

RELATIONS BETWEEN CULTURAL AND STRATIFICATION DIMENSIONS OF STUDENTS

Mishal Batayneh¹, Danijela Bonacin², Dobromir Bonacin²,
Žarko Bilić³ and Damir Jurko⁴

¹ Faculty of Education - University of Travnik, Bosnia & Herzegovina

² Faculty of Social Sciences dr.M.Brkić, University of Herzegovina, Međugorje, Bosnia & Herzegovina

³ Faculty of Sciences, University of Mostar, Bosnia & Herzegovina

⁴ Faculty of Education, University of Split, Croatia

Original scientific paper

Abstract

If we go back through history from the beginning of human existence, and we follow the timeline of human development to date, we will conclude that the consequence of man's cognition is formulated and visualized through the practical application of his inventions. A man and his achievements, and other types of social wealth and available natural resources, the quality and structure are the productive power of society, but it can also mean the power of the individual. This paper discusses the relationship of sociological stratification and cultural phenomena with students derived in the position of latent dimensions. The results showed that there are two mechanisms for the integration of stratification and culture, one of which tends to education and knowledge, and the other forming the local authority and material acquisition. It is indicated that it is just for the management and control of great importance to the determination of such a tendency, especially in the key roles, especially in politics and any type of management, of high-ranking individuals.

Key Words: culture, society, stratification, relations, students

Introduction

Cultural phenomena are studied since the man appeared, while about the sociological to say nothing even though both in the 20th century experienced scientific propped expansion of knowledge. Talking about the cultural and sociological dimensions of students raises the inevitable question - whether culture determines our future sociological (stratification) dimensions or sociological dimensions determine our future cultural dimensions? Social status is an element of social structure, place the individual has in the social structure. Thus, each individual has a particular place in the social structure that tells exactly where he is (Bonacin, Da., 2011). Social rank as performance needs of their students (actors) in the six main roles (Goffman, status, micro-political status, macro political status, place of birth. The cultural dimensions of students include two latent mechanisms: Convention and caution (Bonacin, Da., 2011). Convention is mainly based on legal thinking, while caution is reminiscent of the common law. The most widely viewed distinguish traditional society with stable and solid social, customary, religious, economic and psychological patterns, and modern society arising from the industrial revolution and, depending on the development of technology and science rapidly changing social patterns (Bonacin, Da., 2011). Studies of social profiles of students carried out at universities in Croatia (Bjelajac and Chick, 2005; Ilišin & Potočnik, 2008) demonstrating a strong social origin, or social selectivity students as a social group, making us leads to the conclusion that culture is elected micro-stratification dimension.

It is social skills, behavior and personal style taught in the family, and thus the link between social origin and destination of the social layer can be enhanced (Goldthorpe, 2003). Life transitions, although representing normative events, often cause stress for many individuals. Despite the stress that they cause, they stimulate the processes of development and change in personality or adjustment process (Lackovic-Grgin and Sorić, 1997). According to the Dakota-model, there are distinguished four dimensions orientation of students: orientation to career, personal search for meaning (creative-reflexive orientation), the motivation for superiority in relation to others, and reliance on the assessment authority (Lavelle and O'Ryan, 2001). Different developmental orientation to some extent determine the social attitudes and behaviors of students. For example, students with a creative and reflective orientation showed better social skills and greater tolerance to diversity which makes it easier to build new friendships and involvement in student life (Živčić-Bećirević et al., 2007). Students that have to study and change the place of residence have better academic adjustment than students who remained at home. It is possible that these students are motivated to learn and feel a greater responsibility to parents who fund them and as soon as possible finish college (Živčić-Bećirević et al., 2007). We can conclude that the students may more easily leave the existing cultural heritage and to accept other cultural entities as equal and therefore more readily fit into one of six latent stratification mechanisms.

Every culture is maintained by the existence of values and mechanisms of integration in society, regardless of whether they are religious (holy) or secular values (progress). The diversity of cultures can be defended today when defending diversity as a principle that becomes desirable values of normative character. Acceptance of diversity of culture does not mean a rejection of modern culture, but acceptance of culture as "one of". Concepts diversity of cultures and modern cultures are not alternatives. Acceptance of diversity does not mean the negation of modernity at the same time. The diversity of culture in itself and includes modern culture. It is about mankind being a multicultural community. Culture can be evaluated only from itself as subsistence response and if it "inside" try to understand, and very often it just does not do this, but it imposes standards of evaluation to measure other cultures (Cifrić, 2007). Does this mean that sometimes stratification dimensions are based on the wrong basis, taking into account the diversity of cultures as a value? (Cifrić, 2007). Today's culture is formed through the press, the Internet, television and all other media and created modern culture based on the information available (Fanuko et al., 1995). We discuss whether that culture affects the stratification dimension of students. We can emulate the concepts of Antonio Gramsci, the canonical authors of British cultural studies: Cultural hegemony and the terrain of civil society. Cultural hegemony would be the conquest of political power with culture resources on the field of civil society. If we "win" the culture, we've won the power too. (Bobbio, 1969; Kalanj, 2000). Discussing the role over from the cultural stratification in the world we can see that "almost all societies and cultures have lower value ascribed to women and not men, from which it stems lower values of social stratification (Gali, 2002). Considering the hypothesis that men govern culture (Merchant, 1981; Mies and Shiva, 1993; Mellor, 2000), one can not help thinking that men are elected by the stratification dimension that is one determined woman. Gustav Racenhofer (Merton, 1979) distinguishes five basic innate interests, some of which are on this subject the most important social interest which includes social interaction among members of society and transcendental interest. In social interest which includes social interaction among members of society, interaction will result in better results of the individual. The transcendental interest is expressed through various forms of religion and the indicator is part of human civilization. Looking Racenhofer's transcendental interest which we can identify with the cultural dimension of the students, and Piaget's final stage of cognitive learning (stage of formal operations) it turns out that every man reaches this phase since this period includes all higher levels of abstract operations that do not require specific objects or materials (Piaget, 1970). We can say that already acquired cultural dimensions define stratification dimension student.

Considering the classification and the classification of students in a particular group, we have to take into account the individuality of which is kept and it is possible that is exempt of all sizes, both cultural and sociological. The existence of the phenomenon of individuality and there is a certain space of freedom (Kerić, 2011). In this space we will certainly develop creativity taking into account that with a little delay we look at already placed students. So the research question would be to what extent and direction of cultural dimensions determine stratification dimensions of students?

Methods

Through 2010-2011.g. initiated the project "Research of sociological, management and moral values of students" sponsored by the Faculty of Education in Travnik. The subjects were students from Travnik, Mostar, Split, Rijeka, Osijek, Nis and Pula. A total of 210 indicators applied to 2500 students. For the purposes of this study from the total cash retained 406 entities described with latent dimensions dobvenim orthoblique procedure. Results are first considered for the normalization of category data, and then processed component factor analysis with rotation in orthoblique position. Thus prepared latent dimensions processed by canonical correlation analysis (Bonacin, 2010).

Results

Latent dimensions of social stratification were identified as: SD01 - Educational status, SD02 - Passive control material status, SD03 - micro-status, SD04 - macro political status, SD05 - Status of birth and SD06 - Status of social activities. Cultural dimensions were two, namely: KD01 - Convention and KD02 - Caution in the proceedings. All latent mechanisms are described in detail in the original paper (Bonacin, Da., 2011). As is clear from Table 2, two possible canonical factors and both significant were obtained. Cultural dimensions are in first canonical factor uniform and very high which indicates that they are in principle compatible with and define the global cultural canonical dimension. When stratification dimension, however, is not so. Same order of magnitude (> 0.90) only educational status. Although visible and some other indicators range from tiny negative to barely small positive value, so it is considering all possible words in the interpretation is largely justified neglect.

Described canonical factor associated sociological stratification indicators and cultural indicators in a way that the fore undoubtedly puts education. A convention and alert as layered aspect of cultural studies only reinforces the importance of education and educational status. This is therefore a complex mechanism that is best supported by educational interpretation as modern culture. The second canonical factor, however, is very interesting configured.

Table 1 Variables in model

1	SD01 - Educational status
2	SD02 - Pasiv control material status
3	SD03 - Micropolitical status
4	SD04 - Macropolitical status
5	SD05 - Status of birth
6	SD06 - Status of social activity
7	KD01 - Conventions
8	KD02 - Caution

Table 2 Results of canonical correlation analysis

	Kan1	Kan2
SD01 - Educational status	0.99	-0.07
SD02 - Pasiv control material status	0.26	0.49
SD03 - Micropolitical status	0.19	0.92
SD04 - Macropolitical status	0.23	0.19
SD05 - Status of birth	-0.09	0.10
SD06 - Status of social activity	-0.10	0.58
Explained variance (Total = 43.99 %)	0.19	0.25
Redundant variance (Total = 15.58 %)	0.15	0.01
KD01 - Conventions	0.98	-0.19
KD02 - Caution	0.90	0.44
Explained variance (Total = 100.00 %)	0.89	0.11
Redundant variance (Total = 67.28 %)	0.67	0.00
Canonical correlation (R)	0.87	0.20
Canonical determination (R2)	0.75	0.04
Hi-2	576.7	15.6
Degrees of freedom (DF)	12	5
Wilks lambda	0.24	0.96
Probability (p)	0.00	0.01

That can be seen in the cultural part only Caution with significant projection (0.44), while the sociological stratification highlighted several dimensions. Among them before all micro-status (0.92), then the status of social activities (0.58) and Passive control material status (0.49).

All this suggests that in the study population of students in the social and cultural level there is a latent specificity towards which it tends to one aspect of designing the system of social values, which is largely characterized by local dynamics and local values most likely in the direction of acquiring material goods.

That's why there is a very high caution as a concept because it is obvious that the local community (village, small town) people need to watch out for my "image" which is very easily destroy careless actions or at least proceedings which the local community does not approve.

So this factor can be recognized as locally focused social energies and interests. Although usually not discussed about it is not in the results, but which has, it is noticeable and certainly should be noted that the configuration of factors extremely weak influence have macro political status and status of birth.

Generally it seems it can be concluded that in the population of students, there are two latent mechanisms that integrate cultural and stratification dimensions which are: a) general culture with high significance of education and b) locally, materially-oriented action.

According to test the significance of the first canonical factor was far more important which is not surprising considering that these are students, but not the second factor can not and must not be neglected.

These results extraordinarily allocated possible action in the sports (and the educational and other) management, because they warn that young people, who will "tomorrow" when completing higher education probably after a few years be carriers of management tendencies.

Meaning, in their communities and beyond and is all the more important to identify precisely those, given the education disseminate cultural activity in their work, business and elsewhere (Bonacin, Da., 2008). It is also their role and social duty to educate everyone around him and others that provide opportunities and also to the formal, informal and otherwise educate globally.

But as we have seen, at the same time, there are certainly tendencies that should recognize, locate and neutralize, and those are the ones that can be described as "an attempt to put the local environment under control" in terms of the potential of obtaining material benefits. Of course that no reason against material gain has nothing to do, but those for whom this is a fundamental drive and to the local communities is due whenever raises important global issues as they generally are not interested.

Conclusion

A sample of 406 entities - students from the wider area of South Africa, is described with a number of indicators that are reduced to a factor of latent dimensions. For the purposes of this study were taken stratification (6) and culturally (2) factors

that were analyzed by canonical correlation analysis. The results showed that there are two significant canonical factors where the first had a much more intense relationship of culture and stratification but also described education as the key link of this area.

Another factor, the lower links of the region warned that there is a local cautiously actions to local interests, mainly the status and material. The need for identifying persons who can have one or the other mechanism of this very pronounced because the models these kinds of people very different, and are therefore many consequences potentially significantly different, especially in the case of controls e.g. In Education Management. Sport management, and other related domains that are directly related to the planning, management, administration and the like.

References

- Bjelajac, S., & Pilić, Š. (2005). Rezidencijalne preferencije studenata [Residential preferences of students. In Croatian.]. *Školski vjesnik*, 54(3-4), 279-310.
- Bobbio, N. (1969). *Ideological Profile of Italy In The Twentieth Century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- Bonacin, D. (2008). *Uvod u kvantitativne metode* [Introduction to quantitative methods. In Croatian.]. Kaštela: Personal edition.
- Bonacin, Da. (2008). Prapovijesni čovjek, moderni čovjek, čovjek koji upravlja [Ancient man, modern man, a man that manage. In Croatian.]. *Međ. simpozij "Čovjek i moderni svijet"*, Univerzitet u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, pp. 73-80. (ur. Čaklovića, F.).
- Bonacin, Da. (2011). *Latentna struktura položaja upravljačkog potencijala studenata u prostoru društvenih atributa* [Latent structure of students managing potential position in a space of social attributes. In Croatian.]. /Master thesis./ Travnik: University of Travnik.
- Cifrić, I. (2007). *Bioetička ekumena. Odgovornost za život susvijeta* [Bioethical ecumene. Responsibility for world coexistence. In Croatian.]. Zagreb: Pergamena.
- Galić, J. (2002). *Zloupotreba droga među adolescentima - rezultati istraživanja* [Drug abuse among adolescents - the results of research. In Croatian.]. Zagreb: Medicinska naklada.
- Goldthorpe, J. (2003). The myth of education-based meritocracy. *New Economy*, 10(4), 234-239.
- Fanuko, N. et al. (1995). *Sociologija* [Sociology. In Croatian.]. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
- Ilišin, V., & Potočnik, D. (2008). Profesionalne i životne aspiracije studenata Zagrebačkog sveučilišta [Professional and Life Aspirations of Students University of Zagreb. In Croatian.]. *Sociologija i prostor*, 3-4, 285-310.
- Kalanj, R. (2000). *Ideje i djelovanje. Oglеди o kulturnim promjenama i razvoju* [Ideas and actions. Essays on cultural change and development. In Croatian.]. Zagreb: SE Razvoj i okoliš.
- Kerić, V. (2011). Individualnost kao supstrat u sociologiji svakodnevnoga života [Individuality as a substrate in the sociology of everyday life. In Croatian.]. *Amalgam - časopis studenata sociologije*, 5, 83-96.
- Lacković-Grgin, K., & Sorić, I. (1996). Prijelaz i prilagodba studenata na studij - Jednogodišnje praćenje [The transition and adjustment of students to study - One-year follow-up. In Croatian.]. *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru, Razdio filozofije, psihologije, sociologije i pedagogije*, 34(11), 53-66.
- Lavelle, E., & O'Ryan, L.W. (2001). Predicting the social commitments of college students. *NASPA Journal*, 38, 238-253.
- Mellor, A.K. (2000). *Mothers of the Nation: Women's Political Writing in England 1780-1830*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Merchant, K.A. (1981). The design of the corporate budgeting system: Influences on managerial behavior and performance. *The Accounting Review*, 56(4), 813-829.
- Merton, R. K. (1979). *O teorijskoj sociologiji* [About theoretical sociology. In Croatian.]. Zagreb: CDD.
- Mies, M., & Shiva, V. (1993). *Ecofeminism*. Melbourne: Spinifex Press.
- Piaget, J. (1970). *The Science of Education and the Psychology of the Child*. Grossman, New York.
- Živčić-Bećirević, I., Smojver-Ažić, S., Kukić, M., & Jasprica, S. (2007). Akademska, socijalna i emocionalna prilagodba na studij s obzirom na spol, godinu studija i promjenu mjesta boravka [Academic, social and emotional adjustment to college with regard to gender, year of study and changes of residence. In Croatian.]. *Psihologijske teme*, 16(1), 121-140.

RELACIJE KULTUROLOŠKIH I STRATIFIKACIJSKIH DIMENZIJA STUDENATA

Sažetak

Ukoliko se vratimo kroz povijest od samih početaka ljudskog postojanja, pa pratimo vremensku crtu čovjekovog razvoja do danas, zaključit ćemo kako je posljedica čovjekova spoznavanja uobličena i vizualizirana kroz praktičnu primjenu njegovih pronalazaka. Čovjek i njegove spoznaje, pomagala i drugi vidovi društvenog bogatstva te raspoloživa prirodna bogatstva, njihov kvalitet i struktura čine proizvodnu moć jednog društva, ali mogu značiti i snagu pojedinca. U ovom radu razmatrani su odnosi sociološke stratifikacije i kulturološki fenomeni studenata dovedeni u položaj latentnih dimenzija. Rezultati su pokazali da postoje dva mehanizma integracije stratifikacije i kulture, od kojih jedan teži edukaciji i spoznaji, a drugi formiranju lokalnog autoriteta i materijalnom stjecanju. Upozoreno je da je baš za menadžment i upravljanje od velike važnosti utvrđivanje ovakvih tendencija, naročito kod ključnih uloga, posebno u politici i menadžmentu, visoko pozicioniranih pojedinaca.

Ključne riječi: kultura, društvo, stratifikacija, relacije, studenti

Received: March 25, 2014

Accepted: December 20, 2014

Correspondence to:

Assoc.Prof. Dobromir Bonacin, PhD.

Faculty of social sciences dr.M.Brkić

University of Herzegovina

Bijakovići, Međugorje, Bosnia & Herzegovina

Phone: +385 (0)99 663 7597

E-mail: dbonacin@hotmail.com