

Analyzing Symbolic Violence Phenomenon in Project Schools

Tuğba KONAL MEMİŞ¹ , Mithat KORUMAZ² 

¹PhD. Student, Yıldız Technical University,
Educational Administration, İstanbul, Türkiye
²Assoc. Prof. Dr., Yıldız Technical University,
Educational Administration, İstanbul, Türkiye

Corresponding author : Mithat Korumaz
E-mail : mkorumaz@yildiz.edu.tr

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study is to determine whether teachers are subjected to symbolic violence by administrators and, if they are, to disclose the practices of symbolic violence, the reasons behind it, and the reactions of teachers in the face of symbolic violence. The study was conducted using a single case-holistic design. The context of this study is a prestigious and well-established project high school located in one of the high-income districts of İstanbul. The participants of the research consisted of 14 project school teachers, all of whom were selected using the criterion sampling method. A semi-structured interview form, observation, and document analysis were employed in the study to collect data. The data were analyzed through thematic analysis. This study highlights three themes that are ‘incidents of symbolic violence’, ‘roots of symbolic violence at project schools’ and ‘reactions to symbolic violence’. The results demonstrate that teachers are exposed to symbolic violence, which is more visible and severe in the vertical hierarchy at school. Symbolic violence practices are exercised not only by administrators but also by the state, colleagues, and parents against teachers. Regarding the reasons for symbolic violence at project schools, administrators with high symbolic capital, pressure groups (parents/media), and pressure on success are prominent. Lastly, the study discloses that teachers mostly succumb when confronted with symbolic violence; however, some of them resist it and even choose to respond or remain unresponsive.

Keywords: Symbolic Violence, Habitus, Capital, Field, Project School

Submitted : 22.02.2024
Revision Requested : 14.06.2024
Last Revision Received : 29.06.2024
Accepted : 25.07.2024
Published Online : 10.09.2024



This article is licensed
under a Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0
International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

1. Introduction

“The word ‘violence’ is in fact applied to countless phenomena, and used to describe all sorts of events and behaviors, both individual and collective: delinquency, crime, revolution, mass murder, riots, war, terrorism, harassment, and so on” (Wiewiorka, 2009, p.3). When hearing the word ‘violence’, people often think of physical harm. However, in the modern world, the phenomenon of violence is mostly realized by dominating the mind of an agent and targeting the line of reasoning rather than physical harm. Likewise, Bourdieu focuses on the concept of symbolic violence without ignoring its physical effects. As reported by Bourdieu, “violence mostly applied through symbolic channels such as communication, acceptance, feeling, and invisible and unnoticeable for the exposed ones” (Bourdieu, 2015, p.11). In this sense, symbolic violence is regarded as a phenomenon that those who are exposed to are also responsible and unconsciously internalized and leak into the thoughts and practices of agents. Bourdieu stated that symbolic violence pervades every aspect of social spaces. Therefore, in every relationship, there is a bit of symbolic violence. Symbolic violence is a way that power—what is meant by power—is used not only by political authority, but also by those who hold large numbers and amounts of capital to consolidate and protect its symbolic power and symbolic capital, as well as its own status.

Symbolic violence basically refers to the case where agents with more symbolic capital, along with other types of capital and symbolic power, accept and approve this power and status. To achieve this, the power hierarchy can also be used as a tool. Regarding the school context, it can be seen that there are different power hierarchies, such as teacher-student, teacher-administrator or student-administrator. At this point, those who occupy higher positions in the hierarchical system at school may exert symbolic violence on others. Symbolic violence can occur in many forms at schools. Teachers may be victims of symbolic violence. Goldstein (2006) specified that stakeholders such as parents and teachers may be a matter of symbolic violence. Moreover, since administrators are at the top of the hierarchy, they may direct symbolic violence against teachers. Bourdieu (2015) claims that symbolic violence is at the center of every relationship. In this case, teachers who are responsible for revealing power relations that lead to symbolic violence and establishing critical rationality turn out to be the side exercising symbolic violence. To exemplify, the administration sometimes imposes responsibilities that are not included in the job definition on teachers against their will and requires teachers to fulfill them, or the administration intimidates the teacher with a look or tone of voice. Namely, it is in question that administrators create a power area for themselves, establish authority, and transform it into symbolic violence using the tools they already have. However, symbolic violence can sometimes be dispersed in informal horizontal social networks. That is, symbolic violence may be exercised among colleagues, administrators, or students. In this regard, it is important to disclose the symbolic violence that teachers are exposed to in order to prevent symbolic violence. Furthermore, informal social networks in schools and the fact that schools are open, social, and constantly interacting systems are both advantages and challenges to deal with the phenomenon of symbolic violence in the context of schools. However, Bourdieusian theory suggests that preventing symbolic violence can be achieved by revealing the inequalities underlying power relations. It is paradoxical that teachers are the victims of symbolic violence, but they can also be the tools that prevent it. Therefore, it is crucial to handle symbolic violence from the teacher’s perspective. The aim of this study is to determine whether administrators have inflicted incidents of symbolic violence on teachers or not, the meaning teachers attribute to the phenomenon of symbolic violence, and, if such a violence exists, to reveal the practices leading to the phenomenon of symbolic violence in educational institutions, reasons prompting administrators to exert symbolic violence on teachers, and teachers’ reactions to the phenomenon of symbolic violence.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Bourdieu’s Thinking Tools and Symbolic Violence

Bourdieu developed theories about power, stratification, action, culture, and sociological knowledge (Swartz, 2015). Despite the fact that the concepts like habitus, capital, field, symbolic power, and symbolic violence can be characterized independently, they turn out to be meaningful when they relate to each other within these theoretical frames (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2014).

Habitus, one of Bourdieu’s most well-known concepts, is a difficult concept to define precisely because of its nature. While habitus shapes the agent, it is also a concept shaped by the agent. Therefore, it is both a structured and a structuring mechanism. Bourdieu (2005) expresses the concept of habitus as the cognitive and physical schemas through which people assimilate, accept, and perceive the world during their socialization periods. In other words, it refers to the basic set of knowledge that agents possess in their schemas as a consequence of their residence in a specific culture or subculture. The relationship between habitus and symbolic violence is believed to play a crucial role in the

internalization of symbolic violence. Even our predispositions or actions in our habitus can bear traces of symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1990a). As mentioned in the previous sections, the types and volumes of the capital that the agents belong to are also determinants of their habitus. Symbolic violence, on the other hand, is a phenomenon inscribed on the body of an agent through habitus. Like habitus, habitus is a mechanism that we do not even realize when we are in it, which we accept most of the time and is deeply reflected in both our intellectual, mental, and physical processes. Our habitus has something to do with the capital types we have, and symbolic violence is the case of imposing the dominant groups' symbolic capital on the dominant ones, which means symbolic violence is a sort of process of imposing symbolic capital. This signifies that it targets transforming an agent's habitus using various channels. Moreover, habitus may prevent the agent from comprehending the symbolic violence to which they are exposed and contributes to their reproduction. In general, it may put agents in an engulfing stalemate. At this point, it is useful to remember that habitus is not accepted as a destiny because it has a structuring side. It is possible to break the chain through education and building critical rationality. Therefore, habitus can be both the cause and solution of symbolic violence.

Field is a concept that is closely related to Bourdieu's other key concepts and becomes true when used in relation to them. The field is a social space where people maneuver, develop strategies, and struggle for power (Bourdieu, 1989). The concept of the field represents the place where power relations are revealed, and the hierarchy is structured as the place where struggles are exhibited. Basically, this is where the hidden and overt aspects of the struggle between the parties and their causes are reflected. At this point, it is useful to remember the belief in victory that underlies the struggle in these fields and the idea that what is achieved is worth the struggle. This leads to some consensus on the fight. The shared consensus is called 'doxa' by Bourdieu. With the help of doxa, symbolic violence can be justified in the eyes of oppressed. Thus, fields are thought to be places where symbolic violence can be justified. The doxa that exist in the social field and the habitus that adopt it become a common game in the field and reflect symbolic violence as a natural phenomenon (Olcer, 2019). Indeed, fields are places where symbolic violence takes place. The field of education is the very field where symbolic violence is formed by political power. Because it is not overt or direct violence, it is carried out by mechanisms that are subtly and insidiously placed within the fields.

In Bourdieusian sociology, the term capital refers to any form of resource that an agent accumulates and uses to obtain power in a field. The power and influence of actions depend on the capital included. That is why; agents should have forms of capital to be powerful in a field. The inadequacy or abundance of any capital type designates the agent's power, role, and position in a field. Agents are positioned in social spaces by their size and forms of capital (Bourdieu, 1989). Capital means the ability to exchange dispositions like educational background, religious affiliation, and ways of speaking with other agents in some forms like domination, subordination, or sharing (Bourdieu, 2017). Bourdieu argues that among all other types of capital, there is also a bit of symbolic capital. Therefore, he argues that symbolic capital covers other types of capital to some extent. Furthermore, Bourdieu's concept of symbolic violence is closely related to symbolic values such as prestige, honor, and prestige that the concept of symbolic capital includes (Anderson, 2013). In the modern world, power holders instill their own values, cultural norms, language use, artistic tastes, and so forth to the oppressed through symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1984). Through institutionalized fields, especially education, they permeate their own symbolic capital into the bodies and mindsets of lower classes. The oppressed become a part of it by naturalizing and accepting symbolic violence.

This study examines the phenomenon of symbolic violence in the field of education. The climate, practices, and outcomes of schools are crucial and influential because human activities and humans themselves are at the center and education fundamentally attempts to influence people. Symbolic violence is also more about how affected people perceive and make sense of it. How the imposer displays symbolic violence also matters; however, how the affected perceive it is more vital. In this respect, there is a completely distinctive relationship between the phenomenon of symbolic violence and education. Bourdieu characterizes education as a field. As he depicted, since the concept of the field, whose boundaries are not clearly defined and are in relation with other fields, has moved from the monopoly of the agent to a national and even international dimension, the field of education also appears as a large-scale research field by including these features. Basically, education is a field where struggle prevails and symbolic violence is embodied. Moreover, Bourdieu cites that constantly reproduced symbolic violence can end by revealing unjust power relations. In that regard, questioning and revealing the place of the concept of symbolic violence in the field of education is crucial for ending the reproduction of symbolic violence in schools.

Agents struggle to occupy cultural capital through institutions in education. The education they receive offers them cultural capital, depending on their habits, economic capital, and social class. Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) argued that the cultural capital obtained through education creates inequality in the social space by offering some advantages to agents. Agents who rise to a dominant position in society want to impose their cultural capital on others, and as a result, they become a part of symbolic violence. Therefore, the reproduction of symbolic violence through schools emerges.

Moreover, under the guise of the principle of equal opportunity, schools equate socially unequal students. In this case, lower-class students automatically succumb to their education life. Thus, the school does not go beyond being the center where inequalities are reproduced. Bourdieu stated that rather than promoting equality of opportunity, the school contributes to the reproduction of social inequalities and to the legitimation of these inequalities through meritocracy discourse (Bourdieu & Whitehouse, 2013). It also uses various tools to naturalize and institutionalize inequalities and symbolic violence. For instance, central examinations are important tools that mask symbolic violence and inequalities in education. Assuming—or making the stakeholders assume—that all students come from equal conditions and have equal capital, it charges students with exams as the cause of failure.

3. Method

3.1. Research Design

We conducted the study using a case study research design, which is a qualitative research approach. According to Neuman (2012), qualitative research can be realized by examining in detail the events that occur in the natural flow of social life. We implemented a qualitative research approach in the current study because it requires in-depth interviews and analysis to make the phenomenon of symbolic violence visible in schools. In the case study, the aim is to collect extensive, systematic, and detailed information about the cases (Patton, 2014). Yin (2009) divided case studies into four categories: single case-holistic design, single case-embedded design, multiple case-holistic design, and multiple case-embedded design. When a rock-solid theory is present in a study, single cases may provide an elaborate description and even support for it (Dubois & Gadde, 2002). In this study, we implemented a single-case holistic design because there is a single analysis unit as well as a well-formulated theory and it is a matter of strengthening or refuting this theory. Because the theory of symbolic violence is widely accepted to have been well-formulated by Bourdieu, we utilized a single case of holistic design in this study.

3.2. Context of the Study

The context of the study is a project high school in İstanbul. According to paragraph 9 of Article 22 of Law No. 28941 published in the Official Gazette on March 14, 2014, project schools are defined as “the schools that are established within the framework of cooperation agreements with domestic or foreign institutions and organizations or other countries, carry out national or international projects, and implement certain education reforms and programs” (Official Gazette, 2014). Implementing the project school practice is intended to increase the quality of education in parallel with the increasing number of schools (Cırt & Günday, 2019). What is expected from these schools is to come to the fore in terms of academic success as well as social, sportive, artistic, and technological projects and to increase the quality of education.

We conducted the study in a prestigious and well-established project high school located in one of the high-income districts of İstanbul. The school has approximately 500 students and 50 teachers. The average age of the teachers is in the range of 40-45, as in many project schools. The school is among the schools preferred by students with the highest scores on the national exam held throughout Turkey. Therefore, the school involves students with the highest academic achievements across the country, and academic achievement entry levels at the school are quite high. In this sense, the school has an atmosphere in which academic success, project production, competition participation, and achieving a degree in competitions are more prominent than in other project schools. The pressure of success is intensely felt by teachers, administrators, and students. Many academic and social projects are produced at schools, and students take an active role in these projects. The school has a competitive climate among students and teachers. Administrators demand support and work from teachers in many subjects apart from their job descriptions. There is a high-power distance between administrators and teachers. The location of the school principal’s room is not immediately accessible, and approval from the secretary is often required before the principal’s meeting. In the school principal’s office, all security camera footage from the school is always kept open. In general, the attitudes of the administrator are regarded as open to communication and friendly; however, power distance is always felt. There is a formal relationship between the teachers. Although most teachers have the qualifications required to work in a project school, some have already started working at the school before it was converted into a project school, and they have a sort of unproductive attitude toward project production.

3.3. Participants

We employed a non-probability sampling method. In a qualitative study, smaller samples are purposely chosen to maximize the use of limited resources, and doing so helps to investigate the research phenomenon comprehensively

(Patton, 2014). The participants of this study comprised 14 teachers working in one of the most established and prestigious project high schools in Istanbul, Turkey. We selected the participants of the study using the criteria sampling method, which is a nonprobability sampling approach. One of the criteria within the scope of this study is that teachers had worked with administrators for at least 2 years. As the second criterion, we considered the career phases of Bakioglu (1996) and included teachers who were in the relaxation, empiricism/activism, and specialization phases to eliminate possible shyness and provide the most qualified data for the study. It is important to be able to include extensive and saturated data from a convenient number of participants that are knowledgeable and experienced in terms of the research phenomenon (Sargeant, 2012). We included 14 participants in the study because I realized that the research reached saturation. Also, we gave pseudonyms (Oblomov, Raskolnikov, Bazarov, Akakiyevic, Anna Karenina, Vlasova, Sonya Semyonovic, Natalya Rostova, Konstantin Levin, Ivan Karamazov, Chichikov, Golyadkin, Madame Odintsova) to the participants to keep their identities confidential.

Table 1. Participants' Backgrounds

Pseudonym	Educational Status	Master's Degree	Years of Experience	Experience in The Institution	Union Member
Oblomov	Bachelor's degree		20	6	no
Raskolnikov	Bachelor's degree		8	2	yes
Bazarov		Educational Administration	16	8	yes
Akakiyevic		Mathematics	17	7	yes
Anna Karenina		Educational Administration	18	9	no
Pelagueya Nilovna Vlasova	Bachelor's degree		16	10	no
Sonya Semyonovic		History	20	2	no
Natalya Rostova		Sociology	14	3	no
Konstantin Levin	Bachelor's degree		16	4	yes
Ivan Karamazov	Bachelor's degree		15	4	no
Chichikov		English	16	3	yes
Yekov Petrovic Golyadkin,	Bachelor's degree		20	11	yes
Madame Odintsova		Sociology	13	3	no
Lisa Kalitina		Educational Administration	14	5	no

As seen in the table above, 8 of the 14 teachers participating in the study had a master's degree. It is remarkable that 3 participants have a master's degree in Educational Administration and 2 participants have a master's degree in sociology, demonstrating that teachers have prior knowledge of the research phenomenon and can provide profound information flow to the research. While 8 of the participants are in the specialization phase and 5 of the participants are in the empiricism/activism phase, only 1 of the participants is in the relaxation phase. Such diversification of professional experience is actually accepted as a typical case in project schools. That is, it is not common practice for teachers with little professional experience to overlap in project schools, meaning that the context of the study represents a typical project school. In addition, the participants must meet the conditions of working with the same school administration for at least 2 years. Finally, 6 out of the 14 participants were union members. While 2 of the 6 participants are currently members of the union that has the most members and is known by many to have political ties, 4 participants are members of unions that are considered oppositional.

3.4. Data Collection

Before the data collection process, I obtained the necessary official permissions from Yıldız Technical University's Ethics Committee. One of the most important factors in qualitative research is to obtain a profound analysis based on multiple sources (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018). Based on this, we obtained data from diverse sources that presented multiple sources. Therefore, we employed a semi-structured interview form, observation, and document analysis in the study. In addition, using at least three data collection tools ensures triangulation and increases the credibility of the study (Denzin, 1978). We reviewed the relevant literature and created several questions. We formed an interview form

by selecting clear, focused, single-dimensional, and non-directing questions among these questions. While preparing the interview form, we consulted with 3 field experts and a language expert. This contributed to the credibility and transferability of the study (Yin, 2009). Then, we conducted pilot interviews with two teachers and re-examined and checked for clarity of the questions in the interview form. We also utilized unstructured observation data to support our dataset. In this observation, we included the remarkable attitudes, behaviors, and words that we encountered during breaks, meetings, and after school when some of the teachers were in their rooms. Creswell (2013) emphasized that field notes enrich the data of the study and provide a detailed setting for data analysis. Therefore, we observed where the administrators positioned themselves symbolically, particularly their attitude and communication style. Such notes are of remarkable value to make sense of symbolic violence, as they may be an obscure mechanism for victims. To contribute to research credibility, interviews should be conducted in a friendly and comfortable context (Creswell, 2013). For this reason, the first 5-10 minutes of the meeting were conversations from daily life. Each interview lasted approximately 30 minutes.

3.5. Data Analysis

We analyzed the data from the interviews using thematic analysis, which is a content analysis technique. Thematic analysis is primarily used to classify, examine, and describe themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In accordance with the content analysis technique, we applied Creswell and Creswell's (2018) five-phase data analysis framework. We analyzed data from the study in certain phases. First, to systemize the data, we transcribed and computerized the data collected in the form of audio-visual recordings. Second, we reviewed the dataset and compared it to the recordings. Then, we and a faculty member experienced in qualitative research coded the written data separately. The raw and impartial analysis of the data obtained from the interviews contributed to the credibility of the research (Creswell, 2013). Subsequently, we used the codes showing concordance from both groups to identify themes and form descriptions. Finally, we reviewed the themes and descriptions. In the final phase of the data analysis, we included documents indicating symbolic violence along with field notes that we believed would nourish the dataset and support existing themes.

3.6. Credibility and Transferability

The term validity and reliability were replaced by the concepts of credibility and transferability in qualitative research. In this study, we took various measures to contribute to the credibility and transferability of the study. In qualitative research, obtaining opinions from experts who are experienced in qualitative research and research subjects increases the credibility of the research, which is called peer debriefing (Creswell, 2013). While preparing the interview questions for the study, we consulted with 3 separate field experts along with a Turkish expert to ensure credibility. In addition, one of the most well-known ways to increase credibility is triangulation. Triangulation is accomplished by diversifying the data sources, the researcher, the theory on which it is based, and the data collection method (Denzin, 1978). Considering this, we obtained data from diverse sources that presented multiple sources. Therefore, we employed a semi-structured interview form, observation, and document analysis in the study. Using at least three data collection tools ensures triangulation and increases the credibility of the study (Denzin, 1978).

After receiving expert opinions, we conducted pilot interviews with two teachers and re-examined and checked for clarity of the questions contained in the interview form. We made the necessary corrections in line with the feedback obtained, which contributed to the transferability of the study (Creswell, 2013; Yin, 2009). For the interviews, we made use of field notes to intensify the data inference. Field notes contributed to the credibility of the study (Phillippi & Lauderdale, 2018). Therefore, we took notes during the interviews. These notes included some gestures, mimics, intonations, a glance, or an implication, and any kind of thing needs to be taken into consideration as they are difficult to record. Moreover, we recorded the interviews and sent them to the participants for approval. In qualitative studies, ensuring data accuracy promotes study transferability. To contribute to research credibility, interviews should be conducted in a friendly and comfortable context (Creswell, 2013). To this end, we set up interviews where the participants wanted and felt comfortable, as well as at a time that was convenient for them. Before starting the interview, we presented the printed version of the interview protocol in which there is information about the purpose of the research. The confidentiality of personal information and withdrawal from the research are welcomed at any time.

4. Findings

This chapter presents the findings and comments obtained from the study. As a result of the analysis, three themes emerged: "incidents of symbolic violence", "roots of symbolic violence" and "reactions to symbolic violence".

4.1. Theme 1: Incidents of Symbolic Violence

Incidents of symbolic violence in project schools are basically considered as “administrative-based”, “state-based”, “parents-based”, and “colleague-based”. One of the subthemes derived from the analysis of participants’ interviews is administrative-based symbolic violence. Teachers cite administrators as the major perpetrators of symbolic violence in schools. To illustrate this point, Oblomov perceives it as a warning that administrators show up in the teachers’ rooms when the bell is about to ring. She likens it to the act of waiting at the door to check the teachers’ arrival times and indicates his view in this way:

Oblomov: It is symbolic violence that administrators frequently show up in their teachers’ rooms. His visit to the teachers’ rooms when the bell was about to ring was a form of warning against teachers. It has prejudice in itself. It is like the fact that administrators wait at the school entrance in the mornings shows me that my arrival and departure times are being checked.

The second subtheme derived from the analysis of the interviews of participants is state-based symbolic violence. Some participants discussed symbolic violence from a broader perspective and focused on symbolic violence practices that they believe are perpetrated by the state. For example, Bazarov perceives the government’s process of transferring its ideology to students as symbolic violence against all stakeholders. Bazarov’s views on this subject are as follows:

Bazarov: The government emphasizes issues that it considers important for its ideology in its curriculum. For example, July 15. Making it mandatory for schools to create bulletin boards on this issue is an obvious symbolic act of violence against all stakeholders in the school. Other national holidays are not emphasized. . . . Why not universal values? Why is the government’s ideology wanted to be imposed on us? Or why was the importance attributed to July 15 not attributed to Republic Day? Killing another person day by day while promoting one ideology is symbolic violence by the government.

The third subtheme obtained from the analysis of the interviews is parent-based symbolic violence. Some participants argued that families consciously or unconsciously inflicted symbolic violence on teachers, administrators, and their children. For example, Levin complained about the messages and calls sent by the parents at inappropriate times and found the administration guilty in this regard. He claims that, encouraged by the attitude of the administration, parents use symbolic violence by ignoring teachers’ private lives as follows:

Levin: One of my parents’ audacity to text me at midnight, even during summer vacation, is symbolic of violence. It is also a violence that the administration is a partner in, which makes the parents think that they have this right. Because at every meeting, it is said that our teachers are supposed to share their phone numbers and create a WhatsApp group. We have to set it up if we want it or not. Otherwise, we will be blacklisted.

Another subtheme derived from the analysis of interviews is colleague-based symbolic violence. Teachers point to some colleagues as perpetrators of symbolic violence at schools. Madame Odintsova indicates that her overwork makes some of the teachers uncomfortable, placing pressure on her. She argued that overworking makes a teacher prominent, and standing out bothers some of her colleagues.

Odintsova: You are doing and you want to do it properly, but maybe your co-workers do not want to work that much and are uncomfortable with your work. In a way, it puts you under pressure. There are two sides to this: either you will work, you will make the administration happy, or you will be less visible and you will make your colleagues happy. This is actually symbolic violence by co-workers.

We also made use of the observation process in addition to the interviews. To illustrate, during the teachers’ board meetings, we took note of points such as the way the principal gave a say to the teachers and his overall attitudes. We detected that the teachers talked for only about 10 minutes in a meeting that lasted about three hours. Besides, the two-minute speech of a teacher was interrupted three times by the principal himself. However, he was disturbed by the fact that some teachers were talking to each other during his speech and felt the necessity to warn them. Realizing that he had talked too much and had not given a say to the teachers, the principal requested the clerk teacher to add some of his talk to the official meeting records. Based on the meeting observation report, we can actually say that the administrator did not give voice to the teachers and ignored their opinions, silenced and ignored them, which is an obvious form of symbolic violence.

4.2. Theme 2: Roots of Symbolic Violence

The reasons for symbolic violence at project schools acknowledged by teachers consisted of three sub-themes as “administrators with high symbolic capital”, “pressure groups (parents/media)” and “pressure of success”. The sub-theme of administrators with high symbolic capital, which is under the theme of roots of symbolic violence at project schools, highlights the attitudes of administrators who are endowed with various privileges and who have a

surplus of different types of capital in project schools, which in fact means symbolic power. Participants expressed the opinion that symbolic violence is highly likely to appear in project schools since administrators have considerable symbolic power. To illustrate, one of the teachers believed that the power of staffing is a type of symbolic power that the other administrators in other schools lack. The view of a teacher that symbolic violence results from the staffing authorization of the administrator is as follows:

Oblomov: The principal selects you and can send you a reply within 4 years. This is a practice similar to that in private schools. Therefore, it gives a completely different power to the administrators. It makes you feel like you have to everything. Prove yourself, or else, bye. In such a case, would the attitude of the principal toward you ever be the same as in other schools other than project ones? No.

The sub-theme of pressure groups (media/parents/teachers) focuses on the parents of project schools having a relatively large amount of different types of capital and some assertive teachers as well as the media, which can be a pressure factor. Because families with high cultural capital have high expectations from education, they can exert pressure on the project school. According to the participants, most families in the project schools can express themselves well and do not hesitate to hold administrators and teachers accountable when necessary. Likewise, project schools are closely followed by the media because they are schools with the highest academic success in the country. Under these circumstances, the media also function as a pressure group. To illustrate, one participant believed that administrators avoid possible negative expressions from the parents in online settings.

Oblomov: Administrators are afraid of their parents. In fact, it would be more accurate to say that they flinch from their parents. They fear that the image of the school will be destroyed. Any negative discourse by the parent is spreading very quickly now because of WhatsApp groups. Or any negative case to be posted on social media now means more than before. That is why the administrators do not want to conflict with the parents.

The sub-theme of pressure of success features stakeholders' high expectations from project schools because they are the ones with the highest academic achievement across the country. Accordingly, participants utter that the pressure to produce projects is exerted to administrators, teachers, and students exert pressure to produce projects to meet the expectation of success. They also assumed that this was due to the nature of the project schools. Most participants cite the pressure of success as the most visible reason for symbolic violence in project schools. To illustrate this point, the view of a teacher that symbolic violence results from high expectations created by the pressure of success is as follows:

Akakiyevic: Projects schools are institutions where various high goals are set, administrators and teachers are selected to carry out a mission and vision, and there are various connections and high expectations. Even the name itself has a psychological effect. This creates pressure on the administrators; therefore, this pressure inevitably reflects on the teachers.

In addition to the interviews, as part of triangulation, we observed the administrators and teachers to obtain abundant data in the natural setting of the study. Most participants cited administrators with high symbolic capital as the main source of symbolic violence in project schools. We observed some cases that were compatible with the above views. For example, a teacher who was waiting at the door for a while to meet with the principal stated that the principal always welcomed his peers and was in constant communication with union members of which he was a member. What is more, once we noted that the administrators did not find the dressing of the female students appropriate for dancing in a ceremony, and they wanted them to wear different costumes. However, we saw the families going to the principal's office together quite angry. The principal allowed the students to dance in the clothes they wanted without even arguing with their parents. After the ceremony, he stated that he had accepted the offer to prevent it from appearing on the media. This statement reveals the strength of families with abundant capital and the risks of disrepute impact administrators as well as teachers.

4.3. Theme 3: Reactions to Symbolic Violence

Reactions to symbolic violence consist of three sub-themes as "compliance", "resistance" and "inactive responses". The sub-theme of compliance includes the arguments of teachers about accepting and submitting when they are exposed to symbolic violence. For example, Rostova emphasized that victims accept symbolic violence because they avoid exposure to symbolic violence or because they fear that the volume of symbolic violence may be increased. The following is the related argument:

Rostova: We're doing nothing. If we do anything taunt or protest, we are labeled as insane. They'll cross us out. Thus, we submit. If we react, we will again be subjected to symbolic violence. When this is the case, as teachers, we choose not to do anything. It is a pity that we, as educators, do not unite against anything and do not react to anything. No strike, no reaction, no criticism. What a pity!

Regarding the resistance sub-theme, some of the participants considered that when facing symbolic violence, teachers prefer to struggle; they do not hesitate to conflict and try to eliminate symbolic violence with various methods. To exemplify this, Golyadkin utters that even if it is rare, teachers can withstand symbolic violence. However, he considers that this is a wear process described as follows:

Golyadkin: If a victim does not get tired of struggling and knows his rights, he or she may struggle and claim his rights. But that is very rare. For example, one of our school teachers is one of them. He was the person who sued for mobbing in the country. He sought justice in his previous school, but he admits that this process was grueling.

The last sub-theme, inactive responses, covers cases in which teachers neither accept nor reject symbolic violence. This indicates incidents other than direct acceptance or opposition. Rather, it refers to teachers' attitudes when dealing with symbolic violence. Participants stated that teachers can neither provide direct reactions nor remain completely silent to cope with symbolic violence. For example, Chichikov asserted that teachers prefer to grouch and share it with their friends in the face of symbolic violence:

Chichikov: Our biggest reaction is to grumble. Or to share it with our close friends. Maybe we get relieved when we share, but I don't know. That is why teachers come together, they immediately begin criticizing their administrators. For minutes. They pour out and relax. However, no one can say half of what they say to their managers' faces.

We also examined how teachers' responses vary in the face of symbolic violence practices. To set an example, one of the teachers stated in his conversation with his friends that after he had a child, the administration's view of her deteriorated, and she was made to feel that she would not work as efficiently as she used to. The attitude toward the teacher could be evaluated as symbolic violence. Regarding documentation, by analyzing one of the meetings, we observed the practice regarding the levels of English classes cited as "unanimously accepted". Contrary to what was written in the meeting record, teachers could not reach an agreement regarding the continuation or abolition of the practice, despite a long dispute. However, the administration stated that they would implement their decision. Indeed, they implied teachers' decision was somewhat of not really worth, and as a result, they declared themselves as decision makers. As a matter of fact, the "unanimous" statement in the meeting record revealed that. However, teachers did not respond to the disregard of their will. They neither showed any resistance nor made any complaints against the practice based only on the decision of the administration.

5. Discussion

According to the study results, symbolic violence acts perceived by teachers in schools fall into four subthemes. Although teachers highlighted the symbolic violence practices exercised by the administration, they also identified symbolic violence acts from a broader perspective, that is, state-based symbolic violence and those directed by parents and colleagues. The reasons why teachers consider administrators to be the most discernable source of symbolic violence at school may be several reasons. In the first place, it is known that administrators have distinctive privileges and resources in the context of the research, which is a project school. It is also indisputable that the symbolic capital of project school administrators is higher than that of other public schools. The administrators in these schools are more effective in the system because they are directly appointed by the Ministry. They have a fairly large network and can make use of union support more effectively. In addition, the opportunity to establish their own staff at the school makes them more effective in the school than other schools. By employing alternative financing tools, they can also freely act on the budget. The greater the symbolic capital, the higher the volume and frequency of symbolic violence is expected to be. Nonaka and Takeuchi (1995) denoted administrators as "knowledge engineers", which somehow empower them and legitimize their symbolic power. In project schools, based on these findings, it is the administrators, especially the principals, who are called "knowledge engineers". Thanks to the symbolic capital they belong to, both the students and teachers locate them in a higher and untouchable position at school, which increases the extent of symbolic violence and legitimization.

Capital enables agents to exchange dispositions like educational background, religious affiliation, and ways of speaking, with other agents in some forms like domination, subordination, or sharing (Bourdieu, 2017). That is, agents who have much of the type of capital that matters in a field have the power to dominate and subdue others. Furthermore, the inadequacy or abundance of any capital type designates the agent's power, role, and position in a field. Agents are positioned in social spaces by their size and forms of capital (Bourdieu, 1989). Administrators in project schools are known to make use of extensive financial resources to establish relations with unions or even directly with ministers and benefit from political power, which signifies their symbolic capital. As the source of symbolic capital in the school, the symbolic capital they own provides a kind of superiority and power to administrators. In their study, Yıldız et al. (2021) highlighted that leaders generate crises to convince their advocates of their legitimacy, and crises give rise

to symbolic violence incidents. Because symbolic capital equips agents with the power to domination over others unwittingly that they may even ratify (Jourdain & Naulin, 2016). As a matter of fact, this superiority is revealed through symbolic violence practices, as stated by the participants and supported by observation. Acts of symbolic violence exercised by administrators come in forms based on legitimate power under which symbolic violence is justified. To illustrate, administrators tend to dominate teachers mostly over schedule and security duties. Consequently, it results in the approval of power, respect, and obedience or fulfilling the legitimate demands of an agent (Swartz, 2006). In this case, teachers feel the necessity of fulfilling the legitimate requests of administrators due to the symbolic power they hold across the school.

Teachers also handle symbolic violence from a broader perspective and claim that the state produces symbolic violence at schools through various means. Likewise, in his study, Apple (2006) indicated that the government uses the curriculum as an instrument of symbolic violence to ensure the continuity of existing power relations among the classes. Bourdieusian Theory regards education as a privileged field because political power and the upper classes exert their symbolic power on unprivileged individuals in the field of education. This is done mostly through the curriculum and policies dictated by national and international powers. The symbolic values and power of the dominant are anticipated to be hidden in many elements from textbooks to elective courses, from values planned to be taught to objectives. After all, teachers perceive the government's process of transferring its ideology to students and of raising a religious generation as symbolic violence against all stakeholders. Furthermore, the recent disgracing and prevarication of the teaching profession, as well as substitute teacher practices, can be counted as acts of symbolic violence exerted by the state. Furthermore, feeling obligated to self-censor when criticizing the education system is considered an act of symbolic violence. Lastly, teachers believe that the authorization of administrators to choose teachers in project schools violates meritocracy in staffing, which might be regarded as an act of symbolic violence by itself.

Teachers consider parents to be another symbolic perpetrator at a project school. Each family is assumed to have a certain level of knowledge about the field of education, and this might be the element that determines the extent to which the family benefits or does not benefit from education. For instance, parents who have not benefited from education and have no knowledge of the field of education do not blame the education system for their child's failure; on the contrary, they put the blame on their child. On the other hand, families with high cultural capital in education systems blame the system and teachers because they know the flaws of the system. Murphy (2013) claims that the capital of families in relation to the education system is formed by their exposure to the education system and varies in accordance with their habitus and variation in capital. "Those who have the benefit, through family, parents, ... and so on, of information about the formation circuits and their actual or potential differential profit can make better educational investments and earn maximum returns on their cultural capital" (Bourdieu, 1998, p.25). At this point, social capital is believed to play a key role in the acquisition of cultural capital through education. On the other hand, it is not possible to buy cultural capital using only economic capital. Rather, families can accumulate capital that they pass on to their children. Therefore, education is also seen as a method of forming cultural capital. Although it is not just about academic knowledge, it is about much more than that. According to Murphy (2013), because lower-class families do not have strong social capital, they often set small goals for their children's education.

Another source of symbolic capital within schools is considered to be teachers' colleagues. Teachers, like other agents in the field, have different types of capital. Within the school field, some teachers may hold more economic, social, or cultural capital than their colleagues. Others may have a relatively large amount of experience in the profession or institution. The state of being more dominant in the school field as a result of experience may sometimes turn into an element of symbolic violence against newcomers and novice teachers. In the light of the obtained data, it can be seen that some young teachers are exposed to this violence because of their lack of experience. Similarly, teachers assigned to a project school from another type of school indicate that they are deficient in subject knowledge. In addition, within the competitive climate in the project school, teachers are reluctant to appreciate each other's achievements and sometimes even belittle their colleagues' achievements. That is, colleagues struggle with each other to gain various privileges in the school field. It sometimes appears in the form of ignoring, belittling, not appreciating, and sometimes vilifying colleagues to administrators or other colleagues. The teachers attribute the symbolic violence exercises that take place in the project schools to three reasons: the enormous amount of symbolic capital possessed by the administrators in the project schools, the parents and media featuring a pressure group, and the pressure of success felt by the stakeholders from diverse sources.

Bourdieu's concept of symbolic violence is closely related to symbolic values such as prestige, honor, and prestige that the concept of symbolic capital includes (Anderson, 2013). Basically, symbolic violence is the imposition of the status, prestige, power, title, value, and beliefs of power, that is, their symbolic capital, on those who are below them in social spaces, which is also accepted by the ones who are exposed to it. As the game metaphor mentioned in the

literature review suggests, rewards are not always monetary. Actors sometimes achieve symbolic gains that picture them as valuable, recognizable, useful, and prestigious both in the eyes of themselves and in the network they belong to. Administrators in project schools are acknowledged to have considerable symbolic capital through which they can be appointed. By means of the symbolic capital they possess, administrators struggle to be more prestigious and valuable within the network to which they belong and to maintain their privileges. Ensuring these privileges requires that other actors in the field approve them. For this reason, administrators consciously or unconsciously exercise symbolic violence and ensure the continuity of their dominance over school.

Administrators in project schools can make use of extensive financial resources, establish relationships with unions or even directly with the Minister, and even benefit from political power. The symbolic violence is created by the pressure of success, which can increase the intensity of symbolic violence for both teachers and administrators. In fact, this pressure may come from families, unions, the district national education directorate, or the Ministry of Education. In this regard, it is obvious that project schools have a distinctive aspect from other public schools, and administrators are equipped with various powers. This distinction may further strengthen administrators' use of symbolic violence. Many teachers succumb to this pressure so as to continue working in these schools, as students are high achievers. Furthermore, it is known that project schools are closely related to political authority, and the social capital and symbolic power of administrators appointed to these schools are quite high, which equips administrators with even more symbolic power. Furthermore, in project schools, the accountability mechanism works effectively, and the concept of accountability comes to the fore (Genç, 2021). A tighter accountability mechanism is said to operate thanks to the direct communication of the administrators in the project schools with the Ministry. As a matter of fact, the success rates and project production in these schools are closely followed by the authorities, media, and parents. All these factors are believed to play a crucial role in the volume of symbolic violence that takes place in project schools.

Regarding reactions in the face of symbolic violence, most participants assert that teachers choose not to succumb when confronted with symbolic violence. The minority indicates that some teachers resist symbolic violence and even choose to respond or remain unresponsive. The habitus of an agent determines how he or she will behave in the face of an incident or action. The relationship between habitus and symbolic violence is believed to play a crucial role in the internalization of symbolic violence. Even our predispositions or actions in our habitus actually bear traces of symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1990a). Moreover, habitus may prevent the agent from comprehending the symbolic violence to which they are exposed and contributes to its reproduction. Agents act like fish in the sea, an ordinary world for fish (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 2014). In general, it may put agents in an engulfing stalemate. It is possible to break the chain through education and building critical rationality. Therefore, habitus can be both the cause and solution of symbolic violence. Teachers, on the other hand, since they normalize symbolic violence as part of and as a result of their habitus, they often adopt a submissive attitude or do not even realize what they are subjected to. Teachers who react to or resist symbolic violence may be aware of this phenomenon but do not normalize or legitimize it in their habitus. Nevertheless, as suggested by Bhambra and Shilliam (2009), being silent does not come through just by permitting subordinates to talk or to utter their matters; instead, organized or structural alterations should be employed so as to ensure that they are truly taken into consideration. Therefore, it is crucial that teachers make structural adjustments as well as not remaining silent in the presence of symbolic violence. In fact, the phenomenon of symbolic violence should be addressed within the framework of critical theory. It is necessary for teachers to object against the symbolic violence that they are subjected to and even produce without even being aware of Objecting, on the other hand, is possible only with inquisitiveness and reactivity that take place on the ground of reflexivity (Topcu & Yaslioglu, 2022). With a participatory approach to organizational processes, it may be possible to reduce the effects of symbolic violence by pacifying elements that ensure the maintenance of existing power relations and by uniting social and organizational realities on the same ground (Topcu & Yaslioglu, 2022).

Recommendations based on the results of the study are as follows for policymakers and practitioners:

- Teachers and other stakeholders in the school field must develop a critical awareness of the symbolic violence phenomenon, and equal participation in both decision-making and implementation processes should be favored within schools.
- An internal evaluation process should be employed to highlight symbolic violence practices and to reveal the beliefs, values, attitudes, behaviors, and discourses of administrators and teachers through which both may acquire critical reflexivity.
- Heterodox arguments should be supported in schools so as to unsettle orthodoxy, the loss of prestige and the precarisation of the teaching profession.

Recommendations based on the results of the study are as follows:

- The study was carried out as a single case study in a prestigious and well-established project high school located in one of the high-income districts of İstanbul. Although it is based on a well-established theory and ensures the use of multiple data from different tools, multiple case studies may be favored to gain more profound insight and consider the research phenomenon in its natural flow in various contexts.
- In the research, it is seen that teachers are not only exposed to symbolic violence but also exercise it because of the symbolic power they hold within the classroom. Therefore, studying the phenomenon of symbolic violence reproduced by teachers and directed at students may be beneficial in terms of examining symbolic violence practices in schools holistically and making the phenomenon visible from the perspective of different stakeholders.

Ethics Committee Approval: They obtained the necessary official permissions from Yıldız Technical University's Ethics Committee (03.08.2022/2022.08).

Informed Consent: Consent was obtained from the participants.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Author Contributions: Conception/Design of Study- M.K., T.K.M.; Data Acquisition- M.K., T.K.M.; Data Analysis/Interpretation- M.K., T.K.M.; Drafting Manuscript- M.K., T.K.M.; Critical Revision of Manuscript- M.K., T.K.M.; Final Approval and Accountability- M.K., T.K.M.

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.

ORCID :

Tuğba KONAL MEMİŞ 0000-0002-4612-2236
Mithat KORUMAZ 0000-0003-1800-7633

REFERENCES

- Anderson, A. (2013). Teach for America and symbolic violence: A Bourdieuan analysis of education's next quick-fix. *The Urban Review*, 45(5), 684–700. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11256-013-0241-x>
- Apple, M. W. (2006). *Eğitim ve iktidar* [Education and power] (E. Bulut, Trans.). İstanbul: Kalkedon Publishing.
- Bakioglu, A. (1996). Öğretmenlerin Kariyer Evreleri (Türkiye'de Resmi Lise Öğretmenleri Üzerinde Yapılan Bir Araştırma. *M. Ü. Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi 2. Ulusal Eğitim Sempozyumu Bildirileri*. Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Bhambra, G., & Shilliam, R. (2009). *Silencing human rights: Critical engagements with a contested project*. London: Macmillan.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Dinstinction: a social critique of the judgement of the taste* [La distinction: critique sociale du jugement]. (R. Nice, Trans.). New York: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological Theory*, 7(1), 14–25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/202060>
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason: on the theory of action*. Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990a). *The logic of practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2005). *The social structures of the economy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. (2014). *Düşünsel bir antropoloji için cevaplar* [Answers for a reflective anthropology]. (N. Ökten, Trans.). İstanbul: İletişim Publishing.
- Bourdieu, P. (2015). *Masculine domination*. Ankara: Bağlam Publishing.
- Bourdieu P. (2015a). *Pratik nedenler*. (H. U. Tanrıöver, Trans.). Ankara: Kesit Publishing.
- Bourdieu, P. (2017). *Ayrim: Beğeni yargısının toplumsal eleştirisi*, (D. Fırat & G. Berkkurt, Trans.). Ankara: Heretik Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Whitehouse, J. C. (2013). The school as a conservative force: Scholastic and cultural inequalities. In *Contemporary Research in the Sociology of Education* (RLE Edu L) (pp. 32-46). London: Routledge.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Cirit, H., & Gunday, R. (2019). Ortaöğretim özel program ve proje uygulayan eğitim kurumları'nın arka planı ve proje okul uygulamaları. *Uluslararası Türk Kültür Coğrafyasında Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(2), 143-151.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among the five approaches* (3rd ed.). New York: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). London: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research. In *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed., pp. 29-71). London: Sage.
- Dubois, A., & Gadde, L., E. (2002). Systematic combining: An abductive approach to case research. *Journal of Business Research*, 55(7), 553–560. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963\(00\)00195-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(00)00195-8)
- Genc, G. A. (2021) *Proje okullarında algılanan örgütsel destek, okul etkililiği ve örgütsel vatandaşlık davranışı arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi* (Publicaiton (Giresun ili örneği) (No. 690646) [Master's Thesis, Giresun University]. YÖK Ulusal Tez Merkezi.
- Goldstein, R. A. (2006). Symbolic and institutional violence and critical educational spaces: In the name of education. *Journal of Peace Education*, 2(1), 33– 52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1740020042000334082>
- Jourdain, A., & Naulin, S. (2016). *Pierre Bourdieu'nün kuramı ve sosyolojik kullanımı*. (Ö. Elitez, Trans.). İstanbul: İletişim Publishing.
- Ministry of National Education Regulation of Educational Institutions Implementing Special Programs and Projects, T. R. Official Gazette, Issue: 29818 (2016a). <https://www.resmigazete.gov.tr>

- Murphy, M. (2013). *Social theory and educational research. Understanding Foucault, Habermas, Bourdieu and Derrida*. London: Routledge.
- Neuman, W. L. (2012). *Toplumsal araştırma yöntemleri: Nicel ve nitel yaklaşımlar I-II. cilt* (5th Ed.). Ankara: Yayın Odası.
- Nonaka I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge creating company*. Oxford University Press.
- Olcer, H. (2019). Pierre Bourdieu sosyolojisinde simgesel şiddet sorunsalı ve biçimleri. *Nosyon: Uluslararası Toplum ve Kültür Çalışmaları Dergisi*, 2, 34-49.
- Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Nitel araştırma ve değerlendirme yöntemleri* [Qualitative research and assessment methods]. (M. Bütün and S.B. Demir, Trans.). Ankara: Pegem Akademi.
- Phillippi, J., & Lauderdale, J. (2018). A guide to field notes for qualitative research: Context and conversation. *Qualitative Health Research*, 28(3), 381-388. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1049732317697102>
- Sargeant, J. (2012). Qualitative research part II: participants, analysis, and quality assurance. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 4(1), 1-3.
- Swartz, D. L. (2015). *Kültür ve iktidar: Pierre Bourdieu'nün sosyolojisi* [Culture and power: the sociology of Pierre Bourdieu]. (E. Gen, Trans.). İstanbul: İletişim Publishing.
- Topcu, G., & Yaslioglu, M. M. (2022). Sembolik (simgesel) şiddeti eleştirel yönetim perspektifinde değerlendirmek ve mücadele etmek mümkün mü? *İktisat İşletme ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi*, 1 (1), 117-128.
- Wieviorka, M. (2009). *Violence: A new approach*. London: Sage.
- Yildiz, S., Korumaz, M., & Balyer, A. (2021). Symbolic violence teachers experience at schools. *Journal of Economy Culture and Society*, 63, 165-180. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26650/JECS2020-0101>
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and method* (4th Ed.). London: Sage.

How cite this article

Konal Memiş, T., & Korumaz, M. (2024). Analyzing symbolic violence phenomenon in project schools. *Journal of Economy Culture and Society*, 70, 107-120. [10.26650/JECS2024-1441308](https://doi.org/10.26650/JECS2024-1441308)