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Chapter I  Introduction

Every day in classrooms teachers judge the actions of children. Every day in those same classrooms students learn morals, values, or cultural norms from numerous sources including their teachers, textbooks, peers, instructional choices, or the curriculum. In some cases the attitudes and knowledge transmitted are deliberate and known to the participants. Possibly, in other instances, they are unconscious to some or all of those involved because they are so embedded in the culture of the society or education system that they are taken for granted. Through this taken-for-granted acceptance, the culture is reproduced. If educators are to understand and account for what happens in schools, then it is necessary both to document and to analyze the reproduction of culture that occurs daily within schools.

The investigation of possible cultural reproduction occurring through covert means constituted one goal of this study. Conceivably, this taken-for-granted learning occurred through the hidden curriculum. A related intention of this study was to examine empirically a
hidden curriculum in one setting and then to raise conceptual questions regarding its nature.

**Clarification of Terms**

Prior to describing the problem under investigation, a brief overview of key terminology appears warranted. The following definitions are simplified for the purposes of this chapter. Chapter 2 investigates these definitions in more detail.

For the purposes of this study, curriculum is defined as what students experience in schools (McCutcheon, 1982b). By definition, then, curriculum is the process of presenting learning experiences to students. Although this definition includes instruction, the learning process is excluded. Therefore, the curriculum can only present a learning experience. Learning is the process through which an individual attends to the object and, as such, learning is controlled to some extent by that individual. Therefore, the actual process of learning remains outside the curriculum agents' control. Curriculum can either be intended or unintended. The intended curriculum, the one which a teacher plans and executes, will be referred to as the overt curriculum. The planning for such a curriculum usually occurs prior to instruction but can be instantaneous, the teachable moment. The hidden
curriculum refers to the unintended curriculum. In this, certain acts may be intended but the consequent learning resulting from that act is unintended. The overt curriculum and the hidden curriculum together constitute what students experience in schools.

Cultural reproduction and the methods of cultural reproduction constitute other terms needing clarification. In a general sense, cultural reproduction concerns the process of inculcating students with the culture of a specific society. The methods by which this is accomplished are currently a matter of curriculum debate. One perspective, correspondence theory (Bowles & Gintis, 1977), suggests that students are inactive participants. In this deterministic view, the institution passes on the dominant culture to unsuspecting and passive subjects. A second view, resistance theory (Willis, 1977; Apple, 1982b), maintains that learners can have an active role in this cultural reproduction. The students might actively accept or resist the culture offered, but regardless the culture is reproduced.

**Problem Statement**

Traditionally, public schools have been viewed as vehicles to transmit societal values, expectations, and traditions. Certainly, the American public has indicated
that morals should be included in the overt curriculum. Public opinion polls conducted during this past decade by Phi Delta Kappa substantiate this contention (Gallup, 1975, 1980, & 1981). In each case the percentage cited below represents the affirmative response to the question "Are you in favor of public schools teaching moral education?: 79%, 1975; 79%, 1980; and 70%, 1981. In addition, in 1980, 83% of parents with children in public schools responded affirmatively to this question. Apparently the American public believes schools should be involved in moral education.

If the education of morals is viewed within a larger socialization context, then several questions and potential disagreement points emerge. What morals should be included within the overt curriculum represents one concern. Several points of view exist within American society that have differing, indeed often opposing, views of what should be included in the curriculum. Currently, the liberal-conservative debate is impacting on American society in general with a resulting influence on the educational system. For example, during the Sixties and Seventies the liberal trend resulted in the inclusion of controversial social issues within the curriculum. Recently the public opinion pendulum seems to have swung to the conservative or New Right position. Generally the
New Right suggests the family and the church should have the responsibility for teaching morals. Further, they argue schools should retreat from "their arrogant intrusions into the affective domain" (McGraw, 1982, p. 95). Rev. Greg Dixon, the national secretary for the Moral Majority, claims that:

Through such exotic titles as values analysis, values clarification, situation ethics, death education, sex education, environmental education, and now the new global education, they [educators] are bent on totally stripping from children those traditional American values that parents and the majority of those who pay educators' salaries still espouse (1982, p. 97).

Closely related to the liberal/conservative dichotomy is the religious/non-religious. In an extensive questionnaire and interview study, the Connecticut Mutual Life Report on American Values in the '80's (1981) claims the United States is the most religious of the industrialized countries. The findings emphasize the divergent views existing within American society. Selecting curriculum content could prove problematic given this diversity.

Therefore, while some Americans indicate that morals should be included in the school's curriculum, others challenge both the values taught and the role of the public school system in teaching them. If morals or values are included in the overt curriculum, then they are known to most participants and are open to public
They only pose a problem when some segment of the community disagrees with their inclusion. At that point the public can challenge the curriculum.

The issue becomes further complicated, however, when the socialization aspect of schooling is explored. Traditionally, schools have been viewed as a means for reproducing the culture; they can be considered a socialization agency. Cultural reproduction, according to resistance theory, involves the active production of culture by the participants themselves (Willis, 1977). Therefore, reproduction might be more than just the passive transmission of cultural norms but could involve the creation of norms. This raises several concerns constituting the first goal of this study. First, while segments of cultural reproduction might be overt with the intentions known to the participants, other taken-for-granted aspects might remain out of awareness. In the latter instance, the culture reproduced is so inherent in the culture that its inclusion within the curriculum does not represent a conscious, deliberate choice. If students are socialized, that suggests they are learning some attitudes or behaviors. Potentially, this avenue of cultural reproduction could be far more problematic than the inclusion of values, morals, or traditions in the overt curriculum as it is more difficult to identify or
challenge. Conceivably, the overt content might contain other latent messages for the learners. This also may vary by learner, classroom, school, or district. Seemingly, if education is a purposive act, it is necessary to raise the taken-for-granted content into awareness as this content might be presenting learning experiences contradictory to the stated intentions of the overt curriculum.

A second issue concerning this covert cultural reproduction is the 'content' being taught. The nature of the produced and reproduced content probably influences future career and personal choices, knowledge, and attitudes of the learners involved. Consequently, it is possible that certain sites might tend to reproduce cultural norms which could result in an inequality of opportunities (Goodlad, 1984; Lakomski, 1984). If students are covertly presented with learning experiences then it would seem important to document that this is so and to question the potential impact on the learners.

If we can document that cultural reproduction does occur in schools, then an examination of how it operates appears warranted. In the literature, the term "hidden curriculum" is often used to describe the covert form of cultural reproduction. The meaning of this term remains problematic, however. Does it mean that we do not intend
to teach this content, or that we intend to but do not consider it a component of the overt curriculum? If the content is a taken-for-granted cultural norm, then the agent of this content could be unaware of or not question its existence. This possibility is enhanced, given that the agents are usually members of the culture and therefore possibly unaware of the inherent aspects.

Further, schooling is a complicated endeavor with learning experiences presented through numerous sources. Can we assume that teachers are the major agents of cultural reproduction? Perhaps it is produced by the learners themselves through learning experiences presented within the educational setting or the surrounding environment. Apparently, further empirical investigation into the forms of cultural reproduction would be useful.

A second facet of this study, consequently, addresses the nature of the hidden curriculum concept itself. This concept has been used to explain some aspects of the schooling experience, yet the meaning of the concept depends on individual interpretations. Seemingly, there is a need to clarify what sources might present potential learning experiences. Given the variety of potential sources there could be numerous hidden curriculums in a given classroom or school. In
other words, can we assume that one hidden curriculum exists or is the hidden curriculum dependent upon the actors, setting, time frames, or sources?

In summary, then, this study investigates the cultural reproduction possibly occurring within an educational setting via the hidden curriculum. Reid (1978) suggests curriculum theorists must address the "what," "how," and "should" questions. This study examines these questions empirically and conceptually. Cultural reproduction is the what while the hidden curriculum is the how. After these are identified then it is possible to address whether they should be included in the curriculum. At that point, the curriculum can either be accepted or rejected but the decision would be deliberate; not by default because of cultural blinders. The following general research questions guide both the empirical and conceptual facets of the study:

**General Research Questions:**

1. Is cultural reproduction achieved through the hidden curriculum? If so, how? What is the nature of this cultural reproduction? What is produced?

2. From whom is the hidden curriculum hidden? In what sense is it hidden?

3. What are the empirically observable sources of that curriculum?

4. Do the overt and hidden curriculum interact? If so, how?
5. Do changes in actors, time, or sources influence the hiddenness of the curriculum? If so, how?

6. If an aspect of the hidden curriculum is raised into consciousness does it affect the participant? If so, in what ways?

**Methodological Overview**

The empirical dimension of the study was conducted in the high school of a blue collar community adjacent to a large midwestern city. Although this site was actually the researcher's third choice, in retrospect, the selection of this particular school and classroom provided a glimpse into a fairly typical midwestern school district that would not have occurred in the other sites. A social studies curriculum was chosen as this subject is frequently perceived as the one especially responsible for passing on the culture. As Osborne (1984) suggests, "Given its citizenship mission, social studies, more than any other subject in the curriculum, is a vehicle for ideological hegemony" (p. 106). Social studies emphasis on such content areas as national history, political systems and ideology lends credence to this assertion. Conceivably, cultural reproduction could be more observable in a social studies curriculum than in others. Further, if the above topics were a component of the overt curriculum then it might be possible to identify the interactions between the curriculum taught overtly and the one learned covertly.
A qualitative, naturalistic methodology was selected for several reasons. Given the nature of the phenomena investigated, the prime criterion was to select data collection devices which encouraged a phenomenological, multiple perspective approach. Inherent in the problem selected was the need to observe classroom events and to identify concurrently the meaning they had for the various participants. In this it was also necessary to probe for the taken-for-grANTED or out of awareness facets. Lastly, the temporal, actor-dependent and context-bound nature of the problem required a flexible methodology in order to identify emerging themes and constructs.

Therefore, field notes obtained through an extensive observation period and interviews were the primary data collection techniques employed. A five-month period of on-site observation allowed the researcher to identify the what and how questions manifested in behavior. In-depth, open-ended conversational interviews were used to ferret out the meaning ascribed by the participants. The combination of observation and interviews was crucial as the back-and-forth relationship enhanced the researchers' understanding of the phenomena. Specifically, observation raised certain questions which, in turn, were discussed with participants in order to establish their
meaning. Consequently, the emic perspective gained through the interviews provided the researcher with other lenses to view classroom events. That, in turn, raised further questions for the interviews. A hermeneutic spiral resulted with a continual interaction between understanding and interpretation.

Data analysis employed the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The analysis was ongoing. By employing the hermeneutic spiral previously described, the researcher continually sought to understand the phenomena under study and to relate the evidence to the conceptual framework. Understanding generated through reflection on the evidence was used to develop further questions. Several trustworthiness techniques were embedded within the research design. Chapter Three will describe the methodology employed in further detail.

In summary, the methodology was chosen to reflect the nature of the problem being studied. However, this choice also reflects the researcher's belief that naturalistic, field-based research is necessary if we are to understand what occurs in schools. Classrooms and schools are complicated, holistic settings. By dissecting those environments into 'researchable chunks', researchers might lose sight of the dynamic,
interdependent nature that educational phenomena frequently have. It is therefore a methodological premise of this study that events occurring within classrooms must be viewed within their context. By divorcing the event or actors from their natural context, we run the risk of not understanding the holistic nature of schooling.

**Organization of the Dissertation**

Chapter One has defined, in a global manner, the problem under investigation. Chapter Two reviews the cultural reproduction and the hidden curriculum literature. The conceptual framework of this study is then clarified. The methodology employed within the study is described and explained in Chapter Three. Chapters Four, Five, and Six address Reid's (1978) questions of what, how, and should. Chapter 4 presents a portrait of the class and then investigates what the students appear to be learning covertly. In Chapter 5, this evidence is used to interpret how this occurred in light of the cultural reproduction and hidden curriculum literature. Further, this chapter will raise questions regarding these concepts. The should question addresses the implications of the study. In Chapter Six, therefore, the implications for the participants will be explored. However, although the findings are contextual
to this site, it is possible to raise issues that might well pertain to other contexts. These broader implications will also be included in Chapter Six. Finally, methodological implications will be addressed.
Chapter Two  Literature Review

Cultural production and reproduction have recently attracted a great deal of interest in the field of curriculum and in education. It seems that this literature can be divided into correspondence and resistance theories. The hidden curriculum is frequently portrayed as the means through which cultural reproduction occurs. As noted in Chapter One, the issue of cultural reproduction constitutes Reid's (1978) what curriculum question while the hidden curriculum is being envisioned as the how question. This review of literature summarizes the major trends in the conceptual and empirical writings on correspondence theory, resistance theory, and the hidden curriculum before the describing the conceptualization guiding this study.

Cultural Reproduction

Base/ Superstructure

Prior to discussing the correspondence and resistance theories, it is necessary to review briefly the concept of base/superstructure (Alcock & Armaline, 1983; Williams, 1973). In a marxian sense, the base
includes the productive forces, social relations of production, and the material relations of production. Productive forces refers to such factors as labor power, objects of production, natural resources, and the production process itself. The social relations of production addresses the relations between the owners and the non-owners. Finally, the material relations of production refers to the arrangement of productive forces. Productive forces are susceptible to change resulting from technological advances or the availability of resources. However, the social relations of production, the basis of social classes, is resistant to change. Change in the base, if and when it happens, occurs through conflict. Carnoy (1982) explains:

As material conditions change, through class conflict, so do relationships between individuals in different social positions, positions determined by the social organizations of production and each person's relation to production (p. 80).

Such change is problematic since the conditions in the base are legitimized by the superstructure. The term superstructure refers to "a set of non-economic institutions, notably the legal system and the government" (Cohen, 1978, p. 216). Therefore, such institutions as the government, legal, or educational systems would be classified as components of the superstructure. These institutions support the economic
order of the base. In turn, the ruling class and its ideology dominate the institutions of the superstructure. The concept of ideology is particularly crucial. The ideological control of the subordinate classes is referred to as the hegemony of the bourgeois, and according to a marxian analysis, is deeply rooted within and influences the operation of the superstructure. Hegemony, the process through which the dominant ideology becomes dominant, is the goal of the superstructure. The dominant ideology, consequently, is the process by which society 'normally' operates. As Williams (1973) suggests:

[Hegemony] is a whole body of practices and expectations; our assignments of energy, our ordinary understandings of the nature of man and of his world. It is a set of meanings and values which as they are experienced as practices appear as reciprocally confirming. It then constitutes a sense of reality for most people in the society.... (p. 5)

Publicly supported schools are an apparatus of the superstructure and, as such, are considered to have role in the continuation of the base. This relationship between the base and the superstructure can be viewed from a correspondence or resistance perspective. The next section of this review will address these two perspectives.
Correspondence Theory

A reproduction, deterministic position suggests that:

Through the schools and other superstructural institutions the capitalist class reproduces the forces of production (labor, division of labor, and the division of knowledge) and the relations of production -- the latter predominantly by the maintenance and development of a 'legitimate' ideology and set of behavior patterns (culture) (Carnoy, 1982, p.81).

The ideology of the base, therefore, is reproduced through the use of the superstructure. The ideology perpetuated reflects the reproductive needs of the base. Bowles and Gintis (1976), prominent advocates of the correspondence perspective, suggest that the social relations of schooling correspond with the economic base and result in the reproduction of an unequal social formation. Simply, they contend, "Different levels of education feed workers into different levels within the occupational structure, and correspondingly, tend toward an internal organization comparable to levels in the hierarchical division of labor" (p. 132). Further, Bowles and Gintis (1976) argue:

Education has been historically a device for allocating individuals to economic positions, where inequality among the positions themselves is inherent in the hierarchical division of labor, differences in the degree of monopoly power of various sectors of the economy, and the power of different occupational groups to limit the supply or increase the monetary returns to their services (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 49).
In the correspondence view, then, the ideology of the dominant class is reproduced passively within the schools -- without conflict. The base determines what will occur and the superstructure reacts to this shift. Social class determines the education a student receives which in turn determines the economic role the student will perform as a member of the productive forces (Cohen & Lazerson, 1972). This occurs because schools, as Carnoy (1982) explains:

...are not only an ideological apparatus but also a repressive one. And this is a key to understanding their functioning: it is not enough to say that the schools inculcate pupils with dominant ideology; the institution as such has repressive functions: by law, it can force students to behave in particular ways, to conform over to a predetermined behavior pattern, and it has the periodical power to keep pupils in school, in other words it can keep them physically bound to be exposed to the ideological training it chooses to give them and this in co-operation with the state's repressive apparatuses (p.100).

Correspondence theorists argue ideology emanates from the base and is imposed through the institutions of the superstructure. Consequently, ideological change must occur in the base prior to a change in the messages of the superstructure.

Resistance Theory

Recently, the correspondence theory has been challenged as too static and exclusive of human agency. As Williams (1973) suggests, there is "the continual
possibility of the dynamic variation of these forces" (p. 5). This perspective led to the development of resistance theory. Resistance theorists maintain the base does not just impose ideology upon the superstructure, but the superstructure partially interacts with the base. For instance, Apple (1982b) argues:

...by focusing on schools only as reproduction institutions, we may miss the dynamic interplay between education and an economy and be in danger of reducing the complexity of this relationship to a bare parody of what actually exists...(p.68).

Application of this notion to schools suggests that some students do not just passively accept the bourgeois ideology but actively resist it. Through this resistance they become actively involved in constructing the culture they experience. As Sharp (1981) contends ideology is not merely imposed but can be constructed by the participants:

Ideology has been defined as a system of signs embedded in material practices and routines that condition and structure the range of ideological messages. In other words, ideology is constituted within the forms and structures of social relationships: it is not merely external and imposed (p.143).

Although the literature on resistance theory is primarily conceptual in nature, several empirical studies have been conducted. Perhaps, the most notable is Paul Willis' (1977) ethnography of the "lads" in an English
working class, all-male comprehensive secondary school. Willis argues that the lads do not buy into the "exchange" aspect of the traditional teaching paradigm. This paradigm suggests that teaching is a fair exchange of "...knowledge for respect, of guidance for control" (Willis, 1977, p.64). The lads, comprised of non-conformist working class students, do not accept the worth of the knowledge offered by the school for particular reasons. This judgment was based on their knowledge of the working class culture. Therefore, the lads continually challenge the formal environment of the school and create an informal one that they controlled. Having a "laff" and controlling their own experiences provides these students with a sense of agency. Great pride was taken in not fulfilling the academic requirements of the school. In this they rejected the mental labor propagated by the school and its authority in favor of the manual labor evidenced within their working class culture. Consequently, the exchange notion inherent within the traditional paradigm was not considered valid. Further, the lads exhibited a sense of agency which is contrary to the deterministic correspondence perspective.

In this context, two concepts were germane: penetrations and limitations. Penetration, as defined by
Willis (1977), designated, "Impulses within a cultural form towards the penetration of the conditions of existence of its members and their position within the social whole but in a way which is not centred, essentialist or individualist" (p. 119). Limitations referred to "those blocks, diversions, and ideological effects which confuse and impede the full development and expression of these impulses" (p. 119).

Willis maintained the lads partially penetrated the dominant teaching paradigm, and, based upon their individual logic, realized the exchange offered by the school was not worth the price the lads were asked to pay. Consequently, they denied school culture, and created a counter-culture reflecting the shop floor. As Willis suggested:

[The 'lads']...have adopted and and developed to fine degree in their school counter-culture specific working class themes: resistance; subversion of authority; informal penetration of the weaknesses and fallibilities of the formal; and an independent ability to create diversion and enjoyment (p. 84).

The irony was that the culture produced within the informal realm by the lads themselves ultimately forced the reproduction of the bourgeois ideology they rejected.

However, contrary to the assertions of the correspondence theorists, the lads resisted the teaching paradigm and participated in the cultural production. These themes of resistance and agency were also evident
in several other ethnographies. Everhart (1983b), in an investigation of an American junior high school, noted that some students attempted to gain control of the informal culture. Unlike the lads, the "kids" (Everhart's terminology) met the basic requirements of the institution. The remainder, and majority, of their school time was spent in pursuing their own informal interactions. Cusick's (1973) ethnography of American high school students supported the behavior pattern evidenced in the Everhart study. According to Apple (1982b) the Everhart study indicated that the kids resisted the cultural reproduction undertaken by the school. He continued:

While the kids clearly exercise a fair amount of informal power in the school setting -- by goofing off, bugging teachers, and so on -- like the lads they both participate in and at least partially reproduce hegemonic ideologies that may be less than helpful (Apple, 1982b, p.106).

Jean Anyon's (1981) work provides further insight into how working class students can resist the dominant ideology. This study describes the curriculum experienced by students in schools representing different socio-economic status: working class, middle class, affluent professional, and executive elite. The evidence suggests the experiences available to the students in each school differed immensely. Similarly, the attitudes of the students towards schooling and the ideology
presented varied by status. In the working class school, the students resisted their schooling experiences. However, the middle class students believed, "If one works hard in school (and in life), one will go far" (p. 16). In addition, Anyon (1981) maintained that narcissism (or extreme individualism) was the dominant theme at the affluent professional school while excellence was the dominant theme of the executive elite school. The teaching methodology differed within these schools with rote memorization dominant in the working class schools, while there was progressive emphasis on individualization, creativity, problem solving, and critical thinking as the economic status of the learners increased. The acquisition and conceptualization of knowledge varied in relation to the social origins of the students. However, as Anyon (1981) concluded:

We can see class conflict in the struggle to impose the knowledge of powerful groups on the working class and in student resistance to this class-based curriculum. We can see class conflict in the contradictions within and between school knowledge and its economic and personal values and in attempts to impose liberal public attitudes on children of the rich (p. 38).

Each of these studies suggested the dominant ideology was not accepted by working class student but was resisted, within boundaries, by some students. By resisting, however, the students relegated themselves to the working class in that they did not acquire the
necessary credentials and knowledge to meet the upwardly mobile criteria.

That the American studies indicate the students were willing to meet the basic requirements of the school is an interesting question to ponder. Apple (1982b) suggests that:

For like the lads in Willis's high school, similar things hold true for students in United States, though the specifics of class reproductions are somewhat more muted due to a different history and a more complex articulation among the state, education, and an economy (p. 104).

Perhaps a complicating factor within American settings is the myth of the American Creed (Boudy, 1981) or American Dream. In England, social class is quite set and identifiable through such factors as class accents. In United States, to discuss social class in deterministic language is almost considered 'un-American'. The kids in Everhart's study, though resisting the process, possibly completed their work because they still accepted education as a means to achieve social mobility. And the potential for social mobility is still a key component of the American Creed. Possibly, many American students still perceive the educational exchange to be a fair exchange.

In summary, it would seem that the resistance theory of cultural reproduction provides a far richer lens through which to view schooling than correspondence
theory. As Sharp (1981) notes:

...the conditions of ideological reproduction of the social formation are to be found in production itself and not merely externally. In the ongoing routines of the labor process, through the habit of submission to authority, for example, practical ideologies are reproduced and reinforced (p. 127).

In both the case of the correspondence and resistance theories, the result is the inculcation of the dominant ideology. However, within the resistance theory the suggestion of agency suggests a potential for change. Seemingly, if schools are indeed reproducing the culture, sometimes to the disadvantage of the students, and students are resisting and therefore producing countercultures, it would seem imperative that the nature of this phenomenon be empirically investigated. However, little empirical work has been conducted on this topic, especially in the United States.

Frequently, the processes of hidden curriculum and socialization are considered to be perpetuators of the culture. In the marxian perspective, addressed in the first part of this literature review, such cultural reproduction is perceived as a negative factor. Yet this is not always the case. Nyberg and Egan (1981) make a distinction between the socialization and education functions of schooling. By socialization they mean:

Preparation for a life of gainful employment and participation in everyday social, economic, and political activities -- active citizenship [while]
education refers to a somewhat different and less practical set of dispositions and capacities to appreciate and enjoy those aspects of one's culture that include a historical perspective and the life of the mind (p. ix).

Further, Nyberg and Egan advocate:

A socializing theory is society-bound in that it is constrained to describe how to produce agents who will be effective within a particular society. It has no part then in recommending transformations of society, as it has nothing beyond present social utility to which it can refer (p. 40).

They continue that education, after passing on tradition, can encourage students to transcend the tradition. The previous discussion on the influence of cultural reproduction might suggest that after traditions are acquired, whether through socialization or education, it could be problematic to transcend the tradition or culture. In addition, those traditions could be classified as components of hegemony and therefore ideologically questionable.

Therefore, further empirical information as to how cultural reproduction and production occurs would seem useful. That schools accomplish this reproduction, intentionally and unintentionally, has been a frequent topic of discourse. For instance, Dewey (1975) argued that teachers:

...teach them [morals] every moment of the day, five days in the week. ...the limits or the value of so-called direct moral instruction (or, better, instruction about morals), it may be laid down as fundamental that the influence of direct moral
instruction, even at its very best, is comparatively small in the amount and slight in influence, when the whole field of moral growth through education is taken into account (p. 3).

The teaching of cultural norms and morals has been linked to the concept of hidden curriculum. In a sense, this cultural knowledge has been classified as "residue learning" (Jackson, 1968) that the students have absorbed from their schooling experience (Dewey, 1975; Hersh, Miller, & Fielding, 1980; Martin, 1976; Phillips, 1979). Seemingly, there is fairly general agreement that schools contribute to the learning of cultural norms both intentionally and unintentionally. The benefits of this knowledge might be questionable given the various perspectives. As previously discussed, marxian analysis suggests that children from subordinate classes are receiving instruction based on bourgeois ideology. Others classify the cultural norms being transmitted as either benign or beneficial. Regardless of the perspective employed, how this is achieved has not been clearly delineated. Vague reference is made to the hidden curriculum and yet, neither has this term been clearly conceptualized nor has its relationship to cultural reproduction been empirically substantiated.

**Hidden Curriculum**

The term hidden curriculum is frequently employed in discussions on curriculum, yet the term itself is unclear
and dependent upon the interpretation used. Part of this confusion results from the different definitions of curriculum that abound within the field. If curriculum is used synonymously with curriculum guide or document, then the term hidden curriculum is not logically consistent. However, if the broader definition of curriculum is employed, what learners experience within schools (McCutcheon, 1982b), then the notion of a hidden curriculum makes sense. Curriculum, in this perspective, is the process through which learning experiences are presented. The learner attends, consciously or unconsciously, either cooperatively or antagonistically to the matter presented. With the overt curriculum, what is presented is intended by the teacher and shared with the learner. However, in the dimension of the hidden curriculum some aspects of the learning experience may be unintended, taken-for-granted, or remain outside of awareness. This study subscribes to the broader definition of curriculum and to aid discussion, the planned, "official" curriculum will be classified as the overt curriculum.

By definition, if the overt curriculum is planned even if the planning is instantaneous, then the hidden curriculum could be considered to be unintentional. However, this distinction fails to address such questions
as: To whom is it unintended? Where does it come from? If the hidden curriculum is unintended then how does it occur? If the hidden curriculum is presented through numerous sources then could there not be numerous hidden curriculums?

Simply defining hidden curriculum as unintended does not further our understanding of the phenomenon. The confusion of what constitutes a hidden curriculum is reflected in the various labels applied in the curriculum literature. For instance, it has been classified as: "the unstudied curriculum" (Overly, 1970); "the hidden curriculum" (Jackson, 1968); "what is learned in schools" (Dreeben, 1968); "implicit curriculum" (Eisner, 1979); "residue learning" (Jackson, 1970); and "by-products of schooling" or "side-effects" (Vallance, 1973-74).

The lack of clarity regarding the meaning of the hidden curriculum encourages "an almost wholesale dumping of unknowns and unresolvables into its pot" (Vallance, 1980, p. 142). Seemingly, if this term is to be a useful lens through which to interpret schooling then it must be more precisely conceptualized (Martin, 1976; Vallance, 1980). Pratte (1981) further argues:

Beyond agreement that there is a hidden curriculum involving the shaping of students' learning in terms of character traits or conditioned response patterns, there was a surprising wide range of claims regarding the form these traits or patterns take, whether the metaphor is a metatheoretical
heuristic abstraction or a theoretical concept, and, if the latter, whether the hidden curriculum is a theoretical concept used to further understand what goes on in schools, or is a tool used in the quest for a liberating pedagogy, or is an instrument to promote a more equalitarian democratic society by illuminating the class nature of society (p. 314).

The difficulty with the use of the term hidden curriculum is further compounded by ideological positions. There is some agreement on the content taught or learned through this curriculum including morals, attitudes, norms, culture, or ideology. Whether these components are appropriate raises a host of questions that depend on ideological perspectives. For instance, a marxian analysis suggests that the hidden curriculum is perpetuating the capitalist system to the detriment of some students. Others, such as Nyberg and Egan (1981), assume the cultural reproduction occurring through socialization is an inevitable and desirable component of education. These ideological assumptions, then, complicate the view of hidden curriculum. Further, throughout the literature appear different conceptions regarding the origin, the nature, the purposes, the degrees of intentionality and of awareness of the hidden curriculum. The major themes in the literature are reviewed in the following section.

Important questions to address are from whom is the hidden curriculum hidden and from where does it
One perspective throughout the literature is that while the teacher perpetuates the hidden curriculum, it is unintended (Snyder, 1970; Saylor, Alexander, and Lewis, 1974; Eggleston, 1977). For example, a teacher might choose to display students' grades publicly in order to motivate the children. However, the student could learn a sense of competitiveness which was not the teacher's intention. As Synder (1970) suggests:

Covert, inferred tasks and the means to their mastery, are linked together in a hidden curriculum. They are rooted in the professor's assumptions and values, and the student's expectations, and the social context in which both teacher and student find themselves (p. 4).

Dewey's (1938) concept of collateral learning is similar:

Perhaps the greatest of all pedagogical fallacies is the notion that a person learns only the particular thing he is studying at the time. Collateral learning is the way of formation of enduring attitudes, of likes and dislikes, may be and often is much more important than the spelling lesson or lesson in geography or history that is learned (p. 48).

Tanner and Tanner (1980) equate collateral learning with hidden curriculum and further support the unintentional aspect.

This view of the hidden curriculum suggests that while the actions were planned to accomplish a specific goal, the learners might attend to other facets. Possibly, the students might be very aware of these learning experiences. As Dewey suggests, the effects of
hidden curriculum might be greater than those manifest through the official curriculum. Eggleston (1977) maintains the hidden curriculum is "clearly visible to the students -- probably even more so than the official curriculum" (p. 18). Further, Saylor, Alexander, and Lewis (1974) argue "the means of meeting requirements, passing examinations, and earning teacher favor may become the ends of the student's curriculum rather than the objectives envisioned by the teacher" (p. 26). The hidden curriculum, therefore, could be presented unintentionally by a teacher but the resulting learning experience could be clearly visible to the student.

A closely related perspective of the hidden curriculum suggests that the teacher presents the content intentionally to achieve desired ends, but this content is not considered a component of the overt curriculum. Perhaps this interpretation stems from the distinction between socialization and education made by Nyberg and Egan (1981). McNeil's (1981) definition appears to be representative. "The term hidden curriculum indicates that some intentional outcomes are not formally recognized, these are unofficial instructional influences, which may support or weaken the attainment of manifest goals" (p. 286). Although Gordon (1980) includes 'unintended' within his definition, he also
states potential outcomes are "not openly acknowledged to the learners in the setting" (p. 3). Dreeben (1968) clearly conceptualizes the hidden curriculum as a socialization agent. Therefore, the teacher might intend the action but as it is considered a socialization process, it is not perceived as a component of the overt curriculum. Dreeben (1970) cites authority as an example:

The most obvious evidence that authority relationships are part of classroom life is that teachers assume final responsibility for directing activities: they plan the work, make assignments, judge the products, keep order, reward and punish. (None of these denies that pupils assume some of these responsibilities in many classrooms but where they do, it is by teachers leave...). (p. 88).

The child, Dreeben (1970) claims, learns authority relationships through observing and participating in the social structure of the classroom and school. However, it could be questioned whether the teacher intended a universal acceptance of authority or was merely establishing classroom control.

A third perspective evident in the hidden curriculum literature, then, focuses on the meaning of the values, cultural norms, and ideologies perpetuated through a hidden curriculum. This view is closely related to the notions of cultural reproduction explored earlier in the chapter. This body of literature suggests the schooling process continues the economic, social, and political
order via the hidden curriculum. Giroux's (1978) definition is representative, "The hidden curriculum here refers to those unstated norms, values, and beliefs transmitted to students through the underlying structure of schooling, as opposed to the formally recognized and sanctioned dimensions of the schooling experience" (p. 293). Authors as Anyon (1980; 1981), Apple (1982a; 1980; 1971), Giroux (1981a; 1978), and Sharp and Green (1975) argue these aspects of schooling must be raised into consciousness in order to encourage critique. This marxian, critical science, or radical approach considers the major question to be, "How does the process of schooling function to reproduce and sustain the relations of dominance, exploitation, and inequality between classes?" (Giroux, 1981b, p. 293).

The proponents of the critical science view agree that the hidden curriculum perpetuates cultural norms. Giroux (1981a) explains the concern:

In general terms, the liberal analysis abstracts the normative basis of the hidden curriculum from its ideological context and appears mute over the question of why certain sets of values are considered legitimate while others are not (p. 73).

Unlike the liberal perspectives previously discussed, the marxian critical theorist have a basic ideological disagreement with the cultural values included within schooling. They consider such values as the work ethic,
class distinction, and the status quo social order as undesirable components of the hidden curriculum. In a marxian sense, this content perpetuates the dominant ideology and therefore must be challenged.

However, the problem remains whether those involved in facilitating such a curriculum are aware of its existence. If these agents are members of this culture then they might not be aware of the ideological and cultural messages included within the hidden curriculum. It is possible that neither the teacher intends nor are the students aware of the ideology presented. These taken-for-granted components of the culture comprise the everyday lifeworld of the participants and might not be open to question. For instance, teachers are members and products of their society and might be unaware of the assumptions underlying that society. Students might accept the schooling experience as the norm and fail to question certain practices. Apple (1982b) argues:

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.... These purposeful, reasoning and well-intended actors', hence, may be latently serving ideological functions at the same moment that they are seeking to alleviate some of the problems facing individual students and others (p. 13).

Seemingly, both the teacher and the learner might be unaware of the potential learning experiences presented
through the hidden curriculum.

Marxian critical theorists claim participants continue to accept the natural way of doing things or the dominant ideology. This status quo ideology is transmitted through the hidden curriculum. The critical theorists are ideologically questioning whether this should happen -- Reid's (1978) should question. However, their interpretation rests within their marxian philosophical frame. The marxian macro perspective suggests the base is enforcing its ideology through a superstructure apparatus, the school. Yet critical theorists fail to explain how the hidden curriculum is created, in a micro sense, other than to refer broadly to hegemony.

So far, this literature review has focused on the teacher as the perpetuator of the hidden curriculum. Yet there is some evidence to suggest students can also create this curriculum. Anyon (1981) describes a situation she has classified as resistance:

Active sabotage sometimes took place: someone put a bug in one student's desk; boys fell out of their chairs; they misplaced books, or forgot them; they engaged in minor theft from each other; sometimes they rudely interrupted the teacher.... The children also engaged in a good deal of resistance that was more passive. They often resisted by withholding their enthusiasm or attention on occasions when the teacher attempted to do something special (p. 11).
Further, Eggleston (1977) suggests that students can create a hidden curriculum by controlling the pace by which the teacher can deliver the overt curriculum. He also maintains that peer groups can establish a hidden curriculum. The Cusick (1973) and Willis (1977) studies lend credence to this assertion. Seemingly, students might be agents of a hidden curriculum and, as such, be aware the learning experiences.

This review has hinted at various sources from which a hidden curriculum could emanate, such as teachers, students, organizational structures, and the cultural milieu. Other sources have been described within the literature. For instance, Anyon (1981) found that content, teaching strategies, and activities all contributed to the hidden curriculum found in the different economic status schools. In another study, Anyon (1979) documented the role of text books in perpetuating the dominant ideology. Martin (1976) noted other sources including use of language, exercise of authority, student-teacher interactions, rules and regulations, audio-visual materials, timetables, and tracking-systems. However, Martin also maintained that "as new practices, procedures, environments, and the like are introduced into educational settings, they become potential generators of hidden curricula" (p. 140).
Apparantly, hidden curriculum might be relative to a given context, time frame, and participants. Martin (1976) claimed:

A hidden curriculum is always of some setting, and there is no reason to suppose that different settings will have identical hidden curricula. Actually, a hidden curriculum is not only of some setting, but it is at some time; therefore we cannot even assume that a single setting will have identical hidden curricula at different times (p. 138).

Anyon (1981) provided evidence to support the relativity of the hidden curriculum, though in this study the relativity was ascribed to the class structure. Yet the literature through referring to 'the' hidden curriculum suggests the existence of a single, dominant hidden curriculum. For instance, Vallance (1973-74) has described how a hidden curriculum of homogeneity developed out of an attempt to create an American identity during the nineteenth century. It must be questioned, however, if all schools created the same curriculum.

In summary, the conceptualization of the hidden curriculum has a varied history within the literature. For some scholars, it is unintended and unknown to the participants while for others it is intended and known. The proposed sources include teachers, students, cultural milieu, printed material, teaching strategies, class structure or overt curriculum. These interpretations are
complicated by the ideological perspectives evident in the literature. In addition, the curriculum can be considered to be relative to specific time frames, actors, or settings. Martin's (1976) definition, perhaps, best reflects the diversity evident:

A hidden curriculum consists of those learning states which are either unintended or intended but not openly acknowledged to the learners in the setting unless the learners are aware of them (p. 144).

Although Martin's definition is comprehensive, it still focuses upon the teacher as the originator of the hidden curriculum and consequently neglects the role of students.

The multi-faceted nature of the hidden curriculum literature has created a potentially rich conceptualization but this very richness confuses the meaning of the term. Each of the perspectives provides insight into this phenomenon, and yet there is a need to forge the various perspectives into a united conceptualization in order to reflect its complex and dynamic nature.

Summary

This review of the literature investigated several broad areas of academic interest, including work on cultural reproduction and the hidden curriculum. Resistance theory was portrayed as a more useful
analytical tool than that of correspondence theory. The correspondence literature maintains that the hegemony of the dominant classes controls the schooling process. Yet, several resistance studies suggested that working class students often produced their own working class counter-culture. This production, ironically, resulted in 'working class kids getting working class jobs' (Willis, 1977). The answer to the what question might be the reproduction, through hegemony, of the dominant ideology. However, a good portion of this scholarship remains conceptual in nature. Therefore, empirical investigation within American schools appears warranted.

The second part of this review focused on the hidden curriculum literature which was portrayed as varied and confusing. The lack of a clear conception into just what the term means raises concerns regarding its usefulness as an analytical tool. In addition, although exceptions do exist (Anyon, 1981; Apple & King, 1983; Dreeben, 1968; Everhart, 1983b; Jackson, 1968; and Willis, 1977), most of the work regarding the hidden curriculum has been conceptual rather than empirically based. Even some of the above mentioned studies did not focus on the nature of the hidden curriculum, but rather on cultural reproduction. The hidden curriculum was assumed to be
the vehicle of this reproduction but its nature was not explored in great depth.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Vallance (1980) has called for further qualitative research into the hidden curriculum. She contends this research needs to address: 1) what is being learned outside of the formal curriculum; 2) the method by which this being accomplished; 3) an assessment of the educational significance of such learning; and 4) to provide a judgment regarding the merit of the learning experiences. Vallance further notes that the latter two items are dependent upon values, raising the ideological concerns previously mentioned in this chapter.

In summary, this literature review has established the need to conceptualize clearly the hidden curriculum and to ground this conceptualization empirically (Barnes, 1982). A second need evident is to empirically investigate the covert facets of cultural reproduction that might occur in schools (Purpel & Ryan, 1983). The following section outlines the theoretic framework derived from the literature review.

**Conceptual Framework**

This study investigated the hidden curriculum as the means for cultural reproduction. The following conceptual framework is an attempt to integrate the
hidden curriculum literature reviewed, and the notions implicit in the cultural reproduction literature.

A hidden curriculum is not a static entity, but rather is interactive and dynamic relative to the context, actors, and time frame. The above factors are dependent upon the sources acting in a specific setting and with certain participants. In addition, learning experiences can be presented through a multitude of sources. Together these factors constitute the dynamic, interactive nature of the phenomenon represented by the term hidden curriculum and this must be reflected in its conceptualization.

A hidden curriculum is specific to a given context in a particular time period, and to the individuals within that setting. A change in the context could dissolve the hidden curriculum, bring it into conscious awareness, or foster a new one. Even within one setting, during the same time frame, there could be several different hidden curriculums operating for different individuals or groups. Yet there could also be several common characteristics evident within the respective hidden curriculums.

There might be degrees of hiddenness. For example, a potential outcome could be unknown to central office curriculum staff. However, the teacher might be quite
aware of such an outcome, but not consider it a component of the overt curriculum. For the student, this outcome might constitute the most salient aspect of the experienced curriculum. How is this curriculum hidden? Hidden by what? It might be hidden because the outcome is considered to be a normal component of schooling, by routine, or by the overt curriculum content and therefore taken-for-granted.

Another important consideration is the potential sources of the hidden curriculum. Potential suggests a learning experience might result from the source but that is not inevitable. Individuals might acquire different learning experience from the same source. Further, within some sources inherently there are potential learning experiences. The choice of discussion as a teaching technique might foster a view of knowledge that is different from an expository technique. Therefore, sources can include 'excess baggage' that can present components of the hidden curriculum.

Consequently, what happens within schools or influences schooling has the potential of presenting learning experiences which, in turn, constitute a hidden curriculum. Numerous sources exist as demonstrated by the following non-exhaustive list. On a global scale, the cultural and school milieu constitute a major
potential source. Certainly, the discussion on hegemony suggested examples of how the culture can create learning outcomes. Other factors within the school itself could reflect this hegemony including expectations, goals, values, discipline techniques, school facilities, timetable organization, and tracking or grouping patterns. The field of study contained within the overt curriculum could include numerous hidden messages. For example, a civics curriculum might advance certain attitudes towards different governmental systems. Teaching techniques and learning activities might create other components of the hidden curriculum such as the development or the lack of development of critical thinking. Anyon's (1981) study supports this assertion. The messages included in artifacts, including textbooks, audio-visual aids or the school building itself, can present a hidden curriculum. In addition, a hidden curriculum can develop from the interpersonal ethos existing in a setting.

These sources, only a sampling of ones that may be interacting within the context, can also contribute to the overt curriculum. The difference might be in the interpretation and the depth of awareness. Possibly, a hidden curriculum might resemble an onion with different layers of understanding and awareness. Knowledge of possible future consequences from the learning experience
might be one potential avenue to explore. For example, if students are presented with the work ethic through the hidden curriculum, then on one level, this learning outcome might be considered desirable. On another level, this learning experience might be perceived as encouraging students to acquire working class, not managerial, skills. While this act might be intended, the long term effects might not be considered.

Therefore, an agent might present a learning experience overtly but might not intend or, indeed even envision the learning experience created when an individual student attends to the object.

The issue of interpretation is further complicated by layers of ideology. Marxian curriculum theorists would classify such content as the work ethic, as hegemony perpetuated by the dominant ideology. However, others might consider such content as fulfilling the schools' role in socializing children into society. Both of these perspectives, hegemony and socialization, suggest the content of the hidden curriculum might be perpetuated through taken-for-granted norms. Perhaps a hidden curriculum might be effective because it is not acknowledged but remains partially or totally hidden.

The issue in this study is not to "solve" these dilemmas, but to expose the hidden curriculum that might exist
within one setting and then to raise questions regarding its potential influence upon the learners.

The definition of hidden curriculum employed within this study, adapted from the Martin (1976) and Hannay and Roth (1983) definitions, reflects the diversity evident within the literature. The hidden curriculum originates from multiple sources existing in society in general and the schooling environment in particular. The hidden curriculum, therefore, consists of the presentation of learning experiences in a given context. The teacher and learner might or might not consciously be aware of these potential experiences and the long term consequences.

The application of this conceptual framework to cultural reproduction via the hidden curriculum will be investigated in Chapters 4 and 5. This discussion will attempt to determine whether the framework is as fluid as implied, to identify the various sources of the learning experiences, and to ascertain what cultural reproduction occurs, if any. Chapter 4 will present an account of what the students in this context appear to be learning via the hidden curriculum. Chapter 5 will provide an interpretation of these learning experiences related to the cultural reproduction literature. Chapter 3 will describe the methodology employed within this study.
Chapter Three  Methodology

The methodology should reflect the problem under investigation. In this study, it was necessary to observe classroom events and to establish their meaning to the participants. Further, as the problem included the everyday meaning of classroom events, it was necessary to identify taken-for-granted facets of those events. Therefore, the methodology had to be flexible and able to account for multiple perspectives. The methodology was selected to meet these requirements.

Methodological Assumptions

The framing of the research questions created the need for a naturalistic, qualitative design. As Hall (1981) suggests, "The investigation of out-of-awareness culture can be accomplished only by actual observation of real events in normal settings and contexts" (p. 166). In general the emergent design had to reflect the participants' perceptions and the context. Specifically, the phenomenological assumption of multiple perspectives was inherent in the conceptualization previously described and in the choice of data collection devices.
Further, the phenomenological nature was reflected in the perceived need for an emic understanding of the participants' view of the situation. The etic nature of the study, the outsider's or researcher's perspective, was reflected by the establishment of a conceptualization prior to data collection and analysis. However, a naturalistic approach was maintained by continually applying the participants' perceptions to the conceptualization and thereby modifying the conceptual framework.

Establishing the meaning of an action or behavior was deemed more important than merely identifying the behavior. The methodology enabled the researcher to observe and identify the participants' meanings of the action within the context in which it transpired. Further, the emergent methodology allowed for, indeed encouraged, the establishment of a hermeneutic spiral (Mehan and Woods, 1975) alluded to in Chapter One. Questions arose during the observations which were then discussed with the participants in conversational interviews. These responses in turn provided alternative lenses of meaning through which it was possible to interpret the phenomena observed. Through this process a phenomenological perspective was maintained and the
conceptualization, as characterized by Glaser and Strauss (1967), was grounded in the data.

However, although the researcher philosophically agreed with a phenomenological perspective, there seemed a concurrent need to push the interpretation beyond an emic perspective. As Sharp and Green (1975) advocate, "Phenomenology with its failure to situate men and its idealist tendency to disembody mind deprives the student of society of some of the tools whereby a dialectical exploration of the relationships between structure and consciousness might be developed" (p. 30). After describing the context and the meanings to the participants, the critical theory questions of should or ought appear crucial (Macdonald, 1981).

McCutcheon (1981) describes the different assumptions underlying the interpretations of phenomenology and critical theory:

A researcher using a qualitative approach based on assumptions and principles of phenomenology would be likely to interpret events in light of the meanings participants make of those events, whereas a researcher using qualitative approach based on assumptions and principles of critical science might interpret events in light of wider theoretical considerations, then critique the phenomenon in light of those considerations, calling for changes in practice or theory (p. 5).

A critical theory paradigm suggests the purpose of research is not merely understanding or description, but change.
The problem is normative; what constitutes desired change? Popkewitz (1981) identifies two different forms of critical theory: residual and emergent. These branches of critical theory differ on what constitutes beneficial change. Popkewitz defines residual theory as:

> While maintaining some distance from the effective dominant culture, incorporates major residuals of the past culture into its critique. Change involves alternatives within existing institutions as well as creation of oppositional institutions to the dominant culture (p. 14).

Emergent critical theory, according to Popkewitz, "Is in opposition to the dominant culture, rejecting social formations, meanings, and values in search for new meanings, practices, and relationships" (p. 15). Marxian critical theorists are included within this vein of critical theory. McCutcheon (1982a) makes a similar distinction although the terminology varies. She suggests educational criticism, based upon social science and the arts, is different from the marxian base of critical science. McCutcheon further claims:

> ...critical scientists employ a marxist/neomarxist framework, while educational critics draw upon various pertinent theories, values, and knowledge from history and the current scene for their frameworks (p. 171).

Even with these epistemological and ideological differences, McCutcheon maintains, "In both forms of inquiry, researchers make use of their theoretical and value positions as they collect evidence, interpret it,
and critique the phenomenon under study" (p. 171).

The assumptions underlying this study reflect the residual or educational criticism perspectives and consequently varies from the marxian view outlined in the literature review. The normative view of change is crucial in this regard. The emergent critical theory conception of change is based upon marxian theory and suggests that if change is to be successful, it will have to be revolutionary. Residual critical theory or educational criticism maintains that change can be incremental and evolve from existing practice. In this study, therefore, the espoused purpose of research is to describe the phenomenon in a naturalistic, emic manner in order to facilitate a critique. The assumption is that this critique will raise awareness for practitioners and thereby encourage incremental or evolutionary change.

**Design**

As previously mentioned, given the topic, the design had to be flexible and emergent to the needs of the study. Therefore, decisions regarding research questions, interview questions, key informants, and analysis were adapted as necessary. The researcher did not enter into the study tabula rasa, indeed, the possibility of such an entry state is questionable (Bulmer, 1979), given the existence of the researcher's
past history, experiences, knowledge and the nature of interpretation. However, this conceptualization was not considered prohibitive due to its general nature. Rather, the intent was to revise and modify the framework as required to account for the evidence generated. The following research questions were developed prior to selecting the site and influenced the initial design decisions.

General Research Questions:

1. Is cultural reproduction achieved through the hidden curriculum? If so, how? What is the nature of this cultural reproduction? What is produced?

2. From whom is the hidden curriculum hidden? In what sense is it hidden?

3. What are the empirically observable sources of that curriculum?

4. Do the overt and hidden curriculum interact? If so, how?

5. Do changes in actors, time, or sources influence the hiddenness of the curriculum? If so, how?

6. If an aspect of the hidden curriculum is raised into consciousness does it affect the participant? If so, in what ways?

Questions relating to the conceptual frame:

1. Contextual Factors:
   a. Does the hidden curriculum vary with individuals? If so, how is this manifested?
   b. What influence do temporal considerations have on the degree of awareness?
c. How do the surrounding environmental (context) factors influence the development of a hidden curriculum?

2. Sources of the Hidden Curriculum:
   a. What are the sources of the hidden curriculum in this setting?
   b. Does the content area itself create potential learning experiences? If so, how is this manifested in the setting?

3. Dynamic Dimensions:
   a. If an aspect of the hidden curriculum is raised into consciousness does it affect the participant? If so, how?

These questions and the conceptual framework generated some of the components of the design, including temporal considerations, the observers' role, site selection, and data collection techniques. The following sections will address these decisions.

Temporal Considerations

Timing entry into the school was an important consideration in the research design. The start of a new school year was selected in order to take advantage of what Garfinkel (1967) calls a natural breach. Garfinkel defines this term as a naturally occurring event that forces the taken-for-granted into awareness. By making the everyday occurrence problematic, the meaning is more observable (Douglas, 1976). During a time of uncertainty, such as the start of a new school year, the
routines and taken-for-granted might be most overt and known to the participants. The constitutive or hidden rules might be more noticeable for individuals in the process of discovering them. There was an attempt to document these routines as they were newly created in the school year and before they became taken-for-granted or reduced to what Reid (1978) classifies as procedural regularities.

The design of this study, therefore, attempts to employ two natural breaches. First, a Grade Ten class was chosen as it was the entry year for this particular high school and the new experience would assist in making the everyday happenings more noticeable to the students. Therefore, the novelty of the context for the students would aid in identifying the phenomena of interest.

Secondly, it was deemed important that the researcher enter the site on the first day of school as the start of a new school year is also a natural breach. In their study of the beginning of the school year, Cornbleth, Korth, and Dorow (1983) found that "Schools do not simply reopen in early autumn and carry on from the previous spring. In a sense, schools are recreated at the beginning of each school year" (p. 3). Therefore, in this study the intent was to observe the establishment of the norms and expectations that constitute school and
classroom climate in order to draw from the students the rules as they emerged. This assisted the researcher in understanding the participants' meaning. Further, if the researcher was a part of the classroom from its creation, the possibility of the researcher 'fading into the woodwork' would be enhanced. To some degree this did occur. As the teacher involved explained, "I think the fact that you've been here from the beginning [of the year] has made it part of the game [for the students]."

Role of the Observer

Facilitating reflexivity was a key role played by the researcher. Reflexivity is the process an individual uses to sense of the their everyday lifeworld (Leiter, 1980). This concept refers to the back and forth relationship between the general and the particular. The general perspective is used to interpret particular events and, in turn, the particular is employed to understand the general. Through this process the general is understood through the relationship to the particular, or is indexed to the specific context. Therefore, individual objects and events are indexical to particular contexts.

In this study, reflexivity was encouraged in two major ways. First, the researcher attempted to reflect on the meanings of a particular occurrence or artifact in
regards to the conceptualization of the hidden curriculum employed and to the notions of cultural reproduction. The researcher then attempted to enter the everyday lifeworld of the participants, encouraging them to be reflexive about the setting and their experiences. Specifically, the investigator posed questions in order to raise certain indexical elements to the consciousness of the participants. Through this process an attempt was made to ferret out the participants' meanings of happenings, accounts or artifacts.

Site Selection

The study was conducted in a blue collar, bedroom community of a large Midwest American city. This site was actually the third school district approached for research entry. In the first two instances, a teacher was approached prior to requesting clearance from the central office. In both cases, the teachers were enthusiastic and almost eager to review their practices. However, when entry was requested of the central administration, permission was denied for administrative reasons. The reasons given were that one school had a new principal while the other was adding a new grade level.

Therefore, the next attempt at gaining entry was made first at the central office. The researcher did not
select the teacher. The only criterion established by the researcher was that the teacher be teaching an entry level social studies class. In this situation, the superintendent agreed to the study and contacted the concerned principals regarding participating teachers. The researcher was presented with a choice of two separate schools and teachers. The study was discussed in a very general manner with both teachers and principals. One teacher decided not to participate given his coaching demands, while the second agreed to participate. The principal explained why he selected this specific teacher:

I selected [the teacher] because I feel that [he] had the type of personality that probably you were looking for. He is very open. He is very easy to talk to and I think his attitude permeates into his students.... I also felt that to put you [with] a very, very structured teacher might not have been going along with what you were trying to achieve.

Further, the principal explained that as this class was unstructured the presence of the researcher would not interfere with the classroom:

I thought for your particular purposes, his style of teaching would probably fit in because you weren't so much interested in the quality of his teaching -- even though he is a good teacher -- as you were just with the ease of being able to get in and out. His class is kind of loose. So I didn't really worry about you disrupting it....

Certainly, the easy access to the classroom assisted the research, as the researcher could observe when it was
convenient and she was not required to establish a fixed routine.

The teacher, Mr. Jensen (a fictitious name), had the final say as to whether he participated in the study or not. He commented, "I thought I had the complete choice of whether to accept it or not. And if I had said no, I don't think they would have forced it". However, unlike the teachers in the two districts that denied access, this teacher did not seem particularly interested in systematically investigating his own practice. He was interested in being involved in a research study in a general sense, but did not seem interested in active involvement. Consequently, the possibility for collaboration decreased. This lack of interest influenced the study as the teacher, although willing to meet with the researcher when requested, usually did not initiate any conversations or indicate any substantial interest in the data generated. Certainly, the top-down method of entry might have fostered this attitude in that the teacher had not initiated the questions and therefore, did not have a sense of ownership. However, the choice of teacher may have allowed for a fairly typical teacher, in that he was not involved in the university through graduate school nor was he particularly interested in theory or research. In this
way he might represent the majority of teachers who 'do their job' and are not frequently involved with research studies.

**Site Characteristics**

**The School District**

The school district was located near a large midwestern city and generally could be classified as working class, although some parts of the district were middle class. The average family adjusted gross income in the district for 1981 was $19,137 which ranked 234 out of 615 districts within the state. In comparison, three wealthier nearby districts had such average gross incomes as $33,246; $33,195; and $29,349. The lowest income average in the county was $17,257. The average income per district for the state was $19,843 with the highest being $56,141 and the lowest $12,634. An in-school study, conducted a few years previously, suggested the main parent occupation was that of truck driver and blue collar worker at a nearby electric plant. The district also had a substantial farming population. The average price range of homes within the district, according to a national real estate firm, is $45,000 - $55,000 (HER Realtors).
The School

The high school, the only one within the district, included grades 10-12 and enrolled 1,350 students in 1983-84. The physical plant was attractive and appeared spacious enough to meet instructional needs. The facilities included an auditorium, football stadium, and such specialty classrooms as industrial arts and home economics. Adjacent to the school was one of the county's vocational schools.

According to a school interview survey of the 1984 class, academically, 50% of the graduates planned to attend a 4-year college, 4% a 1-year business college, 24% a 2-year technical college, and 3% a vocational school for less than one year. A further 10% of the students intended to begin work after graduation while another 9% planned on entering military service. In 1983-84, out of a senior class of 405, 95 students attended the vocational school next door.

The Class

As previously discussed, a social studies class was chosen as this course is frequently considered the vehicle through which the culture is formally taught. Mr. Jensen taught two separate social studies courses, Modern Man and Current Events. He requested the researcher not observe the new course Current Events as
it just being implemented during that school year. Therefore, the decision was made to conduct the research in the Modern Man course. The content centered on modern world history dating from the revolutions of 1848 to the present time. According to the Graded Course of Study, this course was the final one in a historical sequence that began with early man. During their three years in the high school the students were required to complete two of these courses, although not necessarily in order. As the class observed was in the fall semester, the sophomore students had not had an opportunity to enroll in the earlier courses of the sequence.

One class was chosen to allow the researcher to become immersed within the setting and known by participants. The plan was to observe this class for the duration of its existence. That entailed observing the class from the first day of school on September 6, 1983 to the final exam on January 21, 1984. The reason for observing for the entire semester was to explore the temporal aspects of the hidden curriculum. Further, the extended period of observation would allow the researcher to gain the trust of the participants and move from "stranger to friend" (Everhart, 1977). This did seem to happen with students who willingly shared their knowledge of the schooling experience, even frequently relating
their 'misdeeds' which could have resulted in their suspension. However, the teacher never seemed comfortable interacting on a personal basis with the researcher. This might be attributable to a lack of common interests.

Mr. Jensen's third period class was selected because the time slot was congruent with the researcher's schedule. The class was homogeneously grouped with membership in this class solely determined by the school timetable. Early in the year, Mr. Jensen maintained the class was similar to his two other sections of Modern Man. However, at the end of the semester he claimed:

[In] the other two classes that I have there is a wide range of academics. You could probably get a well-shaped bell curve. Third period isn't that way. It seemed like there was either good students or lower students. There were very few middle of the roaders.

The classroom itself was not conducive to an academic course. Actually, the room was equipped and designed as a drafting classroom. Because the desks were high the students sat on uncomfortable backless stools. These desks were not movable in any practical sense. Furthermore, the number of drafting desks available was insufficient for the enrollment. Consequently, the drafting desks were arranged in a 'U-shape' and a number of pellet desks were located within the center of the 'U'. This area was referred to as the "pit." One window
at the far end of the room provided the only natural light. The walls were bare except for one published poster on nuclear war and one poster relating to drafting concepts. These posters did not change during the year nor were any added. The room was hot in the early fall months and cold in the winter months.

This site did not appear to be atypical. The school building and the characteristics of the school interaction patterns appeared similar to those of other high schools in the surrounding area. The students claimed that the instructional and interaction patterns evident within this classroom were similar to those in their other classrooms. The descriptions of the teaching methodology appeared congruent with those reported by Goodlad (1984) in his national survey. Further, the teacher seemed to be typical to other teachers within the school and was not selected because of some unusual characteristic. The students were not tracked and their enrollment within this class was based upon graduation requirements and timetable restrictions. Therefore, the researcher has concluded that this site is typical of other high schools within the midwest.

**Data Collection Techniques**

As previously mentioned, the data collection techniques were designed to encourage a hermeneutic
spiral. In this there was an attempt to create a dialectic relationship between the observations and the interviews. Credibility devices were embodied within the data collection and analysis techniques.

**Observation Modes**

The researcher entered the site as a stranger to this specific curriculum, school, and district. In addition, although the researcher had taught secondary social studies for seven years, she was neither a product of the American educational system nor had she ever been in an American Grade Ten Social Studies classroom prior to the observation period. Consequently, the researcher was able to make problematic some facets of the situation that might otherwise remain out of awareness because they might be taken-for-granted.

Prior to beginning the study, the researcher planned to move from what Gold (1969) has described as an observer-observer or complete observer mode at the start of the investigation to more of a participant-as-observer role at the end of the study. During the first two weeks, then, the researcher just observed classroom events. In this mode, the investigator stayed aloof from the participants and attempted to bracket personal biases in order to gain an understanding of the context. This period was methodologically important, as when viewing
the setting from a stranger's perspective the researcher
could observe aspects which might quickly become
commonplace (Bogdan & Biklin, 1982). While the
investigator was successful in this mode, movement to
other stages soon became problematic.

Throughout the semester, the researcher remained in
the observer-observer mode while in the classroom despite
the initial intention to move into the participant-as-
observer mode. In this role, the researcher had planned
to informally interact with the students during the class
sessions. However, the total lack of any group work and
the demand for almost total silence within the room
prohibited interaction which would have been necessary
for greater investigator participation. In the
participant-as-observer mode, the researcher did ask the
participants their meaning of the acts or accounts
observed, however due to classroom restrictions, this
occurred almost totally outside of class in the interview
sessions.

The researcher's location within the room certainly
influenced the observations. During the first two weeks
of school the researcher was located in the back corner
of the room. Given the height of the drafting desks,
visibility was impaired. Further, the researcher was
physically separated from the students and had little
opportunity for informal interaction. At first the researcher attempted to create interaction by moving around the room when the students were given seatwork. However, this did not prove to be a viable alternative for two reasons. First, as the teacher did not usually walk around the room when the students were working individually, the researcher's movements were very noticeable. Secondly, when the researcher did attempt this interaction the students tended to ask her 'teacher type' questions. The concern that any situation suggesting a teacher-student relationship might impair future interview data quickly put an end to this type of movement.

The researcher next moved to the middle of the 'U' which provided a better view of the classroom and a new set of students to interact with. When the teacher rearranged the desks a few weeks later, the researcher moved to the tip of the 'U'. Each move provided a different set of individuals to interact with and a different perspective of the classroom. In each case, the students nearby quickly became key informants who assisted the researcher in figuring out what was happening in the class, providing information on what occurred during the days the researcher was absent, and
personally reflecting on matters such as the difficulty of tests.

Observation

The primary data collection technique was observation of classroom interaction. Observation began on September 6, 1983 with the opening day sophomore assembly. The researcher observed the class each day for the first two weeks of school. Until the end of September the researcher observed at least two but usually three days a week. During this initial period the observation days were typically Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. In early October, the suspicion that the teacher planned seatwork for the observation days led to the decision to vary the field days. Tuesdays and Thursdays, therefore, became possible observation days. However, no change in behavior was observed. Observation continued until the last day of class on January 21, 1984. Additionally, in order to view the students' experiences in a broader sense, the researcher also attended several school events such as football games or pep rallies.

The frequent presence of the observer encouraged the participants to return to their normal way of acting. In the exit interviews the participants were queried as to whether the researcher's presence had made a difference
in their behavior. Out of seven students asked, only one student claimed the researcher's presence made a difference in how they acted within the class. That student claimed:

It makes you think before you do stuff 'cause it's like an extra person and you [the researcher] are writing stuff down and you want to make to make the younger crowd act more older. You may not do as many crazy things.

Another student's comment is reflective of the six who claimed the behavior remained the same:

When you first came everybody wondered why you were doing that [taking notes and tape recording] and that was about it. After a while -- kids will be kids -- they'll do what they want. After you've been there for a while they'll start to relax and they'll just do what they want. If they are going to be noisy, they'll be noisy. Like me, I noticed you and everything but then I forgot about the tape recorder and everything. I hardly knew you were there.

In addition, all but one student claimed the teacher acted in the same way whether the observer was present or not. Even this student maintained the teaching method was the same; the difference was in interaction styles:

He makes a little special effort to be nicer even when he is a rotten mood for you [the researcher]. Where with us he would be more willing to be more angry and just yell at us, and go around sulking all day but for you he'll try to be more nice.

The teacher claimed the observer's presence did not influence the students' behavior nor his own.

Field notes were maintained for each observation. Typically, the right hand side of the notebook was used
to record what was occurring in the class while the left
hand side contained observers' comments or questions. In
addition, each class session was tape recorded. These
tape recordings were used to fill in when the researcher
could not note all the interactions. Therefore, they
were used to substantiate and complete, not replace, the
fieldnotes. Even so, the tape recordings only recorded
the comments of the teacher and nearby students. The
combination of field notes supported by audio-tapes
allowed the researcher to maintain a clear record of the
events and interactions within the classroom. Artifacts
and other nonreactive measures used for instructional
purposes, such as tests, quizzes, or handouts, were also
collected.

Interviews

As previously discussed, interviews were employed to
complete the hermeneutic spiral. The interviews were
used to understand the emic meaning of the classroom
interactions and the schooling experience. Through these
interviews, the researcher was able to understand the
events within classroom. Formal, taped-recorded
interviews were conducted with all but three of the
students. The three exceptions were not interviewed
because they did not have a study period and the
researcher had agreed not to remove any student from a
scheduled class. The teacher was also formally interviewed five times throughout the semester. Open-ended questions were developed prior to the interviews, however the format remained flexible to allow probing when appropriate. In a sense, the researcher adapted investigative reporter techniques (Douglas, 1976) as one way of overcoming both the deliberate and unintentional distortion by the participants. All audio tapes were transcribed.

After the students had been interviewed, a purposive sample of key informants was conducted to select target students for further in-depth interviews. During the initial round of interviews the importance of several groups within the school became apparent. The students were asked to describe the groups, suggest classmates who were members of these groups, and to identify their personal group membership. Based upon this information seven target students, representative of the groups, were selected for further in-depth interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hoods</th>
<th>Smart Kids</th>
<th>Preps/Jocks</th>
<th>Outcasts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Joanne</td>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Neil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The target students were interviewed at least four times
during the study. Interviews were scheduled when a particular event occurred or to further the researcher's understanding. The target students were guaranteed confidentiality and anonymity; consequently, all names are fictitious. In the exit interviews, each of the seven students indicated that they trusted the researcher to respect this proviso. Certainly, the shared confidences within the interview transcripts provide ample indication that the students were open regarding their activities and feelings.

In addition, informal interviews, actually more like conversations, were conducted when deemed appropriate and were possible. The structured nature of the class greatly prohibited this method of data collection.

Both the formal and informal interviews were crucial in understanding the participants' perceptions of events and the resulting facilities. The term facilities suggests something is awarded factual status by an individual. Others might perceive an event or object differently thus creating divergent facilities regarding the same subject. In the interviews, therefore, questions were asked to bring the 'hidden' aspects to consciousness. When this happened, an attempt was made to monitor a change in behavior and perceptions evident
in classroom interactions. The meaning of these changes were then discussed in the next interview.

Reactivity

In any observation study the possibility of reactivity is a serious one. Key questions to address include whether the observer's presence influenced the participants' actions in a setting and whether the interview questions raised awareness which might have changed the behavior or responses. In a previous section, it was indicated that the observer's presence influenced some members of the class but that this influence was minimal. However, there is some reason to believe that the interviews did raise questions for the participants that might have influenced their future actions. In one case, one male student claimed:

Like when we were talking about the groups of kids -- stuff like that. I sort of realized that it doesn't really matter what group the kid is in, they are still people and you should really not put them in groups. They are individuals [and] they should not be treated like that. [Mike]

However, this same student claimed that the researcher's presence within the classroom did not influence his actions, "It's not going to inhibit me because like if I'm going to do something there is nobody that is going to stop me unless they have a gun."

A more serious instance happened with Patti. This also resulted from the interview questions. Patti had
begun the year by making a series of sarcastic comments to the teacher. In the first interview, the researcher read those comments to Patti in order to establish her purpose in making them. Patti, hearing the remarks outside their context and without the laughs of her peers appeared honestly upset at the projected image. Within a week of the interview Patti began to answer questions in class, changed her physical appearance through grooming, and attempted to interact pleasantly with the teacher.

In a second interview, Patti explained her actions:

> When you [the researcher] told me some of the lower remarks that you had wrote down that I made at the beginning of the year, I listened cause they didn't sound too good. I'm kind of changing a little bit -- trying to....

This change in Patti was short-lived although she managed to raise her grade to a 'B' and did have the support of the teacher. She explained, "It was definitely different. I never expected for him to talk that nice to me. It's really nice the way he talked to me." Within four weeks of this conversation, Patti had again withdrawn from the classroom interactions, ceased to participate in classroom discussions, and reverted to her original attitude about the class.

Seemingly, persistent observation was very crucial in overcoming the cases of known reactivity within this setting. By continued long term observation the
researcher was able to overcome her influence on the setting as the participants returned to their normal manner of interaction and behavior.

**Data Analysis**

The constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) was the major data analysis system employed. By constant comparative, Glaser and Strauss (1967) advocate that the researcher collect the data and then analyze that data to establish the themes or categories evident. These categories become the focus of further data collection and analysis, so the evidence is constantly compared to the emergent categories. However, in this study the a priori conceptualization required that this method be somewhat modified. The evidence was continually checked against the a priori conceptualization and the developing interpretation. In this, data analysis was on-going throughout the data collection phase. Consistent with the constant comparative method, analysis and interpretation were grounded in the data generated.

In the data collection stage, a methodological notebook was maintained. In this notebook comments regarding methodology and analysis were preserved. In addition, the left hand side of the field note book contained comments regarding the potential analytical
categories and the possible relationship to the conceptual framework. These notations were used to develop interview questions, to focus the classroom observations and for analysis purposes. The methodological comments assisted the researcher in achieving what Guba (1981) refers to as necessary reflexivity.

When the data collection phase was completed a more intense period of analysis began. Initially, a review of the cultural reproduction literature was conducted. This added new constructs to apply to the data. Throughout this process the researcher constantly wrote what Schatzman and Strauss (1973) classify as analytical memos. These memos suggested potential interpretations of the data.

Huberman and Miles (1982) addressed the problem of data reduction in qualitative studies, and recommended the data be condensed into easily retrievable data displays to assist in the analysis process. Therefore, the next step was to reduce all student interview transcripts into two columns: learned outcomes and learning sources. This information was entered on a computer to facilitate retrieval and the integration of individual interviews. The printed data displays were given to the subjects in order to conduct a member check.
When necessary, the computer data displays were revised.

The learned outcomes and sources were consequently coded into major categories and applied to the conceptual framework. These broad categories included power and authority, social stratification, work ethic, fair educational exchange, American Dream, and resistance. Each of the sections was organized into sub-categories and color codes were assigned. The interview transcripts, field notes and artifacts were then color-coded to reflect the categories. As suggested by Schatzman and Strauss (1973) disconfirming evidence was actively sought during this process.

**Credibility**

Various credibility devices were included within the design, the data collection techniques and analysis. Certainly, the length of the observation period, as previously described, met the requirements for persistent observation. Other criteria included triangulation, peer debriefing, member checks, structural corroboration, and referential adequacy.

By observing for an extended time period, five months in this study, Eisner (1979) contends the researcher can identify the typical and atypical of the setting. In addition, Douglas (1976) argues for a depth-probe in which the researcher becomes immersed in the
setting for an extended period of time. This depth probe allows the researcher to feel the setting while still attempting to observe the phenomena. Through the extended period in this setting the credibility criterion of persistent observation advocated by such researchers as Guba and Lincoln (1981) was achieved.

According to Patton (1980), triangulation is the use of a variety of data sources in a study. In this study, triangulation was sought through the variety of data collection devices and the number of participants. As Douglas (1976) suggests, the evidence from one source was 'checked out' with other sources in order to determine its trustworthiness. In a sense, the researcher adapted what Douglas (1976) calls investigative reporter techniques as one way of overcoming both deliberate and unintentional distortion by the participants. For example, by using the group descriptions generated by one or more informants to query other participants, the researcher was able to create a whipsawing effect that eventually led to a clearer conception of the various groups and their membership. Consequently, through planned triangulation, the interpretation was based on more than one confirming source of evidence.

Peer debriefing was a key trustworthiness component of the design. Throughout the data collection, analysis,
and writing phases a formal peer debriefing group met on a continual and frequent basis -- typically every two weeks. Peer debriefing, as defined by Guba and Lincoln (1981), refers to discussing the evidence and interpretations with colleagues in order to question the interpretations. In this study, the researcher systematically shared sample field notes, interview transcripts, ideas and chapter drafts with three other graduate students who were knowledgeable in the subject under investigation and the naturalistic methodology employed. Interpretations and research techniques were constantly challenged forcing a re-evaluation of these aspects. Through membership in this group, not only did the researcher acquire the desired check on credibility but also received the support necessary during the long, lonely months of field research and data analysis.

Guba and Lincoln (1981) advocate employing a member check as another important trustworthiness practice for qualitative research. By this term, they mean the process whereby the researcher 'checks out' the evidence and interpretation with the participants. In this study member checks were conducted both formally and informally. Informally, the participants were continually asked to confirm or disconfirm the researcher's interpretations. This was accomplished
through the taped and informal interviews. Formally the researcher compiled information displays summarizing the interview data into learned outcomes and sources of those outcomes. These displays were shared with the target students, and in a taped session they were given an opportunity to accept, delete, or modify the information. Generally, the students agreed with the information provided although they did add to the sources of the learned outcome. One trend was to note the importance of their parents as an additional source of certain learning outcomes. The student participants agreed the data generated reflected their individual perceptions.

Structural corroboration and referential adequacy, as described by Eisner (1979), are two additional methods employed to establish trustworthiness. By structural corroboration, Eisner (1979) means the process of gathering evidence to form a holistic web supported by its constitutive parts. Further, Eisner recommends referential adequacy which refers to looking at the phenomena to test the adequacy of the interpretations. "Of course, particular data items may be in conflict because they come from different sources, represent different perspectives, and so on, but inquirers ought to be able to explain these apparent contradictions" (Guba, 1981, p. 85). Especially crucial is the extended period
in the field allowing the researcher to recognize the typical from atypical. Through adherence to these techniques, the researcher was able to ground the interpretations within the evidence. The variety of data collection techniques and such other factors classified by Webb et. al. (1966) as unobtrusive and non-reactive measures, gradually permitted the researcher to develop a holistic picture of the context and the influence on the learners. The constant interchange between the setting and the interpretation, achieved through the hermeneutic spiral, encouraged the interchange required for referential adequacy.

In conclusion, the combination of the data collection techniques, data analysis format, and the techniques for credibility encased within the design and execution of the study lends credence to the trustworthiness of the findings. Through the above factors intersubjectivity was achieved. However, the true test of credibility rests with the reader. As Owens (1982) suggests:

A basic purpose of the naturalistic report is to 'take the reader there' -- to provide a report that yields a rich sense of understanding events and of having insight as to their meaning or, more likely, meanings. Therefore, an important factor in judging the adequacy of a naturalistic research report is the clarity with which the texture and quality of the findings are transmitted to the reader (p. 17).
The findings will be presented through "thick description" (Geertz, 1973). Thick description suggests reporting the behavior in a descriptive manner encompassing the emic and etic meaning. Hopefully the reader will vicariously experience the setting and then accept, challenge, or modify the interpretation (Patton, 1980). This seems the ultimate credibility check.
Chapter Four  Findings

Portrait of a Classroom

The Formal Realm

Hourly, daily, weekly, and monthly routines dominated students' experiences within this social studies classroom. The students entered the room daily, located their desks, dumped their books, snatched a moment of conversation with their buddies, and waited for roll call. The bell rang. The teacher took roll, rarely departing from the script created by the roster, rarely looking at or interacting with the students. The roll continued with the teacher almost barking out the names, asking for excused absentee slips, or calling for quiet. The period began the way it always had began with no deviation, no variety.

"ALLRIGHT" bellowed the teacher and the lesson started. Here, too, routine pervaded. The overt curriculum followed the textbook, chapter by chapter, with little deviation. For six to eight days the students worked through the assigned chapter. During the first few days the students read sub-sections of the
chapter and answered the questions at the end of the section. Usually, the questions were submitted as homework assignments. The questions were not discussed in class.

During this type of work period, the students covertly interacted with their friends. They talked quietly to friends seated nearby and sent notes to those far away. The students invariably deemed their work over around 10:15 although the period officially ended at 10:24. The teacher typically sat at his desk, grading papers, or finishing some administrative task. On question-answering days the pace was languid.

When work on the assigned chapter was almost completed, the teacher conducted a lecture/discussion on the content. Mr. Jensen asked questions; accepted or rejected the answer. He spoke quickly, occasionally writing a name, date, or phrase on the blackboard. An extract from the field notes provides an example of the interaction pattern:

[Field Notes: September 16]
[On Board -- German Unification]
[Teacher explains concept]
[On Board -- Zollverein]

Teacher: What is it? [pause] Steve?
Steve: I don't know.
Teacher: Marcy?
Marcy: I don't know.
Teacher: You people would have been hurting if I passed a quiz on you today, wouldn't you?
[class murmurs agreement]

Teacher: Joanne?
Joanne: [provides the correct answer]

[On Board: Danish War]

Teacher: Paul, what was the Danish War of 1863?
Paul: When Denmark and Germany....
Teacher: Between those two?
Paul: Prussia and Austria [reading from the textbook]
Teacher: What was it over?
Billy: Germany wasn't in it.
Teacher: Germany wasn't a country yet....

Throughout the interchange the students attempted to write notes. Some wrote copious notes while others claimed they only had five pages for the total semester.

On lecture days the pace was frantic.

In the discussion, the students answered the factual questions posed by the teacher. Little interactive discussion between the students occurred, nor did any real conflict of opinions develop. Only one interactive, controversial discussion was observed during the semester. Rather, the norm was to answer the factual questions in order to repeat those answers on the upcoming test.

Occasionally, a surprise quiz broke the monotony. The quiz continued the factual emphasis of the class lecture. Little writing was required in the surprise quizzes or the chapter tests. The following three
questions were typical of the test items encountered by learners in this classroom:

1. Napoleon had four major effects on German unification; they were
   1. ___________________________________________
   2. ___________________________________________
   3. ___________________________________________
   4. ___________________________________________

2. Tariffs were abolished in the German states with the exception of Austria, this was called the
   ___________________________________________

3. Bismarck's struggle with the Catholic Church was known as _____________.

After the test, no class discussion regarding the correct answers occurred. However, the students were expected to correct their mistakes and re-submit the test. During the next period, the teacher assigned a new chapter and the routine began again.

This pattern continued all semester with two exceptions. The pace, however, accelerated near the end of the six weeks grading period, especially near the end of semester. The two exceptions included using a
Scholastic Update on Central America and an Anwar Sadat television mini-series. In the case of the magazine, the only difference was the source. The students still read the sections, answered the questions, and prepared for a test.
Generally, the students accepted the instructional pattern. Some students completed their work and then proceeded to do what they wanted within boundaries of the classroom norms. Others ignored the work, choosing instead to draw pictures or tune out completely. The students rarely complained openly about the classroom work.

The Informal Realm

Yet in spite of this passive routine, the students did not wait as empty vessels to be filled with knowledge. They had an informal realm which they controlled and through which they were controlled. The influence of the peer groups was particularly important. The role of these groups in influencing the learners emerged from the student interviews. The two key groups, as named by the students, were the "jocks/preps" and the "hoods." In addition, other loosely defined groups existed including the "average guys," the "smart kids," and the "outcasts." Apparently, several students did not belong to any group -- almost as if they were members of a non-group or were non-entities.

In the interviews, the students described the different groups, identified class group members, and disclosed their personal membership. Each student interviewed, except the outcasts, easily identified and
named the groups within the school and class.
Overwhelmingly, external factors such as appearance and
behavior factors provided the basis for membership
identification. According to Joanne, preps were:

The jocks, most of them -- the cheerleaders, a lot
of the drill team.... They don't really talk to
everyone in the whole class. There is like one
person they talk to and they don't even notice the
rest of the class. They are very much within
themselves as one group.

Carolyn described the prep manner of behavior, "They can
get away with murder, stuff like that. They'll crack on
[joke about] people who really don't do anything. If
they are different, they [preps] crack or something like
that." The prep dress code included designer jeans,
layers of shirts and sweaters, or fashionable dresses.
The jock, the male prep, also announced his school status
through certain dress codes. For example, Scott
explained how his position as a jock was proclaimed
publicly, "Like on game days, or the day before, you wear
your jersey."

The other group identifiable by their actions and
appearance were the hoods. Black t-shirts, graphically
picturing a rock concert or band, were a major appearance
criterion for this group. In addition, Carolyn
identified the hoods as wearing, "Leather jackets,
chains, weird belts, cut-off sleeves...." Larry, a hood,
described the overt behavior pattern, "Smoking at lunch
and stuff like that. They do everything that most people don't do at school." He suggested hoods do not get along with teachers and, "do everything behind their backs" such as "cheating on tests." A female hood, Patti, contended hoods were "The ones that are in the office, they are the ones who get in arguments with the teachers more, that get the lower grades...."

The other groups were not so clearly identifiable, perhaps because their outward appearance was neither as prescriptive nor as colorful. In general, there appeared to be what Joanne calls "a middle class." This group, the largest, seemed broken into numerous sub-groups not named by the students themselves. Through observation primarily and interviews secondly, several sub-groups were identified, including the average guys, the smart kids, and the outcasts. On a continuum, the average guys were either close to the preps or the hoods. These students manifested some of the appearance criteria or behavior norms of the two extreme groups, but generally were more moderate and were not totally accepted by their preferred end of the continuum. Typically, they completed their work, not causing any great difficulty within the classroom. In this particular class, Gary, Jack, or Billy represented students leaning towards but not quite recognized as hoods. While Paul, Mike, or
Stacey were typical of students leaning towards the jock/prep end of the continuum. In addition, several other students were classified as the smart kids, with Joanne or Carolyn representative of this group.

The outcasts were students who, for various reasons, either excluded themselves or were excluded from informal group membership. For instance, Neil, Ted, Erwood, Harold, and Wayne formed one group within this classroom. They did not interact with other groups except when forced to through class requirements. They were quiet, hard working and almost seemed in fear of the other students. Harold, for example, when asked what a new person to the school would have to do in order to be successful or survive, answered:

For people not to pick on you. Don't smart off to them. If they bump into you, just say you are sorry or something like that. No one has picked on me yet this year because I just do my work and go to class, stuff like that. I don't talk to nobody.

Other students were ostracized by their fellow students for various reasons, frequently centering around physical appearances. In the following interview extract Mike described one such situation:

Mike: There is one particular girl in this class that is cracked down on.
Inter: Who is the girl you are talking about?
Mike: Sara -- the real tall skinny one. People like to crack down on her and they don't give her a real fair chance.
Inter: What does cracked down mean?
Mike: Call her names. I'll have to admit I am guilty about that.
Inter: What kind of names do you call her?
Mike: Geek. Stork head. Stuff like that.
Inter: Why do people do that?
Mike: I don't know. I guess when somebody starts then I guess you, for some reason, just start into.... I know it isn't very nice because it used to happen to me. It still does probably but I know that it isn't too fair for her.
Inter: How does she react?
Mike: [It's] usually behind her back, something like that.
Inter: So it's not to her face?
Mike: Right.
Inter: Has this been going on for a while?
Mike: This is the first year I've seen her.
Inter: So it's the first year she's been....
Mike: Yeah. This school. I guess it's hard to get used to....

Sara tried desperately to make friends within the class, but accepted the failure as personal:

Inter: How are you finding making friends here?
Sara: Hard. I guess 'cause I don't go up and ask them their name.
Inter: Do people come up and ask you your name?
Sara: No.

Within this school and class setting, peer group membership appeared to control the interaction patterns of individuals. For example, Marcy happily associated with Lisa, or Scott but she reluctantly spoke to Steve, Stacey, and Mike. Marcy did not interact, except in a negative or sarcastic manner, with Terry, Larry, Patti, or Sara. By her actions Marcy, a prep, apparently considered herself above the others, especially the hoods.
Actions within the classroom were partly determined by the peer groups. Joanne described her conscious actions resulting from peer pressure:

If I finish first with a test, I'll sit and wait until several other people go up and hand theirs in and then I'll go up like fourth or fifth. If I know the answer to a question, I won't answer it if other people are having trouble answering it. If I'm called on, I have to.

The pressure not to be different as described by Joanne, became obvious one day in class. The teacher asked several students what WASP meant, and no one student provided the correct answer. When Joanne responded correctly, Marcy sarcastically stated to the whole class "How did you know that!" Another student added "She's one of them." Joanne retreated from class involvement for the remainder of the period.

As previously explained, the role of the peer group in influencing the actions of learners, and therefore their access to knowledge emerged from the interview data. As outlined in Chapter 3, the target students were selected purposively to represent the various groups and sub-groups. Neil represented the quiet, non-group while Scott was a member of the jock/preps group. Patti and Larry were hoods. Mike was a middle class student leaning towards the jock end of the continuum while Billy was leaning towards the hood end. Joanne represented
a smart kid. Although all of the student interview data was used, the target student interviews are emphasized.

**Analysis**

The formal and informal realms of this classroom influenced what the learners had an opportunity to learn. This classroom did not seem atypical from other classrooms in the school. Each student interviewed claimed that other classes were similar. Further, the findings of Goodlad's (1984) national study suggested this pattern was typical in social studies classes. The influence of peer groups has also been documented (for example, Cusick, 1973).

The following sections discuss what the students learned within this school setting and the degree to which the hidden curriculum was a vehicle for this learning. Within this site, three major categories of what students might have learned via the hidden curriculum emerged: 1) power/authority; 2) social stratification; and 3) the work ethic. Each of these categories will be explored with attention to the sources of this knowledge; what was learned; the temporal and actor dependent nature.

**Power/Authority**

The hidden curriculum literature emphasizes the perpetuation of compliance attitudes toward power and
authority. Such authors as Dreeben (1970 & 1968) and Jackson (1968) contend that the hidden curriculum is a means through which children are socialized into accepting power and authority. Others in the critical theory mode proclaim hegemony is perpetuated through the hidden curriculum. By definition, hegemony suggests that the dominant class uses power and authority to legitimize its ideology. Therefore, it is not surprising that such authors as Apple (1971), Anyon (1980), Willis (1977), or Giroux and Penna (1981) portray the inclusion of power and authority within the hidden curriculum as a negative factor.

Within this school setting, the role of power and authority in the everyday lives of the students was potent indeed. However, the evident attitudes depended upon the individual actors and temporal considerations. Generally, it appeared accepted that individuals had to obey authority; that they were powerless to challenge authority. Yet, the reasons for this acceptance varied. Certain students, notably the hoods, stated that authority had to be obeyed in order to avoid punishment. Others accepted authority, with its inherent rules and regulations, because in their opinion society has to have rules to control behavior. Only a very few students suggested that authority might be wrong and therefore
should be challenged. Even so, during the observation period, no overt challenge to authority was observed in the classroom. If any challenge occurred it was covert and subtle.

Rules and regulations

It is not surprising that students learned to accept authority and power. Schools are generally hierachical organizations where a small group -- teachers -- try to control the actions of a large group -- students. In this school, the first few days of the semester were almost totally given to establishing rules and regulations. In addition, the student handbook carefully listed the procedures for acceptable interactions within the school. The following selection from the table of contents provides a glimpse of such an emphasis: student use of telephones; attendance; tardiness; leaving school; student conduct code; student dress code; parking regulations; use of the library; and hall permits. The sophomore first day assembly focused on what a student could and could not do within the building. As the principal explained, "It is kind of a downer for the kids. The principal gives all sort of rules and tries to sound mean." After introducing the administrative staff, the principal proclaimed that "...ignorance is no excuse. There are a lot of rules here at the high school because
we have 1200 students, 65 staff members." The remainder of the assembly dealt with the rules, regulations and procedures of the school. Only one student asked a question regarding these regulations:

[Field Notes: September 7]
Student: Can you wear a bandanna?
Principal: No. You can wear ones that are purchased but not ones you make into a headband. If you are unsure you can drop by the office and I'll decide if it is appropriate.

The first few days of the social studies class also focused on rules and regulations. An in-class teacher statement illustrated the tone:

[Field Notes: September 7]
Teacher: This is the drafting room, these are the drafting tables. Mr. F. has a drafting class in here. When he comes in here, they [desks] will be clean -- no writing, holes, etc.... You will have an assigned seat. After the class I will check desks. I will give a detention to anyone who writes on the desk. This is my desk [points to teacher's desk], you do not touch it, you do not sit in my chair.... This is a hall pass, that is the last time you will see it. I don't see a need for you to leave....

After quickly reviewing the course outline, the teacher returned to classroom rules. He discussed the grading system, tardiness, attendance, courtesy, seating plan, submission procedures and format of assignments. The rest of this period, the second period, and the third
period of the year were devoted to administrative tasks. However, on day 3 the teacher spent another 20 minutes on classroom rules. During this period Mr. Jensen exerted his authority over the students by giving a surprise quiz on chapter 22. The chapter had been casually assigned for homework the previous period; the content had not been discussed. Quickly, the teacher established himself as the person who provided rewards or grades for obeying rules and instructions such as completing assigned homework. This pattern would continue throughout the semester.

Physically, the classroom mirrored power relationships. The teacher had the larger desk which he had taken great care to identify as his. Student movement was regulated, and even where the students sat within the classroom was controlled by the teacher. On three occasions during the semester the teacher drastically changed the desk arrangement and consequently where the students sat. On other occasions, the teacher moved individuals, usually for disciplinary reasons. The students did not select their location within the room. Joanne shared her attitude toward the seating plan:

I really don't like seating charts. I think they should let you sit where you want and then if that causes problems move a few people around. But we shouldn't all have to move in a certain order. I don't see any purpose to it besides making his
attendance list easier. I just don't think it is necessary.

Generally, no overt student questioning of the rules or procedures of the school or the classroom occurred, even when these regulations seemed unfair or unjust. If the rule was challenged, the challenge was mild:

[Field Notes: September 7]

Teacher: All work will be handed in on the day assigned. If you forget you will hand it in but you will get a zero.
Student: What is the sense of turning in something if I'll get a zero?
Teacher: Very simple, for tests....

Usually, however, students accepted school policy as given even when inconsistent. The final exam policy provided an example. Mr. Jensen described this policy to the class:

[Field Notes: September 15]

Final exams are given in June, not in January. Exams in January are semester exams so everybody will take them, I don't care if you average 102%. So technically you could say the final exam in this course is in January, your semester exam. So everybody in here will be taking it. Next semester whatever you have next semester in period 3, you will be exempt from that [final exam] if you have missed two days or less. Does everybody understand that?

The student handbook clearly stated the above policy:

1. All students in grades 10-12 who are absent five days or less (excused or inexcused) for yearly courses or two days or less for semester courses and have an 80% or better average will have the option of taking or not taking the final exam.
2. A final exam is defined as the exam given at the end of the school year.
3. All students will take the 1st semester exams.

School policy indicated that certain students would not have to write a final exam in June if they met the criteria. Apparently, a student could meet the requirements in January and still have to write the semester exam. With the same percentage standing in June, the student could decide whether or not to write the exam. Although this seemed inequitable, no student questioned the situation.

Another example of the tendency to accept authority, even when unfair, emerged in an interview with Joanne. She described a current policy for bus students that she considered unfair. These students were not allowed to enter the building until five minutes before morning homeroom began; however, students who drove private vehicles to school could enter the building upon arrival.

Inter: Do any students challenge the administration on this?
Joanne: We've complained to our bus drivers but they just say oh there is nothing we can do about it. [The principal] wants it this way.

Inter: Is there anything that any of you thought about doing about it?
Joanne: Talking to [the principal] but I don't know if anyone has.

Joanne described her frustration in the lack of input into school regulations:

In school I am definitely out of control.... I would like them to ask us. This is the what you are going to have to live under. This is the way it is
going to be every day. Is this all right with you? What do you think? Do you have any better ideas?

A third situation provided an example where one incident presented different learning experiences for some students. This situation occurred when a group of senior football players boycotted a practice. Initially the principal, coach, and athletic director denied future participation on the football team to these students. However, the involved students and parents appealed the decision. The principal described the appeal process:

The parents got an attorney, and the parents appealed the situation to me as principal which is the first level of appeal. And I refused the appeal. Then on Friday it went before the athletic board which is a group made up of four principals, two coaches, the athletic director, and assistant superintendent. The athletic board unanimously upheld the decision. Then it went to the superintendent for a hearing and the superintendent ordered the players reinstated. The superintendent felt as though there would have been some inconsistency in the enforcement of the rule about being suspended from the team if you missed practice. Probably true. I feel the fact that it was a mass boycott by 23....

The principal felt the students involved had not merely questioned authority but had challenged that authority. He claimed:

Life is full of rules and penalties and when you intentionally break a rule as these young men did, you must realize that there is going to be a penalty and you serve the penalty.... Rather than accept that penalty, their parents got involved.

The principal equated the message with the American way:
I feel the situation is that everybody has a voice but when your answer is no, you've got to accept that in order for our system to survive. You get a chance to say what it is that you want to say but then if things still don't change, that's just the way the system works and that doesn't mean then that you should go out and boycott or bomb the Senate.

For the students involved, as players or on the sideline, this situation appeared to present potential learning experiences. Scott, a sophomore member of the football team, maintained the seniors were wrong and they should not have been reinstated. He contended the coach actually won, as the coach decided not to allow the reinstated seniors to play the final game. Scott claimed he learned "that you have to go by authority. You have to go along even if you don't agree with it, you have to follow through with authority." When probed he suggested you challenge authority, "When you want something bad." However, even then Scott stated that authority was usually right, "But you know that they are right, really, most of the time."

Mike had a different account of this incident. He claimed the seniors' action was "stupid," but that they won the conflict. Similarly to Scott, Mike maintained this situation taught him, "Not to be rebellious against your elders because they [seniors] were rebelling in a way against school and it doesn't really get you anywhere. They'll get you in the long run, no matter
what." Unlike Scott, Mike contended that he still would question or challenge authority when it was unfair.

Classroom interactions

Classroom interactions presented other situations from which the students were exposed to power/authority relationships. Throughout the semester the teacher did not discuss the rationale for rules nor did he give the students input regarding those rules. Power remained with the teacher. As one student suggested, "The teacher is not going to let students tell him what to do."

Although the teacher dominated the classroom interactions, some students indicated that they occasionally controlled the pace or topic under discussion. They quickly learned to judge the potential for such diversions through assessing the mood of the teacher. Larry described what he checked for upon entering the room, "Kind of like if he is laughing or if he is just sitting there looking angry." Billy explained:

If you walk in and he is standing up getting ready to teach then you know he is going to be very serious that day. If you walk in and he is all slumped in the chair, not even paying attention to whoever walks in, then you know that you can get away with a little bit more that day.

Topics that could change the discussion were also quickly identified, Larry continued, "Start talking about last night's football game... then we wouldn't have to
work that day." Several other students also noted the potential in personal questions, as Joanne explained, "They could get him talking if it was about himself." However, which students could create this diversion seemed dependent upon their standing within the peer groups. Certainly, a jock such as Scott or Mike appeared to accomplish this, yet an outcast would not succeed or would not even try.

On another level, the students' lack of interest influenced what occurred in class. For instance, when the teacher "tried something new" with the *Scholastic Update*, the result was the only interactive discussion observed during the semester. However, one student abruptly ended the interaction by asking a totally irrelevant personal question, "How did you know it was my purse?" [referring to the teacher finding her purse several days previously]. On other occasions, students interrupted to ask for tape, a library pass, or the date of the next quiz. Through these techniques the students achieved some degree of power in the classroom, usually with the teacher's tacit approval.

**Student control**

Individually, some students managed to control their own actions within the school and the classroom. Steve, a hood, at the beginning of the year glorified in his
ability to establish a sense of agency. He delighted in his successful efforts at "hooking," sneaking a "smoke" at lunch time, and having a cigarette in the bathroom during class breaks. However, by December this sense of agency decreased:

Larry: The teachers are getting to know all my tricks and stuff. I'm not getting away with anything now.

Inter: You did at first? What kinds of tricks did you get away with?

Larry: I could do about anything. I could walk in the bathroom and smoke a cigarette, walk on out and not even have to worry about getting caught.

Inter: And now you get caught?

Larry: They follow me in and follow me out. Everywhere I go there is usually one following me.

However, Larry maintained control of his actions within the classroom. He developed a system whereby he overtly appeared to be doing his work while covertly pursuing his drawing interests. He explained his deliberate actions:

Inter: Do you take notes or do you draw in class?
Larry: I draw. That's how I get started drawing. Instead of doing my work, I just sit there and draw. The teachers don't know if you are writing or what. They don't know if you are taking notes or not.

Inter: If they walk by what do you do?
Larry: Just put a piece of paper on top of the drawing and when they go by I slide it over the top.

Inter: Did you ever get caught?
Larry: No, I never got caught doing that. You can tell when somebody is coming by. You just cover up the paper and act like you are taking notes.
Even though Larry did not seriously work on classroom assignments, he was careful to complete just enough to pass the year. He was proud of his five pages of notes for the semester and considered them adequate to pass the course. He was right; he passed the course.

Curriculum content

The content of the course itself provided numerous examples of how power can control the lives of individuals. An intriguing theme was the issue of economic control. Continually during the semester the topic of American economic control was evident, primarily through the students' comments. The following extract represents this theme:

[Field Notes: September 16, lecture/discussion: Franco-Prussian War]

Student: Where did they [France] get the money? [to fulfill treaty terms]
Teacher: Probably the U.S., Great Britain....
Student: That figures, did they ever pay us back?
Teacher: The only country that paid us back was Finland.... [lists other countries that did not repay loans]
Student: Why don't we just take them over?
Teacher: We are just nice guys.
Student: They wouldn't do that for us, would they?

The students' interest in economic power is reflected in the order of their class answers to the teacher question "What do you need for a democracy?":

"money"
"army"
"the right to vote"
Another student claimed Admiral Perry was correct in forcing Japan to trade with the West because, "They would have just stayed by themselves, but now that they are opened up they can have all that industry and money."

Power, whether economic or military, was a frequent topic within this classroom. This is not surprising, given the turmoil of the twentieth century, the content period under study. However, usually the use of power was not challenged when it pertained to American policy. American expansion was one such topic:

[Field Notes: November 10]

Teacher: Why was Spain willing to sell us a foreign territory? [Florida] [Repeats question several times]
The U.S. was going to take Florida one way or another so they figured they might as well make some money. Again the U.S. took advantage of the situation to expand.

Throughout the discussion on American expansion, the influence of the expansion on the concerned territories was not discussed. History in this classroom was generally presented as value neutral and consequently was portrayed in black and white terms. The role of individuals in historical events centered on the major world figures. That historical events influenced the lives of ordinary individuals and that these individuals were involved or were injured was not a component of the overt curriculum. History was comprised of wars,
treaties, leaders, and power politics. Controversial moral issues were avoided, especially if the teacher had difficulty with the perspective. Viet Nam was not included in the overt curriculum because the teacher stated he had some reservations regarding the reaction to American involvement. Nor was the bombing of the American Embassy in Beirut discussed. However, the invasion of Grenada made its way into the overt curriculum the day after it occurred. One student, Paul, indicated his support of such an invasion stating, "The U.S. is a big power...[and] I think it is good that other countries are afraid of us."

The evidence suggests that in this setting, potential learning experiences were presented through several sources including the school milieu, rules and regulations, classroom interactions, the content of the overt curriculum, the teacher and other students. The acceptance of authority and the use of power appeared to be learned by individuals through these sources. Although in some instances such outcomes might have been intended on one level, it could be questioned whether blind obedience to authority was intended. One such example is obedience to school rules. The students were expected to accept the school rules and were neither given an opportunity to question nor to develop those
rules. However, the acceptance of this authority was most likely intended to facilitate effective management, not to create accepting citizens. Yet the student comments suggested that they generalized this to acceptance of authority in general. An interview quote emphasized this point:

**Inter:** In a democracy, is it important to obey authority?

**Mike:** Yeah, if you don't they'll find some way to get you.

**Inter:** If the government was doing something you didn't like, what do you think you should do about it?

**Mike:** I'm a patriot. Anything my country says, if I like it or not, I'll probably do it. I don't really believe I should back talk the president. If he wants to go to this place if he thinks it will stop communistic aggression, hey I'll get up and I'll go for him.

The use of power as an acceptable political device might be a further outcome of the learning experienced within this setting. Again, the learners were not encouraged to challenge that power nor to question the use of power evident within the social studies content. Critical thinking and evaluation were not promoted, nor did they occur publicly within this classroom.

These learning experiences seem antithetical to democratic, reflective thinking -- supposedly an aim of social studies education. Such aims were espoused by the teacher and included in the school district's Graded Course of Study, but were not modeled in the classroom.
The overt curriculum did not provide any opportunities for students to acquire decision-making skills nor to participate democratically. Rather, within this setting one component of the hidden curriculum appeared to be an acceptance of power and authority. Certainly, this was somewhat actor dependent, and the peer groups were crucial in this regard.

As previously noted, some groups had differing levels of power. Preps and jocks, for instance, were able to assume some authority within this classroom. Therefore, closely related to the issues of authority and power is that of social stratification, the topic of the next section.
Social Stratification

As the following evidence documents, students within this school setting learned through experience that certain groups within society have different expectations, roles, and privileges. Hierarchical group organizations, both formal and informal, continually presented the students with potential learning experiences. Several different social stratifications were presented in this setting, including: the teacher-student hierarchy, county schools, grade levels, peer groups, teacher-student interactions, and the general class structure of society.

Teacher-student hierarchy

Certainly, the power structure within the school itself emphasized one stratification. The top down hierarchy of principal, teacher, and student comprises this social stratification. A hood, Patti, suggested, "The faculty run things. You have to follow. Whatever they say is right." Seemingly, those individuals on the higher level had to be obeyed. The acceptance of this power structure by the majority of the students was described in the preceding section.

County school hierarchy

A minor but rather interesting stratification apparent to some students concerned the position of this
high school in comparison to other nearby county schools. Linda described her perception of school stratification:

When I am around other schools like Williams and Newmarket I feel terrible.... Williams and Newmarket are so rich that they can get anything they want. But you look at Sheffield [research site] -- well, Sheffield is not as bad as Duncan. Duncan is really bad.

Another student, Joanne, also made a similar distinction between this semi-rural school and an inner-city school:

Like people in inner city schools.... It's a lower grade of education. It's just a rougher school. They can go to the school as long as I would. That doesn't mean they have as good an education because they haven't have the same opportunities. There is not that much reason to think that they could go as far as someone from here.

Finally, a third student, Scott, when asked what it had meant having a researcher in the classroom, also referred to the perceived stratification of schools within the area. A researcher made the school seem, "More educational, more higher up.... You feel better because it's more like Williams and Wellington, and you'd rather be like those schools. Sheffield is not really known for education."

Although this theme is not a major one, it is interesting as it demonstrates the relationship made by students between the social standing of their school and others. Possibly, it suggests that students were aware of the stratification of the surrounding society.
Grade level stratification

Another minor theme evident was the stratification of the three grade levels within the school: seniors, juniors, and sophomores. The seniors appeared to have and to use a certain degree of power over the other two grade levels. The sophomores were at the bottom level within the school. Billy described the situation, "Just because they are seniors, they think they own the school and stuff. They push everybody else around." Again, those at the 'higher' end of the stratification were perceived as having more influence and more power.

Peer group stratification

By far the most potent source of social stratification experience and knowledge was facilitated through the peer groups. A smart kid, Joanne, claimed:

You see a really strong class system here and that's really unfair that people who work hard don't really get rewarded for it. Then the preps, they get away with a lot but they don't really earn it.

Scott, a jock, explained the nature of the peer group stratification, "You've got your jocks and your preppies, hoods. The higher ones are probably the jocks. The lower ones are probably the hoods." Patti and Billy, both hoods, described this stratification. Preps/jocks, according to Billy, "Act like they are the mighty of the school and that they can do everything right." Patti explained the preps' attitude toward hoods:
They look at us like we are scums of the earth, and that really makes us mad because a lot of people just don't hang around with the jocks or goody goodies. We're just as smart as they are. Even though we do little different things on the weekends, that you can probably imagine, we're just as smart as them.

The terminology itself was interesting. Preps/jocks were referred to consistently as "higher up people", whereas the middle group or hoods were classified as "lower class people".

Individual status was identifiable by dress, behavior, and attitudes as described earlier in this chapter. One student suggested, "They have an example to set for their friends. They have to show that they are like each other. They all have to be the same, dress the same, and act the same." The resulting structure was rigid and conformist, with almost no movement between different groups. Several students mentioned the groups formed in grades 7 and 8 that were now firm. Joanne's response was representative:

Joanne: Well, for one thing you can't get there now [become a prep]. You are either there or you aren't.
Inter: You can't change that?
Joanne: No, not really. Even if you became friends with the people who are [preps] you are still an outsider. People see you hanging around them [preps], they say you hang around with preps -- they don't say you are one.

Certainly, the most powerful group within the school and the classroom was the preps/jocks. Apparently, they
controlled the student interactions within the school and set the standards for behavior. Thomas explained how the groups informally influenced student interactions:

There are certain kids, I tried liking them at the beginning of school, but they are in with a crowd where they can't like you. 'You are not one of us; we can't like you.'

Formally, the higher group influenced student interactions through controlling the student government apparatus. Patti described the extent of the preps' control:

The preps [are] the people who get chosen for king of the court and queen of the court. They are not only that, they are other things. They are the student council. They are this; they are that. They are cheerleaders. They are just the higher people. That's why they get all these fans, these devoted fans.

Further, during school elections the preps changed their behavior, according to Carolyn, "When there are elections, I see all the preps try and talk to lower students. They are a little bit nicer." Through control of the student government apparatus, the preps/jocks became the institutionalized leaders and as Paul suggested, "You know who are the leaders of your class and you sort of follow them." The preps were able to control information through their positions within the student council, as suggested by Joanne:

I think it was last year the school had a camp outing. The preps knew about it and they didn't spread the information. Most people didn't know
there was one. And as it turned out it was only the preps that went, and one or two other people, but most of the people didn't know they were having one. They found out when the pictures came out.

Joanne described her feelings towards the control of student government by the preps:

Other students say they don't like them but they kind of wish they were them. It would be nice to have the teachers let you get off easy once in a while, being able to get out of class, and be involved like they are. Because they seem to have fun being involved with school activities.

Teacher-student interactions

Some students interviewed believed the power of the preps was also manifested within the classroom. Preps and jocks received preferential treatment according to a number of students. Paul described his perception of the situation in this social studies class where some students can "get away with things":

With Jensen [the teacher] any of the jocks do. Like Scott, he could. And I could and Mike, we get away with a lot. Gets the breaks. Besides Marcy, [he] gives Marcy a break.

One of the jocks, Scott claimed teachers, "Sort of play favorites for the different social classes." He provided a social studies example where he thought he received preferential treatment, "I had a fight one day and I did real bad on a test. He [the teacher] just omitted it and said go ahead." Mike also believed he received special treatment because he was a jock, "[Mr. Jensen] will give you a bit better grade than you
deserved. He did that for me for the first six weeks on a test." Interestingly, while the jocks identified the preferential treatment, other average students contended the classroom treatment was fair.

Observation of classroom interactions supported the claims of preferential treatment received by some students. Certainly, the jocks and preps were freer to interact within the class than members of other groups. For instance, Marcy, Scott, Lisa, and Thomas continually talked during class. The teacher ignored this action for a good part of the year, only separating the students near the end of the semester. However, hoods such as Patti, Jack, or Larry were continually reprimanded for similar behavior.

[Field Notes: September 20]

Teacher: Do you want to bring that back here?
[referring to a piece of paper in Scott's hand]

[teacher reads the paper]

Teacher: The Williams football strategy?

[Scott nods and grins; the teacher puts paper aside, returning it at the end of the period]

[a few minutes later, the teacher finds Patti with a piece of paper]

Teacher: Haven't we been through this before, Patti? [the teacher throws paper away].

A comment on the fourth day of school further reflected this attitude. Mr. Jensen was having the
students fill out index cards with information on their family and school activities. When he informed students to place athletics on one line, a student asked, "What about band?" Mr. Jensen replied, "I don't consider that it exists within this school." The concerned student, Linda, explained how this made her feel, "It made me mad, [feel] terrible. I wanted to show him that I'm in the band instead of him thinking about wrestling all the time, that's all he ever talks about." Further, when the teacher made one of his very infrequent strolls around the classroom, he only stopped to chat with the jocks.

**Curriculum content**

In a sense, the content of the curriculum reinforced the attitudes towards the higher ups as being important and having control. The content rarely discussed the role of the average or working class. Wars were not discussed in terms of who actually fought or how they assisted the higher up military contractors. The following extract was the only time a discussion on the class system was observed:

*[Field Notes: September 13]*

Alright, our class structure in this country is economic. Alright? To us the aristocrats, the aristocracy of this country are definitely the rich people -- the Vanderbilts, the Mellons, the Fords, Rockerfellers, the super rich. You have the upper middle class are simple little millionaires or people who earn $100,000 a year or better. The middle class, like your parents who earn more than
enough to live on, who have extras for mobile homes or vacations. Then we have the economic destitute -- poor. Ours is all based on economics, the root of all evil.

Your European countries are based upon a class structure. By a class structure, it is by birth. Right, you have your monarchy then you have your nobility, broken down into different groups such as a viscount, a count. Then you have your industrialists classified as middle class, upper middle class. Then you have the working people. So it is based more on what family you were born into than how much money you make.

Anybody in this room can end up basically in the upper middle class in this country. Now, to get up in the aristocracy of this country, the super rich, is something to wonder. These people have had money for a century or more.

The irony of this statement was that the teacher suggested family standing, at least the upper classes, ultimately determined social class. This contradicted his earlier care to suggest this was not the American system. The working class was completely excluded from the American scheme. The teacher claimed the American system is based on an economic system that permitted individual advancement, and that this advancement is not based upon social standing at birth. However, he then hinted that American system is not as fluid and that advancement might be somewhat dependent upon family status, which suggests a class system more reminiscent of the type he has referred to as the European. He ignored who controls the economy through production and further, he only discussed the wealthy.
Although this was basically a working class school, the emphasis remained on the role of the higher ups and down-played the role of the working class. On the same day, discussion turned to trade unionism:

Teacher: If President Reagan introduced legislation to Congress to allow trade unions, would your parents be upset?

Mike: It would be the assurance of having a job.

Linda: The trade union says how much they get paid and the working conditions.

Teacher: Trade unions basically control wages and conditions. If I had a factory I wouldn't like someone telling me how much I could pay my workers. Especially the workers telling me how much I had to pay them. That is just human greed. Obviously, if I ran a factory I would like to pay the workers as little as possible, get the most I can for my product. Anyone disagree with that? That is just human greed.

Human greed was accepted as natural for the industrialists but not for the working class. Not one student, even with their working class backgrounds, disagreed with this statement.

General Class Structure of Society

The importance of money and the related status was transferred to society in general. For instance, Billy defined social class as "the higher class, lower class, middle class" and suggested, "It means that people are treated unequally just because they don't have enough money." Acceptance of the influence of groups or classes upon the functioning of society appeared to have been
learned through the hidden curriculum. Some students easily related the role of the groups in the school to society at large. Ted, for example, contended, "I think that the world might not be divided up into preppies or whatever, but the world is divided up into certain groups, like religions or race." The students appeared generally to accept different status levels for different groups, and that these levels resulted in privileges for certain groups. Joanne suggested:

You see that they [preps/jocks] are getting rewards for something that you did and that probably happens in real life. You are not going to always get what you have coming to you, and other people will get good things without working for them.

Acceptance of this situation was necessary, according to Patti because, "Everything goes smoother. If you try to rebel then nobody is going to want it that way. They don't want it that way in the higher class."
The Work Ethic

The evidence suggested that authority and power were accepted in school because of the perceived connection to working world requirements. The necessity for a boss and the division of work into different levels of expertise and responsibility facilitated the acceptance of social stratification. Conceivably, these perceptions of work permitted the hierarchical functioning of the school.

Consequently, the restraints of schooling were accepted because of the perceived similarity to restraints existing in the work place. Although several students based this conjecture on actual work experience, most based their perceptions on folklore expounded by teachers, family, or friends. They projected their future jobs as clerical or blue collar with little reference to managerial or professional positions.

Surprisingly, this was congruent for all peer groups. The hoods' description of work matched that of the preps, smart kids or outcasts. The learning experiences evident in this section were the least dependent upon individual or group perspectives. The members of various peer groups appeared to have learned similar attitudes towards work.

The importance of the work ethic was embedded within the expectations and structures of the school itself.
School was work, preparation for work, with the teacher as the boss. As Scott contended, "The teacher is the boss of your school, of your job." He continued, "It's sort of like a job, an all day job, but it is more learning instead of doing." The taken-for-granted language of the classroom supported the tired metaphor of school as factory. Class assignments were 'work'. Students submitted their 'work', and completed their own 'work'. From this, the students developed perceptions of the world of work which were reinforced by the expectations of the school. A teacher in-class comment provided a typical example:

If you get out in the world and start cheating on the job or sleep on the job, then you will be out of a job. The old saying is cheat in school, cheat in life....

Billy made a similar connection, "If you don't behave in class, you are going to goof off on your job, too. You are going to have the same behavior." Good school work habits, then, would be rewarded in future jobs. Consequently, through their experiences in school, the students developed a picture of a good worker and the world of work.

The students lucidly described the relationship between school and work expectations. One major theme dealt with the attributes of a good worker. These attributes included responsibility, cooperation,
acceptance of routine, and organization. A second major theme concerned the characteristics of working, such as individual, not collective work; following expectations; and extrinsic, rather than intrinsic rewards. This section will first explore the attributes of a good worker as defined by the students prior to discussing the characteristics of working.

Responsibility

Continually throughout the interviews, the students emphasized the importance of responsibility in school and in the work place. As Joanne suggested, "Just that you have to have responsibility. You are required to show up. You owe it to someone who is counting on you, just to be there and do your best." Seemingly, responsibility entailed fulfilling external rather internal obligations.

Aspects of responsibility included punctuality, attendance, and appearance. Punctuality at school was deemed of particular importance, as Patti contended:

Because if you don't practice now, when you get older how are you going to hold a job? How are you going to be able to tell people something and they will expect you to be there. Say you are a businessman meeting some big client at a meeting, over-slept, and came in tired? Over-slept, that just doesn't happen....

Scott also connected punctuality in school with future job expectations, "Being on time is important because when you get older you've got to be places. Your
employer will expect it, and if you are not you could get fired." Further, even the possibility of being hired might rest with school punctuality records. Billy vehemently, and repeatedly, contended:

If you just lay around in bed until 12, you don't get up, and do nothing your day is all gone. You'll have nothing done. No one is going to hire you if they see you missed a lot of school and came in tardy. They are going to figure you would do it to them, just like you did it to school.

The importance of submitting work on time was also emphasized. Marcy explained:

Because if you don't get it in [on time], you fail. Like if you are working and your boss assigns you a report and you don't get it in you will probably be fired. He's not going to have someone working for him that doesn't work.... You are going to have to start learning to be responsible for yourself.

Students viewed regular attendance in a similar fashion. Billy maintained that employers, "Look back at your past records, and they'll figure that if you missed a lot of days at school, you are going to miss a lot of days at work." Again, the habits acquired in school were considered beneficial and necessary for the work place.

Correct dress and appearance were classified as desirable traits for responsible female workers. Being a "bum" was associated with not wearing "nice" dresses and slacks. Apparently, the correct appearance was not a criterion for the male worker, as no male student referred to appearance.
Cooperation

The students frequently classified cooperation as another attribute of a good worker. Simply Scott stated, "To cooperate with your employer, to be courteous to him, and not to make him mad. [Because] if people don't like you, if your boss doesn't like you, if you don't get along with him, he will probably fire you." Cooperation, then, was defined as the ability to socialize and to get along with people. Patti extended this notion, "Learning to get along with people easy. Learning how to deal with certain types of people, what kinds to keep clear of, which kind not to buddy up too much to." Cooperation was useful in a practical sense as well, as Billy suggested, "It is important to get along with people, especially being a carpenter because you need a lot of help when you are hauling boards up. If you don't get along with nobody, nobody is going to help you."

Acceptance of Routine and Boredom

Another necessary attribute of a good worker was the acceptance of routine and boredom. In the minds of the students, the school routine paralleled work routine. Work entailed, "being there, doing it, day after day." Consequently, the worker has to accept the boredom and learn patience, "So that you don't blow up at the manager. If the manager gives you a big stack of stuff,
you don't explode and start yelling at him. Just overlook it and say, Oh well." Ironically, this last quote originated from Larry who most resented and resisted authority.

**Organization**

Finally, organization was classified as a characteristic of a good worker. School requirements assisted students in learning how to be organized, as explained by Carolyn:

School mostly teaches me how I can get prepared. It keeps me organized. When the teachers tell me such and such is due, I put everything down in a little folder. I have a little schedule every day, that's orderly. Keeping order of what to do, what I'm going to do....

Quite simply, students defined organization as maintaining order, remembering due dates, and following schedules. Again, the emphasis appeared to focus on meeting external requirements, not in creating internal ones.

Understanding the characteristics of the working place was the second major theme evident in the interview data. Three categories existed within this theme: individual, rather than collective work; following expectations; and extrinsic, rather than intrinsic rewards.
Individual, rather than collective work

Individual work was by far the norm in this classroom. During the semester students rarely participated in group work. Each day they did their own questions and did not work publicly on teacher approved group work. Two review sessions provided the only slight deviation from this pattern. The teacher organized the class into two large groups: the "good guys" and the "bad guys". A glorified history bee resulted with the teacher asking a student a question. If the student answered correctly his team received a point, but if he didn't, the other team received a turn. Yet this was not group work in the sense of individuals cooperatively working together as students were not permitted to assist their team mates. Competition was encouraged. As Scott suggested, regarding the work place, "You have to compete with other people and the employer would want the one that would go further."

The students were never given the opportunity to initiate and pursue their own projects. Rather, they individually completed their assigned work. The teacher assigned the work, then sat at his desk and supervised. With the tacit exception of the preps and jocks individual talking was prohibited. The students were to do their work and to be quiet. Being supervised, not a
sense of agency, was the accepted norm. As Carolyn suggested, "You don't goof off. I guess if you are behaving right now [in school] then you will behave right then [in work]."

**Meeting expectations**

Meeting expectations and following instructions constitutes the second characteristics of working category. The students maintained that a characteristic of working was to obey the boss. Therefore, a student who failed to obey the teacher would be an unlikely candidate for a job. Billy made the connection, "If someone looks at your records and they find out you were a trouble maker, they ain't going to hire you. They are going to figure once a trouble maker, you are always one." Working meant doing what the boss wants, obeying the regulations, and fulfilling the obligations. Larry, the hood who attempted to control his actions within school, discovered from his work experience:

> You can't sneak off and smoke too many cigarettes. I found that out, got yelled at a lot about that. Really, you've just got to please your boss or you are going to end up out the door real quick.

Larry's comment suggested the techniques he used in school were inappropriate for the work place. However, the results were the same, by the end of the semester his freedom of action within the school was curtailed.
Other students perceived they could use certain techniques to gain "control" over the boss. Unlike Larry who challenged the system, these students were members of the jocks or higher ups and as such accepted the system. Similarly to Larry, they envisioned employing techniques in the workplace that were reminiscent to school tactics. However, their practices had proven successful in school. The result was a startling resemblance between the description of manipulating a teacher and a boss. Mike described his system:

All you have to do is listen in class, laugh at their jokes, or just crack on [joke] them but don't be harsh. You play around with them. If they crack on you then you crack back. You keep it real friendly.

Mike continued that a worker must, "Feel out your employer, find out what type of man he is, or what type of woman she is, and then you go from there." As Scott contended:

People that do good in school and know how to get away with stuff, they'll probably do better than the people who are just there.... You've got to be not really sneaky but you've got to know how to do things. How to act certain times and other times not to act.

These students learned to manipulate individuals within their environment. Certainly, using their jock status, they accomplished this within the classroom.

In addition, Scott maintained that "to make it" in a job, an individual had to make use of "connections,
people that you know are higher up there and get started on the right foot." Both Scott and Mike used their status and the teachers' interest to accomplish that in the classroom and projected their ability to continue such practices in the workplace. Overt challenge was questionable, as Mike suggested, "If you have a job and if you back talk your boss [then] you could lose your job." Through manipulation and compliance, rather than the challenge and resistance advocated by the hoods, the jocks gained some degree of freedom. By playing the game the way it was designed, these students gained a sense of agency, of control. Ironically, the hoods who resisted learned, "Not to run your mouth all the time; learning to control your mouth; learning when to stop talking." It was almost as if the hoods' resistance fostered compliance to the system while the jocks' manipulation fostered subversion of the system.

Extrinsic, rather than intrinsic

The final characteristic of working was an emphasis on extrinsic rather than intrinsic rewards. Grades in school were the external reward, while keeping a job was the external reward for working. For example, Billy claimed, "Like in school, you've got to try to keep your grades up so you don't flunk. In work, you've got to try to keep your ability to work, or you'll get fired."
Success was perceived as meeting external standards, not creating internal standards. For instance, the teacher "gives" a good grade while a student "earns" a low grade.

Of the three major categories advanced in this chapter: power, social stratification, and work ethics, work ethics most clearly reflects the socialization function of school proposed by Nyberg and Egan (1981). As cited in the literature review, the purpose of socialization is:

preparation for a life of gainful employment and participation in everyday social, economic, and political activities -- active citizenship (p. ix)

...[further] a socializing theory is society-bound in that it is constrained to describe how to produce agents who will be effective within a particular society (p. 40).

This statement appears congruent with the attitudes regarding work presented to the students. These taken-for-granted attitudes appear to permeate the school atmosphere and were not questioned. The teacher's comment reflected the Nyberg and Egan quote:

The major purpose of public education is to try to make the effort to prepare students to cope with life in our society. Not to make them brain surgeons, but to present the information, give them the opportunity to gain as much knowledge so they can go out and lead a productive life. And challenge those who want to be challenged, need to be challenged to go out and better themselves in specialized fields of work.
However, it appeared that these students were being prepared for a routine factory job, rather than a creative or professional career. Within this classroom, students were not involved in problem-solving activities nor in independently initiated work. Rather, they were assigned the work and supervised to ensure a satisfactory product. Similarly, the students envisioned work as replacing a teacher with a boss. For students planning a less structured job, the school did not generally present alternative individualized methods. Joanne, for instance, intended to be a photo journalist and considered the job would be "Flexible, it really doesn't have a fixed schedule, just whenever I can work and have a deadline." School, in her opinion, was not preparing her for this type of occupation as "It doesn't have very many long-term projects. I haven't had one this year. They've always been daily. Work a few days, take a test...." Individually established responsibility was not the norm.

If Joanne wanted to foster critical thinking, then she had to accomplish this task herself. Joanne did this. She continually strove to understand current events in light of history, and history through current events. During the class, critical probing questions were initiated only by students, usually during review
sessions. Yet these questions were rare, with most questions remaining at the factual knowledge level. This was not surprising, given the level of most test items. In the above quote the teacher referred to the students who "want to be challenged". What about the students who do not want to be challenged? The students who want to be challenged were accomplishing this individually, as they were not challenged in the classroom. The majority of students wanted to pass the course in order to acquire certain credentials. What were these students learning in this classroom or in this school? That remains the key question.

Summary

Within the classroom described in this chapter, students were not publicly encouraged to critically evaluate or discuss issues. Neither were students required to identify or solve problems. Rather, the normal pattern of learning was rote memorization of dates, names, and events. As poignantly defined by Scott, "Learning is memorization." This lack of problem solving skills became highly visible during the interviews. The students were queried on various social studies issues, and asked to critically evaluate several historical incidents. Students questioned were unable to support their answers logically and they quickly became
flustered mentally. Seemingly, these students were unable to envision the same incident from different perspectives and, consequently, were unable to anticipate alternative responses.

Closely related to the lack of critical thinking was language usage. Students were not presented with opportunities to interact verbally in a critical fashion. Verbal interaction within this classroom entailed the student's answering factual questions with right or wrong answers. Rarely were these answers probed or challenged. Seldom were students asked to verbalize or support their ideas. The students were not required, nor encouraged, to expand on upon their answers. No socratic questioning by the teacher or the students occurred. Discussion was dominated by the teacher, and he remained the source of knowledge. Little formal interaction or debate occurred between the students themselves. Consequently, the existing verbal interaction pattern fostered passive listening skills over active verbal skills.

Writing skills received similar treatment here. Students were not required to write anything beyond a few lines to answer specific test item. Never were the students obliged to produce any creative or critical writing projects. Further, no lengthy written document requiring library skills was assigned during the
The overt curriculum did not encourage the students to experience the creation of knowledge through problem solving. Conformity to norms established by others seemed to be the underlying guide to behavior evident within this classroom setting. Students accepted the rules established by those in authority, whether they were authorities in the formal realm such as teachers and political leaders or were authorities in the informal realm of the peer groups.

In this classroom and school, the students were presented with numerous learning experiences that occurred outside of the overt curriculum. Apparently, this learning occurred through the hidden curriculum. This chapter has described three broad categories of learning acquired through the hidden curriculum. In the next chapter, the relationship of these learning experiences to cultural reproduction will be explored. Finally, the nature of how this occurred, the hidden curriculum, will be examined.
Chapter Five Interpretation

There is some difficulty empirically investigating and interpreting topics such as cultural reproduction. Perhaps an analogy best expresses this complexity. Let us say that there are three persons, one blind and two sighted, sitting around a still pond. One of the sighted persons tosses a stone into the pond. The blind person hearing a stone plop in the pond might approximate what happened. However, he may not be able to identify who threw the stone (if, indeed, someone did), or the ultimate consequences of the stone throwing action. The blind person cannot see the ripples developing, snags sending waves off in various directions, or the movement of underwater creatures forming other disturbances. Further, the agent who actually threw the stone might have had very different reasons for tossing stones than the one projected by the blind person. The other sighted individual, viewing the pond from a different vantage point, might attribute other meanings to the situation.

In investigating cultural reproduction, some researchers seem similar to the blind person listening to
the stone landing in the pond. These theorists empirically substantiate what occurs within the setting, the plop and the ripples, but then interpret these micro events through their macro ideological framework. The boundaries of their ideological position, similar to the pond's shoreline, might limit their perceptions. While these theorists document the plop and the ripples, the interpretation can leap to the causes and consequences of the stone throwing or the ripples. Perhaps these theorists are representing the possible underwater causes of the ripples as empirically observable events rather than a meta interpretation of those events. While interpretation is the very essence of research, frequently the problem is that this interpretation is presented as empirical work, when more accurately it is an interpretation based on empirical observation.

The cultural reproduction literature provides a broad view of the classroom by applying classroom events to a larger social scheme. The evidence might be interpreted through a pre-conceived ideological position. The researcher might view the classroom in terms of the surrounding culture or class structure. The difficulty with this approach remains the leap from specific findings to meta interpretations. Therefore, the interpretation is grounded in the researcher's
ideological framework rather than in the specific evidence (Ramsey, 1983). Through this process an illusion of empirical research is presented, however, the findings are possibly more interpretive than empirical.

The separation of interpretation from specific findings was a conscious methodological decision in this study. Certainly, some interpretation was evident in Chapter 4. However, the findings in that chapter represented categories emerging from the participants and were reported in the emic language of the participants. Therefore, the analysis was grounded within the emic perspective. Chapter 5 attempts to extend these findings to present a more theoretical and interpretive account.

Chapter 5 applies the cultural reproduction framework to the evidence to make sense of the data and to query the theoretic frame itself. Further, the attributes of the hidden curriculum will be explored. The original research questions serve as an organizational guide for this chapter. The discussion focuses on the nature of cultural reproduction prior to addressing the nature of the hidden curriculum.
Cultural Reproduction

Is cultural reproduction achieved through the hidden curriculum? If so, how? What is the nature of this cultural reproduction? What is produced?

Seemingly, cultural reproduction occurred in this school with the hidden curriculum as one of the primary vehicles. Not only did the schooling process present certain cultural messages to the students, but the students appeared to be active agents in reproducing that culture for themselves, and in some cases, for others. Specifically, student attitudes toward power and authority, social stratification, and the work ethic all suggested that the norms of the working class were reproduced. Students did not have an opportunity to form and express ideas in class that could be critically evaluated by their teacher and peers. In the teacher-dominated discussions, power was maintained by the teacher. Most of these students did not interact with or challenge authority. Little sense of personal agency or control was fostered among students through overt curriculum expectations. The sources of power and knowledge were external and not conceived by students as attributes developed by individuals. Consequently, the skills and attitudes acquired by the students through the overt and hidden curriculum appeared more suitable to the
factory floor than to the board room.

These observations are congruent with Goodlad’s (1984) description of social studies curriculum, but perhaps more importantly, they are very similar to the results of Anyon’s (1980) investigation of a working class school. In her investigation, rote memorization was the norm in the working class school while problem solving was more usual in an elite school. Anyon (1980) contends that the working class students resisted school knowledge and restrictions. In this regard, Anyon’s (1980) conclusions are similar to those of Willis (1977).

On the surface, the constructs used in the correspondence and resistance literature appear germane to this study. However, as noted in Chapter 2, resistance theory appears to provide a richer lens through which to view cultural reproduction than that of correspondence theory. In this study, the students appeared to play an active role in the reproduction of the working class culture, but this production differed from the forms of resistance reported in similar studies (Anyon, 1980; Willis, 1977). The basic difference is that these students accepted the ideology perpetuated. As will be illustrated in the following sections, the students in this study generally believed that the American Dream was obtainable. Education was perceived
as a component of this Dream, and consequently the students accepted the educational exchange as a fair exchange. Forms of resistance operated within this ideology. Resistance to the constraints of schooling existed, but it is questionable whether these actions constituted class ideological resistance.

American Dream

Of prime importance in the students' acceptance of the fair exchange concept was their belief in the American Dream. Several students defined the American Dream:

A nice house, have a family, a white picket fence, and have a real good paying job. [Mike -- jock]

To make money. [Billy -- hood]

Getting rich. Having a big house. Living in the suburbs. Having a home computer and a nice car. And a wife and 2.2 kids....[Joanne -- smart kid]

Joanne questioned whether the American Dream was equally obtainable to all Americans because of "prejudice and the fact [that some individuals] don't necessarily have equal opportunities." Education, according to Joanne, might provide an avenue to achieve equal opportunities. Yet she forecasted restrictions created by the status level of different schools. When asked if students within her school could achieve the American Dream, she responded:
Compared to people in other schools [referring to inner city schools], yeah. We are just a medium school. But keep comparing up the scales. Someone from a better school has a better chance just because they learn more. They have the reputation of the school behind them. Odds are if they are from a better school, they are going to be from the majority, they are white middle class. That is all going to be in their favor.

While education might provide assistance in achieving the American Dream, the social status of the school system or school could impair advancement. Other students listed additional personal restrictions that might prevent their success in achieving the Dream:

I don't know of any, but there might be some. [Neil]

Not trying hard enough. Not putting [forth] enough effort. [Scott]

Injuries and mental lapses, stuff like that. [Mike]

Maybe, some people don't have enough education. [Patti]

Again, all seven target students contended that individuals could become "higher ups", although the hoods advocated unorthodox methods:

I won't be really wealthy, unless I made up with some rich doctor. [Patti]

I would start smuggling drugs or something like that. There is a lot of things you can do to get rich. Get around and steal cars, steal a couple of cadillacs. [Larry]

Still, even with the hoods, education was perceived as an integral component of the American Dream. It seemed that education was considered a necessary but not
sufficient condition to fulfill the Dream. Education purchased the credentials necessary to begin the journey towards self-defined goals, but as such was only the starting point. Even Larry, quoted above advocating illegal methods, contended a high school diploma, "Ain't going to help you [get ahead] but it can get you into college." Education was perceived as a means out of the working class to achieve a personalized American Dream. Ironically, the Dream emphasizes individual equality and a non-determinism ethos, consequently down-playing class structure.

Educational Exchange

The students in this study did not overtly resist the curriculum presented. Rather, it was accepted as the norm and therefore, was taken-for-granted. Generally, the students accepted the educational exchange as a fair exchange because of their perceptions of the role of education in achieving the American Dream. They were willing to accept the power and control of the teacher in exchange for the knowledge provided by the school. The perceived similarity between the requirements of school and the workplace and a belief in the American Dream seemed to foster the acceptance of the educational exchange. In this, they accepted the traditional teaching paradigm (Willis, 1977).
In this study, the students were similar to Willis' (1977) lads, as both evaluated the worth of schooling through their perceptions of the work place. According to Willis, the lads rejected school because it was deemed dissimilar to the requirements of an English working class existence. However, as documented in Chapter 4, the students equated the requirements of school with the requirements of their present and future working lives. Consequently, the power and authority of the teacher and the work ethic were accepted as components of a fair educational exchange. All seven target students, to varying degrees, indicated that the exchange was fair.

Their comments substantiate the strength of this belief:

You do your part. You get what you want, what you need. You need to know so you can get a good job and be successful. You can get what you want in the future if you obey and work hard. [Neil — outcast]

Because you go along and put in your time here, you go along with the teachers and get your knowledge, and it pays off in the end. You come back and put it to work in your business or whatever you do. [Scott — jock]

It sounds reasonable. Just the idea of it. For example, if students misbehave, they are out and they have lost their chance, they are expelled. The ones that behave have the chance to go on and keep going further. They have a chance for scholarships. The harder you try the more you get along and the farther you have the chance to go. I agree with that. [Joanne — smart kid]

They are giving you your education for your own use. At the end, they give you a reward, like in a diploma, but the diploma is used to get you places. [Mike — jock]
Because they are going to let you in the building and teach you something that is worth learning. It is worth more than you can pay for. You should treat them like they expect to be treated, follow the rules. [Patti -- hood]

Two of the hoods, Billy and Larry, waivered on the worth of the exchange. While both of these students initially expressed support of the fair exchange notion, they had difficulty in always accepting teacher authority. In the following quotes, both of these responses are included:

[acceptance of the exchange] Because you've got to know what you are doing before you go do it. If you ain't got your education, how to do it, then everybody else is going to think he don't know how to do it.... [rejection of the exchange] Its not fair because they tell you what to do all the time and you can't tell them whether you think they are right or wrong. Sometimes I would like to tell teachers off real good, then I just let it slide and go on. [Billy -- hood]

[acceptance of the exchange] School's a fair exchange, after awhile, in the future.... [rejection of the exchange] Cause they are always trying to tell you what to do and stuff like that. Really ain't worth that much knowledge. I could sit at home and read books myself. [Larry -- hood]

The worth of the exchange seemed contingent upon the students' perception of subject matter relevance. For instance, math was deemed a fair exchange while social studies or science were not. Billy and Larry shared their attitudes regarding these courses:

Like I am going into carpentry and I don't need to know all this stuff about science. They are just pouring it in and telling me I need to know it. I
know I don't because I'm going to work with wood. I ain't going to work with animals, plants, and stuff. [Billy]

How many times do you walk down the street and somebody asks you about George Washington or something like that? Nobody ever talks about him. [Larry]

However, in general and for the future, the educational exchange was accepted as a fair exchange by these students regardless of their position within the peer group structure. The acceptance of the educational exchange as a component of the American Dream suggests that the application of resistance theory, in this school context warrants modification.

Resistance

Seemingly, resistance operated within the notion of fair exchange, not in opposition. Of all the students observed, the hoods evidenced the most overt resistance to the school and the notion of a fair exchange. Larry, in particular, developed a system of resisting school authority. Drawing during class time, as described in Chapter 4, was one major tactic Larry employed. He also had a repertoire of other techniques available, including:

Walk out and pretend you don't hear them [teachers].... Just do my own thing, block it [school] all out.... I usually come here [in the morning] and then if I decide to leave, just leave at lunch.... [bug teachers] by just start talking to them. You just ask them some weird questions and they'll look at you, say 'go over there and sit
down*. If you stand there still talking to them, they'll say 'I said go sit down'. You stay there still talking to them and they'll say 'SIT DOWN'. Then, you say 'God' and walk off.

Although Larry resisted school through these tactics, he equated the control of the teacher to be similar to a boss. He considered both would control his actions and accepted this as the normal way of doing things. Larry was very different from Willis's lads in one crucial regard. Unlike the lads, who took great pride in not completing school work, Larry carefully analyzed the amount of effort required to meet the minimum passing level. He explained:

The D's are just the right amount. You usually know when you've got a D. You do about half the work. You usually end up with a D even if it is right or wrong. [Regarding the social studies final]...I had better do good or I ain't going to pass that class. I've got to get at least a 70 [percent] on it. I've got five pages of notes and some of the dittos, I can at least pull off a 70.

According to Larry, completing the minimum standards was important because of the accrued credentials. In the future, according to the American Dream, the high school diploma could be traded for something he considered of worth. Seemingly, the hoods fulfilled the basic requirements in exchange for certain credentials. Concurrently, however, they rejected aspects of schooling and strained to maintain some degree of agency. The
resistance appeared more focused at the schooling process than the ideology.

The preps and jocks while apparently accepting, not resisting, the prevalent ideology might represent a potential for future substantive resistance. As documented in Chapter 4, students such as Mike or Scott contended they knew how to manipulate teachers and future employers in order to achieve their desired ends. Mike, for instance, claimed students had to laugh at teacher jokes, or "play around with them." Mike further explained his benefits accruing from the educational exchange:

To learn how to manipulate people. Not manipulate in a bad sense, a good way to help you and then in return help them. Because that is what teachers are doing with the students. They'll get mad at you and they'll manipulate you to get real hot but in return you learn something that day. They find out, like on a test, that if you reward them in the sense of getting a good grade on the test.

Lakomski (1984) suggests that ultimately this acceptance of the system might be more capable of fostering substantive resistance and consequent change. These students bought into a system which, through its overt ideology (the American Dream), maintains that individual advancement depends upon the ability and willingness to work. Such students expected to achieve the American Dream, but whether they were acquiring the necessary intellectual skills within this setting to
accomplish this goal remains questionable. If these students do not advance because of social restraints that the ideology claimed did not exist, they might be more willing to challenge the system than students who never believed they could obtain the American Dream. If the exchange does not turn out to be a fair exchange, these students might be more apt to resist the dominant ideology. Therefore, the notion of the American Dream, and the implicit acceptance of the educational exchange, is crucial in understanding this potential resistance.

**Hidden Curriculum**

In this school context, students learned what they learned because it was taken-for-granted and consequently was not questioned. The discussion returns to the concept of hegemony. Possibly in the United States, hegemony includes the American Dream. Buying into this Dream is similar to accepting a paradigm, as it becomes the frame through which the world is viewed. This ideology masks the determinism of the class structure, as the Dream itself hints at the breakdown of the system for able and willing individuals.

The hidden curriculum is one of the primary vehicles through which this cultural reproduction is achieved. This is not acquired primarily through a teacher lecturing on the worth of the American Dream, although
that did occur; rather, this cultural knowledge is acquired by living the ideology through continual, unquestioning exposure. It appears that a web of normalcy develops and becomes the lens through which the students perceive other events and knowledge. The web consists of the commonplace and commonsense attributes of the lived culture. Possibly this web of normalcy, with its consistent message, becomes the norm through which knowledge is constructed. The following section discusses the nature of the hidden curriculum and its possible relationship to such a web.

What are the empirically observable sources of the hidden curriculum?

Chapter 4 documented the "content" of the hidden curriculum, including power/authority, social stratification, and the work ethic. The empirically observable sources of the hidden curriculum included facets of the school milieu, peer groups, overt curriculum content, and teaching methodology. These sources seemed to interact and present similar learning experiences. The school milieu, through the rules and regulations, teacher-student hierarchy, or grade-level rivalry, modeled an acceptance of power/authority, social stratification, and work ethic. The peer groups appeared to foster similar learning experiences, although somewhat
dependent upon the concerned individual. For instance, preps or jocks might be learning how to manipulate others within the imposed guidelines, while the outcasts could be learning to fear authority. Peer groups were formed in middle school, and change between groups was not accepted or anticipated. Therefore, within the peer groups there appeared to be an acceptance of the rigidity of the structure and the lack of individual mobility. Further, the standards established by the groups seemed to curtail or encourage certain actions by their members and, in some instances, of other students.

Do the overt and hidden curriculums interact? If so, how?

The overt curriculum seemed to reinforce and interact with the hidden curriculum. The content of the overt curriculum, again, presented the concepts of acceptance of authority, the role of power within society, social stratification, and the work ethic. Generally, these concepts were not questioned publicly by the teacher or the students. The resulting messages were supported and reinforced by the attitudes presented through the hidden curriculum. These messages seemed to be accepted by both the students and the teacher because of the taken-for-granted notions regarding schooling and society. The emphasis on political and military history
tended to ignore social and personal history. Classroom activities focused on reporting decisions that had been made in history, rather than emphasizing the impact of those decisions on ordinary citizens or encouraging student involvement in a decision making process. The role of citizens in questioning decisions was not explored, nor were alternative historical perspectives presented. The typical teaching methodology and classroom interaction patterns presented similar messages. The expository style of teaching encouraged a passive acceptance of the content with the authority agent, the teacher, maintaining power over the knowledge. Students were provided with little opportunity to initiate projects, define problems, or accept intrinsic responsibility. Generally, the learning experiences encouraged learner passivity whether this passivity was expected by the teacher or by adherence to a peer group dress code.

Do changes in actors, time, or sources influence the hiddenness of the curriculum? If so, how?

The evidence suggests that the existence of a hidden curriculum is somewhat actor-dependent, varying with the individual. As suggested above, certainly the members of different peer groups seemed to have different learning experiences. Perhaps, the hoods learned to accept
authority in order to avoid punishment, while the jocks accepted authority as a means to accomplish their personal goals. Smart kids, such as Joanne, maintained they learned not to answer too many questions in class, while outcasts such as Neil claimed they learned not to bother the higher ups. By far, the least actor-dependent notion perpetuated through the hidden curriculum was the work ethic. Every student interviewed defined the work ethic in a similar manner. Possibly, the Protestant work ethic is so taken-for-granted within American culture that it is not questioned. The teacher, also a product of the web, perpetuates the work ethic because of its engrained nature. In this regard, it might be embedded deeply within the web of normalcy.

This study was unable to document the temporal nature of the hidden curriculum. During the five months of observation no substantial change occurred in the hidden curriculum presented to the learners. Perhaps if the researcher had begun the observation the previous school year and then had 'followed' the students from the middle school into the high school, the temporal nature might have been more apparent. During the semester, events occurred which presented new learning experiences for some students. The football incident provided one such example. However, these new events appeared to be
viewed from within the web and consequently were assimilated. Perhaps a web of normalcy is well established by the time the students reach high school and change might not be as apparent. For example, the establishment of teacher authority over student movement might be quite observable in kindergarten. However, by high school this would have become part of the taken-for-granted norms of the schooling process. Therefore, the temporal nature of the hidden curriculum might be more noticeable in the elementary grades or during an extended observation period.

**From whom is the hidden curriculum hidden? In what sense is it hidden?**

The sources, actors, and temporal nature appeared to interweave to create and support the web of normalcy. Events were perceived through this web and, therefore supported the view perpetuated by the web. The ethnomethodological notion of reflexivity (Leiter, 1980) might assist in understanding this interactive nature of the hidden curriculum. Reflexivity suggests that the particular is used to explain and interpret the general; in turn, the general is used to explain the particular. The result is a continuing circle of interpretation. What happens in the classroom is interpreted through a general understanding of the social world. The
particular understandings generated from the classroom are further employed to understand the social world. The web of normalcy is used to interpret specific events, and in turn these events are employed to substantiate the web. The work ethic provides an example of this interpretive spiral. The students used their perceptions of school work to explain the requirements of the world of work; work requirements were used to legitimate school practices. Further, the web was supported by the perceptions of other individuals such as their friends, parents, or teachers -- participants of the web themselves.

The hidden curriculum is not all that hidden. On one level, the participants appeared to be aware of the individual acts or knowledge presented. However, this awareness was of the immediate situation, and did not seem to extend critically to future consequences. Individuals might not question everyday occurrences or reflect on the possible consequences. The actors are part of the web and perceive its characteristics as the normal manner of conducting oneself. The teacher, for instance, might intend to assist students, but these intentions are grounded within the 'normal' way of doing things and therefore might perpetuate a traditional solution, even at the expense of the student. These
learning experiences, and their possible consequences seem to be hidden within the normalcy of the action or practice. Possibly, the hidden curriculum is hidden from everyone because it is so pervasive and taken-for-granted. As mentioned in the previous paragraph, this circle of reflexivity suggests the general view of the web is used to interpret individual accounts, and vice versa. Consequently, the web is perpetuated.

Ideology adds other possible interpretative layers. For instance, while some individuals might promote critical thinking as a primary responsibility of citizen education, others might believe that a non-challenging citizenship is preferable. Perhaps as a reaction to the turmoil of the sixties some educators might welcome a little less challenge. Similarly, providing an education consistent with the students probable future occupations might be deemed more beneficial than fostering hopes of advancement which could lead to disillusionment. The demand by some parents and businesses for a practical, useful education could reflect this concern. Therefore, for working class students an emphasis on curriculum content deemed necessary for the service industry might be considered more appropriate than an academic curriculum. Certainly, some of the student comments on curriculum relevancy could be viewed in this light.
Content such as math, which assists individuals in balancing a checkbook or working as a bank teller, was considered by students as more useful than history or science. These factors, consequently, could influence how the role of schooling is interpreted and might support the notions inherent in the web of normalcy. In summary, the evidence suggests the participants were aware of the individual components of the experienced hidden curriculum. These facets were accepted as commonplace cultural norms and therefore the individuals failed to consider the long term consequences of such practices.

If an aspect of the hidden curriculum is raised into consciousness does it effect the participant? If so, in what ways?

Two instances of increased student awareness became evident during this study. However, neither resulted in observable lasting change of behavior or attitudes. For instance, Mike mentioned that he became aware of the unfairness of the peer group stratification for certain students. Mike was embarrassed by his involvement in such a restrictive peer stratification but even with this increased consciousness, Mike displayed no lasting change of attitude or behavior towards mistreated individuals such as Sara. Patti also stated that she became aware
that her negative attitudes toward schooling might result in her ultimate failure and the retention of her lower class status. Although Patti changed her classroom behavior briefly by becoming actively involved in the learning process, she soon reverted to her previous behavior pattern. Possibly, the web of normalcy enticed these students back into the normal way of doing things because there had not been a change in the overall everyday patterns. Although their awareness increased, the lack of change in their total world view and in the supportive actions of others limited and eventually prohibited the implementation of extensive change based upon this increased awareness.

There seems to be a threshold of awareness with each layer postulating other possibilities. As each threshold of awareness becomes known, the potential for change might increase. However, this awareness might have to be radical or comprehensive as the web of normalcy, hegemony, can define the possibilities envisioned by individuals. Therefore, it would seem that increased awareness alone might not provide sufficient impetus for change if other factors in the environment remain constant.
Summary

Seemingly, various sources, actors, and, to a lesser degree, temporal considerations interact to create and perpetuate a hidden curriculum. Practices inherent within the schooling experience seemed to present potential hidden curriculums. While in some instances, the hidden curriculum was individualized or particularized through peer groups or personal perceptions, at other times -- such as with the work ethic -- this curriculum was universal. In general, at the event level the hidden curriculum was not that hidden. Aspects of such a curriculum were accepted because they constituted the normal manner of functioning. The participants seemed to lack awareness of the potential long-term learning experiences perpetuated by that curriculum.

Cultural reproduction exists within this view of the hidden curriculum. Students accepted the ideology perpetuated through the surrounding web of normalcy, and resistance was moderate. However, resistance still existed. The hoods evidenced the most overt form of resistance. The seeds of future resistance might exist with the jocks' acceptance of the ideology. However, possibly until the American Dream and perceived worth of the educational exchange are ideologically questioned,
this acceptance may still result in the reproduction of the culture inherent within the web of normalcy. In conclusion, the evidence from this study suggests a hidden curriculum might facilitate in reproducing the culture because that curriculum exists within a taken-for-granted web of normalcy.
Chapter Six  Implications

One purpose of naturalistic research is to encourage individual readers to reflect on their own educational practices and on schooling in general. Educational criticism, as mentioned in Chapter 3, was the research approach used in this study. Educational criticism advocates that the researcher render a vivid account of the studied context in order to facilitate a critique of educational practice. Through this process the reader is invited to experience vicariously the educational practices of the studied setting. The purpose of an approach is to raise the readers' awareness of such practice to facilitate possible change.

Although the findings of this study are obviously context-bound it is possible to raise issues that might well pertain to other educational settings. The major purpose of this chapter is to pose possible implications resulting from the reported educational practices thus, hopefully, encouraging critical reflection. In this, the Chapter returns to the should curriculum question posed
Methodological Implications

An intent of this study was to examine the taken-for-granted facets of schooling. A combination of field observations and participant interviews were used to achieve this goal. During the data collection phase several questions emerged regarding this form of empirical observation. A crucial question is 'How can the taken-for-granted facets of schooling be empirically investigated without raising its nature to the participants' awareness'? For instance, if the researcher observes some taken-for-granted practice and then endeavors to substantiate empirically that observation, the participant must be questioned regarding the phenomenon. This process could raise the participants' awareness of the practice. Without the corroboration resulting from this consultation with the participants, the researcher runs the risk of bias. It seems if the researcher does not confirm the taken-for-granted practice then the perceptions remain highly inferential. However, if the researcher confirms the participants' perspective, are subsequent actions still taken-for-granted? How can the taken-for-granted be confirmed without raising awareness and changing the
taken-for-granted? These are key questions for phenomenological research.

**Site Implications**

This study has raised several questions regarding the observed educational practices being conducted in this classroom. Generally, it appears students were not being intellectually challenged and were only held responsible for the minimum academic requirements. Further, the skills the students were encouraged to develop, through both the overt and the hidden curriculum, tended to be low level skills such as memorization. Higher order skills, such as those required for critical thinking, were not normally found in the curriculum experienced by students. It seems likely the forms of instruction and curriculum communicated covert messages for some learners regarding what constitutes knowledge. For example, students perceived knowledge as facts to be memorized not as something that they could create.

If these students were not encouraged to develop critical thinking skills, how might this influence their future schooling and employment opportunities? The curricula of some economically elite schools includes such skills (Anyon, 1980; Giroux, 1981), suggesting that economically advantaged students might continue in an
advantageous position. The cultural reproduction that occurs in such schools might be very different than what was reported in this study. It might be questionable whether the students from this study could compete in college or the work place with others possessing problem solving skills. Conceivably, the cultural reproduction evident within this site might be fostering unequal opportunities for the involved students.

The ready acceptance of power and authority raises interesting questions about the schools' role in citizenship education. The existence of an active, informed, and questioning citizenry is considered desirable in a modern democratic state. However, if schools model acceptance rather than constructive questioning of authority what are the possible learning outcomes? Once students are socialized into accepting authority, it is perhaps unlikely they will critically question authority as adults. Of course, a compliant clientele might be advantageous for an institution, be it a school or a government, but whether this acceptance of authority serves the best interests of a democratic political system is questionable. Throughout their schooling the students appear to experience situations where the locus of control is external. Seemingly, democratic political ideology should advocate a sense of
individual responsibility. Learning experiences presented through the hidden curriculum might contradict the democratic norms espoused in the overt curriculum. The result might be a contradiction for students between the espoused and lived ideology. The influence on the learners of this contradiction is a topic needing further research.

One perspective of social studies education (Hepburn, 1976; Conrad & Hedin, 1977) maintains that students are citizens in the present, not just in the future. Consequently, this approach argues that schools should provide opportunities that would allow students to practice citizen participation skills. Active involvement in classroom and school decision-making would obviously be important. If students are presented with learning experiences fostering a compliant rather than a questioning attitude, how might that influence their future attitude towards political participation? Assisting students in learning how to constructively question authority might present students with more useful citizenship skills than compliance.

**General Implications**

Frequently, schools are portrayed as miniature societies where students are presented with such learning experiences as interaction patterns, authority
relationships, and participation norms. Through this miniature society, a reflection of the surrounding culture, cultural reproduction occurs. Resistance theory suggests that working class students resist the reproduction of non-working class facets of the culture. However, further research into the ways in which this resistance occurs in the classroom appears warranted. For example, the following question needs to be examined: is the resistance to the dominant ideology conducted consciously or are these actions undertaken to simply alleviate boredom; to resolve dissonance between personal beliefs and external ideology, or the tension between personal agency and external control? In this regard, there is a need to document the various forms of resistance that exist, and to identify the possible future consequences of such actions. As relatively few empirical studies on the application of resistance theory have been conducted, further research into this potentially rich concept seems warranted.

The web of normalcy, as discussed in Chapter Five, is perpetuated by and operates within the miniature school society. If students acquire certain learning outcomes through this web, then these outcomes might influence the learners' perspective and future options. Whether the outcomes should be included within the
content of the overt or hidden curriculum remains a crucial question. If the content is part of the overt curriculum then those involved are appraised of the content, and it is open to public scrutiny. However, if the content is contained within the hidden curriculum it could remain out of awareness. In the latter instance, public questioning of the content would be difficult, if not impossible. Therefore, schools could be presenting learning experiences without addressing Reid's (1978) question on whether the content should be included in the curriculum.

How can such a hidden curriculum be acknowledged or brought into public awareness? If the hidden curriculum is contained within the web of normalcy, then it could be taken-for-granted. While individual acts are known and, perhaps even intended, the long-term consequences might not be considered by educators or the general public. It would seem imperative that those involved in education retreat from their hectic everyday world long enough to question the potential effects of the schooling process. However, the facilitation of such reflection is problematic.

Whether or not the web can be broken is debatable. For instance, consider how a teacher might typically react to a 'difficult' class. Folklore, perpetuated by
the teachers' conversations with other teachers, past teaching experience, and administrative practices, might encourage the teacher to assign 'seatwork'. Through such seatwork, the teacher feels he can better supervise student interaction and thus maintain control of the class. Teacher educators might decry such tactics, but their theories have not been able to pierce the teacher's web of normalcy, and indeed those theories might be perceived by the teacher as alien to the personal practical knowledge acquired through the web. Therefore, the practice of seatwork continues. Student reaction to the seatwork might be boredom, resulting in more misbehavior and lack of control. Yet the teacher might fail to recognize that seatwork is part of the problem, and continue to apply the old recipe, seatwork, to solve the management problem. The crucial question remains how to assist individuals in becoming aware of the web, and its consequences, in order to facilitate change.

Somehow, the web of normalcy must be infiltrated if awareness is to be raised. Yet if the hidden curriculum is perpetuated through the web of normalcy, and the participants are products of and actors within this web, how can they rise above the web to question its existence? Careful reflection of personal educational practices, perhaps through such a vehicle as action
research, might assist in such an endeavor. Collaborative research, conducted by practitioners or a university researcher and a practitioner, might provide another possibility. Through this process, the researchers could jointly investigate and question the educational practices that exist within the setting thus raising their awareness.

Educational change, then, must be considered through this lens. Somehow, schooling is still lumbering on essentially in the manner it has for generations, regardless of proposed or newly initiated schooling practices. The problem under investigation might be perceived through personal practical knowledge perpetrated by the web. Consequently, the very nature of the problem is established within these traditional boundaries. As proposed solutions might well depend upon how the problem is defined, this raises concerns for the possibility of far-reaching change. This change might prove particularly problematic for innovations projecting a different role for the teacher or student. Again, the issue appears to center on breaching this taken-for-granted web in order to increase awareness. However, at issue is not just raising of individual awareness but, as individuals operate within existing structures, system-wide change might be required. The individual might not
be able to change the system, and might be eventually wooed back into the web of normalcy. Change might have to be more comprehensive in order to be implemented successfully. This does not preclude evolutionary change as indeed that approach might provide the most successful implementation. However, the discussion suggests that the individual might need assistance in order to make changes influencing the web of normalcy.
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