



The symbolic violence in universities and the manipulation of communication.

Analysis from Pierre Bordeaux's approach

Alileche Hamama ^{1,*}, Adjal Assia

¹ University of Skikda 20 aut 1955 (Algeria), h.alileche@univ-skikda.dz

² University of Djilali Bounaama khemis Miliana (Algeria), assia.adjal@univ-dbkkm.dz

Received: 31 / 01 / 2024

Accepted: 05 / 05 / 2024

Published: 30 / 06 / 2024

Abstract:

This study explores symbolic violence in higher education institutions, shedding light on the system related to symbolic violence and its role in producing and reproducing class hegemony. The university serves an ideological class function, shaping and reproducing society in its image. This class function occurs in a space of ideological conflict, where the university becomes a symbolic battleground between different class components of society.

Symbolic efficacy in the university, as an ideological class practice, is examined in this study. It aims to explore various concepts and perceptions that can reveal the most concealed symbolic class practices within higher education institutions. The study provides an analysis of various symbolic ideological violence practices in the content, language, goals, and underlying relationships in different aspects of education. In short, the study explores the dimensions of the complex relationship between violence and symbolism in the academic space as a symbolic battleground

Keywords: cultural capital; economic capital; higher education institutions; social status; Symbolic violence;.

*Corresponding Author

I. INTRODUCTION

Understanding social variation, represented by existing differences among people and classes in society, is essential to comprehend the prevailing inequality in the system. Disparities in social and economic levels result in incongruent communication levels. Society and the university represent a vast social space built on the relationships between societal components, manifested in the relationship between individuals and their institutions. Individuals in society conform to the fundamental orientations shaped by their social upbringing. Their social positions and roles – whether in positions of control or subordination – are determined by intersections of economic and cultural capital they possess. In other words, their social status is related to both their economic capital on one hand and their educational-cultural capital on the other – their level of cultural qualification. (Al-Ayadi, Michel, 1994)

In this context, we distinguish between three societal classes: first, the dominant bourgeois class with the highest cultural and economic capital among social classes. Second, the middle class (upper professionals and educated employees) with lower overall capital than the upper class but a significant inclination toward social ascent. Third, the popular class (workers and farmers) lacking real capital in both economic and cultural dimensions.. (Bourdieu, Jean-Claude, 1970)

The society is composed of social sectors varying in their degrees of independence, each possessing its own logic in the production process, such as the economic, political, artistic, and educational sectors. These sectors integrate to form the comprehensive social space after the redistribution of capital between dominant and subordinate classes.. (Bourdieu, Jean-Claude, 1985)

The society constitutes a functional social unit, and therefore, the solidarity pattern that preserves the unity of the society conceals a framework of power relations and dominance in service of the ruling class. At this level of social solidarity, privileged individuals work to impose their dominance as they possess the means to retain control over the upper areas of the social space. It is worth noting that the primary goal of the university in this interactive and conflictual space is not only to prepare individuals for specific social roles but also to prepare them to accept socio-economic inequality resulting from variations in their competencies, self-capabilities, and technological advancements (Bourdieu, 1980)

Within this academic space filled with social conflict, the digital space possesses its own sphere in the process of production and reproduction of existing social conditions. It works towards distributing and categorizing individuals based on their cultural capital. Every university student has distinct characteristics enabling them to produce and reproduce the fundamental conditions of their existence. This process allows them to achieve the principle of self-perpetuation within an institution capable of performing the function of cultural normalization in society. Based on this depiction, the process of reproduction contributes to shaping and generating social relationships among classes and social categories, thereby reproducing social relations(Bourdieu, Jean-Claude, 2007)

1. symbolic violence in the university

The university system fundamentally relies on the data of the societal system. This implies that the university system directly contributes to the production and reproduction of the social system as a whole, maintaining the continuity of the original class structure in society. In contemporary societies, the university dominates the entire field, reminiscent of the historical influence of the church and its dominance over the religious domain in medieval Christian Europe(Bourdieu, 1994)

The symbolic authority existing in the academic field is considered legitimate authority and takes on a transparent character in the realm of relationships among individuals. For example, an individual can provide an interpretation that contradicts the essence of sacred texts based on their cultural-religious capital, through a respectful relationship with the legitimate patterns of expression. This is done to present the interpretation as religious rather than political. It is

emphasized that every university student is adept at using symbolic language in their respective fields. The key difference between the religious institution and the university lies in the fact that the dominant ruling class is the one granting the university its symbolic authority and cultural dominance. In contrast, the church derives its authority from its spiritual function derived from the divine, and when comparing the two authorities, we find that the source of authority in the university takes on a hidden symbolic nature, whereas this nature is overt in the case of the church's authority . (Bourdieu, 1992)

When discussing the academic field, it doesn't solely encompass various relationships among students, such as the influence of the family, which may not seem to have an apparent connection with social classes. Ultimately, it is the university - through processes of exclusion and alignment - that determines the student's social position in society, not the family to which they belong. Similarly, the church prevails in disseminating its religious message. The university sets the standards for success in society, being the institution deemed most legitimate and objective. At this level, technology ignores the reality of the role played by the family in shaping and building an individual. The class-based society necessarily categorizes families and households into social classes based on the total capital, inseparable from technology, particularly cultural and intellectual capital. (Belkziz, 1996)

On the other hand, the communicative action of the family significantly impacts determining the individual's future destiny. This influence persists throughout the child's life, shaping their later habitus and defining the distances the child must overcome and the cultural content they must imbibe .(Belkziz, 1996)

The family is the one that normalizes the child according to its specific "habitus." However, this "habitus" can be distinctive or weak at the academic level, regardless of the individual's level of mental readiness. The university can be linked to the reproduction of society in a way where each individual believes they are pursuing their interests. This, in turn, leads to the production and reproduction of class domination. The hidden symbolic violence among students within the university is crucial, as it takes the form of symbolic violence, allowing the dominant class to impose its cultural dominance as the sole ideal model that gains legitimacy in the university. Bourdieu refers to this symbolic violence as "cultural arbitrariness" because it lacks an objectively justifiable basis for its existence, and there is no objective justification for the cultural superiority of the dominant class in society.(Bourdieu, 1992)

The legitimacy that characterizes authority in the university establishes cultural arbitrariness and contributes to giving symbolic violence its legitimate character while maintaining its hidden class nature. In simpler terms, the authority marked by its superiority takes on a legitimate character. (Bourdieu, , 1972)

Amidst this arbitrary presence of class culture, the transformed nature of culture remains undefined. The university, with its goals and means, seems essential for both those subject to it and those shaping its strategies. In other words, the university turns into a necessary, legitimate, and demanded entity for both oppressors and the oppressed in the class and social sense. It takes its place deep within this circle, exercising additional coercion in the context of the dominance of the ruling interests. This also implies the cultural dominance of the upper classes within the university. In this direction, we find that the school adopts the authority dictated by the ruling class, where bourgeois authority takes the form of the academic model relied upon in higher education institutions .(Bourdieu, , 1998)

The internal practices of the university align implicitly with the necessary external conditions of the dominating classes. Consequently, everything happening within the university reproduces existing class-based social power relations in society. This process confers legitimacy on these relationships, and within this cycle, symbolic power is exercised, taking on a subtle and concealed nature within the university.(Bourdieu, , 1998)

The university performs the function of preserving the current conditions, keeping this role within the realm of academic concealment. The prevalent conditions in the university often

employ a class-based employment that serves the socially and economically dominant classes. This means that the dynamics of academic success and promotion, as in various aspects of university interactions and activities, covertly and intelligently work to produce and reproduce conditions of excellence and success for the offspring of the socially and economically dominant classes at the expense of the working and popular classes.(Bourdieu, Establet , 1974)

The school performs the function of cultural normalization, in this context, it elevates and reinforces the culture of the bourgeoisie without considering that the dominant class culture is just one of several possible cultural options in society. The internal function of the university, as a bourgeois normalization, integrates with its external function, confirming the dominance of the bourgeois class in society, and producing power relations that connect this class with the less present and influential social classes. In other words, the university produces and reproduces class power and influence in society through its selective activities. According to this effectiveness, it reproduces class division in society, classifying students hierarchically and exerting class-based influence that reaffirms the dominance of the upper and middle classes in society each time.(Ivan Illich, 1971)

The process of producing power relations manifests as a selective effectiveness. University selection is based on choosing individuals with a culture that aligns with the group culture. Simply put, the university translates this through the acquired class-based cultural capital reflected in individuals' modes of expression, writing styles, and symbolic assets. Individuals from the upper classes possess a distinct cultural spirit, showing more harmony with the cultural character of the settings, determined by the influence of the cultural capital of their dominant class in society.(Georges, 1982)

2. Electronic Reproduction of Societal Habitus:

In this context, linguistic levels vary with different social classes. The language of marginalized popular classes differs from the language of online platforms and is relatively distant. This means that individuals from this class will face greater difficulties than bourgeois individuals who feel that the language of online platforms is a natural extension of their language in the social and class environment they live in.(Basil, 1975)

In this regard, the class habitus is on varying degrees of homogeneity and difference with the academic habitus. This implies that the university endorses those who possess a culturally aligned capital with the dominant culture, taking the bourgeois class model, represented, for example, by the student union, as a cultural model. Therefore, those who have the conditions for success are often those who nourish their culture in their family environment, while it is more challenging for those who do not find internet culture in their social milieu. For the first group, learning in university is enjoyable and engaging, while for the second group, representing the working-class, it is challenging, exhausting, and less appealing. (Bourdieu, 1990)

Therefore, those who often suffer from symbolic violence are often affiliated with social and cultural backgrounds distant from internet culture. By this, we mean individuals from lower social classes who possess cultural and linguistic capital less aligned with the structure of electronic culture and its requirements. These individuals, representing working-class backgrounds, have not learned how to express themselves in a technological manner or in a typical style required by electronic culture. This results from the lower cultural capital of their families, affecting various aspects of life, inspiring and solidifying the bourgeois model in various activities .(Bourdieu, Jean-Claude, 2007)

Building on this understanding, electronic platforms inadvertently work to limit the aspirations of individuals from lower classes. On the other hand, they enhance these aspirations for individuals from more affluent social classes in society. Regardless of the opportunities for individuals from lower classes to participate in university, these opportunities remain modest compared to what we observe for individuals from higher social classes, mainly due to various conditions, with economic status being a significant factor .(Bourdieu, 1970)

Undoubtedly, social environment exerts significant pressure on the level of virtual aspirations and participation. From this perspective, a significant disparity exists between the opportunities for individuals from humble social classes and those from affluent social classes in society. The university selection process, relying on exams and grades, greatly influences determining the actual aspirations of individuals based on their social and class backgrounds.(Bourdieu, 1970)

Even if we consider that acquiring linguistic cultural capital in the university has been liberated from the influence of social-class origins and has achieved significant improvement, the impact of this factor remains. It persists due to the influence of the initial implicit orientations (first impressions) concerning the relationship between social origin, culture, and the internet.(Bourdieu, 1990)

It is self-evident that electronic platforms not only exclude individuals from their family culture but also make them struggle to access the required culture. They simply lose the ability to coexist with this new culture, which closely aligns with the dominant class culture in society. Individuals from these classes are required to look at things, understand them, and act towards them in a vastly different way than their parents and what they are accustomed to in their family and class environments. This process is under the influence of a cultural normalization process of alienation in the university, causing individuals from lower classes to lose their true sense of belonging to their original world. This unequal normalization is a representation of the communication model required in the university.(Bourdieu, 1978)

This concept provides a methodological approach to uncover the mental activities practiced by society in shaping individuals' minds through the holistic power of moral ability. Symbolic violence dons the guise of a hidden moral authority that imposes a system of thoughts, meanings, symbols, and signs as legitimate. In any case, this authority works to conceal the power relations inherent in the origin of this power or in the configurations of symbolic violence itself. This implies that symbolic violence takes the form of a power capable of imposing a system of meanings and interpretations as legitimate, hiding the relationships of influence and power present in its very origin.(Johann Friedrich, 1978)

The concept of symbolic violence has been established and granted legitimacy to define its dimensions and limits, necessarily working to explore its intellectual implications and identify the ideological functions performed by this type of violence, characterized by its intelligence and cunning. It has the ability to hide and ambush its victims on various ideological levels. This violence is adept at evading its practitioners and victims simultaneously, delving into the depths of its effects, delineating its paths, and exposing its ideological intricacies.(Durkheim, 1963)

The intricate relationship between symbolic violence and university students, in all its manifestations, reveals the various effects this violence leaves on the human formations of individual and social identities. In this context, the psychological pains generated by this violence among students belonging to marginal cultural identities are evident. These include narcissistic injuries to identity, self-deprecation, cultural deprivation, and other psychological-cultural symptoms.(Bourdieu, 1970)

Bourdieu extensively utilized and employed the concept of symbolic violence in most of his sociological and educational writings, as well as in his literary works. He employed it to explore dimensions of male dominance, ideological control, and reproduction, such as in his study of "Habitus" in class and family. He applied it to a variety of intellectual and social issues throughout his theoretical frameworks and scientific works.(Bourdieu, 1970)

Bourdieu defines symbolic violence in his book "Practical Reason" as "subtle, invisible, and unknown violence practiced by both its perpetrators and victims simultaneously." This violence manifests in value-based, emotional, ethical, and cultural practices and employs symbolic tools like language, images, signs, meanings. Often, this violence is revealed in the shadows of symbolic ethical practices against its victims.(Georges, 1982)

In another instance, in collaboration with Jean-Claude Passeron in "Reproduction," Bourdieu defines symbolic violence as "any power of symbolic violence, i.e., any power that affects the imposition of meanings, and imposes them as legitimate, capable of concealing the power relations from which it derives its strength." In another context, he defines it as "any influence that succeeds in imposing specific meanings, presenting them as legitimate, thereby concealing the power relations that underlie its strength." (Georges, 1982)

This concept serves as a mental starting point for uncovering the ideological mental activities practiced by society, class-wise, to shape individuals' minds through an overarching moral power. This implies that symbolic violence assumes the guise of a hidden moral authority imposing a system of thoughts, meanings, and symbols as legitimate. In any case, this authority works to conceal the latent power relations inherent in its origin or in the configurations of symbolic violence itself. (Bourdieu, 1971)

According to this perspective, symbolic violence represents a form of clever violence, an advanced sociological manifestation, playing its cultural role in various social aspects of life. This violence distinguishes itself with intelligence and the ability to hide; it is a type of violence that lives in the subtleties of life and remains concealed. It forms a hidden, veiled, and elusive aspect of concealed violence that eludes observation. (Evelyne, 1981)

Bourdieu defines symbolic violence as the use of symbols, signs, and meanings to control and dominate others. This form of violence takes on a hidden symbolic appearance that enables its practitioners to achieve their goals, exert control, and dominance without resorting to overt and declared force. Symbolic violence is the ability to generate a state of compliance and submission in others by imposing a system of social ideas and beliefs. It relies on generating and ingraining these beliefs in the minds of those subjected to it. Symbolic violence stems from the theory of belief production and, consequently, the production of a group of individuals capable of exercising cultural evaluation and normalization in discourse situations that enable them to culturally and ideologically control others. (Ivan Illich, 1983)

Symbolic violence takes the form of cultural violence to perform major social functions. It can be observed in situations of dominance practiced by those in power over their followers in a masked and deceptive manner. They impose their moral and intellectual references on their followers, creating a deep sense of inferiority, inadequacy, and feelings of deficiency, especially in relation to the ruling class. The subordinates take their place under the umbrella of standards and symbols that reinforce their inferiority, secondary positions, and the sense of lacking in self-worth, talent, honor, and dignity, contributing to a diminished sense of self-esteem. (Saeed Ismail, 1995)

Symbolic violence is intended to generate a state of compliance and submission in others by imposing a system of social ideas and beliefs, often emanating from social and class forces centered in positions of dominance and sovereignty. This type of violence aims to create specific beliefs and ideologies and embed them in the minds of those subjected to this form of violence.

Symbolic violence serves as an expression of the presence of symbolic capital, manifested through cultural elements (values, perceptions, ideas, beliefs, statements, signs, and symbols). Consequently, cultural capital is stripped down to acquire cultural power—meaning legitimacy in presence and practice. Therefore, the exercise of symbolic violence is contingent on the existence of symbolic capital. This capital is then crowned with symbolic authority, expressing its legitimacy. Legitimacy, in this context, implies acceptance of this authority as legitimate and real by those upon whom it is practiced.

To offer a simple understanding of symbolic violence, identifying its characteristics, implications, and features, it can be compared to physical or material violence in terms of the effects each leaves behind: "Physical violence inflicts harm on the subject (upon whom violence is imposed) physically, in the body, or in rights, interests, or security, etc. Symbolic violence, on the other hand, inflicts psychological harm on the subject in terms of self-security, reassurance,

dignity, esteem, and balance. Symbolic violence is no less severe in consequences than physical violence, and while it may not touch upon the right to life, as physical violence sometimes does, it might affect what is sacred to the individual. Symbolic violence could be a stage toward engaging in physical violence. In general, the meaning of violence in this type does not differ from its meaning in the other type, which is the coercion of demands by force, compelling others to relinquish or acknowledge them. In this distinction between the two types of violence, it becomes evident that symbolic violence may be more effective and powerful in achieving its goals than classical security and physical violence if successful. It is crucial to emphasize that the legitimacy of this violence may be the most significant factor in achieving the domination and submission it seeks."

In other words, symbolic violence is more capable and effective than physical violence, as exercised by the state through security forces and the police in specific conditions. One of the major errors of Marxist classics, according to Bourdieu, is that they did not give enough attention to this hidden symbolic power, especially the one exercised in the economic field.

In conclusion, based on this comparison between symbolic violence and physical violence, we can define symbolic violence according to Pierre Bourdieu as "any power capable of imposing a system of meanings and signs as legitimate, thereby hiding the relationships of influence and power inherent in that power itself." This means:

- Symbolic violence takes the form of a power that imposes itself on a group of individuals.
- This power imposes a system of symbolic meanings, values, and signs.
- Symbolic violence legitimates itself by concealing its purposes and power relationships.(Bourdieu, 1970)

Symbolic violence takes on a hidden form, where its impact infiltrates the consciousness of its victims spontaneously, without them feeling the constraints of traditional violence.

In another context, Bourdieu declares in his book "Masculine Domination" that symbolic violence is "transparent, calm violence that penetrates the threshold of vision, escaping the eye and remaining unseen even by its victims. This violence relies on establishing shared perceptions, visions, statements, meanings, and concepts between the victim and the oppressor. Symbolic violence imposes assumptions that, upon careful consideration, appear less credible, revealing acceptance of them as a serious mistake. These assumptions make us perceive historical cultural phenomena as eternal nature or a divine system transcending time.

Violence directed against women is one of the most regulated scenes of symbolic violence throughout history, rooted in the deepest dimensions of human history. One of the most severe forms of cultural violence is symbolic violence that seems intuitive, imposing itself on the victim, oppressor, and judge while claiming not to be violence.

On the other hand, the symbol itself possesses its unique form of violence with the power to influence. It holds the charm of words, the beauty of images, the excellence of meaning, and the agility of expression. It is a transparent, enchanting, mysterious force with aesthetic authority. According to this perspective, cultural, ideological, and philosophical violence, as seen by Bourdieu, takes the form of symbolic violence that asserts itself in the realm of values and the field of symbols, signs, and meanings. Throughout history, symbols have been used to control the higher universe and regulate the cosmic forces (the metaphysical world) and have been employed to control the destinies of humans and determine their social fate.(Robeert, 1971)

If ancient humans truly believed in the power of their symbols to change destiny in the world of gods and invisible natural forces, it is only natural for them to acknowledge the ability of symbols themselves and their effectiveness in influencing humans. Here, the cycle of social faith in the power and danger of symbols began to shape his social belief system strongly. According to this perspective, human symbols evolved into a colossal cultural force, exerting pressure and dominance over specific social groups. Symbol producers, including priests,

sorcerers, and seers, found that they could employ their symbols to control their social environment. They charged these symbols with a sacred character and utilized them to establish broad and comprehensive class domination throughout different eras.

Symbols continue to play a significant role as a class weapon used by religious and secular classes to intensify power, dominance, and differentiation in human societies. In essence, symbols overflow with their inherent power, imposing themselves as a tremendous force in the human imagination. They work to construct and generate meanings, eventually possessing the tremendous power to make human knowledge possible, science accessible, and civilization a lasting entity. Based on this perspective, it can be said that the symbol embodies the image of symbolic capital, capable of manifesting as symbolic authority with the ability to act and influence social, political, and spiritual life.

3. Cultural oppression within the university

When we talk about power, it means the legitimate force possessed by a society, institution, or individual to exercise it for the process of self-regulation in society. This implies that security, police, and social control tools in the state represent legitimate instruments used by the state to impose its authority and system. Hence, any practice of violence seems legitimate if its goal is to preserve the society's safety and security. According to this perspective, the symbol represents legitimate authority and legitimate violence because it expresses a general social conception, gaining consensus from members of society or the majority.

Nevertheless, symbolic domination fundamentally involves normalizing the "other" to feel a sense of subordination, diminished self-worth, and self-contempt. At its core, symbolic domination involves a camouflage process relying on symbolic activities to achieve its power-driven objectives and authoritative goals.(Robeert, 1971)

According to Bourdieu, humans are symbolic beings who produce and shape themselves through symbols. In this view, university relationships constitute the symbolic crucible where human beings are built and formed. University relations represent a dynamic network of symbolic cultural elements, encompassing concepts, meanings, and values. When a person exists symbolically within a context, the place, time, relationships, and elements of existence influence the individual's awareness symbolically. These factors turn into internal programming energy, conditioning human behavior and linking them to a symbolic inevitability.

Throughout history, human rituals, magical behaviors, sacred systems, and myths are systems of unconscious symbolic activities representing the long human history. It is inherent to say that humans are psychologically malleable entities, and this shaping occurs in the context of symbolic exchange in various university institutions. Each educational or social relationship has a specific symbolic psychological content. Therefore, the psychological construction of individuals is significantly influenced by the symbolic educational content surrounding them. The psychological formation is determined by the symbolic contents of interactions within the university in their social environment. This emphasizes the importance of researching the symbolic interactions and their role in shaping the individual and their identity.

Herbart, a long time ago, sensed the symbolic energy of the educational act and realized that educational actions dig their path into human existence. Authority does not lie in violent outbursts, as the child is not better educated through physical violence. The further we distance ourselves from physical violence, the more we can influence children. Education, based on patience and continuity, away from instant visible results, has a more profound impact. Symbolic education is likened to the magnetic force in its symbolic influence, as seen in some ongoing African studies. These studies reveal the intelligent symbolic forces exercised by university institutions in cultural and ideological transformation, a powerful and hidden force shaping individuals' minds and attitudes.

Claude Duneton employed the concept of cultural oppression "L'intimidation culturelle" to refer to the symbolic violence practiced in educational institutions. Cultural oppression takes the form

of symbolic violence, and its psychological effects are more profound and dangerous than other psychological or physical forms. Symbolic violence continuously flows, maintaining its symbolic efficacy over consecutive years in educational life. It strips students of self-confidence, pushing them towards continuous self-deprecation. Symbolic violence, in this formulation, takes the shape of a mysterious and ambiguous cultural oppressive force, leaving the student helpless in the face of the symbolic pressures and meanings. This cultural oppression prompts indifference and submission due to its mysterious nature, making it challenging for students to discern its dimensions and intricacies.(Al-Naqib, Khaldoun , 1993)

The university is both a cause and a consequence simultaneously. While it is a product of labor division and class struggle, it works to reproduce society in a class-based manner. This implies the reproduction of the ruling class values by normalizing the lower-class individuals through cultural and linguistic symbols. For example, individuals from working-class origins encounter several disparities within the university due to their original language differing from the university's language, conflicting with the dominant class's language. Cultural identity also differs from their affluent peers, potentially saturated with Francophone or Anglo-Saxon identities. Poverty in individuals from lower-income neighborhoods may lead to a lack of equal opportunities in technological aspects, intellectual skill acquisition, analytical abilities, and reasoning. This socioeconomic and economic disparity contributes to escalating social conflicts within the university space.

This means that bourgeois individuals experience continuity and integration between their class culture and university culture, facilitating their alignment. Consequently, they become heirs to the social system. On the other hand, lower-class individuals experience discontinuity and contradiction between their class culture and university culture. This estranges them from the university culture, requiring them to shed remnants of their culture and learn new language and thinking approaches to socially align with it. When discussing cultural conflict, it is essential to note the symbolic nature of this conflict, involving symbols, meanings, and interpretations. Sociologists employ the concept of cultural conflict, focusing on the conflict of meanings, symbols, and significances—a hidden and subtle conflict that infiltrates life's sphere, impacting individuals' psychological and ideological formation. It affects participation, leading to the exclusion of working-class individuals while reinforcing the presence of bourgeois offspring. (Al-Naqib, Khaldoun , 1993)

It may be useful to reiterate that all forms of cultural conflict fundamentally involve the mark of symbolic violence and its implications. This means that any ideological and ideological cultural conflict in the university is essentially a symbolic conflict. Culture, in its symbolic sense, encompasses a way of life, perspective, and a framework of meanings, symbols, and interpretations. Accordingly, any cultural capital is symbolic capital, and thus, any cultural conflict represents an aspect of symbolic conflict within the university.

Hence, there is no doubt that all forms of cultural and values-based conflicts, along with conflicts in the realm of perceptions, values, meanings, and interpretations, manifest as symbolic conflicts. Therefore, it can be established that the critical sociological analysis of university functions is based on the premise of symbolic and cultural conflict embraced by social classes.

From this perspective, the university's culture is viewed as a reflection of the dominating social class's culture. Pierre Bourdieu, in his book "La reproduction," sees the educational system's structure and function as continuously translating social inequality into educational inequality through various symbolic means, maintaining it over time and legitimizing it simultaneously (Boubakri, 1997)

- **Referrals and references:**

- ✓ Abdulaziz Al-Ayadi, Michel Foucault , (1994), Knowledge and Power, University Institution for Studies and Publishing, Beirut.
- ✓ Bourdieu P., Passeron J.C., Reproduction, (1970), Elements for a Theory of the Educational System, Paris, Les éditions de Minuit.
- ✓ Pierre Bourdieu, Jean-Claude Passeron, (1964) The Heirs. Students and Culture, Paris, Minuit, 1985; Reproduction: Elements for a Theory of the Educational System (1970), Paris, Minuit, 1973; P. Bourdieu, Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment (1979), Paris, Minuit, 1996; Masculine Domination, Paris, Le Seuil, 1998.
- ✓ P. Bourdieu, Practical Sense, Paris, Minuit, 1980, p. 219.
- ✓ Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron, (2007), Reproduction: Towards a General Theory of Education, translated by Maher Trims, Arab Organization for Translation, Beirut, p. 102.
- ✓ Pierre Bourdieu, (1994) Symbolic Violence: An Inquiry into the Origins of Educational Sociology, translated by Nazir Jahl, Arab Cultural Center, Beirut,, p. 5.
- ✓ Pierre Bourdieu, (1992), Answers: For Reflective Anthropology, Seuil, Paris, p.123.
- ✓ Abdelilah Belkziz, (1996): Political Violence in the Arab World, Arab Future, Issue 5, pp. (68-85), p. 72.
- ✓ Abdelilah Belkziz: Political Violence in the Arab World, the same reference, p. 72.
- ✓ Pierre Bourdieu, (1992), Answers: For Reflective Anthropology, Seuil, Paris, p.141.
- ✓ Bourdieu P, (1972) Sketch for a Theory of Practice, Paris, Droz, p.18.
- ✓ Bourdieu Pierre (1998): Masculine Domination, Seuil, pp. 7-8.
- ✓ Bourdieu Pierre, (1998), Masculine Domination, Seuil, pp. 7-8.
- ✓ Baudelot and Establet(1974) : Capitalist School in France, P.U.F., Paris.
- ✓ Ivan Illich, (1971): A Society without Schools, Seuil, Paris.
- ✓ Georges Snyders (1982): School, Class, and Class Struggle, PUF, Paris.
- ✓ Basil Bernstein, (1975), Language and Social Classes, Minuit, Paris.
- ✓ Pierre Bourdieu (1990), Symbol and Power, translated by Abdel Salam Benabdelaali, Dar Tobqal for Publishing, Casablanca, p. 56.
- ✓ Bourdieu. P (1970), Reproduction, Edi. Minuit J/CPASSERONP Paris, P.22.
- ✓ Pierre Bourdieu, (1978): Symbolic Capital and Social Classes, in L'ARC, N72, 2nd Quarter.
- ✓ Johann Friedrich Herbart: German philosopher and pedagogue (Oldenburg 1776 - Göttingen 1841).
- ✓ Durkheim, (1963). Moral Education, P.U.F., Paris .
- ✓ P. Bourdieu; (1970), (J. C.) Passeron, Reproduction, Paris, Minuit, P192.
- ✓ Georges Snyders (1982): School, Class, and Class Struggle, PUF., Paris.
- ✓ Bourdieu (P.) , (1971), Reproduction P.U.F., Paris.
- ✓ Evelyne Burguiere, (1981), Culture and Social Classes: Inequalities or Cultural Differences, in C. R. E. S. A. S. Socio-cultural Handicap in Question, Editions E. S. F., Paris, p 103.
- ✓ Ivan Illich, (1983) American sociologist of Austrian origin (Vienna 1926) Written: (A Society without Schools, 1971; Vernacular Gender).
- ✓ Saeed Ismail Ali, (1995) Educational Philosophies, World of Knowledge, No. 198, National Council for Culture, Arts, and Literature, June, p. 243.
- ✓ Robeert Dottrenns, (1971), The Crisis of Education and Its Remedies, Delachaux and Niestlé, Switzerland, pp 23-30.
- ✓ Al-Naqib, Khaldoun Hassan, (1993), Educational Problem and Silent Revolution, Study in the Sociology of Culture, Arab Future, Issue 174, August, p. 70.
- ✓ Muhammad Boubakri, (1997), Education and Freedom, For a Philosophical Vision, Pedagogical Action, East Africa, Casablanca, p. 59.