THE SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE TOWARDS PRIVATE SCHOOL STUDENTS THROUGH THE *FRAME STEREOTYPE* IN BANTAENG DISTRICT OF INDONESIA

[1]Suardi, Andi Agustang, **[2]Jumadi**

Corresponding author: suardi@unismuh.ac.id

Abstract. *Private school actors, governments and the public commit symbolic violence against private school students through negative stereotype frames and construct positive stereotype frames for public school students in a social practice. The purpose of this study is to analyze the factors causing private school actors, government and society to commit symbolic violence against private school students through stereotype frames and find positive symbolic violence. This research was conducted using mixed methods concurrent embedded methods in 6 private schools and 6 public schools. Qualitative research informants as many as 43 people were determined using purposive sampling while quantitative research respondents as many as 301 people were determined using random sampling. Data collection was carried out using Likert and Gutman scale questionnaire sheets, direct observation sheets, structured interview sheets and document notes. Qualitative data that has been collected is analyzed through the stages of data reduction, data display then draws conclusions, while quantitative data are analyzed through the stages of verification, tabulation and percentage of data. The results showed that the accumulation of different capital (economic, social culture, baseball) became the deciding factor of public schools as the dominant class and private schools as a popular class with religious capital which had an impact on the dominance of public school classes over private schools in the social sphere (education) which forms a social practice. Symbolic violence is carried out through the mechanism of positive stereotype frames for public school students and negative stereotype frames for private school students. Symbolic violence does not always have negative implications but also has positive / constructive implications because students and private school actors make stereotypes as motivation in fighting (the realm) to form new habitus towards more positive changes in social practices by optimizing religious capital possessed.*

Keywords: Symbolic Violence, private school students, Frame Stereotypes.

1. INTRODUCTION

Every society has the power, knowledge capital, economic, cultural, social, symbol) in an arena (*fiel*) which form a social practice (Bourdieu, F 1993), although they differ from one another. Individuals and social classes need symbolic power as the power of power to live, change and shape life without having to carry out symbolic violence (García-Villegas, M. 2003).

However, research shows that the most special society in the world of Education is inseparable from symbolic violence because of the possession of symbolic power from dominant classes such as symbolic violence towards students (Powell & Dylan Smith Abigail, 2017) (Nairz-Wirth et al., n.d.) (Reynolds, 2017) (Mangera & Simega, n.d.) (R Waters, n.d.) (Ebadi & Zamani, 2018) (Archer et al., 2018) (Brown, 1971) (McGillicuddy et al., n.d.) (Marsh, 2018) (Cheryl Reynolds, 2018) (Gast, 2018) (Tola, 2018) (Roumbanis, 2019). . Symbolic violence is carried out by dominant classes that have the power of symbols in various ways such as popular music (Powell & Dylan Smith Abigail, 2017), learning or lectures (Reynolds, 2017) , (Mang era & Simega, nd), (McGillicuddy et al., nd) , (Gast,

2018) , (Tola, 2018) , (Roumbanis, 2019) , Education systems or school management (Richard Waters, 2017), (Archer et al., 2018) , (Marsh, 2018) , (Coles & Powell, 2020), predatory journal (Coles & Powell, 2020). social space (Coles & Powell, 2020), labeling (Marsh, 2018) and race and class classification (Gast, 2018).

One of the achievements of symbolic power can be achieved through the contestation of discourse, namely the production, distribution and reproduction of discourse on a reality (P Bourdieu, 1991). The winning discourse becomes a *doxa* and there is a discourse that maintains the existence of *orthodoxy* , while the losing discourse becomes *heterodoxy* (Bourdieu, P. 1994). Discourse contestation is done through *stereotype frames* between various parties that contest each other . *Heterodoxy* as a losing discourse owned by a dominated class requires an empowerment towards a change.

Symbolic violence and discourse contestation also occur in private school students in Bantaeng Regency, based on the results of the researchers' initial observations (1) symbolic violence occurred against private school students due to capital (economic, social culture, symbols) , social class, habitus, power and symbolic violence in a social context (habitus x social capital + domain).

The mechanism of symbolic violence by the dominant class is through *the stereotype frame* . *Stereotype frames* are the process of labeling an entity by producing, distributing and reproducing discourse carried out by actors or institutions that have power, knowledge or capital. Public school actors have relations with the government and the community to form *orthodoxy* discourse with superior school stereotype frames and carry out symbolic violence against private school students, while private school actors construct heterodoxy discourse as a counter discourse with religious-based school stereotype frames to counter the hegemony of the power of private schools.

The study of symbolic violence so far has only revolved around the school arena which is antologically limited to relations in the school arena (internal). In contrast to the research that will be carried out into the space of critical paradigm through the analysis of symbolic violence, legal contestation , and *stereotypical frames* between private schools and public schools as a form of symbolic violence carried out by state school actors, government and society (external schools) through production, distribution and reproduction of discourse in the form of *stereotype frames* .

There are a number of factors that form the basis of research *(basic research),* namely (1) social background, namely changes in society that are more fanatical about state schools and discriminatory against private schools. (2) Intellectual background, namely the construction of a movement for change towards class equality between students / private schools and State students / schools through the mission of change and empowerment. (3) The research background is (a) the absence of pierre Bourdieu's theory in seeing positive symbolic violence. Symbolic violence can be positive if the actor makes symbolic violence as motivation in fighting (the realm) to form new habitus and ultimately towards more positive changes (social practices) by optimizing the capital owned

Based on the *problem statement* of this study are (1) symbolic violence occurred against private school students from State school actors , government and society, sociologically ontologically making *frames* stereotyping / labeling, domination, symbolic violence and discourse contestation as *areas of knowledge* and methodological ontologies looking at social reality in micro-macro, structure-factors, subject-objects, (2) the construction of *stereotyped frames* by State school actors, government and society towards private school students, in epistemology sociology uses a critical paradigm (practical : analysis and action) and research epistemology using the *mixed method* paradigm (qualitative-quantitative), (3) Private school students need to be empowered by providing awareness so as not to get symbolic violence from State school actors, government and society, axiologically producing sociological values, namely positive symbolic violence.

2. THEORITICAL REVIEW

According to Bourdieu in the social arena, social battles always occur. Groups that have the same capital and habitus as most individuals will be more able to take action to maintain or change the structure compared to those who do not have capital (P Bourdieu, 1984). Bourdieu further stated

that the arena is also the arena of battle "The field is also the field of struggle" (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). Thus, in a battle some win, some lose. The winning discourse becomes doxa,

while the losing discourse becomes heterodoxy. The discourse that continues to maintain the existence of doxa, namely orthodoxy in charge of maintaining the integrity of doxa. Generally, orthodoxy consists of dominant groups in power and always maintains discourse related to the interests of the group and is always in direct opposition to the dominated group. While on the other hand there are parties or groups that are always building discourses that are contrary to doxa, namely heterodoxy. The opposition between orthodoxy and heterodoxy occurs in the money r called Bourdieu and the universe of discourse (P Bourdieu, 1977). In the context of symbolic violence in the discourse contestation of private school students in Bantaeng Regency, the discourse contestation is played by four main actors, namely the government , State school Actors, Private school Actors, and communities around the area of Private schools and public schools that each produce, distributing and reproducing discourse. *Stereotype* is the process of generalizing a whole class of phenomena based on a little knowledge gained from the class members (Wood, W., & Neal, DT 2009). *The stereotype* itself means giving a standard image or label / stamp to a person or group based on an incorrect or misguided assumption (Child, DBP). Eriyanto (2011) mentions that there are 4 practices of using language as a discourse strategy of marginalization among stereotypes. Stereotypes can be negative and positive (Angraini, 2011), which are constructed by the community (Dyer, R 2002) through the process of categorization, prominent stimuli, schematic processes and semiotics (Krech, D., & Crutchfield, R. S 1948) . The stereotype of a given dimension direction (*direction*), intensity (*intensity* , accuracy (*accuracy*) and content (*content*) (Samovar, 2009).

3. RESEARCH METHODS

This research uses *mixed methods.* Model *mixed methods concurrent embedded.* In this study the first stage uses qualitative research methods and the second stage uses quantitative research methods simultaneously or together but with different weights. The research site or research location in general is in Bissappu District, Bantaeng Regency, which has 6 private schools and 6 public schools. The qualitative meto instrument uses the researcher as the main instrument by using a checklist of observation guidelines, interview guidelines, documentation sheets, photo or video cameras and recording devices. Whereas the quantitative method uses a validated questionnaire i. The qualitative informant method of the researcher used 43 *purposive sampling* consisting of government, community leaders, state school students, public school teachers, public school principals, public school alumni, private school students, private school teachers , private school principals and private school alumni . Whereas the respondents of the quantitative method research used *simple random sampling technique* which amounted to 301 out of 1221 population. Primary data obtained directly such as data from interviews, questionnaires and observations, while secondary data is data obtained from documents related to research. Data collection techniques used were the distribution of closed model   questionnaires,   direct   observation,   guided   interviews, field records and documentation. Qualitative data analysis was carried out through the stages of data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing , while quantitative data analysis data used questionnaire verification, tabulated questionnaire data and percentage of questionnaire data . The validity of qualitative data uses source triangulation, time triangulation and method triangulation, while quantitative data go through the reliability test (accuracy) and validation test (correct).

DISCUSSION

1. Factors That Cause Symbolic Violence
   Symbolic violence against private school students occurs due to several factors, namely:
 a. The ownership of economic capital is different between private schools and public schools. Different economic capital includes (1) ownership of facilities, which are tools directly related to learning such as classrooms and learning facilities and infrastructure such as ceremonial courts, sports fields and reading parks, (2) ownership of material or money owned by public schools more compared to private schools because the material or money owned is

highly dependent on the allocation of school operational assistance funds (BOS) which are adjusted to the number of students in each school.

b. Different social capital ownership between private and public schools. M orking different social includes (1) a public school has a relationship with the government or the tissue is very good because the public schools are government owned schools while the private sector is owned by a foundation or organization that does not have a close relationship such as state schools. (2) public schools have a relationship or network with community leaders through public school alumni community leaders or parents of public school students while private schools also have relationships or networks with religious leaders such as religious teachers . (3) public schools and private schools collectively gather in a community such as the principal work group (MKKS) for school principals, subject teachers' deliberations (MGMP) for teachers but there is no specific community for cross-school students but only in the internal school community. However, private schools still have a community or group based on a foundation or organization that houses the school, such as the Muhammadiyah school community, the Nahdlatul Ulama school community, the Wahdah Islamiah school community among all community members who know each other. So that in terms of quantity private schools have more social capital compared to public schools.

c. The ownership of cultural capital is different between public schools and private schools. Different cultural capital includes (1) the knowledge and skills possessed by public school actors are better because they have professional educators with PNS teacher indicators and are certified compared to private school actors. Whereas for public school students have more general knowledge with indicators of participation and the acquisition of champions or medals in each race. (2) attitudes held by public school students are better in the aspect of disciplinary attitude compared to private school students. (3) The performance of public school students is better and neater compared to private school students, although each school has rules, but the enforcement of different student disciplines that affect student performance.

d. Different symbolic capital ownership between public schools and private schools. Different symbolic capitals include (1) prestige or public appreciation of schools or public school students in general are more valued in the community compared to private schools because they have a good image in society such as superior schools while private schools are still in the process of building a good image because many private schools are known as disposal schools. (2) the status or position of public schools is generally higher in the community than private schools because it is supported by the image of a superior school owned.

I am mastering capital control by public schools covering economic, social, cultural and symbolic capital, so that public schools through capital accumulation are better and have the opportunity to carry out symbolic violence against private schools because their economic , social, cultural and symbolic capital contributes to symbolic violence (Huot, S. 2017). Ownership of capital is able to maintain and change structure (Bourdieu, 1984) because symbols have power (Bourdieu 1991). In addition, having economic, social and cultural and symbolic models encourages a strong sense of entitlement to privileges (Xu, CL 2017) including a sense of being entitled to a better status in the eyes of society.

2. **Religious capital as New Capital**

The ownership of religious capital is different between public schools and private schools. Different religious capital includes (1) public trust in private schools as schools that can teach their children to be children who have a higher religious understanding compared to public schools, (2) Spiritual leadership carried out in the community is dominated by actors. private school actors compared to public school actors such as mosque priests, preachers during the holy month of Ramadan, Friday preaching sermons, preachers on Eid al- Fitr and Eid al-Adha, preachers of h takziah , preachers of weddings. Religion becomes a symbol that has the power to monopolize and yet retains cultural capital as stated by Bourdieu (Rogers & Swartz, 1999), even though (Mulkan, nd2013) includes the religious community capital as social capital.

3. Domination of Quality and Quantity

The dominance of public schools over private schools occurs because of two factors, namely mastery over quantity and mastery of quality. Power over quantity is because public schools have more students, teachers, education personnel, more schools, alumni than private schools. While the power of quality because it has better quality planning, process, results and graduates compared to private schools because it is supported by very adequate school education standards. Public schools as the dominant class have power over private schools through the accumulation of capital owned, giving rise to embryos of symbolic violence in the form of stereotyping of private school students and even stereotypes for actors and private schools. the dominance of public schools over private schools through the mastery of quantity and quality, which has an impact on domination and subordination in the world of Education (Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992).

Different mastery of capital makes different habitus between private schools and public schools, different habitus makes different behaviors, because despite the *habitual* inherent in the entity (Bo urdieu in Fashri, Fausi, 2014), it eventually becomes physical behavior (Wattimena, R A 2012) such as high-discipline learning habits, practice-based learning and neat teacher and student performances .

4. Types of domination

In the Bissappu sub-district of Bantaeng Regency there are various types of dominance, namely (a) the type of domination of the dominant class of state schools over other public schools, (b) the type of dominance of the dominant class of state schools over private schools, (c) the type of dominant class of private schools over state schools, (d) the type of dominant class of private schools over other private schools. However, among all types of dominance found, the dominant type of domination of state schools over private schools is the highest in the community . Public schools as the dominant class in the fight with private schools in an arena (feil) of education do the imposition of habitus by making public schools an example in creating good learning habits and administering best educational practices. Domination is used to explain interpersonal power relations or between forms of power as well as power in education (Pierre Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). Domination is very closely related to symbolic violence, because symbolic violence has the aim to control and dominate others (Grimaldi & Serpieri, 2015).

5. The realm of symbolic violence

The mechanism of symbolic violence against private school students is carried out through the realm of feel in the Bissappu District region and Bantaeng Regency in general as an arena of battle with the aim of occupying dominance, maintaining, changing domination or fighting over dominance. In the process of strengthening the power of anyone can be discriminated against (Quinones, JA 2017) in the arena of battle, both private and public school actors. The battle arena as " *The field is also the field of struggle* " (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992) and the arena of struggle (Bourdieu (1984). For state school actors in Bissappu District specifically state schools have occupied dominance as *high level* schools and continue to maintain dominance towards private schools by continuing to maintain the public image of public schools as superior schools as one of the symbolic capital of public schools, symbolic capital is one of the capital used by the dominant class to maintain dominance (Topper, nd2003), while for private school actors continue to make efforts changing domination through increasing the superiority of each private school with the aim of seizing domination that has been held by public schools, private schools want to be even better than state schools, taking part in the arena of battle between private school actors and public school actors from 301 respondents.

Realm (feel) as a battle arena

Respondent type	Public schools occupy dominance		Private schools want to change dominance		Public schools maintain dominance		Private schools fight for dominance		Total Respondents
	Yes	Not	Yes	Not	Yes	Not	Yes	Not	
Government	6	1	5	2	7	0	4	3	7
Public school students	160	5	150	15	165	0	90	75	165
Public school teacher	4	0	3	1	4	0	2	2	4
Head of state school	4	0	3	1	4	0	2	2	4
Public school alumni	3	0	3	0	3	0	2	1	3
Private school students	90	16	102	4	106	0	80	26	106
Private school teacher	3	1	4	0	3	1	4	0	4
Principal of a private school	3	1	4	0	3	1	4	0	4
Private school alumni	2	2	4	0	4	0	4	0	4
Total Response	275	26	278	23	299	2	192	109	301
Percentage (%)	91,37	8.63	92.36	7.64	99.33	.67	63.79	36.21	100

6. Symbolic violence through the imposition of ideology and the imposition of habitus

Public schools as a dominant school against private schools, through their actors do (a) coercion of state school ideology that is the goal that is characteristic of public schools that is only to build schools to educate young people , which is different from the goals of private schools in addition to educate the children of the nation also has an economic goal that is to get income from educational activities carried out. As stated by Bourdieu about the use of the idea of ology as a symbol of violence to get approval from the dominated class (Rogers & Swartz, 1999), (b) the imposition of habitus or the ability of public schools against private schools in practicing education in schools, because public schools always used as a reference in conducting better educational practices. Although the imposition of ideology and habitus is legitimate in the eyes of private school actors and *unconsciously* (Jenkins, 1992), because economic orientation can damage the quality of schools and references to educational practices can damage the characteristics of private schools that are different from public schools. The following is the percentage of symbolic violence against students from 301 respondents.

Forms of symbolic violence against private school students a										
Respondent type	Coercive ideology (school goals)					Forced habitus (Quality educational practices)					Total Respondents
	SS	S.	K	J	TP	SS	S.	K	J	TP	
Government	4	2	1	0	0	3	2	1	1	0	7
Public school students	44	40	38	25	18	46	42	37	26	14	165
Public school teacher	2	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	4
Head of state school	2	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	4
Public school alumni	2	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Private school students	27	27	25	16	11	38	25	24	19	0	106

Private school teacher	2	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	4
Principal of a private school	2	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	4
Private school alumni	2	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4
Total Response	87	77	67	41	29	99	76	66	46	14	301
Percentage (%)	28.90	25.58	22.25	13.62	9.63	32.89	25.24	21.92	15.28	4.65	100

7. Symbolic violence through stereotypes

Stereotypes used by different classes have done a lot of symbolic violence (Uenal, 2016), each actor represents, justifies and reinforces stereotypes which are a form of symbolic violence or symbolic violence by planting stereotypes (Ditya Perdana, 2014.) and vice versa symbolic violence can give birth to stereotypes (Personal F, 2016.). Through the dominant class power possessed by public school actors become the embryos of public school actors committing violent acts against private school students in social life. symbolic violence is reproduced in daily interactions, practices and daily dispositions (Khanal, P. 2017), through the mechanism of (a) state school actors giving a negative label or label to private school students (out groups), (b) actors public schools give a positive stamp or label to state school students (ingroup), (c) state school actors give a negative stamp or label to students (individuals) and private schools (groups).

Liliweri, A (2009) *stereo tip* has three basic principles which are categorization, heredity and the same characteristics, characteristics, habits of action. Like the stereotype given by public school actors to private school students, is a process of character categorization that applies to all private schools, carried on from generation to generation by public school actors for generations, given to students of private schools and private schools.

The stereotypes given by state school actors to private school students such as *pasikola* (students who go to school in the afternoon), *muhammadon* (students who follow the muhammadiyah religion), *private* students (only private / degrading school students), Christian school students (students who goes to school on Sundays). Whereas the stereotype given by state school actors to private schools is a disposal school, a *private* school (only private / degrading schools), Christian schools (schools have school activities on Sundays). Stereotype means insulting students and private schools, discriminating against students and private schools, damaging the good image of students and schools.

The stereotype for public school students is good students, smart students and high achieving students, while stereotypes for public schools are the best schools, superior schools and government schools. Negative stereotypes adversely affect stereotypes (Rydell et al., 2010), unfavorable (Sánchez Palacios et al., 2009) and imbalances (Vertinsky, 2016) although negative stereotypes have positive effects if they can be directed (Seibt & Förster, 2009) 2004).

Positive stereotypes for students and public schools provide a picture of the condition of private school students and private school groups, be a positive image for groups, help students and school actors behave with others and be a reference for students and state school actors in assessing the condition of their groups. Whereas negative stereotypes for students and private schools are very dangerous for students and the continuity of private schools, are insulting to students and private schools, discriminatory against students and private schools, damage the good image of students and schools.

the stereotypes given are mostly negative, the stereotypes given positively for students of public and state schools (ingroup) and negative for students of private schools and private schools (outgroups).

8. Stereotype variant in symbolic violence

Stereotypes of private school students consist of positive and negative stereotypes with constructive and deconstructive goals and have constructive and deconstructive results for private school students, namely:

No.	Type of stereotype	Purpose of stereotypes	Stereotype results	Actor Actions
	Negative Stereotype	Deconstructive	Deconstructive	The stereotype given by public school actors to private school students is negative and has the purpose of destroying (deconstructive), by private school actors considered as truth so that it follows the stereotypes given by state school actors (deconstructive).
		Deconstructive	Constructive	The stereotype given by public school actors to private school students is negative and has the purpose of destroying (deconstructive), by private school actors is considered as motivation to improve themselves so that they fight in the realm (fiel) to form new habitus, towards better change in a social practice Education in schools (constructive).
	Positive stereotypes	Constructive	Deconstructive	The stereotype given by state school actors to private school students is positive and has a constructive purpose, by private school actors being seen as a lie so that they do not follow the stereotypes given by public school actors (deconstructive).
		Constructive	Constructive	The stereotype given by state school actors to private school students is positive and has a constructive purpose, by private school actors being seen as motivation to improve themselves so that they fight in the realm (fiel) to form new habitus, towards better change in a social practice Education in schools (constructive).

The construction of stereotypes given by state school actors to students and private schools is based on the social values of people who love the quality of graduates so that they are fanatical about public schools and discriminatory against private schools, the stereotypes given by state school actors are followed by students and the community as a truth, even though there are private school students and private school actors who reject the stereotypes given by public

school actors. The stereotype construction that is given by state school actors to students and private schools (a) has negative and if negative direction dimensions , favored and disliked by students and private school actors, (b) has a intensity that is rarely and often is often done by school actors public, (c) has a dimension of determination because there are stereotypes that are right, wrong and half right both for private schools and for public schools, (d) have dimensions of content because the stereotypes given are specific to students or private schools and there are also stereotypes which is general for all students of private schools and private schools . The stereotype construction given by public school actors to students and private schools has a positive impact on students and private school actors because there are actors making negative stereotypes as motivation in fighting (the realm) forming new habitus and ultimately leading to more positive changes (social practice) with optimize capital owned by private school students and private schools in undergoing the education process.

CONCLUSION

Symbolic violence against private school students occurs because of ownership of economic capital , social culture, public school symbols that are different from private schools , the stratification of public schools as *high level* schools while private schools as *low level* schools *,* the dominance of public schools over private schools through mastery of quantity and quality, the existence of different habitus between public and private schools, the existence of different social classes between private schools and public schools, public schools as the dominant class and private schools as popular classes. The real feel of the Bissappu District and Bantaeng Regency in general as an arena of battle with the aim of occupying dominance, changing dominance or maintaining or fighting over dominance. Public schools as dominant schools through their actors commit symbolic violence through the imposition of ideology and habitus . Public school actors provide a negative label or label for private and private school students and a positive label or label for public and state school students which negatively impacts private school and private school students and positively impacts public and state school students, even though there are actors making negative stereotypes as motivation in fighting (the realm) forming new habitus and ultimately towards more positive change (social practices) by optimizing the capital owned by private school students and private schools in undergoing the education process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archer, L., Francis, B., Miller, S., Taylor, B., Tereshchenko, A., Mazenod, A., Pepper, D., & Travers, M.-C. (2018). The symbolic violence of setting: A Bourdieusian analysis of mixed methods data on secondary students' views about settings. *Wiley Online Library* , *44* (1), 119-140. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3321

Child, DBP (2011). Regulation of the Minister of State for the Empowerment of Women and the Protection of Children of the Republic of Indonesia, Number 10 of 2011 concerning Policies on Handling Children with Special Needs

Anggraini, A. (2014). Understanding the Existence and Adaptation of Batak Ethnic Communities in Semarang City. *The Messenger Journal* , *6* (1), 22-28.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice* . https://www.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Hbw2AAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT7&dq=Bourdieu ,+P.+(1977).+Outline+of+a+Theory+of+Practice+(Vol.+ 16). + Cambridge + university + press. & Ots = uUjPHs56u4 & sig = ImgbatI_jbj6RFTBr_cyXkfQvUg

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* . https://www.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=u2ZlGBiJntAC&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=Bourdieu ,+Fieree.+(1991).+Language+and+Symbolic+Power.+Cambridge:+Polity+Pressge : + Polity + Press. & Ots = lnbn1KNApO & sig = eQTtI1nvXj9wKQpngDaqlAyC-mY

Bou rdieu, Pierre, & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* .

Brown, A. (1971). Original Contributions. *The Australian Journal of Optometry*, *54* (2), 36–37. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1444-0938.1971.tb00039.x

Cheryl Reynolds, U. (20 18). *Digital Hiatus: Symbolic violence in an online social learning network for master's level students at a UK* . http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/en/eprint/34603/

Coles, JA, & Powell, T. (2020). A BlackCrit analysis on Black urban youth and suspension disproportionality as anti-Black symbolic violence. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, *23* (1), 113–133. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2019.1631778

Ditya Perdana, D. (nd). *Gender stereotypes in the Anna Karenina Film* .

Dyer, R. (2002). *Only entertainment* . Psychology Pres s.

Ebadi, S., & Zamani, G. (2018). Predatory publishing as a case of symbolic violence: A critical English for academic purposes approach. *Cogent Education* , *5* (1), 1–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1501889

Gast, MJ (2018). "They Give Teachers a Hard Time": Symbolic Violence and Intersections of Race and Class in Interpretations of Teacher-Student Relations. *Sociological Perspectives* , *61* (2), 257-275. https://doi.org/10.1177/0731121418756044

Grimaldi, E., & Serpieri, R. (2015). *Positionality, symbolic violence and reflexivity: Researching the educational strategies of marginalized groups Positionality, symbolic violence and reflexivity: researching the educational strategies of marginalised groups To quote this text: This c . May 2016* .

Krech, D. , & Crutchfield, RS (1948). The field and problems of social psychology.

SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE OF MASS MEDIA . (nd). Retrieved June 12, 2020, from www.pojoksatu.com

Mangera, E., & Simega, B. (nd). EUFEMISATION AS FORM OF SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE ON LEARNING IN VOCATIONAL SCHOOL, MAKALE TANA TORAJA VOCATIONAL SCHOOL . In *journal.unismuh.ac.id* . Retrieved June 15, 2020, from www.journal.unismuh.ac.id/perspektif

Marsh, LTS. (2018). Symbolic Violence: School-Imposed Labeling in a "No-Excuses" Charter School. *Perspectives on Urban Education* , *15* (1), 1–8. http://proxy.library.tamu.edu/login?url=http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=1361928 25 & site = eds-live

McGillicuddy, D., Education, DD-T. and T., & 2018, undefined. (nd). "Turned off" or "ready to fly" - Ability grouping as an act of symbolic violence in primary school. *Elsevier* . Retrieved June 15, 2020, from https: //www.sciencedirect.c om / science / article / pii / S0742051X17306066

Mulkan, D. (nd). *(Private Television Program Cases in Indonesia)* . 19–32.

Nairz-Wirth, E., ... KF-EE, & 2017, undefined. (nd). Habitus conflicts and experiences of symbolic violence as obstacles for non- traditional students. *Journals.Sagepub.Com* . Retrieved June 15, 2020, from https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1474904116673644

Powell, B., & Dylan Smith Abigail, GD (2017). Education 3-13 International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Yea rs Education 1 Views 0 CrossRef citations 0 Altmetric Original Articles Challenging symbolic violence and hegemony in music education through contemporary pedagogical approaches. *Taylor & Francis* , *45* (6), 734-743. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2017.13471 29

Reynolds, C. (2017). *Suffering and symbolic violence in online social learning networks* . http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/en/eprint/32463

Rogers, MF, & Swartz, D. (1999). Culture and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu. *Contemporary Sociology* , *28* (2), 234 . https://doi.org/10.2307/2654908

Roumbanis, L. (2019). Symbolic Violence in Academic Life: A Study on How Junior Scholars are Educated in the Art of Getting Funded. *Minerva* , *57* (2), 197-218. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-018-9364-2

Rydell, RJ, Rydell, MT, & Boucher, KL (2010). The Effect of Negative Performance Stereotypes on Learning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* , *99* (6), 883–896. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021139

Sánchez Palacios, C., Trianes Torres, MV, & Blanca Mena, MJ (20 09). Negative aging stereotypes and their relations with psychosocial variables in the elderly population. *Archives of Gerontology and Geriatrics* , *48* (3), 385–390. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archger.2008.03.007

Seibt, B., & Förster, J. (2004). There at and performance stereotypes: How self-stereotypes influence processing by inducing regulatory foci. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* , *87* (1), 38–56. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.1.38

Samovar, LA, Porter, RE, Stefani, LA, & Sidabalok, I. M. (2010). *Cross-cultural communication* . Salemba Humanika.

Tola, A. (2018). The Euphemization as the Mechanism of Symbolic Violence of the Teachers in Classroom Interaction: Case Study at Public Madrasah Tsanawiyah of Manado in Indonesia. *International Journal of Language & Literature* , *6* (2). https://doi.org/10.15640/ijll.v6n2a15

Topper, K. (nd). Not So Trifling Nuances: Pierre Bourdieu, Symbolic Violence, and the Perversions of Democracy. In *Taylor & Francis* . Retrieved June 11, 2020, from https: //www.tandfonl ine.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1360312032000150779

Uenal, F. (2016). The "Secret Islamization" of Europe: Exploring integrated threat theory for predicting Islamophobic conspiracy stereotypes. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* , *10* (1), 93-108. https://doi.org/10.4119/UNIBI/ijcv.499

Vertinsky, PA (2016). Stereotypes of Aging Women and Exercise: A Historical Perspective. *Journal of Aging and Physical Activity* , *3* (3), 223–237. https://doi.org/10.1123/japa.3.3.223

Waters, R. (nd). S ymbolic non-violence in the work of teachers in alternative education settings. *Taylor & Francis* . Retrieved June 15, 2020, from https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10476210.2016.1210593

Waters, Richard. (2017). Symbolic non-violence in the work of teachers in alternative education settings. *Teaching Education* , *28* (1), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2016.1210593