Journal of Economy Culture and Society

ISSN: 2602-2656 / E-ISSN: 2645-8772

Research Article

Symbolic Violence Teachers Experience at Schools

Süleyman YILDIZ[1], Mithat KORUMAZ[1], Aydın BALYER[1]

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is, first, to find out whether teachers are exposed to instances of invisible symbolic violence at school, especially in their relations with school principals, and second, if such violence exists, to expose the practices which promote it. The methodology used in this research was that of qualitative phenomenology and nine teachers were selected to take part using a snowball-sampling method, which is one of the purposeful sampling methods. In order to collect data semi structured face to face interviews were conducted. The data were analysed using a content analysis technique. As a result of the data analysis, two themes emerged: Symbolic Violence in the School Field and Struggling with Windmills. The results of the research reveal that teachers are exposed to instances of symbolic violence due to the power that principals hold within schools. Our research showed that teachers cannot cope with these practices, which produce inequality and lead to unquestioning obedience.

Keywords: Symbolic violence, symbolic power, habitus, school as field, types of capital

[1]Yıldız Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

ORCID: S.Y. 0000-0002-4279-1184;
M.K. 0000-0003-1800-7633;
A.B. 0000-0002-4157-1155

Corresponding author:
Süleyman YILDIZ,
Yıldız Technical University, Faculty of Education, 34165 Güngören, İstanbul, Turkey
E-mail: syildiz0034@gmail.com

Submitted: 06.07.2020
Accepted: 20.12.2020
Published Online: 22.04.2021

Citation: Yildiz, S., Korumaz, M., & Balyer, A. (2021). Symbolic violence teachers experience at schools. *Journal of Economy Culture and Society*, 63, 165-180. https://doi.org/10.26650/JECS2020-0101

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1. Introduction

Violence in schools has been increasing at an alarming rate. As reported in *Hurriyet* (05/01/2019), a national newspaper in Turkey, 29.3% of teachers are exposed to various forms of violence in or around the schools where they work. Such violent incidents might not only be limited to physical, economic, or psychological cases of violence; they may be varied and found in many areas. After some time, such events may begin to seem normal.

Violence can be defined as the use of power to harm others or to prevent the rights of others (Morrison, Furlong & Morrison, 1994). French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, however, gathered his thoughts around the concept of *symbolic violence* with a different perspective of the concept of violence and defined this concept as "violence mostly applied through symbolic channels such as communication, acceptance, feeling, and invisible and unnoticeable for the exposed ones" (Bourdieu, 2015, p.11). Through symbolic violence, power can be used as a tool to gain status (Murphy, 2018). Thus, violence does not come about by applying force, and mutual consent and acceptance are observed in the implementation of symbolic violence.

In this regard, written rules have an important place in the implementation of symbolic violence. The rules are at the centre of social relations and settled through transformation of sovereignty and emotional bonds (Bourdieu, 1998). Written rules give the state the power to control violence (Schmitt, 2006). Governments apply symbolic violence through written rules instead of using physical violence to make citizens obey rules and regulations (Micaud, 1991, cited in Ozsoz, 2013). Governments implement invisible symbolic violence through institutions. In this way, educational institutions are important tools in transferring symbolic violence to individuals in society. Schools mediate it through the provision of educational services. Bourdieu states that one of the most important tools in the application of symbolic violence is education. In this context, Bourdieu considers education as a process which increases social class differences and strengthens power relations. Bourdieu defines schools as social institutions where the reproduction of power relations between different social classes takes place (Danahay, 1991).

Scott (2012) also found that schools and education preserve existing social inequalities and reproduce them. Bourdieu and Passeron define education as a process that supports existing cultural capital and differentiates students for the benefit of the dominant class (Ozsoz, 2014). Likewise, Apple (2006) states that through the curriculums prepared by governments as a means of education, cultural and economic class relations are continually produced. Therefore, it can be said that symbolic violence is an invisible, polite form of violence and is quite common among employees in educational institutions (Turk, 2007).

Studies conducted on symbolic violence in schools mostly focus on symbolic and institutional violence that teachers exert on students (Herr 1999). Scott (2012) notes that although teachers are in a position of power within their own classes, they may be exposed to invisible violence because they are subject to written practices. These may affect teachers' thinking tools.

2. Bourdieu's Thinking Tools

Pierre Bourdieu mentions thinking tools such as habitus, capital, field, symbolic power and symbolic violence and explained the concept of *field* with a game metaphor. In this competition, there are possibilities of winning and losing. In this metaphor, being a part of the game means having similar cards symbolising different values. Bourdieu states that the boundaries of the field are the places where the effect of the game is seen. There are means of connection with various types of power and capital within the networks of the field. Having the forms of power in these

fields provides access to various benefits (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2014). The concept of *field* helps to reveal hierarchy and power relations more clearly. With this concept, the researcher tries to uncover the elements that are not seen by establishing a relationship between the micro-cosmos field and the macro-cosmos field while questioning the reasons for the conflicts (Swartz, 2011). Indicating that there are fields such as laws, education and religion, Bourdieu describes social fields where unjust competitive practices are held (Murphy, 2018).

The concept of *habitus* refers to recreating individuals' tendencies (Calhoun, 2010). Actions and perceptions that are compatible with the situations cause these tendencies (Bourdieu, 1977, cited in Swartz, 2011). With this concept, Bourdieu emphasized that it was possible to create moral character by organizing habits and achieving morality. Previous experiences play an important role in the framing of habitus (Murphy, 2018).

According to Bourdieu individuals learn to accept existing inequalities in society because of their previous experiences. These experiences make them add their expectations to their habitus. Over time, individuals draw their own boundaries by gaining insight from their success in games with *habitus* (Calhoun, 2010). As there is an ontological complicity between habitus and the field, Bourdieu states that the field tries to structure habitus, and habitus tries to structure the subjective perception of the field (Bourdieu, 2006, cited in Ozsoz, 2013). While individuals struggle between the powers in the field and their habitus, they change structures and make them compatible with their habitus.

According to Bourdieu, the "cards" show the *capital*. In this context, there are four types of capital: economic, cultural, social and symbolic. Economic resources comprise economic capital. Social capital is related to human relationship networks. All behavioural patterns learned through education constitute cultural capital. Symbolic capital is the perception, understanding and recognition of the value attributed to any of the other forms of capital (social, cultural and economic) and identified in terms of its structure as the combination of the other forms of capital (Gergs, 2003). The function of each type of capital differs in games, and they provide dominance in the game. Habitus is shaped by the types and amounts of capital.

2.1. Symbolic Violence and Education

Bourdieu connects the concept of symbolic violence with the concept of symbolic capital by using honour, respect and prestige (Anderson, 2013). Bourdieu explains this concept as transforming the relations of domination and obedience into emotional relationships and states that these relationships can be established with the partnership of the exposed ones (Bourdieu, 1998). Murphy (2018) defines symbolic violence that is applied through structures such as education and religion as the power created by an individual through imposing hierarchy and position on others. It is a fact that some individuals have much more economic, cultural and social capital. And they use this to impose symbolic capital and cultural values onto others. When individuals try to use this power against others who have less symbolic capital than themselves, they apply symbolic violence. This process leads to the continuity of dependent relations. It also causes the dominance of groups or classes and the reproduction of the existing social order, and so ends in various inequalities (Anderson, 2013).

Symbolic violence occurs in the form of obligations, debts, roles, expectations, discourses and non-verbal communication, rather than physical harm. Symbolic violence fortifies social inequalities and ensures the adoption of these without questioning and restricting individuals (Toshalis, 2010). Another concept of Bourdieu relates to symbolic violence is *symbolic power,* which enables

individuals to apply violence on behalf of their institution (Goldstein, 2006). In this sense, those who dominate social, political and economic practices possess some or all of the power such as rewards, advantages, privileges, experiences, and options. Such power makes them dominant.

Individuals may have these types of capital at different levels in certain fields, and sometimes their amount changes. Cultural capital, in particular, is a key factor in the implementation of symbolic violence because struggling for cultural capital in a particular field leads to an effort to transform social classes and power hierarchies (Scott, 2012). Those holding power dominate others using their capital, and this causes the dominant ones to implement symbolic violence on the non-dominant ones. Bourdieu describes this state as the most powerful structure exerting symbolic violence. In this regard, law and media are two important tools which ensure the dominance of power by society (Akbal, 2018).

Bourdieu and Passeron (1990) give special importance to education in their analysis. According to Bourdieu, education systems legitimate class inequalities and reproduce these inequalities. Having cultural capital and high-class habitus is considered a success in the education system. Since most students from the lower class do not have these advantages , their failure is inevitable since education promotes class inequalities (Sullivan, 2002).

Education is the field of socialization. Through education symbolic violence is implemented, and it reproduces intellectual and moral integration of a group or a class without resorting to physical pressure (Danahay, 1991). It is also an important tool in obtaining cultural capital. Those who are powerful increase and maintain their positions in society by promoting their cultural, social and symbolic capital through education (Swartz, 2011). Thus, education systems are shaped by the habitus of the dominant upper class and function in accordance with their interests. Cultural capital is particularly beneficial for success in the struggle for opportunity in the field of education. Later, symbolic forms of success can be converted into economic capital. This is further indication of the idea that education applies violence symbolically (Scott, 2012). Existing policies ensure the existence of symbolic violence in schools. These policies determine what stakeholders should do in advance. Those consciously challenging such policies might be declared as deviant. With behaviour norms deeply embedded in social practices, an atmosphere emerges in which these policies are normal, usual, and remain constant (Goldstein, 2006).

Bourdieu and Passeron (1990) describe schools as examples of places that protect and reproduce existing social inequalities and that also structure social institutions (Scott, 2012). Discursive effects of symbolic power and symbolic violence can be found in different ways in schools. Symbolic power not only targets students but is also directed at teachers, parents and other stakeholders (Goldstein, 2006). Therefore, it is important to make symbolic violence visible from the teachers' perspective.

The imposition of symbolic power by administrators in teacher-principal communication in schools might lead to protests and rebellious behaviour, and create a culture among teachers against the normative organization of the education system. Noguera (1995, cited in Goldstein, 2006) states that the violence experienced by teachers and students in schools may be a symptom of a much more important problem in society, especially in the school. Goldstein (2006), on the other hand, states that it can lead to failure in establishing safe learning communities.

In this context, the purpose of this study is to determine whether teachers are exposed to symbolic violence by written rules in their relations with principals, especially the invisible concepts of habitus and field frequently used in Bourdieu's works. The research also aims to expose school practices which promote symbolic violence. It is thought that this study may develop a critical perspective on revealing symbolic violence practices encountered in schools.

3. Method

3.1. Research Design

This qualitative study was carried out using a phenomenological design. Phenomenology aims to reveal the meaning or nature of our daily experiences in order to gain an in-depth understanding and focuses on people's perceptions, descriptions, feelings, judgments, and interpretations of a phenomenon and how they approach that phenomenon while talking to other individuals (Patton, 2014). Such studies aim to reveal cases that cannot be observed easily such as experiences, feelings, thoughts, beliefs, and attitudes of individuals by using the interview method (Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2011). Within this scope, the study pattern that was chosen was that of collecting in-depth data from the participants regarding the symbolic violence phenomenon and thereby revealing their experiences of this phenomenon.

3.2. Research Participants

The participants of this research were nine volunteer teachers working in different types of schools. Participants were included in the study using the snowball sampling method, which is a type of nonprobability sampling and is useful in cases where participants are difficult to find, especially in sensitive and relatively confidential subject matters. In this sampling method, the researcher asks participants to suggest other sample members (Etikan et al., 2016) to participate in the study. In this context, interviews were conducted to ensure data saturation for the current study, and the depth of the data was considered. Participants were given the names of the characters in the novel "Son Ada" ("The Last Island") by Zulfu Livaneli, whose subject is symbolic power. In this novel, the subject was power relations, which changed when people on an island started to be governed by an authority.

3.3. Data Collection

The data were collected using the semi-structured technique. Since symbolic violence is a phenomenon that cannot be easily felt and noticed by the exposed ones, this technique was preferred. In phenomenological studies, open-ended and semi-structured interview questions and face-to-face interviews are the most appropriate ways to collect data (Marshall & Rossman, 2010). Semi-structured interview questions allow researchers to change sub-questions in the light of participants' status and responses (Merriam, 2013).

Within the scope of the research, the relevant literature was reviewed, and then the interview questions were formed. In order to ensure reliability and transferability, the interview questions were finalized after consulting with five researchers and one language specialist in qualitative research, all of whom are related to the field of study. Pilot interviews were conducted and the questions re-examined, after which it was found that the current interview questions were suitable for collecting data.

The interview protocol, prepared in accordance with ethical principles, was sent to the participants by e-mail before the interview. This protocol aimed to create an environment of emotional trust by stating that participants could withdraw from the meeting whenever they wanted. Meetings were held face-to-face by appointment in environments where participants felt comfortable. They were held at pre-determined meeting places. Interviews took an average of 30 minutes, and a voice recorder was used with the participants' approval. To ensure data multiplicity, notes were taken during the interviews, and the data transcribed after the interviews were presented to the participants for approval.

3.4. Data Analysis

The data were analysed with the content analysis technique. In accordance with the procedures of this technique, the data were divided into themes. For the data analysis, the notes taken during the interviews and the transcripts of the interviews were revisited. The analysing cycle proposed by Saldana (2015) was used to interpret the data. In the first cycle, direct coding was completed, and the similarities between the first codes were examined to find subcategories in the second cycle. Later, themes containing the same categories were formed. The themes were analysed by experts in the field to discover categories and codes.

4. Findings

In this part, the findings obtained by analysing data transcripts and observation notes are presented. As result of the data analysis, two themes, Symbolic Violence in the School Field and Struggling with Windmills, emerged.

4.1. Theme 1: Symbolic Violence in the School Field

As Bourdieu's field concept identifies a field where conflicts of interest are experienced, schools are conceptualized as the field in this research. One of the reasons for this is that it is accepted that Bourdieu encourages researchers to question what information is valuable in the school field and which groups represent power. In this study, symbolic violence was used to identify which groups are powerful in the school field and to reveal power-based and hidden power relations.

4.1.1. The King's Guard

Since two of the participants defined the school principal as a king, this category was named "the King's Guard", and the capital that principals have (as seen from the teachers' perspective) was included here. The teachers stated that a school principal's social capital is very powerful, and principals have privileges such as favouritism. Principals have powerful social capital based on privileges and obligations which result from their networks and group memberships with actors such as politicians, education union leaders, senior public officials, supervisors, and other school principals. In this regard, Lara said, "*The principal has connections with the education union to protect him, and political connections with the head of the district and so on. He does not get any punishment*." Then, Author expressed his opinion as follows:

> "It is possible to have status with political connections. It is a must to have favouritism in this way. In a place where there is no competence, there are, of course, more royalists than the king. The ones who get a position they do not deserve administer teachers in a way they do not deserve."

The teachers stated that principals know legal procedures well and do not receive punishments when faced with a sanction by finding an explanation compatible with procedures. They also said that principals' cultural capital was powerful due to their knowledge about work and procedures at school. Grocery's Son stated the following on this subject:

> "We try to read the legislation, but they find such a great explanation compatible with the legislation… They know the legislation very well because they have been in this field for years. Of course, we don't know as much as they do."

Furthermore, the teachers expressed the view that principals have many powers due to legal legislation, and so they perceive themselves as the authority in a school and have the perception that they cannot be criticized. Also, it was stated by the teachers that principals are the only administrators in WhatsApp groups and that they also have a room which represents their authority. In addition, the teachers gave other examples of the symbolic capital which principals have, and they used analogies like "king", "principal" and "boss".

The participant Author used the metaphor of God to explain how effectively school principals use all their different types of capital and to express that principals' habitus resulted from such capital: *"...The principal constantly expects obedience from someone. It is not possible to criticize or to say what he said is wrong because he is king, so he is God principal. That's what I call them.*"

4.1.2. Prestigious Withdrawal

Teachers' perceptions of capital change according to the economic situation of the place where they live, as well as to parents' profiles, and financial opportunities. While two of the teachers defined themselves as being economically middle class, most of the participants stated that teachers can be categorized as poor and living at the poverty threshold because the majority of them live in a metropolitan area. Lara stated that teachers' perceptions of social capital vary based on where they live: "*The public's view of the teaching profession changes according to region and geography. There is not the same respect experienced here as in the east part of Turkey. While you are given much respect in the east region, you are an ordinary person here."* While some of the teachers stated that teaching is a valued, respected and outstanding profession, others stated that teachers are just ordinary people. Lara emphasized the loss of the profession as social capital by stating that, *"The teacher used to be trusted by people, but now has turned into someone that cannot be trusted."* In terms of cultural capital, one of the teachers had a doctorate degree, one had a graduate degree, and another was doing graduate work. None of the teachers provided any information about their principals having greater academic experience. Finally, some teachers stated that they read legal legislation, but they did not have sufficient knowledge about its implementation, that is, they had little cultural capital.

4.1.3. God Principals

This category, the name of which was provided by one of the participants in the study, emphasizes the habitus developed by school principals based on their powerful capital. In this category there are findings of cases of symbolic violence experienced by teachers. Many examples of symbolic violence were created by practices shaped by structures in the habitus such as security duties, timetables, meetings, ceremonies, management decisions and teachers' leave and were hidden in the school field. This section attempts to reveal what was learned from the interviews with the teachers. As they stated, examples of symbolic violence produced by school principals representing symbolic power in the school field were observed especially in regards to teachers' timetables and in the days and hours assigned for school security duties. School principals use practices such as persuading teachers, making arbitrary limitations and generating inequalities, changing teachers' timetables, arranging teachers' classes in a disorganised manner, increasing the workload of teachers, and reducing lesson hours to cause teachers to experience economic loss. Some of the teachers' opinions on this subject are as follows:

> "When the principal wants a teacher to do a task that she/he does not want to do, the principal does not arrange the curriculum as the teacher wishes, adds additional lessons, does not assign extra lessons, excludes you from the other teachers, and ignores what is said. " (Author).

Another example of symbolic violence against teachers who object to inequalities or who do not comply with the principal is duties related to school security. The teachers stated that principals frequently changed the places of their security duties and increased the number of teachers given such duties, thus punishing the teachers who do not obey them. Grocery's Son stated, *"I wanted to teach painting, but the principal said that I would teach calligraphy and it would be as he wanted",* which is an example of symbolic violence based on maintaining the current order and increasing the habitus of the principal. Many of the participants stated that principals especially used their legal legislative powers to produce inequalities. Seagull explained that the principal used supervisory power frequently and followed the exact time teachers came to school. He also said, *"The principal enters the classes without informing us beforehand. Okay, the principal makes the audit, but it is an arbitrary one, and he also specifically tracks the teachers' school entrance time."* Author also stated that the principal frequently reminded teachers of his powers to end the internship process in their first year of teaching:

> "The following year, he cancelled my duties in a class and did not assign outside exams to me. When I investigated why everyone was given exam tasks and why I was not , I learned that the principal did not send my name to the exam commission. He asked 'Why were you were wearing this checked shirt and velvet trousers?"

In this statement Author said that the principal cancelled his exam and class responsibility duties that provide additional income and interfered in his choice of clothes, although it was not prohibited in the regulations. Moreover, Grocery's Son said that the principal cancelled the exams by stating that there were not enough questions. Lara's statement, which is an example of symbolic violence based on mutual consent and acceptance, shows that principals also use their powers to give permission as symbolic violence. Lara expressed her opinion as follows:

> "I have two kids, and when the kids get sick, we need to take them to the doctor, or they have different needs. Therefore, we need to get permission from the school. In such cases, you inevitably deal with the school administration. Whenever you want something from them, they are inevitably waiting for something in return."

Lara stated that the principal constantly searched for teachers' mistakes, took down statements when there was a problem, and kept these for years. Number 36, Lara, and Number 22 also stated that the principal provoked parents and students against teachers and forced teachers to obey. Number 22 explained it in this way: *"The principal started to ask the parents if they were happy with the teacher and if they had any problem with the teacher."*

> "One of our teachers, who had a different opinion, had many troubles because of the principals. They provoked parents against the teacher, provoked students, and made the parents submit petitions against the teacher. An inquisition was started against the teacher, and the teacher had to leave the school. Such tricks are played."

Author's statement above shows that principals use ideological tools, and they arouse fear and anxiety in teachers by using other types of violence such as tricks and slander, thereby making teachers obey. Similarly, Seagull stated that teachers are "blacklisted" when they have problems with the principal. This statement of number 4 is similar: *"The principal gives written notifications to teachers he cannot agree with and tries to catch them in some way by watching from cameras."* It shows that principals use security cameras as a means of pressure and diminishes other teachers' objections by punishing one of them. Number 36 also said that the principal prevents the school board and school commissions from making decisions. Seagull added that, *"If you give an answer to the principal on a WhatsApp group, then you are already in trouble"*, which means that the principal turned WhatsApp groups into a means of pressure.

Number 22 stated that, *"At the last school I worked at, there were level classes such as class A and class B. For example, certain classes were always given to the same teachers",* which showed that the principal grouped the students based on their success and assigned those successful classes to the teachers she/he got on well with. Moreover, Number 36 said, *"The support staff at the school wandered the halls with a list of the teachers' names and added a plus on the list for teachers present and a minus for the ones that were not present. Why would a servant supervise a teacher?",* thus expressing that teachers are checked by someone of lower status. He also mentioned that the principal often entered the classes without informing the teacher by listening at the classroom door.

Bourdieu stated that symbolic violence is mostly applied using non-verbal communication, expectations and discourses. There are also examples of symbolic violence in communication and the ways principals and teachers relate in the school field. For example, Grocery's Son stated that *"The principal plans a separate meeting with the teachers he gets along well with and excludes others, pushing them aside".* In addition, Number 36 stated that principals especially kept some teachers under control by saying "*The principal chooses the teacher to make him/her do some tasks, but cannot force some teachers to do such tasks. Then, a situation like 'You can do this', 'You have to do this,' appears.*"

It is possible to understand that principals show favouritism from Lara's statement: "*If someone who is not from his own education union comes to school late, he immediately keeps a record of it. However, if it is someone who the principal considers close, then the principal ignores it*". It also might be concluded that principals apply symbolic violence in the school field with feelings of revenge. Some participants stated that personal situations such as health problems and childcare were carried to the school field by principals and were used in communication. Number 36 emphasized the case by stating that, *"One teacher had a child with Down syndrome. At the beginning of each semester, the principal asked the teacher to renew the health report on the child's illness. Does Down syndrome go away?"* These findings show that there is a hierarchy among employees in the school field, and the principal, who has more powerful social, cultural and symbolic capital, imposes this situation on teachers by using their status and hierarchy and develops relationships with the aim of sustaining this situation.

4.1.4. Notice of Investigation

The discussion that comes under this category centres on the findings which are related to cases of symbolic violence experienced by teachers and which arise from legal practices stemming from laws and regulations. The category name is a metaphor, often expressed by teachers, and derived from the way "condemnation" in legal legislation is made known. The teachers stated

that existing legal practices limit them and do not allow them to act freely. They also stated that there are some practices that they have to comply with due to threats of force and legal enforcement at school.

Number 22 said that *"There is a regulation that limits the teacher in terms of assessment and also in the use of auxiliary books. You cannot do that; there shouldn't be a very restrictive implementation like a ban. For example, there are such problems with the purchase of supplementary books for foreign language teaching."* In addition, Seagull stated that there are many "yellow envelope" (condemnation penalty) practices regarding the procedures, such as school entrance-exit time, extra security duties, and extra courses, and principals frequently make use of such practices. Additional lessons and forced in-service training are other examples of symbolic violence arising from legislation. Lara stated, *"When there is a one day public holiday, seven hours of additional lessons are not paid. I was supposed to attend in-service training, but I did not want to attend. The Ministry assigned me here automatically."*

It is possible to say that inquiries by the Ministry of National Education also produce symbolic violence in schools. In this practice, inquiries in schools are carried out by another school principal working in the same district. It might be said that this situation also creates the perception that principals support each other, and this practice increases principals' capital. Regarding this issue, Seagull stated:

> "When an inquiry is started against a teacher, the inspector does not come; local supervisors come. Local supervisors are already the other directors in that district. As such, it is the blind leading the blind. In other words, it is not possible for the principal to be punished."

The findings in this category show that meetings, ceremonies, and administrative procedures related to arranging timetables, leave, extra security duties as well as investigations in the school field are important factors in shaping the habitus and in formation of the common identity of a school institution. It is seen that these practices are embedded in the institutional structure of a school and produce symbolic violence.

4.2. Theme 2: Fighting with Windmills

In this section, the findings are presented in two categories. The theme was named after a participant's analogy, describing the failures of a participant while struggling with symbolic violence.

4.2.1. Feeling Experienced

The teachers stated that they are nervous after experiencing symbolic violence, they have to control their nervousness constantly, they are afraid of being dismissed from their profession, and they find this situation annoying. In this regard, Number 4 stated that "*We are all human beings; we can all make mistakes, but such things cause the teacher to be constantly on edge.*" Author mentions the school principal's power in the implementation of school projects, and he stated that the teacher has to obey and cannot oppose the principal: "*The teacher's position in school is between the two lips of the principal. You cannot criticize the principal, you cannot criticize the administration, you cannot mention their mistakes; you will continue working quietly.*" Again, Author said that when the school principal is not obeyed, the teacher is declared unwanted (deviant in Bourdieu's terms) in the school field.

Some of the teachers said that they had psychological disorders, and that these conditions decreased their performance and efficiency. One participant expressed a fear of blotting the register , and another participant stated that all these emotions depersonalize the teachers by forcing them to obey.

4.2.2 Struggling Techniques

As result of the data analysis, it was found that teachers make use of different techniques to handle the incidents of symbolic violence experienced by them. As Bourdieu stated, some of them fully accept this situation and shape their habitus accordingly. Other teachers use legal means such as getting away from school and complaining. The majority of teachers stated that they accept this situation and try not to pay attention to it. Seagull stated:

> "Coping with this is like fighting a windmill. After all, he takes you to his blade and turns you. I wait for him to open an inquiry whenever I have such troubles. Thus, it is not possible for you not to get a penalty there. One of our colleagues complained about the principal, but they punished the teacher by proving him wrong. What will you do when you see these examples? You see, the teacher is absolutely right, but they find a way, this regulation, that law ... Somehow, they make the teacher the guilty one. Therefore, you ignore everything."

As seen in Seagull's statement, teachers experience learned helplessness in struggling with incidents of symbolic violence and turn this situation into mutual acceptance by ignoring everything. In addition, this statement of Seagull shows that those challenging symbolic violence practices can be declared deviant, and teachers are secretly instilled with an awareness of what they should not do, thus developing a habitus that these norms will always exist.

Number 1 stated that he tries to regard things positively, avoids the school administration, focuses on experiencing professional satisfaction, and tries to suppress this situation, saying, *"I try to provide my professional satisfaction myself. I feel happy when I implement new techniques and get results in lessons."* On the other hand, Grocery's Son tried to increase his social and cultural capital by fighting these practices, which can be seen in this statement of his: "*We know some inspectors. We asked them. We tried to read the legislation, but the principals always find ways ...*" Number 22 struggles against this situation by using his capital in a similar way. Number 22 stated, "*I use my legal rights, I fight in that way. I argue when I should argue. So, I have no worries about what happens to me. If I have to complain, I complain.*"

Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) stated that there are different positions with capital in different fields, and that those in these positions constantly fight in their fields. This section discusses the findings related to the emotions the teachers experienced as a result of symbolic violence practices within their habitus. It also discusses their fighting techniques, the way they accommodated to these phenomena in their habitus, and their efforts to transform the hierarchy of power. The teachers stated that they often accept symbolic violence and choose obedience and harmony because they fail when they struggle in their habitus. A few stated that they chose to work in other schools as they had failed to fight against these practices in their former schools. These findings show that the practices in the school field shape teachers' habitus.

Within the scope of this research, the teachers were asked about reducing symbolic violence practices in the context of teacher-principal relations in schools. In response, the teachers suggested that when choosing principals specialists should be selected according to their competence to

choose principals well, that principals should not work in the same school for a long time, that teachers should learn their legal rights and develop their ability to defend themselves, that administrative inquiries should be carried out fairly and quickly by experts, and that legal procedures should be applied fairly. Number 22 stated:

> "I think personal and professional development is very important. In addition, the laws should be very clear. Too many things are the principal's responsibility. It should not be so; there might be a procedure such as having a jury. It is also not right for school principals to investigate things. The principal protects the principal. More specialized people should be involved in this process."

Number 36 emphasized that school principals should avoid accusatory language and instead motivate teachers by stating, "*I think principals should see the positive aspects of teachers, motivate them, and establish good communication with them*." Some of the teachers suggested that the principals have too much cultural and social capital, and that legal regulations should be revised. As Bourdieu states, symbolic violence, which is at the centre of every social relationship, also has an impact on relations in the school field. All these findings show that symbolic violence is critical in shaping teachers' habitus in particular, and teachers' culture in general, through the capital, assumptions, and allowed practices of principals within schools.

5. Discussion

According to the research results, school principals have powerful social capital based on privilege due to their social networks and group memberships. They also have powerful cultural capital and other symbolic capital such as many powers in the school field in their relations with teachers. Accordingly, school principals representing "authority" in Bourdieu's symbolic violence studies have powerful capital. By implementing such capital, principals possess superiority to teachers under their authority and persuade them of the legitimacy of their power. In today's world, this type of authority is symbolic (Schubert, 2002). Robinson and Kerr (2009) state that leaders in organizations tend to produce objectified symbolic violence based on an organization's vision and cultural capital, and they can use the capital to obtain symbolic capital and to restore the legal authority of bureaucracy. Gast (2018) underlines that school principals have great power and capital in shaping school discourses and making classifications in their relations with teachers.

According to another result of the study, examples of symbolic violence in the school field emerge especially with the way the principals use their powers in practices such as making timetables, assigning security duties, planning meetings and ceremonies, making classroom inquiries, and granting teacher requests. In addition, school principals might use symbolic violence practices by adding additional lessons, restricting the economic rights of teachers, and increasing their responsibilities. They also interfere in teachers' lives by criticizing their way of dressing, assigning extra exam duties, putting security cameras everywhere, writing reports based on supposed negligence of duty, forming unnecessary school commissions, assigning classes based on the level of success, and meddling in teachers' problems in their private lives. The practices of provoking parents and students against a teacher, punishing a teacher by choosing a victim, having teachers followed by other employees in school, and keeping teachers' problems on the agenda are other practices that produce symbolic violence in schools. Due to powers that principals have from legal regulations, the threat of penalties based on practices such as school entrance-exit

time, extra security duties and weekend courses, additional courses and in-service assignments given without any need for them, and the implementation of inquiries by local supervisors of the Ministry of National Education also cause symbolic violence. Therefore, teachers are subjected to oppressive impositions in the school field in the many examples mentioned. Through practices and symbolic means arising from the powers of school principals, their symbolic privileges, and the legal regulations at their disposal, teachers are deprived of many opportunities due to the crises produced in the school field. Hierarchical arrangements ensure that those who dominate the teachers' habitus are accepted as having privileges by teachers, and thus, the teachers have to agree to symbolic violence. Symbolic violence leads to imposing the dominant world views of the dominant ones on both the oppressed ones and on their social field (Bourdieu, 1991). The dominant ones use symbolic ways to ensure that the suppressed ones see their sovereignty as natural and justified (Bourdieu 2015). Toshalis (2010) states that symbolic violence occurs and prohibits opportunities by supporting social inequalities and adopting arbitrary classifications without questioning. Leaders produce crises to make their followers believe in the legitimacy of their charisma and to confirm their legitimacy, and crises lead to symbolic violence. In addition, managers in organizations can turn habitus into symbolic violence (Kershaw, cited in 1991, Robinson and Kerr, 2009). Agencies are exposed to symbolic violence when the attitudes of those in authority and the powers they are given in accordance with laws are combined (Akbal, 2018). Gast (2018) states that school principals make hierarchical arrangements against teachers through their powerful capital, which represents symbolic power, and they changed both their own habitus and teachers' habitus to ensure the maintenance of these practices by means of other practices producing symbolic violence at school. Scott (2012), in a similar study, states that teachers serve as both exposed ones and perpetrators of symbolic violence and sometimes are not aware of school practices supporting symbolic violence that they are exposed to.

According to another result of this study, when faced with symbolic violence practices, teachers experience uneasiness and fear of dismissal; thus, they constantly have to control themselves and their performance, ensuring that there is no decrease in their efficiency . Some teachers even have to get psychological support. Moreover, these practices reduce opposition to school principals and create a constant obedience in the school field. Bourdieu (1991) draws more attention to the complexity of symbolic violence than to the restriction of liberties. Both emotions experienced by teachers, and inequalities caused by symbolic violence in the school field, cause this complexity. Incidents of symbolic violence in the school field not only cause teachers to experience psychological disorders such as fear and anxiety but also create complexity among school workers. As a result of symbolic violence, authority of the dominant ones is accepted by the disadvantaged ones (Bourdieu, 2000). It shapes the habitus with tendencies such as shame and anxiety in both behaviour and emotions. In fact, this phenomenon causes reactions such as flushing, stuttering, and clumsiness, and loss of control of body (Bourdieu, 2015). Similarly, Elena (2016) finds that imposing power and ignoring the group's cultural values can marginalize people, cause disappointment, and promote rebellious behaviour.

According to another result of the study, while tackling these practices producing inequality, teachers shape their habitus in different ways such as accepting the situation, ignoring it, complaining, and moving away from the school field. Although teachers sometimes attempt to struggle against it, they frequently change their habitus due to acceptance and neglect, believing their situation will never change. Goldstein (2006) reports that symbolic violence practices are deeply embedded within norms of behaviours and practices protected and nurtured by an organization (Robinson & Kerr, 2009)

A further result of the study showed that symbolic violence might be reduced if school principals were appointed based on their administrative competence. It was also thought that teachers' awareness of their legal rights, limiting school principals' powers, conducting administrative inquiries appropriately, and motivating teachers instead of using accusative language could reduce symbolic violence in schools. These justified demands of teachers include some changes in the school field. A change in symbolic lifestyles is effective in organizing the world in different ways such as the reduction or elimination of authority relations (Schubert, 2002).

In conclusion, school principals have powerful social capital based on the privilege with their social networks and group memberships, and when they make use of such capital, they provide superiority and persuade teachers to accept their power. Moreover, principals use their powers while preparing timetables, assigning extra security duties, conducting meetings and ceremonies, making classroom inquiries, and granting teacher requests. This results in a decrease in performance and efficiency and produces inequality, which in turn shapes teachers' habitus in different ways such as their accepting the situation, ignoring it, complaining about it, and/or moving away from the school field. Schools should be places where teachers feel free while practising their work since teaching is an autonomous profession. Appointing principals who have administrative competence can reduce symbolic violence. It was also mentioned that teachers' awareness of their legal rights, limiting school principals' powers, conducting administrative inquiries appropriately, and motivating teachers instead of using accusative language against them could reduce symbolic violence in schools. Scott (2012) states that symbolic violence discussions might be a guide in solving, understanding and leading these struggles in the field of education. Schubert (2002), on the other hand, has given up defending existing norms to fight against symbolic violence, and emphasizes that we should seek alternative ways of existence and thinking. Recommendations offered through this research are as follows:

- Attempts to eliminate threats to polyphony and multiculturalism can provide ways to end symbolic violence.
- Changing legal norms, questioning habitus in the school field, and increasing awareness among the stakeholders in the school can improve the situation.
- School principals' administrative qualifications and qualities should be questioned.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.
Conflict of Interest: The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.
Grant Support: The authors declared that this study has received no financial support.

References

Akbal, A. (2018). Türkiye'de sağlık alanında dönüşüm: Sembolik güç ve sembolik şiddet ilişkisi [Transformation of the health sector in Turkey: Relations of symbolic power and symbolic violence]. (Doktora tezi). Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.

Anderson, A. (2013). Teach for America and symbolic violence: A Bourdieuian analysis of education's next quick-fix. *The Urban Review, 45*(5), 684–700.

Apple, M.W. (2006). *Eğitim ve iktidar* [Education and power] (E, Bulut, Çev.). İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayınları.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (Vol. 4). Sage. London.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Acts of resistance: Against the tyranny of the market*. New York: The New.

Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian Meditations*. Trans. Richard Nice. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. (2014). *Düşünümsel bir antropoloji için cevaplar* [Answers for a reflective anthropology]. (N. Ökten, Çev.). İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Bourdieu, P. (2015). *Masculine domination*. Istanbul: Baglam Publishing.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (2015). *Reproduction: Principles of a Theory on the Education System*. (A. Sümer, L. Ünsaldı and Ö. Akkaya, Trans.). Ankara: Heretik.

Calhoun, C. (2010). *Ocak ve zanaat Bourdieu sosyolojisinin ana* hatları [The craft: the outlines of Bourdieu's sociology]. İstanbul: İletişim Yayıncılık.

Danahay, M. A. (1991). Breaking the silence: Symbolic violence and the teaching of contemporary " Ethnic" autobiography. *College Literature*, *18*(3), 64–79.

Elena, B. (2016). Objective Violence and Symbolic Violence in Schools. Studies on the Perception of High-school Students. *International Journal of Social and Educational Innovation (IJSEIro),* 3(5), 53–60.

Etikan, I., Alkassim, R., Abubakar, S. (2016). Comparison of snowball sampling and sequential sampling technique. *Biometrics & Biostatistics International Journal*, *3*(1), 1–2.

Gast, M. J. (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

Gergs, H. (2003). Economic, social, and symbolic capital. *International Studies of Management and Organization, 33(*2), 22–48.

Goldstein, R. A. (2005). Symbolic and institutional violence and critical educational spaces: In the name of education. *Journal of Peace Education*, *2*(1), 33–52. https://doi.org/10.1080/1740020042000334082

Herr, K. (1999). Institutional violence in the everyday practices of school: The narrative of a young lesbian. *Journal for a Just and Caring Education*, 5(3), 242–55.

Hürriyet Gazetesi. (2019, Ocak 5). Öğretmenlerin yüzde 29.3'ü şiddet görüyor [29.3 percent of the teachers are exposed to violence]. http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/gundem/ogretmenlerin-yuzde-29-3u-siddet-goruyor-41073526

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (2010). *Designing qualitative research* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Merriam, S. B. (2013). *Nitel araştırma: Desen ve uygulama için bir rehber [Qualitative research: A guide for design and application*] (S. Turan, Çev. Ed). Ankara: Nobel.

Morrison, G. M., Furlong, M. J., & Morrison, R. L. (1994). School violence to school safety: reframing the issue for school psychologists. *School Psychology Review*, 23(2), 236–256.

Murphy, M. (2018). *Sosyal teori ve eğitim Foucault, Habermas, Bourdieu ve Derrida'yı Anlamak* [*Social theory and education: Understanding Foucault, Habermas, Bourdieu and Derrida*]. (M. Korumaz ve Y.E. Ömür, Çev.). Konya: Eğitim Yayınevi.

Özsöz, C. (2013). Pratik, kültür, sermaye, habitus ve alan teorileriyle Pierre Bourdieu sosyolojisi [*Pierre Bourdieu's sociology with theories of practice, culture, capital, habitus and space].* Serap Suğur, Aylin Görgün Baran (Ed.), Sosyolojide yakın dönem gelişmeler içinde. (ss. 3-21). Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayını.

Özsöz, C. (2014). Pierre Bourdieu: Simgesel şiddet, eğitim, iktidar [Pierre Bourdieu: Symbolic violence, education, power]. *Cogito*, *74*, 290–311.

Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Nitel araştırma ve değerlendirme yöntemleri [Qualitative research and assessment methods].* (M. Bütün ve S.B. Demir, Çev.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.

Robinson, S. K., & Kerr, R. (2009). The symbolic violence of leadership: A critical hermeneutic study of leadership and succession in a British organization in the post-Soviet context. *Human Relations*, *62*(6), 875–903. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709104546

Saldaña, J. (2015). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. London: Sage.

Schmitt, C. (2006). *Siyasal kavramı* [*Political concept].* (A, Çelebi ve E. Göztepe. Çev.). İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

Schubert, J. D. (2002). Defending multiculturalism: From hegemony to symbolic violence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *45*(7), 1088–1102.

Scott, B. C. (2012). Caring teachers and symbolic violence: Engaging the productive struggle in practice and research. *Educational Studies*, *48*(6), 530–549. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2012.733279

Sullivan, A. (2002). Bourdieu and education: How useful is Bourdieu's theory for researchers? *Netherlands Journal of Social Sciences*, *38*(2), 144–166.

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. doi: 10.1080/00220270903267972

Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2011). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri [Qualitative research methods in the social sciences].* Ankara: Seçkin.