

# **“A” Level Sociology**

## **Teaching Notes**

### **Education and Training**

#### **5. The Hidden Curriculum (1)**

### A. Introduction.

1. In terms of the kinds of ideas discussed in previous notes on the formal curriculum, there are clear implications from this concerning not only what is learnt and why it is learnt, but also, most importantly, how it is learnt in schools. In this respect, we need to move the focus away from the structural role of education and onto what actually happens within classrooms.

2. The school, like any social institution, involves a process of socialisation and social control (there are, for example, norms and values to be learnt). Some of these norms and values are fairly explicit ("You must work hard if you want to get a good job") whilst others are implicit (or "hidden"). These include:

- Respect for authority and
- Different social class and gender expectations of pupils held by teachers.

3. We need, therefore, to look in greater detail at the nature of the hidden curriculum (those things that are taught implicitly and which do not appear on the formal curriculum) and how it affects conceptions of success and failure within the education system.

### B. Defining the Hidden Curriculum.

1. Although not the first sociologist to use the concept, the term "hidden curriculum" was originally coined by Phillip Jackson ("Life In Classrooms", 1968) to draw attention to the idea that schools do more than simply aid the transmission of knowledge between one generation and the next. Jackson argues that we need to understand "education" as a socialisation process.

- A process that involves the transmission of norms and values as well as a body of socially-approved knowledge (that also involves socially-derived conceptions of what constitutes valid knowledge, acceptable levels of understanding and so forth).
- We have to understand not just the social construction of knowledge (the way cultures define and produce what they consider to be valid forms of knowledge), but also the way the teaching and learning process is socially-constructed. In this respect, Jackson encapsulates this idea when he argues:
  - "The hidden curriculum refers to ways in which pupils learn to accept the denial and interruption of their personal desires and wishes".

2. Jackson is arguing that pupils, if they are to succeed within the education system, have to "learn how to learn". That is, they have to learn to conform not just to the formal rules of the school but also to the informal rules, beliefs and attitudes perpetuated through the socialisation process.



- Meighan ("A Sociology of Education", 1981) expresses this idea thus:

"The hidden curriculum is taught by the school, not by any teacher...something is coming across to the pupils which may never be spoken in the English lesson or prayed about in assembly. They are picking-up an approach to living and an attitude to learning."

- Haralambos ("Themes and Perspectives", 1991) sums-up these ideas thus:

- "The hidden curriculum consists of those things pupils learn through the experience of attending school rather than the stated educational objectives of such institutions."

### **C. Education as a Process of Socialisation.**

1. We need to interpret these ideas to arrive at an initial understanding of two things:

- Firstly, the concept of education as a process of socialisation. People learn both:

a. The things that our society considers to be technically valuable (namely, certain types of knowledge and skills) and also:

b. The things that enable knowledge and skills to be successfully transmitted from one generation to the next.

- Secondly, the relationship between:

a. The way the educational process is socially structured (in simple terms, the nature of the social relationships which surround the educational process) and

b. The process of social interaction that takes place within every classroom.

2. Meighan points to one of the classic theoretical dilemma's in sociology, namely the relationship between social structures and social actions. Since this relationship is an important one, it might be useful to look at the way in which it affects the nature of our ability to understand education as a social process in our society. The educational process involves two distinct - but clearly related - levels of analysis:

- Firstly, on a structural level, there are certain values (expressed through such things as traditions, customs and beliefs) that shape the nature of the formal educational process. On a simple empirical level, these values condition such things as:
  - Where formal education takes place.
  - Who the participants in this process are.
  - The general relationship between the various participants.
  - How success and failure is measured.

- The overall purpose of the educational process...
- In this sense, we need to understand the general purpose and structure of the process. Here we are considering the "rules of the education game" in our society.
- Secondly, at the level of social interaction within the classroom, it is clear that these values are translated into norms that govern the general behaviour of the participants in the socialisation process. On a simple empirical level, these norms condition such things as:
  - How order is created and maintained in the classroom.
  - The specific relationship between the various participants.
- Thus, we need to understand how the "rules of the education game" in our society are interpreted, modified and upheld within the school itself.
- If we can understand the origin and nature of the social values that condition the overall structure of the educational process, we can also begin to understand the nature and origin of the various norms of behaviour that operate within specific classrooms. We can also understand what Meighan means when he argues that the hidden curriculum is taught by the school rather than by individual teachers.

#### **D. The Rules Of The Education Game.**

1. There are two basic types of rules that apply when attempting to understand the social structures that surround and shape the nature of education as an institution:

- Firstly, those that specify the very broad relationship between education and other social institutions (the relationship between educational qualifications and work, for example).
- Secondly, those that specify the particular nature of the educational process as it actually occurs within schools. It is this second type of "rule" that I now want to initially address in more detail.

2. The "Ghosts" of Social Structures.

- One way of understanding the relationship between structural imperatives and classroom interaction is to adopt Meighan's concept of "haunting" ("A Sociology of Education", 1981). He argues that when teachers and pupils enter a classroom for the purpose of education, they are surrounded by the "ghosts" of such things as:
  - The architect who built the school:  
That is, the physical environment within which the teaching and learning process takes place - whether the room is light, warm and inviting or, alternatively, cold, dark and off-putting.



- The writers of books:  
The knowledge that is transmitted is, in effect, determined by the nature of the information used in the classroom.  
  
For example, if the writers of books adopt sexist or racist language, these ideas (in addition to the formal knowledge content of the books) will also be transmitted to pupils in terms of assumptions about gender, ethnicity, etc.
- The creators, users and patrollers of language:  
This is significant in relation to Bernstein's concept of elaborated and restricted codes of speech.
- The demands of employers:  
Employers differentiate people on the basis of socially-recognised qualifications. Teachers are, therefore, constrained in their teaching by the ghost of examinations. Pupils have to be taught against a background of preparation for formal examinations (they have to learn the techniques involved, what constitutes valid knowledge and so forth).

### **E. The Content of the Hidden Curriculum.**

1. The basic idea behind the concept of the hidden curriculum is that pupils learn a things that are not actually taught in the formal curriculum. The hidden curriculum refers to the way the learning process is organised:

a. Consciously. For example:

- In terms of the physical organisation of the school itself - a place separate from the home, work and so forth.
- The organisation of the classroom - teacher standing at the front, pupils arranged in rows,

b. Unconsciously. For example:

- The way individual teachers interpret the behaviour of pupils.
- The way teachers have different expectations of pupils based on interpretations of behaviour in class.

2. Pat McNeil ("Fundamentals of Sociology", 1986), the hidden curriculum involves learning such things as:

- How to respond to and cope with authority.
- How to get on with others (both pupils and teachers).
- How to pass the time.
- How to deal with boredom.
- How to establish priorities.

- How to conform to the expectations of teachers and your peers.



- McNeil sums-up this general idea when he notes:  
"Studies of the hidden curriculum have been especially popular with researchers who wish to show that, whatever the official goals of education may be, what actually happens in schools has more to do with control, domination and the consequent reproduction of social inequality."
3. Continuing this theme of "hidden learning", Jackson argues that merely to study any subject in the curriculum, the pupil has to learn deference:
- To the authority of the teacher:  
Failure to observe implicit and explicit classroom rules leaves the pupil open to sanction (from mild rebuke, through formal punishments, to the less tangible forms of teacher labelling - getting a reputation as a "difficult" pupil, a "trouble-maker", "stupid", etc.). These rules govern such things as:
    - When it is permissible to speak.
    - Who you are permitted to speak to.
    - Where you are allowed to sit.
  - To the selection of what is presented as valid knowledge in books:  
To pass exams (and thereby succeed in educational terms), the pupil has to learn to conform to what the teacher presents as valid forms of knowledge.
  - To the system of learning:  
This involves such things as:
    - Individualism - learning is a process that should not, ultimately, be shared.
    - Competition - the objective is to demonstrate you are better than your peers.
  - To the teacher's assessment of progress:  
In this respect, the pupil must defer to what the teacher says is progress - to do otherwise is to run the risk of being negatively labelled and sanctioned.
4. These, therefore, are "rules of the educational game" and illustrate the nature of socially-derived assumptions carried by the teacher into the classroom, since teachers are well-aware of the pressures placed upon them to fulfil one of the prime requisites of education in Britain, namely to orientate their pupils towards the taking and passing of examinations.
- To paraphrase Meighan, examinations are a powerful ghost, haunting both the organisation of the school and the relationship between the teacher and their pupils (structural as well as personal).
5. A further illustration of ghosting is provided by David Hargreaves ("Social Relations In A Secondary School", 1967) in terms of the various ways teachers use their experience to label and categorise pupils.



- In his study Hargreaves observed that:

"When a teacher takes a new class, he (sic) will tend to divide the class into three categories. Firstly, the "good" pupils who conform to his expectations. Secondly, the "bad" pupils who deviate. Thirdly, those who are not outstanding in either conformity or deviation. It is the names of the pupils in the first two categories that are learned immediately by the teacher. For those in the residual category, actual names are learned very much more slowly.

These inferences which the teacher draws in such a highly selective way from the pupils' behaviour, and the "categorization process" to which it leads, act as a definition of the situation in which teachers and pupils find themselves. This definition provides the plan for all future interaction between the two parties".

- The implications of this labelling process are clear when we think about the likely consequences for the future achievements of each of these groups. Thus, the assumptions made and conclusions drawn by teachers will affect the behaviour of pupils - whether the result is outright rebellion, a withdrawal from the competitive process or an increased immersion in that process.

6. To return to Jackson's original definition of the hidden curriculum, we can see the learning process (both formal and informal learning) as one that:

- a. Takes place within the limitations of various structural imperatives.
- b. Involves social interaction between teachers and pupils concerning the precise basis upon which teaching / learning takes place.
- c. Reflects the powerful, structurally-derived, position of the teacher.
- d. Places limitations on social action, in terms of what both the teacher and pupils can legitimately do in the classroom.

- Conformity brings long-term rewards in terms of educational success, whilst in the short-term the pupil may have to suffer boredom, strict teacher control, etc.
- Non-conformity brings short-term rewards (alleviating boredom, passing the time, etc.), while, long-term, the pupil may suffer from a lack of educational success.

Thus far we have seen that schools are secondary socialising institutions that appear to be organised for a dual purpose, namely:

- a. The transmission of technical knowledge and skills (the things children learn as part of the formal curriculum, such as how to read and write).
- b. The transmission of social skills and orientations.  
In effect, the things that children learn as part of the informal or hidden curriculum (such as the importance of recognising status differences, authority structures, educational qualifications and the like).

**F. The Hidden Curriculum: Structuralist Perspectives.**

1. Functionalist and Marxist sociologists have recognised and interpreted the dual role of schools as being a structural requirement for any society (something that must be done if society is to continue in its present form).

- Whatever their fundamental differences (which are many and varied), Structuralist sociologists agree that education is a socialisation process where values are transmitted and the norms governing the organisation of schools and classrooms reflect these values. Thus, the way societies are organised at an institutional level affects the way an education system is both physically and socially organised.

- The significance of a hidden curriculum is that it represents a means whereby children have to learn to conform to the normative expectations of teachers if they are to successfully negotiate their way through the educational process.

2. However, the hidden curriculum involves more than simply learning social values and norms. It also involves the pupil's ability to attune themselves to the norms and values transmitted through the education system if they are to be successful in their educational career. This is a subtly different idea to that put forward by Structuralists.

- For both Functionalist and Marxist sociologists the focus of their attention is on the structural relationships that exist within a society. This tends to mean two things:
- Firstly, they are not very interested in looking at individual behaviour (social action), since they argue that this behaviour represents the outcome of some form of social stimulation. In effect, if an individual simply reacts to stimulation then the object of study for sociologists necessarily becomes the stimulation itself (in effect, the causal factors involved in producing individual behaviour), rather than how individuals behave.
- Secondly, the idea that behaviour is conditioned by socialisation and that the socialisation process (within the family, education, work and so forth) is largely a passive, one-way, process. That is, the individual is subjected to various socialising influences and pressures and reacts to them accordingly.

3. There is little interest shown in the analysis of how and why particular individuals succeed or fail within the educational system. For Structuralists the main point is that a small minority must succeed while the larger majority must "fail". Structuralists do not look in detail at individual social behaviour because:

a. It is of little sociological interest to them and

b. Their belief that the causes of human behaviour are to be found by looking at the larger and wider picture of the way in which societies are organised institutionally (Functionalism) or economically (Marxism).

**G. The Hidden Curriculum: Interactionist Perspectives.**

1. If Structuralist sociologists can be broadly (if not always accurately) be characterised as being interested in explaining the educational process in terms of what goes-on in society outside the classroom, Interactionist sociologists tend to take the opposite view; they focus on what happens inside the school, the classroom.

- This reflects the general Interactionist perspective since there is a belief that the most important object of study for sociologists is the way individuals actively construct and reconstruct their world on a daily basis. In socialisation terms, for example, the focus is on the way this is a two-way (if not always equal), active, process of communication.
- Interactionists, therefore, criticise Structuralist views on the socialisation process in terms of seeing socialisation as a "social production process".
  - Raw materials (people) are assembled.
  - These materials are passed through various socialising machinery (such as the family, the education system and so forth).
  - After a few years, out pops a fully socialised individual...
- Although this a gross oversimplification, it does convey a flavour of the criticism involved. For Interactionists looking at the socialisation process we would need to add the idea that the "raw materials" become actively involved in the day-to-day production and reproduction of the machinery through which they pass.

2. As might be expected, therefore, Interactionist perspectives on the hidden curriculum differs from other perspectives for a number of reasons:

- a. The nature of the hidden curriculum is not determined by the structure of society and the social background of the pupils within an education system (although these factors must be taken into account).
- b. The hidden curriculum can be learnt and used to a pupil's advantage.
- c. It involves understanding the dynamic relationship between teachers and pupils, pupils and other pupils and so forth.

3. Sociological interest focuses on the teacher - not as an unwitting "agent of ideological control", but as the nexus (the point at which two things meet) where the values of society meet the consciousness of individuals. From this viewpoint, we need to analyse and understand the dynamics of classroom interaction if we are to arrive at an understanding of things like differential educational achievement.



**Understanding Classroom Interaction.**

1. Unlike Structuralist sociology, Interactionists have concentrated on what actually goes-on in the classroom - in terms of interaction between teachers and pupils - rather than concentrating on what is supposed to occur. This is not to say that Structuralists have not been concerned to analyse specific forms of classroom interaction :

- Paul Willis ("Learning To Labour", 1977), for example, constructs a broadly Marxist-inspired analysis of the lives of working-class male school pupils by focusing upon their school experiences.
- David Hargreaves ("Social Relations In A Secondary School", 1967), working within a broadly Functionalist perspective, analysed teacher - pupil relationships by adopting a form of overt participant observation.

2. However, Interactionist sociologists have provided the greatest depth of sociological insight into classroom interaction and behaviour, precisely because this is the focal point of their studies. Such sociology has focused on the nature of subjective meanings within the classroom - an attempt to understand such things as:

- How teachers maintain order on a daily basis.
- How pupils cope with school, authority, each other.
- How people are motivated, labelled and categorised.

3. Interactionists, therefore, have a different perspective in the sense of not focusing on such things as:

- The role of education, for example, as a functional social sub-system within society [Functionalism] or
- A means of reproducing ruling class hegemony [Marxism]).
- While Structuralist writers have analysed classroom interaction in terms of the ways teachers and pupils carry-out structural imperatives, Interactionists have been concerned with the (sociologically) messier process of the way the participants in the educational process actually go about the day-to-day construction and reconstruction of school life.





**Interactionist Methodology.**

1. A great deal of Interactionist methodology ("methodology" in this sense being a belief about how it is possible to create reliable and valid knowledge about the social world) focuses around Labelling Theory.

- In order to understand something we give it a label (a name) and we associate various characteristics with the label. We do this in order to make sense of the world around us and, by so doing, we are able to impose a sense of order and regularity on the social world.
- In this respect we categorise everything (people, ideas, experiences and so forth) as "types" - things that appear to be related. For example, in educational terms, a teacher, through their experience in the school, comes to learn what makes a successful pupil. Each teacher creates a mental type around the label (for example, what constitutes "a successful pupil") and classifies all pupils according to how closely they conform to or deviate from the mental type.

2. Howard Becker ("Social Class Variations in the Teacher - Pupil Relationship"), for example, showed how teachers in Chicago High schools (the equivalent of our secondary schools) classified and evaluated their pupils against the standard of the "ideal pupil".

- Becker found that those pupils who came closest to the ideal were mainly drawn from middle-class backgrounds, whilst those who were furthest from the ideal were mainly from working class backgrounds.
- The main point to note here (apart from the relationship between teacher labelling and social class) is the fact that, by attempting to categorise students in this way, teachers actually created problems within the classroom. When a teacher had labelled a child as "far from the ideal" they behaved towards that child in terms of the mental label they had created. In short, they interpreted the behaviour of the "non-ideal" students (lack of interest and motivation, misconduct and so forth) in the light of the label they had created for that child.

3. David Hargreaves' study ("Social Relations in a Secondary School") indicates much the same kind of things (in an English school) as Becker observed in American schools some thirty years before.

- For Hargreaves, the labelling process is set in motion on the basis that teachers create definitions of "pupil types" based on their past experiences. The ability to apply labels (such as "intelligent / stupid") and to make them stick to pupils comes from the relatively powerful position of the teacher in relation to their pupils (power - or authority - that comes from the teacher's and pupil's relatively different positions in the school hierarchy).

- Hargreaves noted that once the teacher has defined various categories (types) and pupils had been allocated to a category, two main things tended to happen:
  - Firstly, the teacher used the "pupil category" as a reference point for the interpretation of a pupil's behaviour. That is, the teacher used knowledge of the category into which he / she had mentally placed the pupil in order to interpret or make sense of that pupil's behaviour. Consider, for example, a pupil who is having difficulty completing a piece of work:
    - a. If that pupil has been classified as "intelligent", then the teacher is likely to interpret the child's difficulty benignly; they will offer help and guidance.
    - b. If that pupil has been classified as "stupid" or "lazy", then the teacher is likely to interpret the same behaviour differently; it may be taken as an indication that the child "isn't trying hard enough" or that they "obviously weren't listening" when the task was explained.
  - Secondly, because pupils need to refer to the behaviour of others towards them in order to get a picture of how relatively successful they are, pupils internalise the image they get of themselves from what G.H.Mead has called significant others - in this instance, the teacher (although in other instances these significant others could be fellow pupils). The child relies on the teacher to provide a self-concept - to tell the pupil, in other words, how successfully or badly they are playing their allotted role.
  - Charles Cooley used the concept of a "looking-glass self" to express the idea that we understand who we are from the way others behave towards us. When we interact with others the way they behave towards us gives us a concept of who and what we are. Just as we look into a mirror in order to physically see ourselves, so we look into the mirror of how others behave towards us to see ourselves socially.
  - When we think about who we are, we think about the way others behave towards us. We interpret the behaviour of others towards us in order to "see ourselves as others see us". This process is a highly subjective one (we may interpret the behaviour of other people incorrectly), but it is a significant one. As W.I.Thomas, has noted, whenever we define a situation as real, it is real in its consequences.
4. Additionally, in terms of labelling, other pupils and other teachers will come to recognise the label any child has attracted and will consequently behave towards that pupil on the basis of an already existing label. While it is not impossible for a child to shake-off a label, it does become extremely difficult if the label is widely shared.
- Teachers compare perceptions about their pupils and this reinforces a consensus label about pupils. A teacher who has never taught a particular pupil will already

have knowledge about him or her supplied through the labels attached by other teachers.

5. A concept frequently used by Interactionists is that of a "self-fulfilling prophecy". This is, the idea that by predicting something will happen we unconsciously take steps to ensure that it will happen. For example:

- a. A teacher labels a pupil as "clever" or "stupid".
- b. On the basis of this label (and its associated characteristics - a stupid pupil is also lazy and poorly motivated, for example), the teacher predicts whether or not the pupil will succeed or fail educationally.
- c. The teacher's interaction with the pupil will be based on the label and the kind of interaction process suggested above (how teacher's deal with children having difficulties) will take place. The "stupid" pupil will have the fact of his / her stupidity reinforced by the teacher. Conversely, the fact that the "stupid" pupil is having difficulty confirms to the teacher that the pupil was labelled correctly in the first place.
- d. The pupil, because he or she is taking a cue from the teacher, comes to see him / herself in terms of the teacher's labelling. The "intelligent" pupil is encouraged, motivated and succeeds. The "stupid" pupil is discouraged, demotivated and fails.

6. While the idea of a self-fulfilling prophecy can be used to explain educational success and failure (see, for example, "Pygmalion In The Classroom" by Rosenthal and Jacobson), it is important not to assume that this process is an inevitable consequence of labelling. Although teachers may be significant others in a pupil's school life, there are other possible "significant influences" - the most obvious of which might be a child's parents and friends.

- Simply because a teacher tries to convince someone that they are a certain type of pupil, it doesn't automatically follow that they will conform to their stereotype. When a teacher is critical of a child, a number of possible outcomes present themselves. For example, a small selection of possible responses might include:
  - a. You may conform to the teacher's expectations. You amend your behaviour in the light of the criticism.
  - b. You may ignore the criticism.
  - c. You may be inspired to prove the teacher wrong in their criticism.
  - d. You may be so depressed by the criticism that you give-up trying...

## H. Concluding Comments.

1. The Interactionist sociology of education is one that highlights the significance of the hidden curriculum as a way of identifying and explaining many of the social processes of negotiation and conflict within the classroom / school.

- In particular, it has identified and explained the messy process of socialisation that takes place within the school. It has identified its weaknesses, failings, successes and shortcomings and does not take for granted socialisation as an "inevitably successful" process that churns-out pupils who are perfectly socialised into an acceptance of both adult roles generally and adult work roles specifically.

2. An example of this form of sociology is provided by Nell Keddie ("Classroom Knowledge", 1971) when she discusses the concepts of educational success and failure in relation to the type of sociological interpretations put forward by Structuralist sociologists:

"One consequence of the particular normative orientation of much sociology of education [that is, Structuralist sociology] has been its definition of educational failure: explanations of educational failure are most often given in terms of pupils' ethnic and social class antecedents [background] and rely on a concept of social pathology rather than one of cultural diversity. It is only recently that attention has been given to the defining process occurring within the school itself and to the social organisation of curriculum knowledge...

[Interactionist] studies suggest that the processes by which pupils are categorised are not self-evident and point to an overlooked consequence of a differentiated curriculum: that it is part of the process by which educational deviants are created and their deviant identities maintained... I hope to raise questions about these processes by considering two aspects of classroom knowledge: what knowledge teachers have of pupils and what counts as knowledge to be made available and evaluated in the classroom. This involves casting as problematic what are held to be knowledge and ability in schools rather than taking either as given."

- Keddie's argument is that to understand the significance of the hidden curriculum we have to look into the school classroom - at the relationship between teachers and their pupils.
- In this respect, we might note a fundamental difference between the (Structuralist) arguments of Parsons (Functionalism) or Bowles and Gintis (Marxism), where the emphasis is on the ways in which pupils are overtly socialised into future adult roles and the observations made by Paul Willis in "Learning To Labour" where he demonstrates how the young working class males in his study tried to subvert the socialising attempts by adults within the education system...

3. What tends to be missing from Structuralist accounts of the nature of the education system is an understanding of the participants' point of view:

- The teacher's definition of school and classroom reality.
- The pupil's definition of school and classroom reality.
- In relation to the idea of a self-fulfilling prophecy, we also have to be aware that socialisation within the school is not necessarily a simple one-way process (from the teacher to the pupil). Pupils also attempt to socialise teachers, in that they bring into the classroom a set of pre-defined expectations about what constitutes the teacher's role.
- Another aspect of the "hidden" socialisation process within the school is the attempt, by teachers, to convince their pupils of the "reality" of their future lives in the adult world outside the school. Teachers' knowledge and assumptions about the nature of the adult world spill over into the classroom and become a part of the teaching process - a part of the hidden curriculum, whereby teachers categorise their pupils on the basis of their response to both the teacher's role and their attitudes to the values of learning that the teacher holds and attempts to perpetuate.

4. Following from the above, a number of researchers have pointed out that schools involve a culture clash between the norms and values of teachers and the norms and values of working-class pupils. J.B.Mays ("Education and the Urban Child", 1962) puts the idea thus:

"The teachers in the school find themselves at the nexus of two distinct cultures with a correspondingly difficult role to play. Being themselves mainly conditioned by the grammar school tradition and the middle-class system of values, they have to make a drastic mental readjustment to be able to deal sympathetically with the people whose attitudes and standards are so different. Even those teachers who have themselves risen from working-class backgrounds, do not, contrary to what is generally supposed, always find it psychologically an easy matter to adopt a sympathetic, non-condemnatory, attitude towards the less favoured representatives of their own social class."

- Having looked at the basic theoretical stand-point of Interactionist sociologists concerning the nature of the hidden curriculum (and the way their interpretations differ from those of Structuralist perspectives), we can now look in more detail at some examples of the hidden curriculum and the way this concept relates, through labelling theory, to the development of pupil sub-subcultures.