In response to our interview questions, Peter McLaren used Edgar Allan Poe's short story "The Purloined Letter" to point to a lucid characteristic of the hidden curriculum: "The best way to hide something is to put it right in front of somebody's eyes where they are not looking for it ... [the purloined letter] was put in such an obvious place nobody bothered to look there because it was too obvious. That is in a sense a metaphor for what has happened to universities." Much like the purloined letter, the hidden curriculum hides "in plain sight." As with many of the scholars we interviewed, McLaren used a metaphor as a beginning to his analysis and wove theory into his lived experiences as an academic. This chapter was written as a companion to the literature review in the introduction to explore ways in which the concept hidden curricula can be explicitly applied to higher education. We wanted to understand how scholar/educators in the academic community perceive and conceptualize the socialization functions of post-secondary school. We interviewed a variety of faculty and administrators, many of whom have contributed to the literature on socialization and hidden curricula in primary and secondary school.

This project grew out of a larger study that utilizes methods of visual ethnography. The research began as an assignment to photograph the hidden curriculum on campus. The collection of photographs provided a broad spectrum of visual imagery of the hidden curriculum; however, much of the data on the subject could not
adequately be gathered using still image techniques alone. Physical depictions of certain elements of hidden curricula, including classroom structures, architecture, fraternity and sorority gatherings, and representations of school pride, were somewhat obvious, but a large part of what constitutes the hidden curriculum—social relations like race and gender hierarchy, social class reproduction, the inculcation of ideological belief structures, and so on—was much less visible. Because it proved challenging to capture and illustrate socialization processes visually, we began to further “photograph” the hidden curriculum by videotaping interviews with scholars in the field of education on the topic. The goal of our larger study was to produce multiretextual documents that utilize visual techniques but are grounded in theory and research, including a video documentary entitled Right Before Your Eyes: Conversations on the Hidden Curriculum, and an interactive Internet dialog for “public elicitation” of continuing research.2

To date, we have conducted open-ended interviews with twenty-one members of the academic community including university and community college faculty, deans, and administrators. Subjects were selected based on their professional experience and contributions to the literature on socialization and hidden curricula. However, our selection process was strongly determined by lack of funding, which necessitated interviewing easily accessible participants. The video interviews were conducted either at Arizona State University during Spring Symposia visits or on location at professional conferences that we attended. Data collection began late in 1998 and continued through early 2000. The interviews were semistructured, engaging interviewees in a conversational inquiry about the hidden curriculum that lasted approximately one hour. While some general questions were employed for consistency, discussions developed in directions suggested by the interests and experience of the interviewees. Table 2.1 (see p. 41) lists the interview subjects. Interviews were transcribed and coded. The following categories of the hidden curriculum emerged from our analysis of the interviews: (1) perspectives and definitions of the concept; (2) the role of the physical environment; (3) the importance of the body; (4) intentional or overt socialization practices that were not particularly well hidden; (5) socialization functions taught as elements of professionalization, and resistance to attempts at socialization.

COMING TO TERMS:
DEFINITIONS OF THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM

One of the most problematic aspects of the hidden curriculum is in the name itself. Many of those interviewed struggled with the inadequacy of terms for describing how extracurricular information is conveyed in the process of higher education. Just as the term hidden agenda conjures up something covert or undisclosed, hidden curricula suggests intentional acts to obscure or conceal—a conscious duplicity that may not always be present. However, the hidden curriculum is not something that we must look behind or around in order to detect; in most cases it is plainly in sight, and functions effortlessly. For example, Roxana Ng (Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education, University of Toronto) characterized the hidden curriculum as “the way in which business is usual takes place in the university.” A similar point was expressed by Alexander Astin (Higher Education Policy, UCLA) in his reference to values and the way that they unconsciously dictate various hidden curricula:

Values are at the very basis of education. . . . Just having a curricular requirement is a value. We can’t escape values; they are embedded in everything we do. What we can do is to ignore the value questions and act as though they don’t exist . . . which is what I think we have been doing.

Karen Anijar (Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Arizona State University) also noted the embeddedness of values as a component of the hidden curriculum and specifically highlighted how it operates on a semiotic level: “In the university we have ‘excellence’ values . . . but the unit of measure by which we are measuring what excellent is, is absolutely obscured for us.”

The Donaldo Macedo (Department of English and director of bilingual and ESL studies, University of Massachusetts) definition underscored how socialization penetrates and transforms the individual: “What I see as hidden curriculum is how it’s really embedded in the psyche and the discourse and the attitude.” Mary Romero (School of Justice Studies, Arizona State University) elaborated the critical process whereby curricula are embedded and naturalized, in other words, “hidden”: 
Part of surviving an institution and making it in a profession is learning to ignore, or to become part of it, and so that it also all of a sudden dissolves, it becomes invisible. So then we also become part of the institution.

Interviewees provided a variety of thick definitions for the concept. Individual interpretations of hidden curricula depended largely on two things: (1) interviewees' political leanings, disciplines, and paradigmatic perspectives; and, (2) their individual experience of hidden curricula in the context of their education, research, and teaching. Generally, the term was given different meanings depending upon the functionalist, liberal, humanist, Marxist, or critical postmodernist paradigms of the interviewees. Most subjects provided critical perspectives of hidden curricula, challenging one-dimensional interpretations of the concept. For example, Anijar made the point that hidden curricula are plural when she identified the protean nature of the curricula process in her definition:

I don't think there's a singular hidden curriculum. I think it's something that transforms itself like anything else. I don't think it's something that's singular or constant. I think it changes, it moves. . . . It doesn't remain constant. If it remained constant it would be easy to unearth and deconstruct and everybody would know about it and where it would occur. . . . It moves and it reconfigures itself like anything else. It's a process . . . .

Recognizing plurality and process is essential in challenging the early reproduction theories of Durkheim, Dreeben, and Jackson, who depicted students as passive receptacles for unified and unproblematic social messages. The presence of multiple and conflicting messages opens up spaces for students and faculty to be active players in the systems that attempt to socialize them. Michael Apple (Division of Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Policy Studies, University of Wisconsin, Madison) in his definition challenged the perception of students and teachers as simply passive receptacles, and included agency and the development of strategies to avert the institutional requirements of school:

There is no real hidden curriculum that simply socializes these passive beings as if they're puppets whose strings are somehow pulled

by the major marionette at the university. So the way I tend to look about this is that institutions, to use the metaphor I like to use, are "arenas." Where there are various interests, various cultural forms, various struggles, various agreements and compromises, in which students are pretty active players. . . . So when I talk about the hidden curriculum . . . it is one way of talking about the way in which cultural struggles and policies—people's lives—are conditioned by an institution.

Critical postmodern and Marxist interpretations of the topic drew attention to the curricular, ideological, physical, and structural components of schooling that privilege dominant interests and ultimately serve social class reproductive ends. Peter McLaren (Division of Urban Schooling, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, UCLA) captured this aspect of hidden curricula as accomplishments of the university, itself a central institution of the larger capitalist system:

I guess the hidden curriculum, one could say, consists of the tacit ways in which knowledge and behavior get constructed outside the usual course materials and scheduled lessons in a way to conduce us to comply with dominant ideologies, dominant social practices so that there is an inducement. . . . How does the institutional site that we are working in organize desire? How does it deploy discourses in particular ways? How does it set up the environment? All these factors are important when you discuss the hidden curriculum.

Many of those interviewed underscored the functions of hidden curricula in (re)producing inequality and differential outcomes. Even the grading system reflects ideology, as Donald Blumenfeld-Jones (Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Arizona State University) explains: "We think that we need to compare people to each other to give those who have better grades—meaning more cultural capital, more school capital—that translates into more material capital for them."

However, some definitions of members of the academic community corresponded with Jackson's (1968) and Dreeben's (1968) observations, conceptualizing hidden curricula as necessary socializing mechanisms that shaped desired behavioral outcomes. For administrators like Elizabeth Miller (Director, Center for Teaching Excellence,
Texas A&M), socialization was a central feature of college: “From day one we talk about traditions, traditions, traditions. And how the Aggie is this and the Aggie is that and the Aggie is the other. A lot of our ethics are taught through that.” Miller’s functionalist perspective emphasized the hidden curriculum as a necessary element of social reproduction, serving an essential integrative function and inculcating students with desirable societal values.

An analysis of the various interpretations of the hidden curriculum points to the redefinition as more than an issue of semantics, but a critical assessment of whether or not socialization is “hidden” in the sense of attempting to deceive, or simply an embedded, accepted component of the educational process that has not been directly examined. While each interviewee unpacked the term and framed the concept to capture the realities of its effects, taken collectively, there was little departure from two early definitions of “hiddenness” employed by Jackson (1968) and Vallance ([1973/1974] 1983). No single definition emerged from the interviews, nor was anything radically new added. This suggests that while complex, the concept is relatively well defined and understood.

In moving from the literature on kindergarten through high school, to the observations made by interviewees in this study of post-secondary education, it became clear that while certain applications may be different, as Anjari stated: “The specifics of where it [in a public school situation or a private school] appears in each instance might be different but there really is no difference from what is going on in an elementary school.” In identifying hidden curriculum in higher education, Romero underscored the persistence of structures that discipline and socialize:

Hidden curriculum I see as the values and norms that get embedded into the way that we structure our courses, the way that we structure our curriculum, the way that we structure the organization. And I think a lot of these elements may be established as intended, as well as unintended.

Applying this to the curriculum of the School of Justice Studies where she teaches, Romero explained how values and norms get incorporated:

There are certain faculty that would emphasize justice issues in terms of social justice in terms of an understanding of collective justice in terms of larger society and there will be other faculty that will emphasize individual rights versus group rights. You can see how part of that hidden curriculum gets into our larger public debates over affirmative action, use of vouchers in funding public schools.

Blumenfeld-Jones noted the “authoritarian hierarchical structures” that distinguish persons in the classroom as “expert talkers and there are inexpert listeners.” We can again look back to Philip Jackson’s early work, which made an important point reiterated in our interviewee’s definitions and understandings of the topic: “Life in college classrooms is surely different from life in lower grades, but beneath the obvious differences lies a basic similarity. In a fundamental sense, school is school, no matter where it happens” (1968; 1990, xxii). For the most part, the hidden curriculum remains an embedded and largely ignored element of academic life.

THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM AS MANIFESTED IN THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

A number of interviewees drew attention to architecture and the physical environment as elements of the hidden curriculum that functioned as socialization factors. Like Bill Williamson (1974, 10–11), a British sociologist, who wrote “educational attitudes of dominant groups in society still carry historical weight and are exemplified even in the bricks and mortar of the school buildings themselves,” interviewees reflected on the built environment of their institutions, and suggested that buildings, the physical arrangement of classrooms, occupation of physical space, and other architectural structures honor certain histories and convey political agendas. In making this point, Blumenfeld-Jones linked the structure of the university buildings to the structure of curriculum.⁴

Looking at the building you are to have a certain attitude towards education and towards that institution that's embodied in that building. When you walk through the doors—through the arched door with the gothic work on the wood, and the stone work, and the
windows and all of that—you are to feel a certain something. The way in which you structure an institution tells you about the desires and agendas of that institution.

Interviewees that noted the embodiment of attitudes, emotions, and dispositions toward education and learning in physical structures almost always pointed to the divisions among disciplines. Architectural investments were noted in schools of engineering, business, and the physical sciences. By contrast, the humanities and social sciences were cited as examples of disciplines housed in vernacular buildings with less stature on campus and less prominence in terms of physical space (e.g., temporary structures or basements). The following quote by Blumenfeld-Jones captures this observation:

Most university administrations favor tremendously the natural sciences and mathematics. . . . I’d like to say it’ll be a cold day in hell before Education gets a building as beautiful. So I’d say if you want to look for the hidden curriculum here [ASU], it is where does the money go for what kind of buildings—who gets the facilities?

The people we spoke with argued that emphasis in the built environment is largely a result of the rise of corporate culture on campus and a push toward vocationalization and specialization. Disciplines in the American academy have increasingly developed businesslike organizational cultures. For some scholar/educators in this study, not only has higher education become a less independent subsector of the economy, but curricula—both formal and informal—are overdetermined by the logic of exchange. In a higher education manifestation of Bowles and Gintis’s (1976) “correspondence thesis,” one of the main purposes that hidden curricula serve in the university is to prepare people for the corporate world (Chubb and Moe 1990; Cohen 1993; Etzkowitz, Webster, and Healey 1998; Lucas 1994; Nelson 1997; Parsons and Platt 1973; Slaughter and Leslie 1997; Spring 1972; Shor 1980; McLaren 2000). Some of those we interviewed believe that informal curricula and the belief system associated with capitalism reproduces individualism, competition, and a “natural” hierarchy based on what Parsons (1959) described as the “winning and losing” notion of achievement. The consensus is that even in the physical environment the hidden cur-

riculum implicitly orders and qualifies particular kinds of knowledge, meanwhile marginalizing “other” disciplines as “low status” and as providing less marketable knowledge. Collectively, scholars whom we interviewed expressed fears that what qualifies as worthwhile knowledge will more often be defined on the basis of its marketability rather than on its social functions.5

Most of those interviewed were skeptical of the blurring distinctions between university education and training for capitalist divisions of labor. They argued that corporate culture and the push toward vocational specialization in higher education has grown more dominant over the past several decades. Douglas Kellner (Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, UCLA) described professional socialization agendas as largely influenced by the habitus of corporate culture:

I would agree that part of the hidden curriculum of the current structure and organization of education is bringing the marketplace, corporatization and business into the university and into schooling. . . . They see the corporate model as the model for schools.

In addition, our interviewees’ critiques of the link between the physical environment and the curriculum frequently noted social stratification. Anjjar called attention to specific messages of exclusion and inclusion written on the walls (i.e., graffiti and posters) and types of bodies enclosed within the walls:

The buildings themselves tell you who belongs in there . . . what’s on the walls tells you who belongs in there and who doesn’t. Some people are in and some people are out. Some knowledge is privileged and some isn’t. Yet we want to seem like we are inclusive and embracing.

Physical environment also structures the level of interaction between faculty and students, as observed by Romero:

Our classrooms are not in the same building as our offices. Since classrooms are very spread out over a large area, the kind of interaction that might occur between students and faculty going to class in the same building where faculty have their offices, does not occur.
Christine Sleeter (director of Master of Arts in Education, CSU-Monterey Bay) identified a structural link between physical space, curriculum, and social stratification that is produced by the particular funding formulas in California:

With the UC (University of California) system it’s like a tracking system serving predominantly white middle- to upper-class students and getting a richer funding formula. And the CSU (California State Universities) serving predominantly working-class students of color and getting a poorer funding formula. . . . In order to get money from the state you have to be able to demonstrate that you’re using the space you have in certain ways.

The physical environment of the classroom is codified as “student work stations” measured by square footage:

What that does, is it translates into a conception of teaching as students come in and sit in fairly close rows. And if you want to have forms of pedagogy that involve people in either moving around . . . other than sitting in almost airplane seats, it starts running up against the constraints that were put into place for how you get funding to have this space in the first place.

Limited physical environment for teaching and learning restricts educators’ choices of pedagogy and may influence some to abandon innovative programs and revert to restraining the minds and bodies of the working-class student:

[W]hat begins to appear to me is that monies are available for taking largely working-class, in many cases underprepared students, who are coming into higher education, having kind of a batch processing curriculum, almost following the egg crate design that . . . you’re supposed to put people in it for a certain amount of time, deliver a curriculum, test them over that curriculum and move them on.

THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM AS MANIFESTED IN THE BODY

The body itself, and the way in which it is schooled, were identified by several interviewees as sites for investigation of hidden curricula. The following section further explores the manifestation of the hidden curriculum in the gendered, racialized, class-based bodies of students and faculty. The body is a crucial socializing force that symbolizes gendered and racialized social meanings. Women and academics of color talked about regularly having to maintain a duplicity of being (DuBois 1989) in order to function in the university setting. Anijar offered the following example of how academic culture creates expectations of class-based gender behavior and presentation of self that worked to privilege and reproduce class status:

When I was finishing my dissertation my advisor told me that when I go on my interviews . . . I have to do sort of a wardrobe transformation because how I would dress would not be acceptable within the academy because it comes out of a certain social class. She said on my interviews I am to never eat spaghetti because you can’t eat it without being sloppy. If everybody else is drinking, I ought not to be drinking because then it might be constructed that I am an alcoholic . . . even if I was sick from eating because they do the three meals a day I should eat because I am female and I don’t want anyone to think that I have an eating disorder.

Eating too much or eating too little is less likely to be noticed or to carry the same negative consequences for the male body as it does for a female one. Other women and academics of color noted that they frequently found themselves alienated from university settings if their class and social status background was not congruent with that of the academic environment. Like Karen Anijar, they described dropping (or suspending as necessary) incompatible class habits, as well as feeling pressure to modify behavior and appearance because of gender, race, and ethnicity. Romero elaborated on the intersectionality of race, class, and gender with an example of how the hidden curriculum framed the Latina body as a site incompatible with Ivy League expectations.

I remember very distinctly as assistant dean at Yale trying to get an idea of what would be the appropriate dress to wear to a particular activity. One of my colleagues, a white woman, said, “Just don’t wear anything ethnic.” I never thought of myself as wearing anything ethnic. But then I thought: Is it my earrings? Is it my jewelry? Is it my hair? The way I wear my hair? Should I be cutting my hair? Should
I be wearing it so it's tightly matted to my head? Or is there a particular kind of makeup? All that becomes a part of fitting the norm. That same year I recall an undergraduate Chicana I ran into as I was walking across campus. She shocked me by her comment. She said, “You know, today I almost went and got my hair cut, but I decided not to.” I said, “Why?” She said, “Well it occurred to me that Dean Romero has frizzy hair so it's okay. I don't have to cut my hair.” It never occurred to me that even my physical presence, my body, my hair would be part of being a role model to students who didn't have that image on a campus for them.

Michael Apple noted that within the one institution, different messages were received by students of color and white students:

As it becomes increasingly white, those people of color who come feel as if there is no community for them. So their hidden curriculum is very different than the hidden curriculum of dominant groups. They see very few people like themselves there, the lived culture of the institution makes them feel like “the other.” What we have then is a group of people who basically come from families that have made it.

Romero described gendered and racialized bodies as functioning as visible signs of status and hierarchy that are sometimes reflected in white students’ disrespect and rejection of women and faculty of color: “In talking to my colleagues, particularly white colleagues and even more so, male colleagues, I certainly get challenged more in terms of grades.” This is a pretty open secret of campus life—the differing experiences that gender and race have on the act of teaching were acknowledged by several of the white academics interviewed. For instance, Peter McLaren commented:

I know that white students have raised questions with colleagues of mine who are African American or Latino/Latina in ways that they would never question a white professor in class. They just wouldn't think of questioning a white professor. Asking them to justify and almost testing them in ways they would never test a white professor.

Roxana Ng (Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto) has written poignantly about how her anti-racist pedagogy produced opposition.6 One white male student who was supported by various individuals in her institution filed a complaint, the handling of which demonstrates how sexism and racism disempower feminist and minority faculty:

I was asked to teach this course on cross-culture education where I incorporated into the course both stuff on racial and ethnic minorities as well as gender issues. And halfway through the course a student was really mad and he complained that I was a biased teacher... He complained to the chair of the department. And the chair asked to see me and he says there was this complaint. First of all, he said there were complaints. So I said, “How many?” He finally said it was actually only one student that complained. But somehow one student complaint overruled everybody who was actually getting something out of the course. There’s kind of an implicit—almost agreement—among men in this context as students, as administrators. And I was told actually halfway through the year to change my curriculum.

The visibly gendered, class-based, and racialized body is clearly an important element of the hidden curriculum as it is transmitted through the interactions of students, professors, administrators, researchers, and scholars.

THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM OF INTENTIONAL PRACTICES

Many interviewees remarked that higher education institutions maintain overt socialization practices that are not really hidden because the outcomes are intentional. Higher education institutions intentionally configure their socialization practices to reproduce particular research interests, habits of mind, and social roles. In comparing interviewees’ comments, it is clear that intentional socialization agendas vary across settings and depend on the way each university or department frames its work. For instance, Miller described Texas A&M’s “other curriculum” that reinforced tradition as a fundamental aspect of campus identity:

I think the hidden curriculum is probably one of the most important curricula that we have. We have unannounced curriculums that are
very important. . . . Texas A&M is a very tightly knit, very high tradition university, and that's one of the things that really knits us together. There is an *esprit de corps* that is quite unique. A kind of culture there is quite unique: "it's a kind of a one for all, and all for one." It's kind of a three musketeers thing and it really spills over in everything we do.

Another example was provided by Romero, who also observed overt socialization practices that led to the development of distinct definitions of self as a leader:

At Yale, students impart a hidden curriculum as a message that you are a leader. You are going to be leading the country. Thinking originally, thinking creatively, and learning new knowledge is important.

Apple described an intended hidden curriculum embedded in the University of Wisconsin's institutional mission to counter its radical past:

My own institution has a long history of radical political activity and cultural experimentation. And for many people that's a little threatening. So parents want to hear publicly that there is an official hidden curriculum at the institution which is don't worry when your children come here, they will be fine.

Higher education in the United States ranges from two-year community colleges to the Ivy Leagues, from general liberal arts programs to graduate and professional education. Linda Darling-Hammond (professor of education, Stanford University) argued that the overall institutional mission can be revealed by analyzing the smaller socialization agendas:

Not all higher education institutions are the same. Some really see it as their mission to provide access to a wide range of people, to really create opportunity in the society, and many state universities configure their responsibility that way [but] not all of them do. But you can also find public institutions that behave just as though they were private institutions in the way that they think of admissions, manage financial aspects of the university, and see their mission as either a teaching mission, a developmental mission, or a select and sort mission. And I think that plays out in the way universities make decisions about incentives for professors and rewards for teaching versus rewards for research, as much as it plays out in things like admissions policy.

Some institutions define themselves as "access expanders" for students, who for reasons of race, class, gender, economics, immigration, and language status would not have access to higher education. Such institutions focused their intentional practices and socialization agendas on producing support systems for their students. Others see themselves as elite finishing schools for the best and the brightest. Institutional differentiation along the lines Darling-Hammond discussed is a central feature of higher education's role in the reproduction of social stratification. This area of intentional socialization functions mentioned by our research subjects has not been well studied to date. However as traditional "brick and mortar" institutions are forced to compete with "virtual" colleges that provide on-line courses and distance learning, socialization will likely become an important marketing feature. This would be a fruitful area for a major research project.

**NEGOTIATING PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION AND RESISTANCE**

Throughout the interviews we found that membership in any academic profession was discussed as an induction process requiring more than competence in a respective field. Moving from novice to professional was described as inculcating particular norms, perspectives, accepted tastes and attributes, jargon, attitudes, and institutionalized practices, as well as embracing certain ideologies. The following statement by David Berliner (dean of the College of Education, Arizona State University) captures the general viewpoint: "You learn very quickly what you have to do to survive in any social situation. When you're trying to belong to a club and there are rules and it takes you a while to learn the rules. So the hidden curriculum is just that set of rules that's not made obvious." Also consistent across the interviews was the belief that the socialization process is more "successful" for those aligned with the values of particular institutional settings.

The alignment process requires submitting to a distinct class-based consciousness in order to acquire necessary symbolic capital (Bourdieu
1973, 1977; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990). As indicated by the comments throughout the study, this consciousness includes race and gender. These elements of the hidden curriculum ultimately serve not only in the reproduction of both hierarchy and marginalization, but alienation as well. Speaking of their personal experiences or making observations of various institutional practices, many academics described how hidden curricula in higher education assimilate individuals into the class structure, practices, and values of an established predominantly white, male-oriented, middle-class academic environment.

The experiences and observations as shared by scholars in this study suggest a tension between acquiring the cultural capital which symbolizes membership in the academy and maintaining individual, cultural, and ideological integrity. It was clear that many of the scholars we interviewed had learned to maneuver throughout their careers with what Colin Lacey (1977, 14) called a “strategic compliance”: bending to institutional constraints, but choosing to retain oppositional beliefs and ideologies. This delicate balance is implied in David Berliner’s observation:

What you want to do is get people to change the world and speak out as faculty members, and change the world of students, but at the same time the people who pay your salary are people who are in fact the established power structure of a society. And how do you do that in a way that allows for both change, personal growth, being a public intellectual, and not alienating the people who hold your purse strings. That’s very tricky.

In describing her efforts to transform the curriculum, Ng reminded us of the risks and consequences of social opposition:

You need to be conscious when you are challenging the system so that you’re not doing it kind of naively. Through a lot of negotiations and struggles, people like myself have carved out spaces to do a different kind of work. . . . We carve out spaces, and the question then is how you actually operate in those spaces.

Although there was broad consensus among the academics included in this study regarding the tendency for hidden curricula to reproduce dominant frames of reference through professional socialization, many held out the possibility of pedagogies of desocialization and opposition. Throughout the interviews, they provided notions of how higher education must also be conceptualized as an arena of resistance. They stressed the need for dissent, compromise, and even outright rejection of certain socializing influences. Several reflected on their own praxis, illustrating the importance of developing cultural transformation by way of “antistructures” or “countercurricula” to challenge the prevailing social and ideological arrangements of the university. Apple suggested the following strategy:

At universities the hidden curriculum must be brought to an overt level, it must be thought about, it must be talked through and the kinds of norms and values you want to organize the workplace. . . . All of that should be brought to a level where people can participate in it, struggle over it, talk about it but it’s got to be done in a way where people feel they can speak honestly and where the norms that are supposed to be usually hidden are democratic, participatory, and organized around critical intellectual and pedagogic work.

Sleeter and her colleagues at CSU appear to be engaged in such praxis by recognizing that the funding formula restricts space and works against their philosophy of education. They began a dialogue to explore ways to retain their vision of building a multicultural institution.

While many of those we interviewed seemed well aware of the limits of resistance and the overwhelming reproductive power of educational institutions, several discussed the possibility that hidden curricula could be changed or expanded to include other values. For instance, Miller argued that her university’s hidden curriculum included more than capitalist concerns:

[What] we’re trying to teach in these hidden curriculums or unannounced curriculums is that there is more to life than just money. . . . the main thing is that we want you [students] to be passionate about life and make a difference. Just one person can make a big difference.

Macedo proposed adding courses in ethics and the foundations of democracy to graduate schools of education:
They have a curriculum that is designed mostly for the development and creation of technicians along the lines of domestication to serve a particular social order. So for instance to finish a doctorate, you are usually required to take a course on statistics. Methods of research are mostly quantitative research but qualitative research also may be required. But there’s no course whatsoever…that would require a student to engage in understanding and studying what it means to be ethical. And it seems to me that one of the prerequisites of becoming a teacher is the understanding, a fuller understanding, of what it means to be ethical.

Critical scholars openly advocated opposition to dominant regimes of knowledge and noted that counter-hegemonic movements exist and continue to challenge the academy. While certain nontraditional perspectives have gained recognition, or at least tolerance in the modern university, acceptance into the mainstream academic culture simultaneously enables the system to control and perhaps pacify alternative ideologies. Nevertheless, some interviewees promoted cultural transformation by way of “antistructures” or “countercurricula,” identifying these as vital resources challenging traditional socialization practices. Drawing attention to the emerging emphasis on service-learning, Darling-Hammond argued that social responsibility was becoming incorporated into the curriculum:

I think there are many places now that are struggling with what does it mean to be educated. And what is the responsibility of the higher educated segment of a society to contribute to the welfare of others, to contribute to the welfare part of society. It gets manifested in some places, in for example, the growth and expansion of service learning courses, internships of various kinds. . . . I think what is important in the institutions I’ve worked in and the programs that I’m involved with is to prepare people to go into teaching who see themselves as having an ethical responsibility. Who see themselves as having responsibility to the welfare of the children they’re going to teach.

This chapter briefly introduced a number of themes drawn both from the direct experience of a small sample of higher education faculty and administrators, and from the concentrated theoretical consideration they have given to issues of curriculum and socialization. Many of their theoretical propositions—the role of the physical environment, the importance of the body, intentional or overt socialization practices, professionalization, and resistance to hidden curricula—are also the basis for the case studies that make up the bulk of this volume. In the chapters that follow, researchers gathered data and analyzed in detail specific postsecondary educational settings. These case studies both confirm the general observations in this chapter and demonstrate the usefulness of the concepts for concrete empirical investigations.

NOTES

1. The authors gratefully acknowledge the editorial assistance and intellectual contribution of Mary Romero in this work. The authors would also like to acknowledge the encouragement, labor, and insights of Luis Fernandez and Lydia Montelongo. Finally, this chapter would not have been written without the mentoring of Eric Margolis and the foundations he established toward applying audio and visual media to the research process.

2. Our intention was not to provide the same product in different media, but to use aspects of each to provide a “thick” understanding of the topic under study. Drawing on the foundations of Eric Margolis (1994) toward applying audio and visual media to the research process, we determined that videotaped interviews recording the accounts and contemplative observations of participants would yield more multidimensional data and comprehensive understandings of the functioning of hidden curricula. In addition, the weaving of scholar educators’ theories and experiences forced us to address “the messy empirical features of the lived reality” (Margolis, 1994, 124).

3. This typology was developed by Henry Giroux (1983a, 48–60). The introduction to this volume includes a review of the literature on hidden curricula and details these paradigms.

4. For a full development of the importance of architecture and the built environment in socialization, see chapter three, “Schooled by the Classroom: The (Re)production of Social Stratification in Professional School Settings,” in this volume.

5. This peculiar tension between the demands of business and social relationships is discussed in detail in several chapters in this volume. For instance, Linda Muzzin examined the influence of international drug companies on Canadian pharmacy schools and the ways in which corporate research demands overshadow the social need for well-educated pharmacists; Kenneth Ehrensal looked at how managers are educated to see their interests as different from workers; Mary Jane Curry showed how immigrants and refugees were schooled to the “pay as you go” ideology of corporate America.
6. For a detailed analysis of her experience see Ng (1997), “A Woman Out of Control: Deconstructing Sexism and Racism in the University.”

7. For a study of the role of faculty advising and mentoring see Acker's article “The Hidden Curriculum of Dissertation Advising” and Margolis and Romero's piece “In the Image and Likeness... How Mentoring Functions in the Hidden Curriculum” in this volume.

8. For an able discussion of how the university manages oppositional movements, see Michael Soldatenko’s “Radicalism in Higher Education: How Chicano Studies Joined the Curriculum” chapter eleven in this volume.

Table 2.1: Interview Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Johnson</td>
<td>Professor, Division of Education and Counseling Psychology, University of Missouri, Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Miller</td>
<td>Director, Center for Teaching Excellence, Texas A&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Blumenfeld-Jones</td>
<td>Associate professor, Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris MacCrate</td>
<td>Coordinator, Development of Faculty Senate for Teaching and Learning, Estrella Mountain Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam DiGangi</td>
<td>Associate professor, Division of Special Education, Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Romero</td>
<td>Professor, School of Justice Studies, Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Watson</td>
<td>Professor, Department of Political Science, Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Telecommunication, Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Shweder</td>
<td>Professor, Division of Human Development, University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Apple</td>
<td>John Bascom Professor of Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Policy Studies, University of Wisconsin, Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Darling-Hammond</td>
<td>Charles E. Ducommun Professor of Education, University and executive director of the National Commission on Teaching and America’s Future Professor, Stanford University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxana Ng</td>
<td>Associate professor, Department of Sociology and Equity Studies in Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Macedo</td>
<td>Professor, Department of English; director of Bilingual and ESL Studies, University of Massachusetts, Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Berliner</td>
<td>Dean, College of Education; Professor, Education Policy Studies and Psychology in Education, Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton Glick</td>
<td>Senior Vice Provost, Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Anijar</td>
<td>Assistant professor, Division of Curriculum and Instruction, Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter McLaren</td>
<td>Professor, Division of Urban Schooling; Curriculum, Teaching, Leadership, and Policy Studies, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, University of California, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Kellner</td>
<td>Professor, George F. Kneller Philosophy of Education Chair, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, University of California, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Glass</td>
<td>Associate dean for research; Professor, Education Policy Studies, Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Astin</td>
<td>Allan Murray Carter Professor, Higher Education and Work; director, Higher Education Research Institute, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, University of California, Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Sleeter</td>
<td>Professor, Coordinator—Master of Arts in Education Program; director, Advanced Studies in Education, California State University, Monterey Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Spring</td>
<td>Professor, Department of Educational Studies, State University of New York, New Paltz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>