Do I feel comfortable here at the law school? Sure. It's, well, a comfortable sort of place to be—I mean, I can grab a cappuccino at the café, and go right out into the courtyard and hang out with some friends—studying, yes, but also just talking, arguing, enjoying the sunshine. I like to hang out here. I'm very comfortable; I feel right at home.

—Grant (a straight white man of upper-middle-class origins)

At first I used to feel weird walking around the halls, like I didn't belong. I couldn't really believe I was here. Now I'm used to it, but sometimes I still kind of look around myself and think, "you really did it, girl," and it's sort of weird, but good.

—Cheryl (a straight African American woman of lower-middle-class origins)

I hate this place. Just walking into the building depresses me. I avoid hanging around this place, and try not to let it get to me.

—Wei (a gay Asian man of upper-middle-class origins)

That schools tend to reproduce patterns of social stratification is a classic theme in the sociology of education (e.g., Becker 1961; Bourdieus and Passeron 1977); that they do so in a recondite rather than forthright manner is the central premise of the literature on the hidden curriculum reviewed in the introduction to this volume. Several of those writing on hidden curricula have remarked on the importance of the physical environment (Apple 1993; Muzzin, chapter eight this
at the outset that while everyone is constantly subject to the socializing influence of their surroundings, most people are typically unaware of being so influenced (McDowell 1999). It is this fact that makes the influence of schools’ built environment a paradigmatic example of how certain curricula remain hidden, even though they are in plain sight.

Of course, physical settings do not function as socializing agents \textit{sua sponte}; they are things. The people who design, ornament, and maintain them are the true sources of socializing messages, and the settings are merely the means by which these messages are propagated. Yet physical structures persist and continue to affect the people who inhabit them long after those who designed and built them have passed from the scene. For example, the Berkeley School of Social Welfare is housed in Haviland Hall, a facility built for the School of Education in 1924. Haviland Hall was designed by the university architect to convey the authority and prestige of the field of education through neoclassical architecture, and it continues to impart to social welfare students today that they gain prestige by association with classical Western culture. On the other hand, new generations of students may “read” structures in a manner that differs from that originally intended, as meanings change over time. Haviland’s grand stairways, classical pediments, and formal entryways, meant to celebrate and embolden Anglo teachers in the 1920s, may alienate students of color pursuing social work degrees in the twenty-first century.

I chose to study schools of law and social work because of the interesting contrast they present. As noted by Martin, “A hidden curriculum is always of some setting, and there is no reason to suppose that different settings will have identical hidden curricula” (1994, 125, emphasis in original). It was the potential difference in the hidden curricula of the two schools that interested me. Law is a traditionally male profession and social work a traditionally female one; wealthy white males are overrepresented among the legal client base while women, children, people of color, and especially the poor constitute much of the social work client base. Despite these differences, however, white men from privileged class backgrounds are disproportionately successful in the two professions, although the effect is more pronounced at the law school and in legal practice. These puzzling facts are among those that the present analysis can help to explain.
HIDDEN CURRICULA OF THE SETTING

In the course of my research, I attended classes with first-year students at the Schools of Law and Social Welfare as a participant observer, and during the first confusing days I was struck by the importance of the physical settings. Before students began to know their professors and peers, they got important cues regarding their new professional roles from the architecture, decor, and level of maintenance of the facilities they entered. Later, as students became familiar with the school facilities, they stopped paying as much overt attention to their surroundings, directing their attention to personal interactions and academic tasks instead; however, the settings continued to provide socializing cues that the students continued to absorb. I will now analyze some of these cues by comparing in detail several aspects of the school facilities: entryways and hallways, artwork, and classrooms.

Entryways and Hallways at Boalt

Because the law school building in fact comprises an original core and two major additions constructed on substantially sloping grounds, negotiating it can be perplexing. An individual entering the law school for the first time is likely to feel rather lost, finding himself or herself dumped unceremoniously into one of many intersecting hallways. A student entering at ground level through the doors facing the Borden Family Courtyard can travel downstairs at the west end of the building to find herself or himself on the ground level of the original Boalt Hall facility, or may travel upstairs and eastward to exit at ground level once again from the North Addition. The effect is disorienting.

During the period in which I carried out my research, rooms in each section of the law school were numbered according to unrelated schemes, adding to the confusion. The Warren of the Boalt hallways served to discomfit the uninitiated while giving the initiated a sense of mastery as they moved from place to place with swift self-assurance. Getting lost was initially a source of embarrassment and anxiety for the first-year students; later, after they could negotiate the halls easily, the confusion of neophytes was a source of amusement for them. One student joked to me when I asked him for directions that “Boalt has been organized so as to cause the maximum possible confusion for [first-year students]” (Field note, August 20, 1997).

Besides confusing the novice, the hallways of Boalt serve to impress. The hallways of the original building core are wainscoted with a rich honey-toned wood called terminalia superba, imported from the west coast of Africa (Epstein 1997, 207). The floors also give a grand impression, being ornamented by linoleum parqueted in a striking checkerboard pattern. Across from the major lecture halls, benches of terminalia superba are inset into the walls for the comfort of waiting students; heating grilles cunningly set into their bases warm the students’ feet. Luxuries like these convey to students that their status is high, warranting every convenience.

In addition to giving an impression of richness, the hallways of the law school give an accounting of wealth. Along the central corridor between the registrar’s office and the library there are long panels of donative plaques, arrayed beneath a quotation from Roger J. Traynor reading: “[T]he law will never be built in a day, and with luck it will never be finished.” A bench is located across the corridor so students can contemplate the list of donors at their leisure. The Capital Campaign Donor Wall acknowledges charity and rewards school loyalty, and since it lists law school patrons according to the amounts of their donations, it also advertises wealth. The largest donations are listed at the top of the wall, conveying the message to students that being willing and able to give money is admirable, and being willing and able to give a lot money is even more admirable.

Reading the names on the wall, students also learn something about the nature of admirable donors: they are mostly male, and apparently mostly white. To give a typical example, there are forty-nine listings in the $25,000 to $34,999 donation category: thirty-nine of these are male and only one is female (the rest are couples or law firms); and there are no Asian or Latino last names among them (Lobby, May 1, 1997). The dominance of the Capital Campaign Donor Wall by white males conveys several messages to students. The first is a reminder that the law has traditionally been a white male preserve. Even so, substantial numbers of women and/or people of color have graduated from Boalt over the past quarter century, but very few appear to have made substantial (financial) contributions to their alma mater. Students may surmise either that female alumnae and alumni of color feel alienated from Boalt and do not desire to donate money to it, or that while they hold fond feelings for Boalt in their hearts, they have not achieved the financial success of their white male peers who do donate. Either possibility might give nontraditional Boalt students pause.
The Capital Campaign Donor Wall is only one vehicle for the acknowledgment of munificence at Boalt. At the time in which I began my research, the administration was causing a virtual plague of memorial plaques to be visited upon the walls. Central law school facilities have traditionally been known by the names of key donors who paid for their construction: the law school itself bears the name of John Henry Boalt, the library is named the Garret McEnery Law Library, and the moot courtroom is the Luke Kavanagh Moot Court. But during the recent construction of the North Addition, patrons of Boalt were permitted to make smaller donations in order to have facilities named after them, and in 1996 it seemed that every room at the law school acquired a name. A small sample of these would include the John Stauffer Charitable Trust Lecture Hall, the Leo and Nina Pircher Seminar Room, and the Carl J. Stoney Lobby (this last being a rather pathetic short empty corridor leading from the library).

Nor were classrooms and corridors all that had donors’ names affixed to them. Professors’ offices themselves were subject to memorializations such as “A Gift of Marvin M. Grove in Honor of Professor Stefan Reisenfeld.” Even individual library carrels had memorial plaques attached. The socializing messages emitted by this profusion of donative plaques tended in two directions. On the one hand, they gave an impression of wealth, privilege, and historical continuity. They suggested that alumni donors were honored, and that students should aspire to achieve honored status by being able to make a large donation to Boalt someday. On the other hand, their proliferation was irritating. Just as sports fans feel that something sacred has been commercialized when Candlestick Park becomes 3Com Park or the Orange Bowl becomes the FedEx Orange Bowl, students who watched the name plaques going up felt that they were a variety of sanctioned graffiti intruding into their private sphere. In an amusing prank, one student lampooned the plaques by pasting up pseudomemorial signs in humorous places: the “Sheryl Howell Women’s Bathroom,” the “Bobby Mockler Blank Wall,” and the “Daniel Tellahalian Family Trust Big Brown Marble Bear” (Hallways, October 29, 1996).

Hidden curricula could also be read from materials posted by the administration on bulletin boards. One such set of bulletin boards, maintained by Career Services, sent messages to students about the careers that were intended for them. The board announcing hiring by law firms was full and busy; that announcing public service jobs was sparsely populated and slow to change. This conveyed to students that law firms were where the action was. In fact, even some of the flyers posted on the public service jobs board sought constructive engagement with the presentation of law firm jobs as serious and public service jobs as “fluffy.” The headline on one read, “Not Just Another Pretty Law Firm: The United States Department of Justice... The Nation’s Litigator” (Hallway, August 26, 1996). In seeking to reverse the gendered polarity of public and private sector legal jobs by deploying macho language against a negatively valued feminine image of law firm practice, this flyer conveyed to students that a strongly masculine habitus is paramount in the realm of law, even in the public service sector.

Other bulletin boards were used for posting grades. At first glance, the importance of these boards seems understated: located around the corner from the main circulation path, the boards list grades according to student ID numbers only. A deeper examination reveals that these obscuring factors in fact emphasize the importance of grades by indicating a need for security. This administrative assertion of a need to safeguard grades is underlined by the fact that the grade boards are enclosed behind locked Plexiglas panels. The implication is that if it were not for the triple level of protection provided by location, encryption, and bolting, students might be deprived of crucial information, or have sensitive information about them revealed or even stolen in the fierce competition for grades.

An Asian student eagerly informed me about the “commandeering” of another bulletin board (Field Note, April 28, 1997). For years, student organizations such as the Asian and Pacific Islander Law Student Association (APILSA) and Law Students of African Descent (LSAD) had had bulletin boards assigned to them in the basement of the original section of Boalt Hall. During the Northern Addition renovations, these bulletin boards were removed, supposedly for aesthetic reasons. Student activists of color felt that this removal was politically motivated, and appropriated a centrally placed bulletin board in the name of the “Color Coalition” (comprising APILSA, LSAD, La Raza, and the Native American Law Student Association). “Color Coalition” was written on a banner in magic marker and thumbtacked to a bulletin board near the Moot Court scheduling board. The contrast between the neat, orderly arrays of the administrative bulletin boards and the Color Coalition’s rather haphazard arrangement of flyers and slogans made the administrative boards look formal, official, and
enduring and the commandeered board look amateurish, chaotic, and ephemeral. The impression generated was that student politics are puerile.

**Entryways and Hallways at the School of Social Welfare**

The corridors of the School of Social Welfare conveyed a hidden curriculum with a nature quite different from that of the law school. If a novice entering the law school for the first time gained an impression of wealth and power, an initiate entering the School of Social Welfare for the first time received an impression of grandeur in decline. Ascending Haviland’s classical grand staircase, one enters a large foyer of gracious proportions—and coated with peeling paint. Haviland Hall is a simple yet elegant rectangular building of four floors, each with classrooms lining a central corridor. Designed by the university architect, John Galen Howard, Haviland Hall was built in 1924 to serve as the home of the School of Education. It is in essence a hand-me-down to the School of Social Welfare, indicating the school’s relatively low status. When originally occupied by the School of Education in 1924 it was probably quite lovely, and its original beauty persists in places such as the stairwells, with their attractively vaulted ceilings and wrought-iron ornamental railings.

For the most part, however, the bloom is off the rose at Haviland Hall. Its halls offer a cautionary tale about life lived under institutional functionalism. The corridors mirror those of poorly maintained public schools and government facilities everywhere: bland beige walls, ceilings of graying acoustic tile, fluorescent lighting, and mismatched furniture. The difference between the linoleum floors at Haviland and Boalt is emblematic. While the law school decorators transformed linoleum into an elegant surface by crafting it into glossy parqueted checkerboards, the floors of the School of Social Welfare displayed linoleum to its worst advantage: brown and beige speckled tiles were selected to conceal dirt, but their dingy color and scratched surface left them appearing constantly dirty anyway. The Haviland hallways conveyed to students the class message that they, like their clients, would need to value pragmatism rather than luxury and to conserve valuable resources. In keeping with this ideology, there were no donative plaques on the walls; they might appear in poor taste to the social welfare community because they valorize wealth rather than substantive or spiritual contributions to the school.

Instead of displaying beauty through rich materials or impressive formalism, charm was displayed in the hallways of Haviland through individual reverent aesthetic gestures. For example, the door of one faculty member was enlivened by a colorful collage of drawings of women and girls wearing traditional ethnic garb and laid against a backdrop of boldly patterned fabric. This collage, created by the professor herself, served not only to ornament and beautify the door, but also to display appreciation for women in all their diversity. Comparing this door with that of a typical law faculty member, it appears that the corridors of Haviland socialize students to value self-expression and political engagement, while Boalt students are socialized to respect order, formality, wealth, and self-restraint.

Like the law school hallways, the corridors of Haviland Hall contained bulletin boards displaying scheduling information, book jackets from professorial publications, employment information, and the like. Unlike the law school, the School of Social Welfare’s administrative bulletin boards did not feature neatly laser-printed headings and schedules. They more closely resembled the Color Coalition’s commandeered bulletin board: titled by hand and covered with colorful flyers. In fact, the student organizational bulletin board was more rigorous in appearance: its titles were computer printed and the information it carried methodically arranged. Whereas the contrast between administrative and student boards at the law school suggested a hierarchical relationship between the wealthy institution and amateur students, the administrative bulletin boards at the School of Social Welfare gave the impression that the administration’s resources and capacities were the same as those of the students. This analysis leads to two conclusions: first, that the relative status of the professions of law and social work is apparent in the law school’s greater resources; and second, that displays of hierarchy valued at Boalt are devalued at the School of Social Welfare.

One thing that was visible in the hallways of Haviland but not of Boalt was student work. The M.S.W. students were occasionally required to make class presentations accompanied by visual aids, and the posters they produced were displayed in the hallways in a manner reminiscent of high school. This high schoolish impression was heightened by the graphically naive style of the posters, with their hand lettering and cut-and-paste collage assembly. If these posters were placed in a corridor at Boalt, they would look “unprofessional” because they
do not aim to display intellectualism, access to resources, or upper-class aesthetic sensibilities. What would seem "professional" at the law school would appear as gauche self-aggrandizement at the School of Social Welfare. The fact that student work was displayed in the halls for all to see underlines the differing socialization messages sent to students about how they will be evaluated by the two schools. At Boalt, the importance of hierarchical grading by professors is emphasized by the grades' encryption and protection. At the School of Social Welfare, on the other hand, student work is put on display for all to see and evaluate. Rather than a private and hierarchical process between professor and student, the evaluation of work is a public community affair. The display of student posters at Haviland conveys to students the ideal that professional learning and work are a communal process.

Artwork at Boalt
The corridors of Boalt Hall were decorated not with student posters, but with fine artwork. Artwork serves not only to ornament otherwise bland spaces, but also to convey messages about the institution that displays it. By choosing to display artwork in the fine arts tradition, the law school administration sent a message to students "sustaining [upper] class continuity" (DiMaggio and Useem 1982, 182). The corridors of Boalt are embellished with a number of portraits of respected alumni and former professors. The individuals pictured are generally white males, accompanied by potent signifiers, including judicial robes and Latin epigrams such as "Simplex vir legibus eruditus a discipulis dilectus." (This translates as "A simple man, an author and scholar beloved by his students." Like many phrases in the law, it sounds much more impressive in Latin.) These portraits convey to students that the law is a domain of white male authority, which may make students who are not white and male feel like interlopers.

During the period in which I carried out my observations, there hung a single prominent portrait of a person who was not both white and male. In the corridor connecting the lecture halls of the original segment of the law school hung a portrait of Elizabeth Josselyn Boalt, whose donation in the name of her husband, the attorney John Henry Boalt, led to the founding of the law school in his name. While given pride of place to honor her monetary generosity, the portrait of Mrs. Boalt incorporates a number of signifiers sending the message that she sits outside the realm of law: she wears a delicate lavender dress instead of formal robes or a dark suit, and is posed in a domestic setting, with a piano and flowers to give a suitably feminine touch. Thus while a portrait of a woman hangs at the heart of Boalt Hall, her place outside the legal sphere is made quite clear.

Besides the portraits, the law school hallways contain one sculpture. This is an abstract statue of a roaring bear (the golden bear is the mascot of the University of California). Between its simple lines and its aggressive posture, it manages to embody the lawyery traits of assertiveness and restraint, modeling the fact that the two traits are not incompatible. The bear, sculpted by Bufano, was donated by the Class of 1948 to memorialize one of their members, Martin Bordin, a popular man who died young (Epstein 1997, 184). It represents an interlinking of fraternal love and respect with school loyalty, characterizing the "old boy network" of Boalt alumni for current students.

While the hallways are sparsely ornamented with formal portraits and the marble bear, the inner sancta of the law school are decorated with Boalt's collection of nineteenth-century English legal caricatures. These black-and-white prints hang in upper-level administrative offices and line the walls of the faculty lounge. Humor is one of the key signifiers of a shared habitus, and the depictions of English solicitors, barristers, justices, and clients constitute an elaborate in-joke. I myself could not see what was funny about the prints perhaps one-third of the time, indicating that my habitus was not as deeply attuned to the lawyery ideal as were those of the Boalt professors who were able to read all the etchings easily. Such rarefied artwork is difficult for those unfamiliar with nineteenth-century English law to interpret; hence its display prevents visitors to the inner sancta from feeling they have penetrated its mysteries. Moreover, it emphasizes and (re)enforces the Anglo-Saxon and male origins of the legal tradition.

Artwork at the School of Social Welfare
Upon ascending the grand staircase and entering the impressive main doors, one's first impression is that Haviland Hall displays the same sort of artwork as does Boalt Hall. A portrait of one Alexis F. Lange, executed on a heroic scale, takes up an entire wall of the high-ceilinged foyer. Like the formal portraits at the law school, it is a painting of a white man wearing the impressive dark robes of academic authority. Ironically, like the classical facade and elegant staircases of Haviland Hall, the portrait of Professor Lange was handed down from the
School of Education. The students I interviewed did not know that Professor Lange was not a representative of the School of Social Welfare (Hallway and Commons Room, March 10 and 11, 1997). For them, the portrait of an unknown “D.W.M.” (dead white male, in student parlance) was another architectural trope that established the building’s respectability. They understood academic power to be symbolized formulaically: “Doric columns + wrought iron + large portrait of random D.W.M. = respectability.” And it is interesting to note that despite their cynicism, the students’ vision of reputability wore a white male face.

Other than the portrait of Lange, Haviland’s ornamentation was largely provided by displays of student work and the staff’s doorway decorations. Vernacular craftwork was featured rather than fine arts. Traditionally, crafts are considered to be feminine, and hence domestic and of lesser import than the fine arts. For the students, artwork such as the collage of women previously described conveyed the message that the appropriate demeanor for a social worker is warm rather than formal, expressive rather than impulsive, and approachable rather than distant—stereotypically feminine characteristics.

Like the individual decorations on office doors, the works of art selected for public display by the School of Social Welfare were virtually the inverse of the artwork at Boalt Hall. They displayed women, children, and people of color—for example, a painting of a brown-skinned woman spinning thread hung in the library and a collection of photographs of “Children of the World” hung in the Social Welfare Commons Room. This picturing of people other than white men had a number of socialization functions: it indicated that such people are deserving of respect; it suggested that women, children, and people of color constitute the social worker’s client pool; and it modeled how social workers should shape their environment (e.g., through displays of artwork) to make their clients feel comfortable.

It is important to recognize that white males need not be discomfited by their omission from representation among those portrayed in Haviland Hall artwork, because this artwork pictured the social work client base rather than social workers themselves. The absence of Anglo-Saxon men suggests that they are unlikely to appear as clients in need of social workers’ professional services. This heightens the status of white males, who in reality do receive services from social workers in many settings (e.g., drug and alcohol treatment programs, homeless shelters, elder care facilities, mental health centers, etc.). The obscuring of the status of white men as welfare clients is the mirror image of the invisibility of women and people of color as judges and attorneys at the law school. Both (mis)representations heighten the status of white men, which is an essential element of the hidden curriculum at elite institutions.

Classrooms at Boalt

In contrast to the institutional display of artwork, intentionally freighted with symbolic cultural messages, the arrangement of classrooms may appear to be dictated purely by function. But the arrangement of classrooms literally shapes the process of professional school socialization. At the law school, the lecture halls are arranged amphitheatrically or, as Michel Foucault would put it, panoptically (1979). In the law school lecture halls, the professor stands at a podium on a stage, and the students sit in rising arcs of seats before him (or, occasionally, her). The professor can see each student, but the students’ eyes are fixed front and they cannot see one another well. In addition, elevated position frequently conveys social superiority, so the lecture halls’ arrangement establishes a power hierarchy.

Students in a law school lecture hall sit in arcs of assigned numbered seats so that the professor can use a seating chart to call on them to speak. This arrangement of a central figure of authority overlooking a periphery resembles Bentham’s design for a prison, the Panopticon, as described by Foucault: an annular building ringing a central observation tower. According to Foucault:

Bentham laid down the principle that power should be visible and unverifiable. Visible: the inmate will constantly have before his eyes the tall outline of the central tower from which he is spied upon. Unverifiable: the inmate must never know whether he is being looked at by any one moment; but he must be sure that he may always be so. (1979, 201)

Like Bentham’s inmates, law school students are locked into places where they are under constant surveillance and subject to examination at any time. As Foucault explains, this is an extremely efficient arrangement for the functioning of what he terms the “disciplinary mechanism” (1979, 197), which entrenches power and hierarchy at
the same time as it trains those who are subject to its workings. Hence the very architecture of the law school lecture hall functions to instill discipline, hierarchical relations, and respect for power and authority in law students.

Boalt Hall also contains a few rooms for seminars, which are open to upperclasspersons (second and third-year students) only. Seminars cover substantive areas on the periphery of legal practice, and attract few students when compared to core upper-division courses such as corporations or tax law. The seminar rooms are designed for small groups, but like other law school classrooms they convey to students that they are deserving of comforts such as custom benches, swivel seats, and thick carpeting. What is strikingly different is that while a desk podium is still provided for the professor, she or he sits with the students “in the round” in these classrooms, significantly reducing messages of hierarchy. This may be read as flattering to upper-division students who are exploring a legal specialty, since it indicates their elevated status by sitting beside the professor. Nevertheless, since only a small percentage of the teaching at Boalt occurs in seminar rooms, their less hierarchical arrangement appears as a deviation from the norm.

Classrooms at the School of Social Welfare

Unlike at the law school, where small circular arrangements of seats appeared as a deviation from the norm, at the School of Social Welfare all classrooms were arranged this way. There were two variants of the circular arrangement at Haviland Hall: classrooms in which students sat around conference tables, and classrooms in which chairs with small attached desks were arranged around the periphery of a room. In both cases the circular setting conveyed the nonhierarchical socialization message that what occurred in the classroom was a communal responsibility. Conference tables comprised rectangular or rhomboid units that could be arranged in different ways to facilitate a variety of community structures, from small groups to class discussions. Since the conference tables were frequently rearranged from class to class, students were trained to take responsibility for flexibility in social organization, learning styles, and practice skills. This was a markedly different message from the fixed and traditional hierarchy conveyed by the law school lecture halls.

While the rearrangements of the conference tables conveyed a certain fluidity to the students at Haviland Hall, this fluidity was not without constraint. The tables were always arranged at least loosely in the round—never into rows or as random individual tables—structurally suggesting that the top-down hierarchy of rows and the anarchic individualism created by random table placement were both unacceptable alternatives. The circular arrangements structured the operations of power in the social welfare classroom in the proscribed way: communally.

Because the panoptically arranged law school lecture halls deployed disciplinary mechanisms in such a clear and obvious way, the rare circular arrangement of law school seminar rooms seemed less infused with power relations. At the School of Social Welfare, however, the circular imperative in classroom arrangements shaped the circle, not as an absence of hierarchical power, but rather as the full presence of horizontal power relations. Whereas at Boalt each student was constantly responsible to the disciplining gaze of the professor, at Haviland each student was continuously responsible to the disciplinary gaze of every other student. If the law school classrooms were panopticons, the social welfare classrooms were omniopticons. The circular arrangement removed hierarchy while shaping an even more effective disciplinary mechanism than the law school amphitheaters could produce. Social welfare students employed communal disciplinary tactics such as shunning to reform students who displayed an inappropriate habitus, which helps to explain why social welfare students conformed to group norms to an extent even greater than that of their law school counterparts.

Besides conveying a message of group responsibility for learning, the arrangements of conference tables were evocative of bureaucratic settings, since bureaucracy and conference tables are inextricably linked in our cultural imagination. The classrooms at Haviland Hall socialized students to work in bureaucratic settings, and particular bureaucratic settings at that. The mismatched tables and chairs that sat in many of the classrooms created an impression of scant resources. While such morose classrooms did not resemble the boardroom of a wealthy corporate charity (such as a museum of fine arts), they did bear a resemblance to the conference rooms of poorly-funded government facilities and public service organizations. Thus the built environment socialized students to professional roles and lowered expectations as to what they could realistically expect to encounter on the job. To compare these rooms to the classrooms at Boalt, it is
evident that the law school socializes students to expect a professional career of much greater wealth, authority, and prestige than does the School of Social Welfare.

Additional Facilities
The hidden curricular lessons conveyed by the corridors, artwork, and classrooms of the two schools were similarly inscribed in their other facilities. For example, the contrast between Boalt’s Belli Commons and the Social Welfare Commons Room made clear the disparate social statuses of the two professions. The Belli Commons was an elegant café where students’ tastes were shaped by a European menu of lattés and cappuccinos, croissants and focaccia sandwiches; the Social Welfare Commons Room offered only mismatched furniture and a few vending machines. Similarly, the libraries of the two schools sent contrasting messages to the students ensconced within them. The law school library was impressively large, comprise several wings, each containing formidable displays of legal tomes and well-appointed study areas. The library at Haviland, on the other hand, was housed in a single room, its once-grand iron grillework and classical plaques marred by dense functional rows of steel bookshelves. In sum, whatever facilities students encountered confronted them with hidden curricula, and while each individual sign or symbol might be subtle, the total effect was powerful indeed.

DISCUSSION
A close analysis of the physical environments of the Boalt Hall School of Law and Berkeley School of Social Welfare reveals distinct hidden curricula embedded in bricks and mortar, furniture and paintings. The hidden curriculum at Boalt prepares students for privilege and exclusivity. It socializes them to adopt role expectations of power and authority, wealth, comfort, and an appreciation of upper class culture. Through its artwork, it reflects the taken-for-granted assumption that the law wears a white male face. The law school’s built environment reproduces the expectation of private sector work, intellectual assertiveness, emotional restraint, discipline, and hierarchy. These socializing messages are targeted to, and much more easily received by, white male students who hail from a position of class privilege. Students such as Grant, quoted at the beginning of this chapter, feel both empowered and “at home” at Boalt Hall. Students with different faces and different cultural capital, however, may not feel the same sense of ease in the corridors of the law school. Some, like Cheryl, feel like imposters, and others, like Wei, feel alienation or a vague sense of unease.

The Haviland Hall facilities send conflicting messages. On the one hand, they send a message about the dignity of professional status and the necessity of discipline in a manner similar to that of the law school through the building’s classical architecture and heroic portrait of an older, robed white man. These factors tend to advantage white men from privileged backgrounds in a manner similar to the impact of the law school setting. On the other hand, the Haviland Hall facilities send messages about limited resources and class aspirations, and about the values of empathy, modesty, tolerance, public service, and communal responsibility. These messages about limited resources and a communal orientation are associated with the school’s private (domestic) spaces and with arts and crafts depicting women, children, and/or people of color. Factors such as these make students who do not have race, class, gender, or other privileges feel at least somewhat “at home.”

Closely examining the physical settings of two professional schools reveals the curricula that were hidden in plain sight, and helps us to explain how the schools (re)produce patterns of social stratification. The messages conveyed by the settings help explain both the fact that white men from privileged class backgrounds are disproportionately successful at the two schools, and the fact that this disparity is more pronounced at the law school. Although they are often unconscious of doing so, professional students absorb the messages conveyed by the built environments in which they find themselves, and are socialized to conform to the hidden curricula thus conveyed. The dispositions they are socialized to adopt have little to do with the knowledge base or overt skills of the professions, but like the formal curriculum, the hidden curriculum must be mastered in order for the students to find success as attorneys and social workers.