



Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Mamangan
Volume 12, Issue 1, January-June 2023

Symbolic Violence Through Negative Stereotypes Against Private School Students in Bantaeng Regency

Author (s) : Suardi Suardi

Source : Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Mamangan, Volume 12, Issue 1, January-June 2023

Publisher : Sociology Education Department of PGRI University West Sumatra

To Cite This Article:

Suardi Suardi, 2023. Symbolic Violence Through Negative Stereotypes Against Private School Students in Bantaeng Regency. Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Mamangan, Volume 12, Issue 1, January-June, 2023: 317-326.

Copyright © 2023, Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Mamangan
ISSN: 2301-8496 (*Print*) & 2503-1570 (*Online*)

Sociology Education Department of
PGRI University, West Sumatra





Symbolic Violence Through Negative Stereotypes Against Private School Students in Bantaeng Regency

Suardi Suardi

Sociology Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, Indonesia

Email: suardi@unismuh.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The research problem is that there is symbolic violence against private school students through negative stereotypes. The purpose of this research is to analyze negative stereotypes towards private school students as a means of symbolic violence. The theory used in this study is Bourdieu's theory of symbolic violence. This research was conducted using a mixed concurrent embedded method in 10 private schools and 6 public schools. 43 qualitative research informants were determined using purposive sampling while 301 quantitative research respondents were determined using random sampling. Data collection used Likert and Gutman scale questionnaires, direct observation sheets, structured interview sheets and documents. The qualitative data that has been collected is analyzed through the stages of data reduction, data presentation and then drawing conclusions, while the quantitative data is analyzed through the stages of verification, tabulation and data percentages. The results of the study show that symbolic violence occurs due to negative stereotypes of students and private school actors by public school actors who have accumulated capital, power in the world of education. The conclusion of the study is that symbolic violence can be done through negative stereotypes. The novelty of this research is symbolic violence through negative stereotypes (individuals-groups) with capital accumulation (economic, cultural, social, religious and symbolic).

Keyword: Symbolic Violence; Stereotypes; Private Schools.

INTRODUCTION

Violence is a term that refers to an event that is horrific, frightening, painful, or even deadly Suardi et al., (2020b); Siska et al., (2022). The phenomenon of violence today has colored almost all aspects of people's lives, from politics, culture, to education. such as cases of child sexual abuse (Nursalam et al., 2018), symbolic violence against students , symbolic violence against students (Maulana, 2021) symbolic violence in teacher work (alternative education settings) (Waters, 2017), violence in gender stereotypes (Serrano-Barquín et al., 2018); (Yahiaoui, 2022), symbolic

violence in the teacher-student relationship (Gast, 2018); (Toshalis, 2010), symbolic violence in academic life (Roumbanis, 2019); (Ebadi & Zamani, 2018); (Roumbanis, 2019); (Rowlands, 2015), symbolic violence in classroom interactions (Ardianto, 2018), symbolic violence in grouping students' abilities (McGillicuddy & Devine, 2018), symbolic violence against ethnic minority students (Khanal, 2017).

This shows that violence is a very serious problem that occurs in the world of education, not only physical and psychological violence but also in the form of symbolic violence (Ebadi & Zamani,

2018). Violence is a form of social problem that must be overcome (Nursalam et al., 2016), because it is part of social deviation. The concept of symbolic violence to explain the mechanisms used by upper class groups that dominate the social structure of society to "impose" their ideology, culture, habits, or lifestyle on the lower class groups they control (Powell et al., 2017).

Symbolic violence is a model of cultural and social domination that occurs unconsciously in people's lives which includes discriminatory acts against groups perpetrated by actors or institutions that have power, knowledge, capital in an arena, the accumulation of which forms social practices .

Based on the results of observations, documentation and initial interviews with researchers in Bissappu District, Bantaeng Regency, researchers saw various social phenomena which were indications of the forerunners of symbolic violence, namely stereotypes against private school students. Stereotypes are part of symbolic violence (Oliveira et al., 2021); (Angeliqa & Sarwono, 2018).

Whereas every society has economic, cultural, social capital (symbols) in an arena (field) that shapes social practices (Angeliqa & Sarwono, 2018). Individuals and social classes need the power of symbols as a capital of power to live, change and shape life without having to use symbolic violence (Gast, 2018).

State schools that have social capital, cultural capital, economic capital and symbolic capital so that they carry out symbolic violence against private school students through stereotypes as part of symbolic violence (Oliveira et al., 2021); (Angeliqa & Sarwono, 2018). To analyze stereotypes as a means of symbolic violence, the researcher uses Pierre Bourdieu's theory of symbolic violence (Khanal, 2017) and stereotypes (Rydell et al., 2010)(Oliveira et al., 2021).

Previous research shows that society, especially the world of education, cannot be separated from symbolic violence such as student symbolic violence in the lecture process through stereotypes (Rashid et al., 2022), violence against students in the educational process at school (Doshi, 2021), Symbolic violence through English (Sah, 2022), through student grouping (McGillicuddy & Devine, 2018), through labeling (Trenton, 2018), through music (Powell et al., 2017), through academic life (Roumbanis, 2019), through the Discuss policya (Li & Xiao, 2020), through a contemporary pedagogical approach (Powell & Dylan Smith Abigail, 2017), through skin color classification (Coles, 2016), through discipline (Toshalis, 2010), through women's soccer (Grice et al., 2023), through the objective structure (Torres & Ubeda, 2015), through racial contact (Gast, 2018), through religious domination, symbolic violence through school domination, through the dominance of quality and quantity. All the results of these studies show that symbolic violence can occur in the world of education.

However, what distinguishes the results of this study is the existence of symbolic violence through stereotypes against private school students which has never been studied by previous researchers, so this research is research that produces "original" findings. This is important to research because this research will provide several contributions, including contributions to existing research in the realm of negative stereotypes towards students.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research uses mixed research methods (mixed methods). Mixed methods concurrent embedded model (Creswell, 2017), is a combination of positivistic and post-positivistic paradigms (Nursalam et al., 2016), In this research, the first stage uses qualitative research methods and the second

stage uses quantitative research methods simultaneously or together but with different weights. The research location or research location is generally in Bissappu District, Bantaeng Regency, which has 6 private schools and 6 public schools. The qualitative method 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 (Serrano-Barquín et al., 2018). While the quantitative method uses a validated questionnaire. Informants using qualitative research methods used purposive sampling totaling 43 consisting of government, community leaders, public school students, public school teachers, public school principals, public school alumni, private school students, private school teachers, private school principals and private school alumni. Meanwhile, the respondents of the quantitative research method used a simple random sampling technique, which amounted to 301 of the 1221 total population. Primary data is obtained directly such as data from interviews, questionnaires and observations, while secondary data is data obtained from documents related to research. The data collection technique used is the distribution of closed model questionnaires, direct observation, guided interviews, field notes and documentation. Qualitative data analysis was carried out through the stages of data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing (Trenton, 2018), while quantitative data analysis used questionnaire verification, tabulation of questionnaire data and percentage of questionnaire data. The validity of qualitative data uses source triangulation, time triangulation and method triangulation, while quantitative data uses reliability tests (accuracy) and validation tests (true) (Creswell, 2017).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Results

Symbolic violence is perpetrated by the dominant class through stereotyping the petty and popular bourgeoisie, as is the case with symbolic violence perpetrated by state

school students and actors, the public and even the government against private school students and even private school actors. Stereotyping is the giving of certain traits to a person or group of people based on subjective categories that can be positive or negative.

The results of interviews with 43 informants consisting of the government, students, teachers, principals, alumni of both private and public schools, namely the label in the community that still states that private schools are exile schools, because they always accept transfer students from public schools, even though now it has started to disappear little by little. The government also excluded private schools as exile schools. In addition, there are people who say that private schools are not good schools, because the schools are not good and the students will not be good either. In addition, in the community there is a Christian school label for schools that are active on Sundays, even though these are no longer available. There are people who declare private school students as "high school students" because many students come to school past school hours, and there are those who state that private school students are naughty students because many students are naughty in private schools, the schools are slums and schools "goat cage" because the class that used to be used was an emergency class that was not feasible. Private schools are a stereotype to demean private schools and private students to demean private school students, private school students are culottes, not slang, behind and tyrannical (Interview February, March, April 2020).

The results of the researchers' observations at public schools and private schools in Bissappu District to reveal stereotypes about private students and stereotypes for private school students, namely there is still a stereotype of exile schools for private schools and for students as students who are unable to discipline.

Because private schools still continue to accept transfers from public schools because these students are no longer able to be disciplined. Other stereotypes that still exist are stereotypes as bad schools, *muhammadon* schools, slum schools and goat shed schools for schools and for students as high school students and delinquent students. This happens because the facilities and infrastructure of private schools are generally still below standard when compared to public schools and teachers who teach in private schools are generally undisciplined in coming late to school and even not coming, while students are given stereotypes by the community as naughty students generally given to transfer students. from a public school that makes trouble at the original school so that it is labeled as a naughty student. Students who come after school hours because there is an image among students for certain schools, do not need to come quickly to school because there are no teachers, even if there are students, they are usually late (Observation 2017, 2018, 2019, 2020).

Symbolic violence is perpetrated by the dominant class through stereotyping the petty and popular bourgeoisie, as is the case with symbolic violence perpetrated by state school students and actors, the public and even the government against private school students and even private school actors.




Figure 1. Symbolic violence through stereotypes given by public school actors to private school students and private school actors

The results of the questionnaire from 301 respondents related to the negative

stereotypes given by public school actors to private school students and private schools, there were 226 respondents or 75.09% of 301 respondents who stated that public school actors gave negative stereotypes to private school students (individuals). and there were 75 respondents or 24.91% of the 303 respondents who stated that public school actors did not give negative stereotypes to private school students (individuals). Meanwhile, for the results of the questionnaire from 301 respondents regarding negative stereotyped schools given by public school actors to private schools (groups), there were 198 respondents or 65.79% of 301 respondents who stated that public school actors gave negative stereotypes to private schools and there were 103 respondents or 34.21% of the 303 respondents who stated that public school actors gave negative stereotypes to private schools.

Symbolic violence through stereotypes given by public school actors to private school students is in the frequent category, while symbolic violence through stereotypes given by public school actors to private schools is also in the frequent category, although with different values.




Figure 2. Symbolic violence through stereotypes given by public school actors to private school students.

The results of the questionnaire from 301 respondents related to negative stereotypes given by public school actors to private school students, there were 56 respondents or 18.60% of 301 respondents who stated that private school students

received negative stereotypes as naughty students, there were 41 respondents or 14.28% of 301 respondents who stated that private school students got negative stereotypes as high school students, there were 11 respondents or 3.65% of 301 respondents who stated that private school students got negative stereotypes as Christian students, there were 13 respondents or 4.31% of 301 respondents who said private school students got stereotypes negative stereotypes as Muhammadiyah students, there were 142 respondents or 47.17% of 301 respondents who stated that private school students received negative stereotypes as private students, and there were 35 respondents or 11.62% of 301 respondents who stated that private school students received negative stereotypes as village students.

Based on the table, symbolic violence through stereotypes given by public school actors to private school students such as naughty students, high school students, Christian students, Muhammad and village students is a stereotype that is not often given by public school actors, only the stereotypes of private students are into the stereotype category that is sometimes given to private school students.




Figure 3. Stereotype categories assigned by public school actors to private schools

The results of the questionnaire from 301 respondents related to the negative stereotypes given by public school actors to private schools, there were 105 respondents

or 34.88% of 301 respondents who stated that private schools received negative stereotypes as exile schools, there were 12 respondents or 3.98% of 301 respondents who stated that private schools received negative stereotypes as bad schools, there were 6 respondents or 1.99% of 301 respondents who stated that private schools received negative stereotypes as Christian schools, there were 8 respondents or 0.26% of 301 respondents who stated that private schools received negative stereotypes as Muhammadiyah schools. , there are 10 respondents or 3.32% of 301 respondents who stated that private schools received negative stereotypes as slum schools, there were 3 respondents or 0.99% of 301 respondents who stated that private schools received negative stereotypes as goat pen schools, there were 157 respondents or 52.15% of 301 respondent y ang stated that private schools have a negative stereotype as private schools.

The stereotypes given by public school actors to private schools such as exile schools are stereotypes that are less often given by public school actors, the stereotypes of bad schools, Christian schools, Muhammadan schools, slum schools and goat shed schools are stereotypes that are not often given by public schools. public and community school actors, only private school stereotypes fall into the stereotype category that is sometimes given to private schools. Symbolic violence against private school students through two forms of stereotypes, namely stereotypes on students and stereotypes on students' schools. Stereotypes against students such as naughty students, high school students (students who go to school after school hours are at 07.30), Christian students because there are schools that have activities on Sundays. While the stereotypes for student schools are exile schools because they always accept transfer students from state schools, schools are not good because the facilities and infrastructure are incomplete which are exacerbated by teachers who are often late and rarely come to teach, Christian schools because of school policies on Sundays, Muhammadan schools (schools that follow Muhammadiyah).

stereotypes for private school students and private school students are given by public school actors, the community and the government, although it is the public-school actor who gives more stereotypes as the dominant class and society, only a few government people provide stereotypes for students and private schools.

Discussion

Symbolic violence is perpetrated by the dominant class through stereotypes of the popular class and the petty bourgeoisie, as well as symbolic violence perpetrated by students and public school actors as dominant class actors against private school students, even in private schools actors as the popular class and the petty bourgeoisie (Grice et al., 2023), so students can be subordinated (Rashid et al., 2022); (Tuğal, 2021) in social life. Likewise with symbolic violence against women (bodies, nudity) through the given stereotypes (Serrano-Barquín et al., 2018), or as symbolic violence for waria who always experience subordination (Rashid et al., 2022), symbolic violence for women in the internet world, violence against subordinated urban communities, and rural migrant workers (Roumbanis, 2019).

Symbolic violence against private schools is through two forms of stereotypes, namely stereotypes against students and stereotypes against students in private schools. Stereotypes as a weapon in committing symbolic violence ; (Oliveira et al., 2021). Stereotypes towards students such as naughty students, high school students (students who enter school past school hours, namely 07.30), Christian students (schools that are active on Sundays). While the stereotype of private schools is exile schools because they always accept transfer students from public schools, schools are not good because the facilities and infrastructure are incomplete, Christian schools because the school policy is active on Sundays, Muhammadiyah schools (schools that follow the Muhammadiyah organization). Stereotypes for students and private schools are provided by public schools and community actors. Stereotype preservation can be done through education (Yahiaoui, 2022) and with stereotypes can maintain

symbolic supremacy (Embrick & Henricks, 2013).

Stereotypes are an insult to students and private schools, discriminate against students and private schools, damage the image of students and private schools (Suardi et al., 2020b) (Suardi et al., 2020a). Stereotypes are used by different classes such as public schools as the dominant class against the popular class and the petty bourgeoisie which leads to symbolic violence ;. Each dominant class actor represents and reinforces stereotypes of the popular class and the petty bourgeoisie which are a form of symbolic violence or commits symbolic violence by instilling stereotypes and vice versa, symbolic violence perpetrated by the dominant class can give birth to stereotypes.

Through the power of the dominant class possessed by state school actors, it becomes the forerunner of symbolic violence against private school students in social life. Symbolic violence is reproduced in everyday interactions, social practices (Khanal, 2017), such as symbolic violence through stereotypes produced by private school actors in everyday people's lives and spread through everyday interactions. Negative stereotypes of private school students have a negative impact on students (Ardianto, 2018), not good for students and inequality of positive stereotypes and negative stereotypes although negative stereotypes have a positive impact if they can be transferred.

Even if private school students experience symbolic violence, they can change themselves to fit existing school structures, practices, and relationships so that they no longer experience symbolic violence (Waters, 2017), so that symbolic violence can have positive implications for students and private schools.

CONCLUSION

Negative stereotypes have implications for symbolic violence against private school students produced by public school actors who have accumulated capital and power in educational practices. Recommendations for future researchers are the construction of positive stereotypes for state school students and state school actors in committing symbolic violence.

REFERENCES

- Angeliqa, F., & Sarwono, B. K. (2018). Symbolic violence and the effort to silencing women in their positions as leaders (critics of the women leaders' habitus in advertising agencies). *E3S Web of Conferences*, 74. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/20187410015>
- Ardianto. (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*, 6(2), 124–135. <https://doi.org/10.15640/ijll.v6n2a15>
- Coles, J. A. (2016). Black lives, too, matter in schools: An exploration of symbolic violence in the era of Trayvon Martin. *Urban Education Research and Policy Annuals*, 4(2), 17–33.
- Creswell, J. W. (2017). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage publication.
- Doshi, V. (2021). Symbolic violence in embodying customer service work across the urban/rural divide. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 28(1), 39–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12571>
- Ebadi, S., & Zamani, G. (2018). Predatory publishing as a case of symbolic violence: A critical English for academic purposes approach. *Cogent Education*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1501889>
- Embrick, D. G., & Henricks, K. (2013). Discursive Colorlines at Work: How Epithets and Stereotypes are Racially Unequal. *Symbolic Interaction*, 36(2), 197–215. <https://doi.org/10.1002/symb.51>
- Gast, M. J. (2018). "They Give Teachers a Hard Time": Symbolic Violence and Intersections of Race and Class in Interpretations of Teacher-student Relations. *Journals.Sagepub.Com*, 61(2), 257–275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0731121418756044>
- Grice, B., Mackintosh, C., Oldfield, S., & Durden-Myers, E. (2023). From performing gender to symbolic violence in English women's football: "Women are not supposed to be viewed in this way." *Managing Sport and Leisure*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23750472.2023.2170269>
- Khanal, P. (2017). Falling prey to the dominant culture? Demystifying symbolic violence against ethnic minority students in Nepal. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 25(3), 457–467. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2017.1280841>
- Li, Y., & Xiao, D. (2020). Mandarin Discrimination in Hong Kong: Four Mainland Chinese Sojourn Teachers' Experience of Symbolic Violence. *Journal of Education Culture and Society*, 11(2), 499–520. <https://doi.org/10.15503/jecs2020.2.499.520>
- Maulana, M. F. (2021). Meme and cyber sexism: Habitus and symbolic violence of patriarchy on the Internet. *Simulacra*, 4(2), 215–228. <https://doi.org/10.21107/sml.v4i2.11899>
- McGillicuddy, D., & Devine, D. (2018). "Turned off" or "ready to fly" – Ability grouping as an act of symbolic violence in primary school. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 70, 88–99. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.11.008>
- Nursalam, Manda, D., & Suardi. (2018). Sexual Abuse (Study of Child Sexual Abuse in Poleang District Bombana Regency). *Palarch's Journal of Archaralogy of Egypt/Egyptogy*, 17(2), 232–240.
- Oliveira, A. S. De, Cristina, N., & Sampaio, M. (2021). Symbolic violence on social media: Covid-19 and the elderly Violência simbólica nas redes sociais: Covid-19 e os idosos Violencia simbólica en las redes sociales: Covid-19 y los mayores. *Research, Society and Development*, 10(5), 1–10.
- Powell, B., Dylan, G. S., & D'Amore, A. (2017). Challenging symbolic violence and

- hegemony in music education through contemporary pedagogical approaches. *Taylor & Francis*, 45(6), 734–743. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2017.1347129>
- Powell, B., & Dylan Smith Abigail, G. D. (2017). Challenging symbolic violence and hegemony in music education through contemporary pedagogical approaches. *Taylor & Francis*, 45(6), 734–743. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2017.1347129>
- Rashid, M. A. ul H., Ghazi, F., & Manzoor, M. M. (2022). Symbolic violence and social adjustment of transgender(s) in Pakistan. *Quality and Quantity*, 57(1), 121–135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11135-022-01344-6/METRICS>
- 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>
- Rowlands, J. (2015). Turning collegial governance on its head: symbolic violence, hegemony and the academic board. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 36(7), 1017–1035. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2014.883916>
- Rydell, R. J., Rydell, M. T., & Boucher, K. L. (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>
- Sah, P. K. (2022). English as a medium of instruction, social stratification, and symbolic violence in Nepali schools: Untold stories of Madhesi children. *Multilingual Education in South Asia: At the Intersection of Policy and Practice*, May, 50–68. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003158660-4>
- Serrano-Barquín, C., Serrano-Barquín, H., Zarza-Delgado, P., & Vélez-Bautista, G. (2018). Gender stereotypes that foment symbolic violence: Nudity and hair. *Revista Estudios Feministas*, 26(3). <https://doi.org/10.1590/1806-9584-2018v26n344848>
- Siska, F., Supriatna, N., & Ratmaningsih, N. (2022). To Cite This Article: Felia Siska, Sapriya, Nana Supriatna dan Neiny Ratmaningsih. 2022. Minangkabau Local Wisdom In Marosok Tradition. *Mamangan Social Science Journal*, 11(2), 101–106. <https://ejournal.upgrisba.ac.id/index.php/jurnal-mamangan/index>
- Suardi, Agustang, A., & Jumadi. (2020a). Symbolic Violence Towards Students in the Context of the Existence of the Stereotypical Frames of Lecturers and Students in the Higher Education System in Indonesia. *Palarch's Journal of Archaralogy of Egypt/Egyptogy* 17(2), 17(2), 249–258.
- Suardi, Agustang, A., & Jumadi. (2020b). THE SYMBOLIC VIOLENCE TOWARDS PRIVATE SCHOOL STUDENTS THROUGH THE FRAME STEREOTYPE IN BANTAENG DISTRICT OF INDONESIA. *The International Conference on Innovations in Social Sciences and Education*, 578–588.
- Torres, R. C., & Ubeda, A. R. (2015). Objective structures and symbolic violence in the immigrant family and school relationships: Study of two cases in Chile. *Social Sciences*, 4(4), 1243–1268. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci4041243>
- Toshalis, E. (2010). From disciplined to disciplinarian: The reproduction of symbolic violence in pre-service teacher education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 42(2), 183–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270903267972>
- Trenton, S. M. (2018). Symbolic Violence: School-Imposed Labeling in a “No-Excuses” Charter School. *Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education*, 15(1), 1–8.
- Tuğal, C. (2021). Urban Symbolic Violence Re-Made: Religion, Politics and Spatial Struggles in Istanbul. *International*

Journal of Urban and Regional Research,
45(1), 154–163.
[https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-
2427.12853](https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12853)

Waters, R. (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>

Yahiaoui, R. (2022). Fansubbing and the Perpetuation of Western Popular Culture's Gender and Racial Stereotypes in Arabic. *International Journal of Society, Culture and Language*, 10(2), 1–11.
<https://doi.org/10.22034/IJSCL.2022.554602.2646>