

**The Hidden Curriculum in Higher Education**  
edited by **Eric Margolis**  
ROUTLEDGE New York and London

**Contents**

Acknowledgments

	ix
1. Peekaboo	1
<i>Hiding and Outing the Curriculum</i> Eric Margolis, Michael Soldatenko, Sandra Acker, and Marina Gair	
2. Hiding in Plain Sight	21
Marina Gair and Guy Mullins	
3. Schooled by the Classroom	43
<i>The (Re)production of Social Stratification in Professional School Settings</i> Carrie Yang Costello	
4. The Hidden Curriculum of Dissertation Advising	61
Sandra Acker	
5. "In the Image and Likeness. ..."	79
<i>How Mentoring Functions in the Hidden Curriculum</i> Eric Margolis and Mary Romero	
6. Training Capitalism's Foot Soldiers	97
<i>The Hidden Curriculum of Undergraduate Business Education</i> Kenneth N. Ehrensall	
7. Downward Mobility 101	115
<i>Learning to Be "Flexible" in an Age of Uncertainty</i> Caroline Childress	
8. "Powder Puff Brigades"	135
<i>Professional Caring versus Industry Research in the Pharmaceutical Sciences Curriculum</i> Linda Muzzin	
9. "Plotting Something Dastardly"	155
<i>Hiding a Gender Curriculum in Engineering</i> Karen L. Tonso	
10. Preparing to Be Privatized	75
<i>The Hidden Curriculum of a Community College ESL Writing Class</i> Mary Jane Curry	

11. Radicalism in Higher Education	193
<i>How Chicano Studies Joined the Curriculum</i> Michael Soldatenko	
Bibliography	213
Contributors	233
Index	235

### **Acknowledgments**

The editor would like to thank Mary Romero and Sandra Acker for their editorial assistance. Marina Gair was indispensable as a research assistant and helped shepherd this project through all of its many phases. The visual ethnography seminar, especially Guy Mullins, Luis Fernandez, Marina Gair, and Lydia Montelongo, helped develop the notion of making the hidden curriculum visible through photography. Guy Mullins deserves special thanks both for videotaping the inter-views reported on in chapter two, and building and maintaining the web site that allowed chapter authors to read each other's work in various drafts and thus helped this collection become more internally consistent than the usual edited volume. Most of all I would like to thank the chapter authors who conducted the detailed research that made this collection possible. It was a pleasure working with all of you.

### **Peekaboo**

*Hiding and Outing the Curriculum* Eric Margolis, Michael Soldatenko, Sandra Acker, and Marina Gair

Most of those who write on hidden curricula focus their attention on "curriculum." We want to begin by making a few observations on the concept of "hidden." In her important article, "What Should We Do with a Hidden Curriculum When We Find One?" Jane Roland Martin identified two sorts of hiddenness: "Something can be hidden in the sense of which a cure for cancer is hidden or in the sense in which a penny in the game Hide the Penny is hidden. "Is the curriculum yet to be discovered or has it been hidden by someone? Martin also noted that a curriculum can be revealed to some, while remaining hidden to others: "Until learning states are acknowledged or the learners are aware of them, however, they remain hidden even if sociologists, bureaucrats, and teachers are all aware of them. Thus a hidden curriculum can be found yet remain hidden, for finding is one thing and telling is another" (Martin 1994, 162). This discussion is helpful, but does not go far enough in investigating hiddenness. We hide to conceal or protect. To secrete. We hide our wealth in a hoard, we hide our feelings, we hide our intentions. In Edgar Allan Poe's short story "The Purloined Letter," a seasoned investigator has been called upon by the French police to lend his intuitive skills to solving a mystery. He asks the police about their search for critical clues: "I presume you looked to the mirrors, between

the boards and the plates, and you probed the beds and the bed-clothes, as well as the curtains and carpets?" To which they reply: "Certainly; we opened every package and parcel; we not only opened every book, but we turned over every leaf in each volume. ..We also measured the thickness of every book-cover, with the most accurate admeasurement, and applied to each the most jealous scrutiny of the microscope. .." The investigator continues: "You explored the floors beneath the carpets? And the paper on the walls? You looked into the cellars?" To which the police again affirm, "We did." "Well then," speculates the investigator, "perhaps the mystery is a little too plain."<sup>1</sup> In this sense some of the hidden curriculum may be intentionally hidden in plain sight, precisely so that it will remain undetected. Much of the built environment, issues related to the body, the statuses of disciplines, and the ranks of higher education institutions are hiding in plain sight.

We use hides to cover our nakedness. As another important story in Western culture teaches, curricula can be hidden by a general social agreement not to see. The reader will recall in the fairy tale "The Emperor Has No Clothes" that the vain emperor was bamboozled by two tailors who invented a cloth so light and fine that it looked invisible to anyone "too stupid and incompetent to appreciate its quality." When presented with the new garment, the emperor thought, "I can't see anything. If I see nothing, that means I'm stupid! Or, worse, incompetent!" When he paraded naked through the city, "Everyone said, loud enough for the others to hear: 'Look at the Emperor's new clothes. They're beautiful!'"<sup>2</sup> Only when an {unsocialized} child observed that the emperor was naked was the truth revealed. Some of the ideological content of higher education intends to bamboozle, to pull the wool over people's eyes. Disengaged intellectuals both pro- mote and deconstruct the clever subtleties and fine quality of ideology embedded in literature, television, rock music, fashion design, and so on because to do so seems competent and smart. Universities teach those who produce neither for use nor for exchange but produce ideology: labor management, mass communication, advertising, and the like. In this sense the university curriculum itself may be seen as a "hide" like a duck blind.

The nineteenth-century writings of Wilhelm Dilthey {1961} revealed human existence as a process of interpretation. Given that, one might consider curriculum itself to be a hiding place, a cache. Meanings are hidden in texts. Hermeneutics {the science of interpretations} emphasizes the non-apparent meanings of texts-meanings that may not even be understood by the authors. Because we humans tell ourselves lies and come to believe them, meanings can be hidden from us. Similarly, cultural meanings are hidden in symbolism; meanings that may involve obscure allusions and connections lurking in texts but remaining beneath the surface. It is also possible, as Vance Packard {1957} alerted us, that there are "hidden persuaders" that subliminally convey messages. Perhaps they can only be revealed by hermeneutic psycho- and socioanalysis. Fruitful work can be done in the secret garden of the curriculum where sexuality, power, and knowledge lie coiled like serpents. Moreover, at least in the West, knowledge is guilty knowledge. One turns away from certain curricula, hides his or her face in shame, hides his or her eyes. This process is one essential part of what Elliot Eisner { 1985 , 97-98 ) called the null curriculum-that which is left out.

Another widely beloved story contains parallels relevant to the hidden curriculum. Elements of curriculum might be thought of as hidden behind the scenes, like the mechanisms run by the bumbling Wizard of Oz. Hidden curricula that are more or less overt-some- times called the "other curriculum"-fit this model. Leadership, entrepreneurship, manners, and class dispositions-the qualities once called "finishing"-and certain glib pseudointellectual styles are elements of this hidden curriculum. These aspects are what Dorothy Smith (1990) termed "the relations of ruling": elements of superstructure, including the curricula of class consciousness, whiteness, patriarchy, hetero- sexuality, and of the West. Although these dispositions and relations are taught and learned, the reproduction of what Bourdieu (1973,40) called *habitus* (discussed below) is very often hidden by a wink. Some of the behind-the-scenes machinery of social stratification is considered "legitimate," and in fact we "pay no attention to the man behind the curtain." There are infernal mechanisms as well.

We hide the evidence of wrongdoing. Many kinds of socialization are indeed covert, will not work if made visible, and in fact will produce resistance if revealed. Here we are thinking of intentionally produced forms of subordination, discrimination, and hegemony that benefit some at the expense of others. As Russell Ferguson (1990, 9) noted: "The place from which power is exercised is often a hidden place. When we try to pin it down, the center always seems to be someplace else. Yet, we know that this phantom center, elusive as it is, exerts a real, undeniable power over the whole social framework of our culture and over the things we think about it." This is clearly a form of "Hide the Penny," and we want to know who did the hiding. We are not talking of oppression-without-an-oppressor, but covert elements of hidden curricula that have been intentionally hidden and which some segments struggle to keep hidden. Curriculum is both a site of and one of the stakes in conflicts between various social groups. These curricula can best be discovered by examining such things as funding, salary levels, the sources of research support, the biases of standardized tests, and additional mechanisms of discrimination and oppression. Like Toto who pulled aside the curtain, some of the work of social science is to reveal the hidden hands and mechanisms that control the social structures-to make visible the powerful who benefit from the oppression of others. Many of the chapters in this volume do just that.

#### A BRIEF REVIEW OF THE "HIDDEN CURRICULUM"

Critical theorists have focused their attention on primary and secondary education. Clearly, this is an essential arena for the study of training, education, socialization, and social change. However, advancing technological society has prolonged the entire education process from kindergarten through high school to college and beyond. Alongside higher education's extension of function from an option for upward mobility to a requirement for social and economic survival, the structures of post-secondary education are rapidly changing. The old segmentations of elite versus mass education, private versus public, and the traditional disciplines of the sciences, liberal arts, and professional schools have differentiated into far more complicated structures. The advent of computer-mediated communications and distance learning, for-profit universities, and privatized research facilities are making it increasingly important to apply the insights of critical pedagogy to an examination of higher education. The concept of hidden curricula serves

as one valuable theoretical framework from which to examine the social functions of higher education.

### Functionalist Origins

Phillip Jackson (1968) is generally acknowledged as the originator of the term *hidden curriculum* in his book *Life in Classrooms*. Through observations of public grade school classrooms, Jackson identified features of classroom life that were inherent in the social relations of schooling. He observed that there were values, dispositions, and social and behavioral expectations that brought rewards in school for students and that learning what was expected along these lines was a feature of the hidden curriculum. He argued that the hidden curriculum emphasized specific skills: learning to wait quietly, exercising restraint, trying, completing work, keeping busy, cooperating, showing allegiance to both teachers and peers, being neat and punctual, and conducting oneself courteously (Jackson 1968, 10-33). These features of school life and requirements for conformity to institutional expectations had little to do with educational goals, but were essential for satisfactory progression through school. About the same time Robert Dreeben (1967) argued that the structure of family life alone could not adequately prepare children for the adult world. He examined the norms of school culture and concluded they taught students to "form transient social relationships, submerge much of their personal identity, and accept the legitimacy of categorical treatment" (Dreeben 1968, 147). The organization of schooling, such as having to wait before getting time with the teacher-transmits these ideas to students. Dreeben maintained that the experience of formal schooling not only taught the overt curriculum, but indirectly conveyed to students values such as independence and achievement, useful for their later membership in adult society. Jackson and Dreeben were drawing heavily on the work of Emile Durkheim, who observed that public schools perform a specific and central form of socialization that other institutions cannot provide. Durkheim ([1925]1961, 147) noted that the family:

[E]specially today, is a very small group of persons who know each other intimately and who are constantly in contact with one another.

As a result, their relationships are not subject to any general, impersonal, immutable regulation. ...[T]he morality practiced in this setting is above all a matter of emotion and sentiment. The abstract idea of duty is less important here than sympathy.

In contrast, schools were precisely concerned with abstract social connections like "duty":

In fact, there is a whole system of rules in the school that predetermine the child's conduct. He must come to class regularly, he must arrive at a specified time and with an appropriate bearing and attitude. He must not disrupt things in class. He must have learned his lessons, done his homework, and have done so reasonably well, etc. There are, therefore, a host of obligations that the child is required to shoulder. Together they constitute the discipline of the school. It is through the practice of school discipline that we can inculcate the spirit of discipline in the child. (Durkheim [1925]1961, 148)

According to Durkheim, " Society can survive only if there exists among its members a significant degree of homogeneity; education perpetuates and reinforces this homogeneity by fixing in the child, from the beginning, the essential similarities collective life demands" ([1922]1956,70). Talcott Parsons (1959), in the "The School Class as a Social System," defended the Durkheimian position that what is essential in a stable and orderly society is the existence of a moral consensus or a set of common values. Socializing children to hold particular values such as those of "achievement" and "equality of opportunity" is necessary to this consensus and is the primary function of education. Parsons contended that schools impart the ideology that inequalities in income and social class status are consequences of differences in educational attainment, and are thus to be expected. This "winning and losing" notion of achievement maintains that those who do well in school ought to be highly rewarded. Parsons believed that the sorting and selecting of students through a selection procedure that gives the appearance of rewarding hard work and talent neutralizes inequality. Such an ideological structure positions subsequent differences in occupational or social class outcomes as fair, thus discouraging resentment by "the losers in the competition. " Conflict is thereby avoided and the whole process serves an integrative function by developing in students the societal values that will sustain a common American culture.

### **Marxist Perspectives**

These fundamental works of Durkheim, Parsons, Jackson, and Dreeben, sometimes collected under the heading of *consensus theory*, provide the foundation for the general definition of the hidden curriculum as the elements of socialization that take place in school, but are not part of the formal curricular content. These include the norms, values, and belief systems embedded in the curriculum, the school, and classroom life, imparted to students through daily routines, curricular content, and social relationships. Starting in the 1960s consensus theory came under broad and sustained attack in the field of sociology {Mills 1959; Sartre 1960; Marcuse 1960, 1966; Natanson 1962; Van Den Berghe 1963; Horton 1968; Gouldner 1970; Collins 1971). Influenced by Marxism, some branches of subsequent educational theorizing became more critical about the way in which schools serve capitalism and the state and function to mediate and legitimate the reproduction of inequality, including social class, racial, and gender relations.<sup>3</sup> The socialization process was analyzed in terms of its reproduction of stratified relationships, outcomes, and ideological belief structures.

The most influential examination of the process by which schools reproduce these dominant interests was *Schooling in Capitalist America* by Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis {1976). In what they termed the "correspondence thesis," these economists demonstrated the relationship between the norms of schooling and the maintenance of the capitalist system. They argued that through formal and hidden curricula schools reproduce the social relations necessary to maintain capitalism: competition and evaluation, hierarchical divisions of labor, bureaucratic authority, compliance, and the fragmented and alienated nature of work. They argued that the reproduction of these skills and attitudes through the educational system corresponds to and prepares students for future stratified work roles. Embedded in the form, con-

tent, organization of the classroom, and the evaluation of students is a message system that conditions students to adopt the traits of punctuality, docility, cleanliness, and conformity. The exact message varied according to the social class of the community around the school. Students in upper-middle-class schools got some messages about internalizing the drive to achieve, while those in working-class schools rehearsed the behaviors appropriate for low-skill, low-autonomy work. For Bowles and Gintis, the hidden curriculum is the process of inculcating these behaviors through the natural and everyday features of school life. Although their analysis draws upon and echoes some of the points made by the functionalists, it differs in its argument that what appears on the surface as a necessary and neutral process of social reproduction serves the demands of more powerful institutions and dominant social groups.

Pierre Bourdieu and Basil Bernstein developed structuralist cultural reproduction theories that extended correspondence theory by recognizing culture (hence education) as a more or less autonomous sphere rather than simply an epiphenomenon of the relations of production. French scholar Bourdieu (1973,40) asserted that students vary in the nature of their early socialization, bringing to school a characteristic class "habitus" or a system of social meanings and understandings. Habitus derived from family environments may or may not contain the "cultural capital" or "symbolic wealth" that makes educational success a likely outcome (Bourdieu 1973, 73 ). Students of middle-class parents are advantaged because schools privilege the social, economic, and cultural capital they bring with them. These students have often attended nursery schools, have access to piano lessons and computers, and in general have been exposed and continue to be exposed to enriching social experiences throughout their school career, developing a reservoir of cultural and social resources. The skills, knowledge, and cultural grammar middle-class students from the dominant culture acquire via such exposure gives them an advantage in decoding and moving comfortably about the school system. By taking for granted such knowledge and treating it as equivalent to "talent" or "intelligence," schools perpetuate an uneven distribution of cultural capital as well as economic capital. In the process, they endorse and normalize particular types of knowledge, ways of speaking, styles, meanings, dispositions, and worldviews.

Bernstein (1977), too, writing from Britain, "emphasizes the mediation of the family between class origins and school as the critical source of class inequality" (MacDonald 1980b, 21). His examination of social class-based linguistic codes was enormously influential within the sociology of education. Schools generally work within what Bernstein called an "elaborated code," one that is compatible with the ways of using language in middle-class households. Kathleen Weiler (1988, 11-12), like other analysts, saw many commonalities between the ideas of Bourdieu and Bernstein:

Thus for Bernstein, as for Bourdieu, different class language and knowledge lead to different educational paths; schools, by employing and legitimating the language and culture of the existing dominant groups, act to reproduce existing class structure.

Weiler (1988,11) considered both writers to present an implicitly functionalist view of schooling: actual experiences in classrooms are not investigated directly, and students and teachers are passive recipients of the reproduction process. Several

feminist writers from Britain, Canada, and the United States have built on *and extended* ideas from these theorists, in particular noting the extent to which it is the work of mothers that is crucial to the culturally reproductive processes of schooling (David 1993; Griffith and Smith 1987; Lareau 1989; Smith 1990). Dorothy Smith (1990,235), for example, one of Canada's foremost feminist scholars, commented that mothers, especially those from the middle-class, consciously produce in their young children "a good vocabulary or such competencies as knowing how to return a brush used for one colour to the pot of that colour so that the different colours do not get all mixed together. It is the investment of mother's work and thought in activities of these kinds which prepares children for school."

### **British Sociologists of Education**

The 1970s was the formative decade for critical sociology of education in a number of countries. In Britain, for example, prior to the late 1970s most of the research sought to investigate the relationship between social class origins and educational outcomes, producing an important body of work, often informed by a conflict view of society, but nevertheless one that was somewhat limited by its positivism and tendency to ignore matters within the school itself. A few early exceptions were studies by Hargreaves (1967) and Lacey (1970), who drew from anthropology to venture into ethnographic studies of the differentiating processes of the school (e.g., streaming-the equivalent of tracking in the United States) that tended to reproduce social class divisions. In 1971, the publication of *Knowledge and Control*, edited by M. F. D. Young, marked a more general change of direction, raising serious questions about how schools processed and defined knowledge. The volume ushered in the loosely bounded movement known as the "new sociology of education." As Sandra Acker's review of the literature demonstrated (1994, 15ff.), these sociologists renewed attention to the reproductive functions of the curriculum in its formal and informal guises. Ignoring the functionalist term *hidden curriculum*, the British scholarship nonetheless investigated similar issues and built on the two theoretical perspectives discussed earlier: the Marxist *social* reproduction analysis of Louis Althusser (1971) and Bowles and Gintis (1976) and the *cultural* reproduction theories of Bernstein (1977) and Bourdieu (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977) (see MacDonald [later Arnot] 1980a, 13-14). Developing in parallel and sometimes in tension with these theoretical developments were ethnographic studies of schools that took their theoretical approach from the symbolic interactionism of George Herbert Mead and Herbert Blumer (Ball 1981; Burgess 1983; Woods 1979, 1983}. These studies emphasized ways in which different types of schools created cultures and subcultures and shaped student and teacher perspectives and interactions.

Two important ethnographic studies of the 1970s came out of the neo-Marxist wing of the new sociology of education: Rachel Sharp and Anthony Green's study of primary schooling, *Education and Social Control* (1975}; and a study of working-class boys by Paul Willis, *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs* (1977}. Sharp and Green drew on phenomenology as well as neo-Marxism. They continued the analysis of differentiation pioneered by Hargreaves and Lacey, but examined it at the classroom level, identifying processes whereby

children's identities became "reified" (rigidly characterized, labeled, often according to social background} despite teachers' ideological adherence to a liberal and progressive pedagogy. In order for the progressive pedagogies to proceed, the teacher relied on the "normal" children keeping themselves occupied, a "bedrock of busyness" (Sharp and Green 1975, 122}, while the teacher worked either with the problem children or with the bright ones who formed an elite, sharing "intersubjectivity" with the teacher herself. While on the surface there was encouragement of individualism, the reality was that the classroom was a stratified society that paralleled society at large. Willis's study was probably the most well-known on both sides of the Atlantic and influenced the approach termed "resistance theory." Willis introduced a theory of cultural production that emphasized the agency that some working-class young men displayed in constructing a culture in opposition to the regime of schooling. In "celebrating" this culture, they succeeded in the short run in defying the efforts of the school to force them into conformity, but ended up confirming their own destinies, so to speak, in restricted forms of manual labor.

Willis was heavily criticized for equating working-class "kids" with working-class boys. The racism and sexism expressed by these lads was deemphasized in his account in comparison to their affirmation of working-class male culture. Willis was in good company, as British sociology of education remained male-centered until about 1980 (Acker 1981, 1994}, a phenomenon also observed in North America and even among leftist sociologists of education such as Bowles and Gintis (Gaskell 1992, 26-27).

By the early 1980s British sociologists of education, together with counterparts elsewhere, were rapidly modifying class analysis to incorporate gender inequality. A number of influential anthologies were published in the 1980s that included both empirical studies and theoretical analyses of gender (e.g., Arnot and Weiner 1987; Women's Studies Group 1978; Deem 1980; Spender and Sarah 1980; Walker and Barton 1983; Arnot and Weiner 1987). Madeleine MacDonald [Arnot] (1980a; 1980b) set forth a project based on neo-Marxist understandings supplemented by feminism to examine how schooling functioned to reproduce stratified gender relations. Angela McRobbie (1978) and other scholars undertook qualitative studies of working-class girls parallel to Willis's work. Mary Fuller (1980, 1982) looked at the forms resistance took when practiced by black girls.

One study that explicitly named the hidden curriculum was Kathleen Clarricoates's (1978) charmingly titled article "Dinosaurs in the Classroom. " Clarricoates described the ways in which teachers sought to capture the interest of recalcitrant boys by shaping the early grades' curriculum around the boys' interests (which, at the time of her study, was dinosaurs). Teachers counted on the girls' putting up with topics that interested the boys, but failed to challenge the boys' disdain for anything perceived to be a girls' topic (such as "flowers" or "houses"). Clarricoates illustrated the ways in which gender inequities were con- firmed as a "natural" outgrowth of school policies and pedagogies. The interest in school-supported differentiation and its relationship to occupational outcomes persisted in studies such as Sheila Riddell's (1992) *Gender and the Politics of Curriculum*, which examined ways in which the process of subject choice in secondary schools confirmed class and gender divisions. Similar concerns with the ways in which the hidden curriculum

(whether or not labeled as such) shaped and limited girls' aspirations could be found in Canada (Gaskell 1992) and the United States (Valli 1986). By the late 1980s, it was increasingly commonplace to consider the intersections of race, class, and gender (Brah and Minhas 1985; Bryan, Dadzie, and Scafe 1987; Wright 1987; Mirza 1992, 1993) and attention was paid to the normative order of heterosexuality in the school and its consequences for gay and lesbian students (Holly 1989; Kelly 1992; Mac an Ghail 1994; Trenchard and Warren 1987). By the mid-1990s, interest in the socialization processes in schools appeared to be declining, as the dominant theme in British sociology of education turned to the analysis of the implications of government educational policy "reforms."

Critical Theorists in the United States A number of American critical curriculum theorists and sociologists were exposed to (and influenced) the new sociology of education in Britain through their participation in a series of influential conferences starting in the late 1970s held at Westhill College, Birmingham, England.<sup>4</sup> Theorists including Michael Apple, Jean Anyon, Henry Giroux, and Peter McLaren engaged in the project of describing how hidden curricular practices provided qualitatively differential forms of schooling to students from different social classes. Challenging the ideological perspectives of early curriculum movements, Apple and King (1977, 86) pointed out that:

Deeply embedded in their ideological perspective was a "strong" sense of control wherein education in general and the everyday meanings of the curriculum in particular were seen as essential to the preserving of the existing social privilege, interests, and knowledge of one element of the population at the expense of less powerful groups.

Apple went on to ask how the educational system preserved a social order stratified by class, gender, and race: "A fundamental problem facing us is the way in which systems of domination and exploitation persist and reproduce themselves without being consciously recognized by the people involved" (Apple 1982, 13). Students encounter norms, values, and beliefs through the rules and practices that form the daily routines and social relationships in the classroom and the extended school. This hidden curriculum, grounded in industry's attempt to control labor and increase productivity, must also foster faith in the putative "neutrality" of schools and the supposed "natural" environment of education and tolerance (Apple 1982, 12; Marcuse 1969).

In a particularly telling study, Anyon (1980) studied fifth grade classrooms differentiated by social class, and observed variations in the physical, curricular, evaluatory, pedagogical, and interpersonal characteristics of each environment. Anyon demonstrated how these variations contribute to the development in the children of certain potential relationships to physical and symbolic capital, to authority, and to the process of work. In light of such studies, critical pedagogues also came to identify those things both intentionally and unintentionally excluded from curricula because of their controversial nature, because they represent different values, or because educators are uninformed and relevant materials are nonexistent.

From the 1970s onward, educational researchers from the United States and elsewhere in the world advanced the discussion from labor force correspondence to consideration of gender, race, conflict, resistance, and the political function of

schooling (Anyon 1980; Martin 1994; Kessler, Ashenden, Connell, and Dowsett 1985; Everhart 1983; Giroux 1981, 1983a; Grant and Sleeter 1986; Kenway and Willis 1997; McNeil 1986; Thorne 1993; Weiler 1988; Weis and Fine 1993; Wexler 1992; Willis [1977] 1981; Young 1971).

In the United States, gender role reproduction was examined in works by Kelly and Nihlen (1982), Grant (1992), and Thorne (1993). Gail Kelly and Ann Nihlen (1982, 167) specifically discussed the hidden curriculum in connection with the reproduction of gender divisions, considering "the messages implicit in the authority structure of the school, its staffing patterns, and the ways in which the curriculum is transmitted, and the systems of rewards and 'correct' behavior." Linda Grant (1992) studied the ways in which different groups of children experienced different hidden curricula, even within the same classroom. White girls were closely tied to their teachers and encouraged to develop academic and social skills, intellectual competence, and deference. African-American girls in the same elementary school classrooms were encouraged to emphasize social competence alone, and they played roles in the classroom such as "go-between" (between the other students and the teacher) and "enforcer" (helping the teacher control the class). Grant made connections between these differentiated skills and typical job market patterns. Barrie Thorne (1993) conducted a closely observed study of children's behavior in classrooms and playgrounds, unearthing ways in which the language and practices of the classroom confirmed the separation of the sexes. In an approach reminiscent of Jackson's original identification of hidden curricular processes, she commented:

The practices of school staff are complex and often contradictory, sometimes reinforcing and sometimes undermining social divisions and larger patterns of inequality. The organizational features of schools also work in both ways. ...Several basic features of schools that distinguish them from neighborhoods—their *formal age-grading*, their *crowded and public* nature, and the continual presence of *power and evaluation*—enter into the dynamics of gender separation, and integration. [italics in the original] {Thorne 1993, 51}

Apple turned to an examination of covert curricular forms. Through the curriculum, students' activities, increasingly specified as rules, processes, and outcomes, are integrated through and rationalized by the material itself (Apple 1982, 155). Apple asserted that the recent history of education in the United States was a continuous search for a general set of principles that could guide educational planning and evaluation. These principles are products of the social, political, and economic values of the dominant groups as well as the demands of the market. Thus, education was organized to assist in the production of the technical/administrative knowledge needed to expand markets, control production and labor, create greater artificial needs, and increase dependency on consumption (Apple 1982, 22). Educators searched for the "most efficient method" (Apple 1982, 12), and the curriculum became increasingly planned, systematized, and standardized. Moreover, the content of curriculum was reduced to that which can be measured by standardized texts (Apple 1988). As a result teachers become mere accessories to the educational machine. The same set of curricular principles led to the construction of "legitimate knowledge," as expressed in

textbooks. Legitimate knowledge proceeds from the complex power relations and struggle among identifiable class, race, gender, and religious groups (Apple 1993, 46). Teaching literacy, for example, becomes the overt and covert shaping of students to accept things as molded for their consumption. "Literacy was often there to produce economic skills and a shared system of beliefs and values, to help create a 'national culture'" (Apple 1993, 44).<sup>5</sup> Indeed this is, to borrow from Peter McLaren (1988,223), "a pedagogy of submission."

Henry Giroux (1983a, 48-60) defined four approaches to the concept of the hidden curriculum: traditional, liberal, radical, and dialectical critique. We have already discussed the first three approaches: the *traditional approach* (Jackson, Dreeben), which accepted uncritically the existing relationship between schools and the larger society; the *liberal approach* (Anyon, Martin), which located the hidden curriculum in specific social practices, cultural images, or forms of discourse that reinforced discrimination and prejudice but could potentially be uncovered and eliminated; and the *radical perspective* (Bowles and Gintis), which focused on the political economy of schooling and regarded the social relations of the production process as the determining force in shaping the school environment. Giroux's fourth approach, *dialectical critique* (grounded in the work of Paulo Freire and represented by authors such as Apple, Giroux, hooks, Macedo, and McLaren) is closely associated with the radical approach in that it rejected the one-sided structuralism and pessimism of the political economy posture. It postulates that hidden curricula is plural and that contradictions open spaces for students and teachers to resist mechanisms of social control and domination and to create alternative cultural forms. This fourth approach is sometimes termed *resistance theory*.

## **Resistance Theorists**

Critical theorists from the United States and Great Britain came to recognize that hegemonic ideology and practice is deeply and essentially conflicted. Because culture is lived and produced, they argued, schools cannot be understood as simply places where students are instructed, organized, and controlled by the interests of a dominant class. Students are not merely passive vessels but creatively act in ways that often contradict expected norms and dispositions that pervade the schools (Apple 1982, 95). Therefore to comprehend schooling, it must be understood as an arena of conflict, compromise, and struggle (Apple 1982, 23-31). In books like *Talking Back* (1989) and *Teaching to Transgress* (1994), bell hooks used her own experience to illustrate how individual students and teachers can recognize and thwart socialization regimes. Paulo Freire (1973,1982, 1994) developed a large body of literature centered on literacy, the development of critical consciousness, and what he termed a "pedagogy of hope." Donald Macedo explored similar themes alongside Apple, Willis, McLaren, hooks, and Giroux. These resistance theorists would like us to counter any functionalist reading of the educational system by calling attention to the important role of agency, resistance, and contestation.

Henry Giroux (1983a, 61-63) for instance, built upon Apple's point that the hidden curriculum must be about both reproduction *and* transformation. He linked the structure of hidden curricula to notions of liberation, grounded in values of personal dignity and social justice. Schools therefore become sites of domination and contestation. This does not mean that the terrain is evenly shared between the forces of domination and resistance, or that all forms of oppositional behavior have a radical significance. Given that acts of resistance vary, each oppositional act must be analyzed to see if it constitutes a form of resistance (Giroux 1983a, 110).

Resistance theorists provide cultural space for possibility. They do not want to see the educational system as a reflection of the capitalist order with students and teachers as mere pawns moved by the logic of capital. The original functionalist approach as well as correspondence theory were rejected because they directed us to see the school only in reproductive terms and negated the possibility of contestation. Similarly, right and left functionalism denied the conflicted nature of education within the wider social, economic, and political order. For instance, the act of reading can be at one and the same time a form of regulation and exploitation *as well as* a mode of resistance, celebration, and solidarity (Apple 1993, 53). For this reason, Apple argued that the dominant society's hegemonic control is a dialectic not reducible to the simple interests of the dominant class (Apple 1982, 29).

The philosopher Jane Roland Martin (1994) proved logically that there is no universal agenda, that socialization exists only in particular context. Apple (1982) then emphasized that hidden curricula involve various interests, cultural forms, struggles, agreements, and compromises. Students are not simply passive receptacles but active players in the systems that attempt to socialize them. Students negotiate, accommodate, reject, and often divert socialization agendas. Hidden curricula occur at multiple places and times during schooling. Nonetheless, we can trace how both the form and the content of the curriculum reproduces structures of power and oppression. As Apple noted, however, we should not conceive of the curriculum as a thing, such as a syllabus or course of study. Rather, we should understand it as a symbolic, material, and human environment that is ongoingly reconstructed (Apple 1993, 144). Critical theorists correctly sought to keep open the possibility of human action and democracy. Nevertheless Apple and Giroux are dubious about the nature of resistance. Apple, for instance, recognized that contestation can be contradictory. It might serve to reinforce and reproduce existent power dynamics, as it did in Paul Willis's study. The process of contestation "may act in contradictory ways that may ultimately tend to be reproductive" (Apple 1982, 25)-a point supported by Giroux (1983a).

Kathleen Weiler (1988) provided an empirical example of the contradictions embedded in resistance by showing how high school students resisted efforts by feminist teachers to make them more conscious of gender inequities. Their resistance is not simple obstinateness, but is grounded in their complex subjectivities, which combine classed, raced, and gendered elements. The white, middle-class women teachers were most comfortable with white, middle-class women students (akin to the intersubjectivity noted by Sharp and Green). In affirming a feminist interpretation of a discussion or class reading as "correct," or in supporting "the girls" in a dispute, the teachers are often denying a competing reality of the boys or the working-class students in the class. Thus resistance seems inevitable and its heroic status questionable.

## CONCLUSION

The idealism expressed in Giroux, Macedo, and Freire's "politics of hope" may have run its course. In this volume, most of the authors sin on the side of structuralism and functionalism rather than displaying an excessive faith in agency. While sympathetic to the possibility of resistance, they give full weight to the power of institutions to manage contestation, reproduce hierarchy, and resist change. Michael Soldatenko's article, for example, analyzed how the Chicano movement (and by extension the women's, gay, and other ethnic studies movements) was "socialized" from movement to stasis by various hidden curricula in the university.

The concept of hidden curriculum bridges any simple attempt to distinguish social from cultural reproduction or to define a special zone of creativity and freedom. In the following chapters, the authors reveal how the structural production of inequality goes along with the socialization to assent to and believe in that inequality: Kenneth Ehrensall demonstrates how prospective managers are selected and segregated from workers while simultaneously schooled to see their interests in opposition to workers. Caroline Childress describes a program specifically designed to lower the expectations of dislocated professionals so they willingly apply for lower-status jobs serving local employers. Linda Muzzin and Karen Tonso give complementary views of how women become second-class citizens in professional schools: Tonso demonstrates how women are systematically excluded both physically and socially from the world of engineers; and Muzzin explains how the woman-dominated profession of pharmacy is devalued and disrespected in pharmacy schools controlled by international biotechnology firms. Carrie Yang Costello examines how the status and beliefs, values and attitudes of future lawyers and social workers are conditioned by the physical environment of their schools. Sandra Acker, Eric Margolis and Mary Romero closely interrogate the personal relationships of thesis advising and mentoring to consider how cultural capital and habitus affect performance in graduate school. Mary Jane Curry pursues a similar interest in her participant observation of an ESL classroom where immigrants/refugees are "assimilated" by a "free" program intended to teach English but more successful at inculcating the value "in the United States you get what you pay for."

This volume only scratches the surface of a very large project. Until recently, theorizing and ethnographic studies on the hidden curriculum have been limited to primary and secondary schooling. The function of education in primary schooling is to transmit the necessary values of society, social consensus, and integration; later schooling has the task of differentiating, recruiting, selecting, and grooming students for adult occupational roles. While the purposes may appear distinct, the traditions of the hidden curriculum remain similar: education is an agency of differentiation and stratification, holding the keys that access valued cultural elements. Aside from studies such as Bergenhengouwen's "Hidden Curriculum in the University" (1987), Holland and Eisenhart's *Educated in Romance: Women, Achievement and College Culture* (1990), Astin's *What Matters in College?* (1993), and Margolis and Romero's "The Department Is Very White, Very Male, Very Old and Very Conservative: The Functioning of the Hidden Curriculum in Graduate Sociology Departments" (1998), little has been written directly about hidden curricula in higher education. The lack of literature raises questions

that are at least partially answered in the studies included in this volume: How does the socialization process continue in higher education? What new elements of hidden curricula appear in higher education? What forms do they take? And specifically, how do institutions of higher learning reinforce gender, race, and social class distinctions ultimately producing stratified outcomes? In our attempt to get a theoretical handle on these phenomena theoretically, we sought the collective insights of a variety of contemporary educational theorists-including some of those who developed the concept of hidden curriculum. The next chapter of this volume sums up those views.

## NOTES

1. Taken from the online version at <http://bau2.uibk.ac.at/sg/poe/works/p-letter.html>
2. Taken from an online version of the Hans Christian Andersen story. <http://www.geocities.com/a-thens/2424/clothes.html>
3. For a particularly succinct statement of a Marxist position on the relation of education to the state and ruling classes, see "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses: Notes towards an Investigation" (Althusser [1970] 1971, 155-56).
4. Conference proceedings were published, including: *Schooling, Ideology and the Curriculum* (Barton, Meighan, and Walker 1980) and *Class Gender and Education* (Walker and Barton 1983).
5. For a detailed exposure of these practices in an ESL class see the Curry article in this volume.
6. Thus the question of contestation is not simply about literacy or texts but about social groups and institutions (Guillory 1987).
7. In another text, Apple returned to the ambiguity of contestation. The controversy over official knowledge, Apple noted, usually centers around what is included and excluded in textbooks. Pressure can be brought to include writers or writings earlier excluded from the text. Apple termed this form of compromise "mentioning." Mentioning may integrate new elements into the selective tradition; however, their close association to the values of the dominant group subordinates them. Thus "[d]ominance is partly maintained here through compromise and the process of 'mentioning'" (Apple 1993, 56).