTION OF THE REFUGE

The refuge is a complex social environment intent on providing emergency accommodation and support services for women and children escaping domestic violence. The feminist movement of the 1960s is largely credited with highlighting

the need for this kind of service and bringing the phenomenon of domestic violence to the forefront of social debate in countries such as the United Kingdom, America, Canada and Australia. Consequently, the refuge has developed into a complex social milieu with everyday practices underpinned by feminist rationale. Refuge practices are largely oriented to the overarching rationale of empowerment in order to facilitate *independent living*[1] (Dobash and Dobash, 1991; Loseke, 1992; Hopkins and McGregor, 1991; Patel, 1994).

Generally aimed at providing safe and temporary housing, these social and spatial environments operate in rural, urban and suburban settings in order to facilitate 'liberation and independence'. Traditionally these settings were appropriated houses, where the subdivision of existing rooms afforded a communal style of living. Typically this arrangement included separate sleeping areas alongside shared kitchen, bathroom and entertainment facilities. This kind of setting reflected early British accommodation trends—with a priority upon the provision of a secure environment, free from violent men. This particular spatial layout also aimed to address, through the layout of space, the loneliness predominantly experienced by women escaping domestic violence (Beaudry, 1985; Dobash and Dobash, 1991; Loseke, 1992).

The information presented in this paper is based upon studies conducted in a communal refuge model, in operation in Southeast Queensland, Australia. This model is typical of current trends in Australia, whereby existing premises are modified to accommodate women and children fleeing violence. This setting is a converted house where staff, who embody feminist ideologies of the women's refuge movement[2], seek to maintain social order through complex interactions which are based upon particular linguistic and spatial strategies. These strategies aim to empower residents and produce 'independent women' within a period of three months. The environment discussed here provides a canvas to explore the way staff attempt to construct 'a sense of place' through talk and acquire refuge membership (Bourdieu, 1989).

ACHIEVING A SENSE OF PLACE IN THE REFUGE

Staff who choose to work in refuges are traditionally female and generally have formal qualifications in social work or affiliated disciplines. This environment is principally established for women and managed by women who sanction feminist ideals through their everyday practices. It is an interpretation of these ideals that defines the internal logic of the refuge and provides a way for ordering and understanding the social world of this enclave. In this environment the inclusion of a male worker is unusual. He is a deviant case. Here his duties are confined to spatial domains reserved for staff and resident interaction. That is, he does not have access to the residential area of the refuge, which includes bedrooms, bathrooms, kitchen facilities, a living room, dining room and an outdoor verandah. This area is located on the first floor of a two story converted house. Other female staff members are not restricted to enter or participate in interaction in this residential area. Furthermore, his practices focus upon interaction with children, and he is discouraged

from engaging with the adult residents. In this instance, his daily practices—which he describes as 'interventionist'—are influenced by his access to different spatial domains and different participants of the refuge setting. Because of this prescribed social and spatial ordering tension is experienced by this worker. This is evident in the following conversation segment. McNay (1999) writes that this kind of tension largely occurs because of the desire to gain control over particular capital by different groups with specific interests. In this instance staff seek to acquire social capital in order to be recognized as legitimate refuge members. And managing talk in a particular way equates with the acquisition of social capital in this setting. What complicates the acquisition of social capital in this refuge is the way gender[3] is used to regulate this process.

Bourdieu conceptualizes *social capital* as one of four primary types of capital appropriated by individuals and groups in order to maintain or enhance their positions in social order; whereby capital is perceived as a valued and largely contested resource that functions as a form of power. Social capital is maintained through acquaintances and networks whereby these valued connections determine one's orientation to and positioning in social space. (Swartz, 1997; Bourdieu, 1997). In the setting discussed here, managing talk in a particular way is a key component in the acquisition of social capital. And embodying this skill is a constituent of refuge membership. What makes this process complicated is the way gender underpins this interactional achievement and attaining 'a sense of place' in the refuge. This set of relations is exemplified in the analysis of the following excerpt.

DATA AND DATA ANALYSIS

In order to analyze the following conversation segment, the techniques of Conversational Analysis, (hereafter CA) and Membership Categorization Device, (hereafter MCD) are used. Harvey Sacks is largely acknowledged as pioneering these procedures. His collaborators Emmanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson[4] are credited with making notable contributions to the development on CA. Both procedures provide a way to explore what is being done in and by talk. Specifically, they provide a means to comprehend the basic structures of speech exchange, the enabling devices which authorize orderly solutions to the problem of meaning in context, the sequential organizations which unite utterances together into audible and coherent meaning, and the logic of speaking rights (Frankel, 1989). In this paper, the techniques of CA and MCD are applied to talk in order to comprehend one of the ways 'a sense of place' is achieved in the refuge (Bourdieu, 1989).

DISCUSSION OF EXCERPT A

In this paper, a segment of talk from the communal refuge model is explored to uncover what linguistic strategies are used in everyday practices by refuge staff. To

do this the following conversation segment, generated during a focus group discussion with refuge staff members, is analyzed. In this instance, the key actors are the refuge coordinator (W1), the refuge worker (W2), a student worker (W3) and the child support worker (W4), alongside the researcher (I). In this particular scenario, the refuge worker (W2) remains a silent but addressed recipient, and the child support worker (W4), is a male.

This conversation was held mid-morning in an open plan section of the staff working area. The content presented here follows an exploration of the category of 'the refuge'. The sense of a shared cultural knowledge of the refuge is a misconception, and this knowledge becomes contested terrain. The following excerpt is a continuation of this exploration, whereby staff discuss the way they describe 'the refuge' to friends. It illustrates the way interactional competence of the refuge is achieved and demonstrates that the embodiment of particular linguistic strategies by staff is a necessary acquisition if participants are to acquire social capital and be invested with authority[5] and subsequently attain the position of refuge membership and achieve 'a sense of place' (Bourdieu, 1989). Comprehending this process is possible because of the different genders participating in this discussion.

Excerpt A

1	I:	So would it make a difference if um your close friend
2		was male or female?
3	W4:	No.
4	I:	And um same question. ((general laughter))
5	W3:	Oh well if it was me yea yeah yeah yeah.
6	W1:	Yeah I'd I'd probably have to retract I I would
7		probably say different things to a woman.
8	I:	Oh like what (.) would be the differences?
9	(0.3)	
10	W1:	I guess I'd be it would be more personalized I I
11		probably wouldn't stay as generalized yeah.
12	I:	Oh okay.
13	W3:	I think with women too I would tend to relay it back
14		to you know in a much broader sorta social (.)
15		picture as in (0.2) you know why are women not men
16		escaping their homes. And isn't that bloody terrible
17		whereas with men I suppose (0.3) um (0.2) no I don't
18		know any men. ((laughter)) I don't I don't have any
19		men friends. ((further laughter with interviewer)) No
20		not really. Arh oh dear.
21	W1:	I guess yeah you do women do more readily start
22		talking about *their* oppression.
23	I:	Hmm, yeah that's interesting.
24	W1:	Yeah.

W3: And I think too the the amount of women when you speak say oh yes I know what you mean exactly I've been in relationships like that. Ya know it's kinda reflective of those (0.2) you know issues of *power* and control in in heterosexual relationships and homosexual relationships. Yeah.
I: Hmm.
W3: Kinda like you know I know what you mean.
W1: That's not to say yeah I would enter into that discussion with a man as we:ll. (0.2) But I I think it's probably more (0.3) objectified in some way it's not as (.) emotionally loaded as what I experience when I talk to a (.) a close female friend. [About
I: [Hmm hmm.
W4: Yeah mine yeah my ((laughter)) preferred are context driven in a sense like people I call frie:nds I'd probably wouldn't describe that much different in a sense whether they're male or female. (.) U:m (.) because of who my friends are so it's ya know it's not it's not ah=
W1: =Hmm.
W4: Because they'd be quite okay and sensitive about this and recognizing the importance um have quite a good sorta structural analysis of society. People outsi:de my group of friends (.) um I probably would talk differently if it was women than if it was a man, and I suppose I'd be gauging all the ti::me ah their sensitivity and um what I'm picking up from them (.) and (0.2) yeah and I would probably be very defensive talking to a man.
I: Oh okay that's interesting. Yeah.
W1: Hmm.
W4: Just just ya kno::w I just know ya know the ones that that are. As as you know you have to question do I really wanna go through it or would these people do I wanna try [and.
W3: [Yeah.
W4: .h Educate them completely [ha:ve I got the energy
W3: [Ye::ah
W4: For all [thi:s
W3: [Yeah
W4: Or do I just play it down and say hardly anything ya [know.
W3: [Yeah

69 W4: And ya know [there's some women I'd think that as
70 well
71 W3: [Yeah
72 W4: And their conversations but yeah I I think it
73 would be true. Definitely.
74 W1: Like I'm wondering if what we're saying is that we
75 can just slip into the all men are bastards mode
76 ((joint laughter)) and not did it [as
77 W3: [Yeah
78 W1: As comfortably as if we're doing it with a
79 male friend. ((laughter))
80 W3: Yeah easily.
81 (0.2)
82 W4: Hmm.
83 W3: Yeah and that's not um to suggest that they a:re but
84 [it's.
85 W1: [Yeah.
86 W3: Yeah sometimes it is easy to slip into that mo::de.
87 Ki:nd it's much simpler ta swallow. (.) In that way
88 rather than to investigate anymore complex yeah roots
89 of the problem.

From the beginning of this transcript excerpt, the researcher seeks clarification on the perceived differences in understanding of the refuge, following previous descriptions of this kind of environment. This clarification is sought by explicitly introducing the variable of gender in line 1. Although (W4) denies this variable as a significant component of understanding, his colleagues perceive it as a possibility. From line 4 a comprehensive discussion of the different descriptions of the refuge, which would be potentially offered to different gender groups *by* different genders, is presented.

In line 5 (W3) claims that she would describe the refuge differently to her close friends, and that this difference is based upon the underlying principle of gender. In line 6 (W1) announces that she would have to retract her prior conviction of indifference to difference, whereby she would *probably say different things to a woman*. The differences are initially explained as the type of descriptions and not the content of descriptions; that is for a close female friend the descriptions would be *more personalized* as compared to the alternative of *generalized*. This account is followed by (W3) justifying her previous description. She manages this from line 13 by connecting the social structure of the refuge to much broader institutional structures. She gives an example in line 15 of a typical emotive question that would accompany a description about the refuge: *why are women not men escaping their homes?* Thus, it could be argued that her description is a politically charged account of perceived power structures operative in the world (underpinned by gender and indicative of feminist ideals that currently bracket existing policies concerning domestic violence).

From line 17 (W3) announces that she cannot offer a typical case of a description of the refuge to men friends, as they remain largely removed from her daily life. However, her experiences of this sex and perceived partnering power structures underpin her discussion.

The refuge coordinator (W1), then refocuses the conversation in line 21 in order to justify why descriptions about the refuge with women are connected to much broader social issues. This is seen to be possible because women, as a collective unit, recognize oppression in their everyday lives. It is worth noting at this point that (W1) is now focusing on the category of women and not the category of a close female friend. This presents (W3) with an opportunity, in line 25, to reinforce that women are a collective who share specialist knowledge on the dynamics of domestic violence. It is at this point that (W3) makes reference to a set of shared dispositions, which are seen to make these kinds of discussions about domestic violence possible. This reference reinforces how achieving 'a sense of place' is regulated by gender (Bourdieu, 1989). She notes in lines 26 and 27: *the amount of women when you speak say oh yes I know what you mean exactly I've been in relationships like that*. These kinds of relationships are then presented as reflectively related to issues of power and control. Here (W3) draws upon explanations underpinning the refuge movement. This connection reinforces the institutional structures operable in the refuge and the way they are embedded in everyday talk.

In line 33 (W1) then redirects the discussion to become an account of differences in descriptions because of different genders. She also redirects the discussion to become an account of differences in descriptions between close female and male friends. This is unlike the account previously offered by (W3). At this point (W1) claims that discussions with a man would be objective and certainly not as emotionally laden as with a woman—who would be a close female friend. It is also at this point that (W1) begins to distinguish between different types of women—not as a collective previously described by (W3). Thus, (W1) manages to refocus the discussion around the category of a close female friend and the category of a close male friend.

In line 39 this discussion is then intercepted by the male child support worker (W4). In this instance (W4) announces that his descriptions of the refuge would not alter according to gender because of who his friends are. Thus, he presents his friends as *different* because difference in descriptions of the refuge is not necessary. Indeed his friends are described as sensitive and capable of making different social and institutional connections in order to comprehend the refuge environment. The descriptive traits assigned by (W1) and (W3), partnered with the female gender, are appropriated by (W4) and described as the collective traits of his close friends (being both male and female). It is not until line 48 that he accounts for possible differences in descriptions of the refuge. These differences arise when descriptions are provided to his friends and those not considered his friends (assigned as people). It is here that gender is nominated a significant component in the descriptions of the refuge: *probably would talk differently if it was a women than if it was a man*. More specifically, from line 51 he reiterates previous accounts made by (W1) and (W3), whereby descriptions with women would be sensitive. Alternatively, descriptions with men

would be defensive. Thus, we come to understand that the procedure of reiterating female staff methods of talk as one's own is a tactic employed by (W4) in order to try and achieve 'a sense of place' and acquire particular social capital linguistically displayed by other female staff (Bourdieu, 1989). This is important because it highlights the way in which being a refuge member is accomplished.

A justification of the way (W4) manages interaction with men follows. This is loosely categorized as 'educational' or 'non-specific'. He concludes that each encounter is carefully evaluated in order to determine an appropriate way of linguistically managing the interaction. And it is in line 70 that (W4) then claims that this process is not confined to men but is applicable to 'some women'—obviously not his friends and indeed not all women—but special kinds of women. In line 75 (W1) then questions the way refuge staff are oriented to feminist ideals of 'liberation and independence'. Specifically she asks the focus group members if the notion that: *all men are bastards,* is an embodied phenomenon of refuge workers, and made explicit when discussing issues connected with domestic violence and close male friends. This is seen as the case by (W3), but not readily acknowledged by (W4), who has previously described the way he assigns particular discussion methods with different kinds of males.

These concluding lines highlight that the shared social capital that specific refuge staff hold is seen to be partially informed by the notion that: *all men are bastards.* Thus, managing the content of talk *and* how it is delivered is equated with the accumulation of social capital and achieving 'a sense of place'. The unsuccessful accumulation of this capital is explained in terms of gender and equates with 'a sense of place of others' (Bourdieu, 1989:19)

In this concluding section (W1) seeks to regulate the acquisition of social capital, by refining and defining it as exclusive. Thus, refuge talk acts as a gate-keeping mechanism, whereby achieving 'a sense of place' in the refuge is regulated through particular linguistic strategies (ibid.). Since (W4) is unable to acquire this social capital (whereby attempts to do so are counteracted by fellow staff) he is held accountable and his position as an authority of the refuge is contested. This inability to master the linguistic norm is described by Bourdieu as a '...permanent linguistic insecurity, the supervision and censorship of the dominant language exert a constant pressure on those who recognize it more than they can use it'. (Bourdieu, 1977a:656). It is (W4) in this instance who makes this process and the acquisition of social capital remarkable. And because of this, it is possible to understand that it is not 'gender' that is a routine accomplishment embedded in everyday interaction of refuge staff, but social capital underpinned by gender.

OVERALL DISCUSSION: THE MAINTENANCE OF A SENSE OF PLACE

Managing daily interaction and achieving 'a sense of place' in the refuge is a result of a particular set of relations (Bourdieu, 1989:19). Bourdieu describes this process by noting that:

> [p]ractical competence is learnt *in situations*, in practice: what is learnt is, inextricably, the practical mastery of language and the practical mastery of situations which enable one to produce adequate speech in a given situation. ... [Furthermore], the definition of acceptability is not in the situation but in the relation between a situation and a habitus which is itself the product of the whole history of its relationship with a particular system of selective reinforcements (Bourdieu, 1977a: 647, 655–656).

In this instance particular refuge staff engage with daily practices which are oriented to the management of talk because these are recognized and compatible with their existing language habitus. Bourdieu describes this kind of relationship by noting that:

> [w]e know, in general terms, that the effects that a new experience can have on the habitus depend on the relation of practical 'compatibility' between this experience and the experiences that have already been assimilated by the habitus, in the form of schemes of production and evaluation, and that, in the process of selective re-interpretation which results from this dialectic, the informative efficacy of all new experiences tends to diminish continuously. This linguistic 'sense of place' governs the degree of constraint which a given field will bring to bear on the production of discourse, imposing silence or a hypercontrolled language on some people whilst allowing others the liberties of a language that is securely established. This means that competence, which is acquired in a social context and through practice, is inseparable from the practical mastery of situations in which this usage of language is socially acceptable (Bourdieu, 1997:82).

The example of refuge talk provided here, demonstrates what ingredients constitute competence and the way these ingredients contribute to the construction of 'a sense of place' or 'a sense of place of others' in the refuge. It is argued that one of the key ingredients in achieving competence and being recognized as a refuge member is gender. As previously noted, the operational strategies of the refuge are embedded with feminist ideals, which are based upon perceived social inequalities. These ideals operate through the overarching rationale of empowerment, which aims to legitimize everyday practices of the refuge. In this instance refuge staff believe in the legitimacy of these ideals and in those who institute them. However, because this environment is informed by ideals bound to gender, participants like the male worker encounter difficulty when expected to recognize and comply with the specific demands of refuge practices. This is because acquiring 'a sense of place' is not simply confined to the acquisition of a linguistic habitus but, underpinned by a gendered habitus (Bourdieu, 1997). Thus, it is gender that informs the way language is managed

in the refuge and the probability of successfully acquiring social capital. Therefore, the refuge operates as an enabling mechanism for those with suitable habituses and a disabling mechanism for those without.

In this instance a gendered habitus is a prerequisite for managing talk in a particular way and the subsequent acquisition of social capital. In this way gender operates to ensure why some refuge staff achieve 'a sense of place' in the refuge and some staff achieve 'a sense of place of others'. Comprehending this process is made possible by examining talk whereby *different* genders participate. Specifically, by analyzing refuge talk it is possible to understand how particular linguistic strategies, informed by a gendered habitus, are considered fundamental components of the necessary socially inscribed manner in which staff participate in the practices of the refuge. In this setting gender regulates the way everyday discourses in the refuge are introduced, appropriated and managed. Here gender underpins the successful acquisition of social capital, which is embedded in the structures of daily interaction, and functions to govern who becomes invested with authority and who achieves 'a sense of place' in the refuge. As already described, this relationship is grounded in the development of a 'linguistic community' (Bourdieu, 1977:532).

CONCLUSION

By treating talk as strange it is possible to understand the way language is used to acquire and maintain social capital by staff with gendered habituses and how this process contributes to the construction of 'a sense of place'. The findings discussed here also provide a means to comprehend the way gender—a larger institutional structure—operates to regulate everyday practices and maintain an organization underpinned by feminist rationale. Goffman relates to the complexity of this set of relations:

> deep-seated institutional practices have the effect of transforming social situations into scenes for the performance of genderisms by both sexes, many of these performances taking a ritualized form which affirms beliefs about the differential human nature of the two sexes even while indications are provided as to how behavior between two sexes can be expected to be intermeshed (Goffman, 1977:325).

Thus, in the case of the refuge, gender is seen to play a pivotal and political role in disciplining staff and regulating the refuge population. An understanding of this process provides clarification of the 'interactional scaffolding' (West and Zimmerman, 1977:147) of the refuge and the way 'a sense of place' operates to maintain social order. In this instance a gendered habitus is the key to the maintenance of a common sense world.

NOTES

1. This reference to *independent living* is noted for instance in Loseke's discussion of strategies employed by refuges in America:

> [s]helter services are for the purpose of "resocializing" the battered woman. As explicitly defined, the goal of services is to produce "strong and independent women," a woman who is "emotionally independent," "emotionally detached from her husband," a woman who can "stand on her own two feet and make her own decisions," a woman who defines herself as "competent and autonomous" (Loseke, 1992:33).

2. In Australia, the refuge movement grew out of the women's liberation movement of the 1960s. This is largely acknowledged as a middle-class movement, which sought to liberate the working class. It was not until the 1970s however, that the women's refuge movement appeared. This movement was divided in its approach in addressing issues of domestic violence. These divisions are described as reformist and revolutionary. The reformist approach stressed the need to work within an existing framework, whereby gender equality was seen to be possible through 'piecemeal reforms'. The revolutionary approach stressed that social structures were embedded in a patriarchal framework and consequently reform was possible by working at a 'grassroots' level to *empower* women. The emphasis here was on the provision of refuges, rape crisis centres and so forth. The reformist and revolutionary approaches are credited with the movement's pursuit of two goals; the active campaigning to eliminate violence perpetrated against women in the home, and the provision of temporary accommodation and the production of independent women (Hopkins and McGregor, 1991).

3. Gender is "an activity of managing situated conduct in light of normative conceptions of attitude and activities appropriate for one's sex category. Gender activities emerge from and bolster claims to membership in a sex category" (West and Zimmerman, 1987:127).

4. Gail Jefferson is noted for her development of transcript conventions used to convey the details of conversation. "These conventions cannot reproduce what is on the audiotape or videotape but are meant to remind the reader of the details of the conduct that can be heard or seen on tape." (Pomerantz and Fehr 1997:70). Please see Appendix A for the transcription conventions used in this discussion at the conclusion of this paper.

5. On the notion of authority Bourdieu (1997:113) writes:

> ... ritual conditions that must be fulfilled in order for ritual to function and for sacrament to be both *valid* and *effective* are never sufficient as long as the conditions which produce the recognition of this ritual are not met: the language of authority never governs without the collabo-

> ration of those it governs, without the help of the social mechanisms capable of producing this complicity ... which is the case of all authority.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper is an outcome of a doctoral study situated at the Queensland University of Technology, Australia. I wish to thank the School of Design and Built Environment at this university for the resources they provided during the writing of this paper. I also wish to extend my thanks to the Queensland Government Department of Housing, Community Housing Division, for the provision of a research grant that supported teaching relief during the development of this paper. I am grateful for the opportunity to present an earlier version of this paper at the conference *Habitus 2000: A Sense of Place* at Curtin University, Perth, Australia. Finally, sincere thanks to the referees of this journal, who provided thoughtful comments.

REFERENCES

Beaudry, M. (1985) *Battered Women*. Montreal: Black Rose Books.

Bourdieu, P. (1977a) Economy of linguist exchanges. *Social Science Information*, 16:645–668.

——. (1977b) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——. (1989) Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological Theory*, 7:14–25.

——. (1990) *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

——. (1997) *Logic and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Dobash, E. and Dobash, R. (1991) *Women, Violence and Social Change*. London: Routledge.

Frankel, R. (1989) Microanalysis and the medical encounter. In Helm, D., Anderson, W., Meehan, A. and Rawls, A. (eds.) *The Interactional Order: New Directions in the Study of Social Order*. New York: Irvington Publishers, pp. 21–49.

Goffman, E. (1977) The arrangement between the sexes. *Theory and Society*, 4:301–31.

Hopkins, A. and McGregor, H. (1991) *Working for Change: The Movement Against Domestic Violence*. Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin.

Loseke, D. (1992) *The Battered Woman and Shelters: The Social Construction of Wife Abuse*. Albany: University of New York Press.

McNay, L. (1999) Gender, habitus and the field: Pierre Bourdieu and the limits of reflexivity. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 6:95–117.

Patel, R.A. (1994) temporary home: Designing sensitive domestic violence shelters. Masters Thesis, Urbana-Champaign: University of Illinois.

Pomeranz, A. and Fehr, B. (1997) Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practice. In Van Dijk, T.A. (ed.) *Discourse as Social Interaction: Discourse Studies—A Methodological Introduction, Vol. 2.* London: Sage Publications, pp. 64–91.

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

West, C. and Zimmerman, D. (1987) Doing gender. *Gender and Society*, 1:125–151.

APPENDIX A

Transcription Conventions

The transcript techniques and symbols used to portray conversational dialogue were devised by Gail Jefferson in the course of research undertaken with Harvey Sacks. These have since been revised. Nevertheless, they are typically used in conjunction with tape-recorded data and aim to convey an accurate account of the occasion. The following transcript techniques and symbols are used in the data presented in this paper:

.	indicates a small pause
(0.2)	indicates pause, silence, gaps or intervals in the stream of talk in tenths of a second
(2.0)	indicates pause, silence, gaps or intervals in the stream of talk in seconds
[	indicates simultaneous utterances
=	indicates latching or contiguous utterances
:::	indicates stretching sound immediately preceding, in proportion to number of colons inserted
please	indicates accent
<u>please</u>	indicates heavy accent
°happy°	indicates notable decrease in volume
.h	indicates an audible inhalation
h.	indicates an audible exhalation
( )	indicates something said but not transcribable
(word)	indicates probably what is said, but not clear
((cough))	indicates a description of some phenomenon
{location}	indicates confidential information revealed, such as address, name, etc.
W2	indicates referencing of refuge worker by name in conversation