The Role of Hidden Curricula on the Resistance Behavior of Undergraduate Students in Psychological Counseling and Guidance at a Turkish University

Sedat Yüksel
Uludağ University
Turkey

Student resistance can be a very important problem for the instructors in universities. Student resistance includes the conscious and preplanned behaviors towards the information presented to them in the classroom and the institutional practices. Typically, student resistance takes the form of passive or active non-compliance with roles and outputs expected of them as students. The purpose of this paper is to investigate the effects of hidden curricula on student resistance. The research was conducted on senior undergraduate students in a Turkish University, in the Department of Psychological Counseling and Guidance. Given the exploratory nature of this investigation, a case study methodology was employed. Data was collected from official documents, class observations, and interviews. The results of this research indicated that the students demonstrated resistance to some dimensions of the hidden and delivered curricula. Specifically, while the students showed resistance towards the delivered curriculum and 'banking education', they did not show similar resistance to symbolic violence and the 'warming-up' process.

Key Words: Hidden curriculum, psychological counseling students, student resistance, teacher education

Introduction

Student resistance to the schooling process has always been a problem for teachers and has become one of the most important subjects investigated by educational researchers. While critical theorists have tended to emphasize the benefits of student resistance to stratified and discriminatory curricula, traditional policy analysis has sought program designs to overcome resistance. Resistance to both the overt or official curriculum and against the covert or hidden curriculum has

been investigated (Margolis, 2001). The purpose of this research is to examine both the positive and negative effects of hidden curricula on student resistance in psychological counseling programs in Turkey. There are mainly two reasons for doing this research in Turkey. First, the research done about hidden curriculum and student resistance has principally been done in the USA and in the UK. Second, as a Turkish researcher, the author of the present study has a better grasp of Turkish culture than most non-Turkish scholars. For this reason, interpretations of students' behaviors that can be considered acts of resistance are arguably more likely to be accurate.

In this research, which tries to reveal the effects of hidden curriculum on students' resistance behaviours at a Turkish university, the literature about the hidden curriculum in higher education and the relationships between hidden curriculum and student resistance was reviewed. Next, the methods, the results of the research were explained. Lastly,

after summarizing the results of the research, the importance of students resistance, suggestions about it, and the limitations of this research are discussed.

Hidden Curriculum

Almost all studies conducted to date on hidden curricula – the researcher prefers the plural, 'hidden curricula', because these practices are neither unified nor singular - start from the recognition that two types of learning take place in schools. In the official curriculum, detailed content objectives and activities are specified. The fulfillment of these objectives is carefully measured via examinations, portfolios, grades and programs of study. Learning tends to be scaffolded and specific achievements are required to progress from year to year. On the other hand, the second type of curriculum, the hidden curriculum, is covert, in that no documents state with certainty and clarity what students are expected to learn. This element of learning has long been identified as 'socialization' (Margolis, 2001). Students must learn to display proper emotions, attitudes, values, habits, and social abilities in school. In short, the hidden curriculum includes knowledge, ideas, practices, and expectations, which are required for success in school but are not stated in the official curriculum.

The hidden curriculum has been defined as 'messages' that are not specifically stated, but that students are expected to learn (Jackson, 1968; McLaren, 1994); as unintended learning outcomes and messages (Martin, 1976; Gordon, 1982); and as activities created by the students based on the teachers' expectations (Snyder, 1971).

Jackson (1968) was first used to the term 'hidden curriculum' to explain his observations in K-12 public schools. Jackson coined this term to clarify the unofficial 3R's - rules, routines, regulations - that make up the life in classrooms. Dreeben (1968) has examined the function of hidden curricula. According to Dreeben, American schools reproduce four key norms for their students as part of their reproduction of democratic capitalism: independence, success, universalism, and specificity. The basic structures of 'the unofficial 3 R's were necessary to prepare children for social, economic, and political life outside school.

Even though the hidden curriculum is not directly mentioned in any Turkish literature regarding Turkish society and schools, writers who examine how students are conditioned to accept the government's ideologies, have a functionalist perspective regarding this issue. Accordingly, the official ideology of Turkey is Kemalism with its main aim being to enable Turkish society to reach the standards of contemporary western civilizations. Thus, official programs and activities are constructed according to this ideology. However, instead of this official ideology, students in Turkish schools are given hidden messages in line with conservative-nationalist and conservative-liberal ideologies. The government upholds these ideologies because they want to promulgate them throughout society. In order to do this, hidden messages are given to the students through activities and textbooks. Furthermore, an obedient attitude and behavior are supported to make them easily adopt these ideologies (Güven, 2000; İnal, 2004).

In the 1970s, Neo-Marxist writers, in order to widen the scope of the hidden curriculum, began to question the schooling process by critiquing relations between school practices and the social, political, and economic hierarchies they reproduced. According to their analyses, students are encouraged to be obedient and compliant, and sorted into their classes, by the hidden curricula of schools which inculcate beliefs, values, and norms that cannot be openly stated in the official curriculum (Apple, 1979; 1982b; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Anyon, 1980; Giroux, 1981a; 1983a).

The ideas of Neo-Marxist writers have also affected some Turkish researchers and writers. Even though these writers have not put forward as effective ideas as the Neo-Marxists in the US and Britain, they have carried out research which clearly illustrates the fact that Turkish schools reproduce the current inequalities in society. Hidden messages are given regarding gender division in textbooks (Helvacıoğlu, 1994; T.C. Başbakanlık, 2000) and due to the fact that it can be relatively common for teachers to have certain stereotypes concerning gender and gender division in class (Köse & Baç, 1999). It has also been determined that the performance levels of students at low socio-economic levels are generally low; they graduate from high schools with low marks and thus cannot enter universities (Köse, 2000/2001).

In the literature on hidden curriculum, resistance is an important topic of study. In particular, the resistance theorists reject the idea that students passively accept social inequalities and assert that students show resistance towards these inequalities in schools.

Student Resistance

As Margolis and his colleagues noted: 'Because culture is lived and produced, schools can not be understood simply as a place where students are instructed, organized and controlled by the interests of a dominant class. Students are not simply passive vessels but creatively act in ways that

often contradict expected norms and dispositions that pervade the schools' (Margolis et al. 2001:15). The term 'resistance' has been used to identify attitudes and social relations that spark its occurrence (Willis, 1977; Apple, 1979; Everhart, 1983; Giroux, 1983a; Alpert, 1991; Cusick, 1992; McFarland, 2001; 2004). Resistance behavior must be a conscious and intended rejection of the disciplines of school. Much deviant behavior is not intended or planned and occurs spontaneously (Erickson, 1984; McFarland, 2004). Resistance theorists seek the actual mechanisms of domination and resistance that take place within the school and more specifically in the classroom, by examining how students employ behavior to demonstrate various creative reactions to the school's hegemonic practices. Resistance theorists study conflict and antagonism in schools and draw attention to the resistance behavior of students (Willis, 1977; Fuller, 1982; Giroux, 1981a; 1981b; 1983a; 1983b; Apple, 1982a; Wexler, 1987; Mc Robbie, 1991; Mac Leod, 1995).

Much of the research on student resistance has been focused on lower class students' conflict with the prevalent school ideology of enforcing the dominant groups' norms and values. Students have been observed resisting dominant ideologies in schools that are perceived as unsuited for the lives of lower class students (Willis, 1977; Apple, 1979; Anyon, 1980; Fuller, 1982; Everhart, 1983; Giroux, 1983a; Erickson, 1984; 1987; Mc Robbie, 1991). Additionally, there are a few studies of student resistance in upper middle class schools (Alpert, 1991; Spaulding, 1995).

Students may adopt resistant behavior as a result of the teaching methods that the teachers employ, unclear expectations, authoritarian teaching practices, unsuitable mandatory classes, subjects being taught above the readiness of the students, feelings of inadequacy, or a personal dislike of the teacher. Students resist activities that they perceive as too hard, or too boring, or activities that they do not like (Brookfield, 1990; Alpert, 1991; Pauly, 1991; Cusick, 1992; Spaulding, 1995; Mc Fadden, 1995). However, not all student resistance should be perceived negatively. Although resistance might disturb class climate and harm both teachers and students, there might be positive aspects of student resistance. For example, student resistance can be a tool for students to struggle for identity, autonomy, and voice; it can produce cognitive and cultural change; and it can confront inequalities in power (Nacon, 2005)

Just as there are many different reasons for student resistance, there are also many different types of resistance behavior. In the literature, these types have been grouped in various ways (Chan & Treacy, 1996; Higginbotham, 1996),

but are most often categorized as active and passive (McLaren, 1994; McFarland, 2004). Passive resistance is tacit; students do not directly show their reactions; instead they generally complain about and criticize the teacher. In active resistance, students show their reactions clearly by challenging or rebelling against authority.

Hidden curricula in higher education

Theoretical publications and research on hidden curricula have mostly focused on students in primary and secondary schools. However, the concept is equally applicable for higher education. Hidden curricula in higher education are visible in the assumptions and values of teaching staff, the expectations of students, the social structures and informal rules of institutions of higher education, and the educational systems in which they are embedded. In order to be successful in higher education, one must demonstrate not only intellectual ability, but also adaptability to the hidden curriculum (Snyder 1971). In higher education the informal demands expected from students include showing a business-like and detached attitude with respect to the subjects of study, working with theoretical constructions, using professional jargon and abstract concepts, conquering uncertainty, anxiety and nervousness, and developing the desire to compete and win (Bergenhenegouven, 1987).

As with the research on hidden curriculum, research on student resistance has also been conducted mostly at the primary and secondary school levels. There have only been a few studies on higher education (Kearney, Plax, Smith & Sorensen, 1988; Burroughs, Kearney & Plax 1989; Kearney, Plax & Burroughs 1991; Margolis & Romero, 1998; Margolis, 2001; Gair, 2003). Additional research on student resistance at higher education levels needs to be done for two reasons: first, to contribute to the theoretical understanding of student resistance theory and hidden curricula, and second, to improve the completion rates of students whose resistance behavior contributes to their leaving school without obtaining a degree. Due to the fact that there are only a few studies of hidden curriculum and student resistance in higher education, and theoretical and empirical knowledge is a wide-open field, the following study was designed to contribute to our understanding at an undergraduate level.

Method

This research was aimed at finding an answer to the

question: 'do hidden curricula have an influence on the resistance behavior of undergraduate PCG students?' Findings are based on qualitative data. The context, the participants, and data sources have been described.

Context

The research was conducted at a Turkish University's Department of Psychological Counseling and Guidance (PCG) within the Faculty of Education. The study group was composed of senior undergraduate students. Throughout this paper, any references to the meaning of 'senior undergraduate students' will represent students in their final year of university. In Turkey, students must be successful in the 'Student Selection Examination (OSS)' in order to be admitted to any departments of higher education. Only approximately 20% of students who take the OSS examination pass (OSYM, 2004). Thus, the students of the PGC Department have already exhibited high levels of academic ability. To ensure admission, many students take courses from private institutions to prepare for the OSS, because high school curricula do not cover the content adequately. These private courses are prohibitively expensive for low-income parents. Thus students from middle and upper socio- economic backgrounds are generally more successful at OSS and consequently, PCG students typically come from middle or upper socio- economic class families.

The graduates of the PCG department are being trained to become counselors in primary and secondary schools. In Turkey, counselors are primarily teachers and are given the title 'guidance - teacher'. Hence, they have to take education and method courses. Even though all of their rights and salaries are the same as normal teachers', counselors do not go into classrooms and teach. It is a career that offers job security, unlike other departments in the Faculty of Education. The Ministry of Education appoints PCG students to schools around the country as soon as they graduate. Moreover private schools also employ graduates of the PCG Department.

Participants

The research subjects consisted of a class of undergraduate senior students at a Turkish University's Department of PCG in the Faculty of Education. Seniors were selected based on the assumption that a period of longer experience in the department may have made them more sensitive to the hidden curriculum and more likely to develop resistance behavior. Additionally, having more experience about teachers and

classes in the university, they have more courage to show resistance behaviors compared to the freshmen students at the university. Further, these seniors were interviewed subsequent to classes being over and immediately prior to graduation. This timing was chosen to lessen the affect of any concerns about faculty reaction. This class was observed in all their courses for 10 weeks. The class consisted of 12 upper socio-economic level (29.3%), 27 middle socio- economic level (65.8%), and only two low socio- economic level (4.9%) students. 31 participants were female (75.6%) and 10 were male (24.4%). As in most cultures, the teaching profession - including guidance teachers and counselors - is female dominated. Race and ethnicity, however, were not studied since Turkey has few immigrants from other countries.

As part of the next stage, 12 out of 41 students who were observed to be demonstrating active or passive resistance behavior were interviewed. These 12 students were informed that their identity would be protected in this study and voluntarily participated in interviews.

Data sources

The research being reported on comprised a case study investigating what Yin defines as: 'a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident... and relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion, and as another result' (Yin, 2003, pp. 13-14). Carrying out a case study was the most appropriate qualitative method with which to conduct this study since the effect of hidden curricula on student resistance behavior may not be universal. Further, this phenomenon will be investigated within the cultural context of Turkey which has not occurred before and there is good reason to believe that culture plays a large factor in the nature of student resistance. Perhaps of most importance, qualitative research is especially well suited for in-depth understandings that are discovery based in nature. Data was collected from three sources: (1) official documents, (2) observations, and (3) interviews.

Data collection procedures

Because questioning the students directly about their social status would be considered culturally inappropriate and because students would be unlikely to reveal their real socio-economic status, information about student demographic characteristics was obtained from the official documents

maintained by the Faculty of Education. The official records contained background information such as their parents' occupations and their places of origin, from which socio-economic status could then be deduced.

Classroom observation was the second data source. A form was created to make use of while observing classes. The form was designed to gather critical incidents into a narrative system of possible resistance behavior related to hidden curricula (Evertson & Green, 1986). That is, observations were made in a natural class climate and the observed resistance behaviors were recorded by taking into consideration the classroom settings in which those behaviors took place. Recording those behaviors using narratives helped the researcher analyze those resistance behaviors in a manner which is superior to checking predetermined behaviors on a checklist. On the other hand, recording student resistance behaviours by handwriting might have caused some minor resistance behaviors to be omitted. If it was possible to record class with a video camera without disturbing the natural class atmosphere, the researcher might have determined more resistance behaviors as the tape could have been replayed as necessary.

Before conducting the research, a pilot study had also been conducted on PCG senior undergraduates. In the pilot study's first phase, two double-major students were selected to conduct classroom observations. They were trained to recognize elements of the hidden curriculum and student resistance. Double-major students are those who wish to graduate with two separate degrees. In order to do this, their first year GPA has to be high and they must also take an entrance test for their second department of choice. Observations were conducted for eight weeks. Six students who showed active or passive resistance based on the observations were interviewed. The observation process of the pilot study went smoothly. However, when the observation forms were examined, it was determined that the observers had confused resistance behavior with more common undisciplined behavior. For this reason, the student-researchers were trained regarding the hidden curricula and student resistance for a total of nine hours. In this training, it was emphasized that resistance behaviors are conscious and planned behaviors and they can be grouped as either passive or active resistance. For example, jokes and complaints are considered passive resistance, whereas active resistance includes challenges and rebellions (McFarland, 2004).

Senior students in the department of PCG were observed for 10 weeks. Structured field observations were used throughout (Bailey, 1994). The researcher did not participate in observations in order not to affect classroom climate. As with the pilot study, two double-major students were employed to conduct observations because they had high grade point averages in their home departments and because they were familiar with the program and could function as participant observers. One student's home department was physical education and the other's was elementary education. They take PCG courses as their second field and receive degrees from both the departments. Because double major students start taking PCG courses during their second year, the students who conducted the observations had not developed close relationships with the majority of the PCG students. It was assumed therefore, that they would be objective and reliable in their observations.

These observers recorded their observations independently. After the observations, the researcher and observers compared forms. This check on inter-coder reliability revealed approximately 90% agreement between the two observation forms. The inter-coder reliability was calculated based on descriptions of students' resistance behavior by both codes. In our meeting, the categorization of resistance behavior by the two coders were compared and discussed. Overall, 19 students were identified as having either active or passive resistance behaviors. The coders agreed on their classifications of the resistance behavior nine out of 10 times. Students who displayed high frequencies of resistance were selected as informants for interviews. The coders mostly agreed when identifying the student resistance behavior. In a few cases, the coders had some disagreement in their categorizations as to whether certain behavior was active or passive. The difference between forms consisted generally of only one student who showed the most passive resistance, which is a difficult behavior pattern to observe directly. This issue was resolved with negotiation.

Upon analysis the observations were divided into six groups: active/successful, passive/successful, active/average, passive/average, active/unsuccessful, and passive/unsuccessful. This was explained to the observers; students who show active resistance directly react, challenge, and rebel. These students might quarrel with teachers. On the other hand, students who show passive resistance react indirectly; they complain and criticize the teacher. These students make jokes, mock, behave in a way that spoils the teachers' motivation, come late to the lessons or not even bother to attend. The performance levels of the students were determined by examining their transcripts. Up till now, students with an average GPA above 3.00 were deemed to be successful whereas between 2.00- 2.99, they were deemed average, and

Table 1. *Students who were interviewed with subsequent groups*

Sort of Resistance	Achievement Level	Student's Name*	Sex
Active	Successful	Sevim	Female
		Yasemin	Female
	Average	Sarper	Male
		Gokhan	Male
	Unsuccessful	Meryem	Female
		Taner	Male
Passive	Successful	Gorkem	Female
		Serpil	Female
	Average	Osman	Male
		Dilek	Female
	Unsuccessful	Iknur	Female
		Tulay	Female

Note. * Real student names are not used. All the names are aliases.

below 1.99, were unsuccessful. According to their success rate and resistance type, two students from each group, 12 students in all were selected to be interviewed (see Table.1). The active/successful group demonstrated active resistance and got high grades. The passive/successful group exhibited passive resistance but also got high grades. The active/ unsuccessful group showed active resistance but received low grades. The passive/unsuccessful group demonstrated passive resistance and also received low grades. The active/average group engaged in active resistance and received average grades. The passive/average group was coded for passive resistance and their grades were also average.

In the next phase, two students from each group were selected to participate in standardized interviews, with the total number of participants including eight females and four males. The interview questions were determined according to the result of observations. Although related literature was taken into consideration to determine the interview questions, the classroom observations were mainly used to structure interview questions since the international literature about hidden curriculum and student resistance cannot explain the academic and social climate at a Turkish university. The interview questions were:

1) Can you tell me about your background?

2) Can you describe for me the typical atmosphere in your class?

3) How are your relations with your instructors?

4) What methods and strategies do instructors generally use to teach in classes?

5) Do you speak out your own thoughts and ideas in classes?

6) Do instructors give homework? (If yes) Can you give examples?

7) Which of your courses do you like or dislike? Why?

8) What do you think about the formal curriculum of Psychological Counseling and Guidance, and the knowledge, which you have been presented in textbooks and instructors' lectures?

9) How does you behavior change according to the classroom climate and your instructors' behavior?

The goal of the interviews was to understand from the student's perspective the perceived curriculum – both overt and hidden –, and the nature of their resistance. Interview questions covered the students' perceptions of class climate, teacher practices in the classroom, their relationship with the instructor and their peers, course content presented by the instructors, textbooks, and behavior related to resistance. As stated earlier, the interviewees had finished their final exams and they were in the process of graduation. For this reason, it is assumed that they spoke frankly in the interviews. The interviews were conducted in Turkish as that is the native language of the students and the researcher. Interviews were taped and transcribed. The Turkish transcriptions of the interviews were translated in English by researcher which were subsequently checked by two academic staff in the department of English Language in the same university.

Analysis of data

Erickson's (1986) interpretive approach was employed to analyze the data. Erickson argues that conceptions of reality cannot be meaningfully separated from the social settings in which they occur. Individuals create meaning through their actions in social settings. Using a variety of data collection methods a researcher can reconstruct a limited understanding of information gathered by and from actors in the field. His or her perspective limits a researcher's understanding of the participants' actions. A researcher must consider the entire body of data collected from the field and look for key linkages among various items of data. Erickson offers techniques for generating assertions from data analysis and for establishing evident warrants for assertions. He advises that the data corpus be broad, and that the researcher should look to both confirm and find evidence. In accordance with

Erickson's techniques, assertions were made based on categories, and confirming and disconfirming evidence was sought. Member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) – effectively included participants in research – was also employed. As a researcher performs an observation or an interview, he or she must restate, summarize, and rephrase what subjects are saying to see if it can be understood. After the researcher has collected and analyzed his first round of data, he or she can then employ member checking in order to ask respondents or other members of the same group if the researcher's preliminary findings seem correct. The researcher then gives members a chance to make additional comments and incorporate these comments to add complexity to the researcher's final analysis. In this research, participants worked with the researcher to modify and revise their assertions. In other words, the meanings derived from these assertions were negotiated with participants.

Results

The findings were analyzed and classified in seven categories. These categories are: (a) classroom setting, (b) faculty stance to creative thoughts and ideas, (c) gender divisions, (d) ideological and worldview divisions, (e) biases about academic and professional courses, (f) exams that are appropriate to "banking system", and (g) not giving enough guidance about scientific research.

Classroom setting

The 41 students who participated in this research had enrolled for PCG during fall 2002. The physical environments of the classrooms were small and technologically inadequate. Courses were teacher centered. Lecturing was the main teaching method; instructors and textbooks were the only sources of information. Students were expected to study the weekly readings and commit much of it to memory. Instructors seldom used an overhead projector. Students passively listened to the instructors and took notes. Instructors occasionally asked open-ended questions after lecturing. Student achievement was assessed by midterm and final exams.

Faculty stance to creative thoughts and ideas

Although the formal curriculum claimed to develop creative thought, data analysis revealed that students were seldom encouraged to discuss their opinions or offer original

thoughts during class. Most educators advocate encouraging students to participate actively and discuss their thoughts for constructive learning to take place (e.g. Davies, 1981; Gage & Berliner, 1984; McKeachie, 1986). However, in the interviews, all the students, active and passive learners alike, mentioned that the classes were mostly teacher-centered. Although the lecturers sometimes tried to involve students in the class by asking questions, the instructors seemed to pick students who would confirm the instructors' thoughts. As an example, two male students commented:

> Osman: The students who talked the way that the instructors like are credited with words such as 'excellent' and 'good job' by the instructor in the classroom. These students always got higher achievement scores in their exams.

> Sarper: In discussions, I generally express my own thoughts. But there have been times when I have been criticized or silenced for expressing an argument contrary to that of the instructor.

Statements like this suggest that the instructor's ideas were to be accepted as truth, there was little or no space for critical thinking or argument. Students who reproduced the teachers' perspective were supported and encouraged in class discussion. When the students were asked how they reacted to instructors who were not open to opposing thoughts, they stated that they got bored, and, did not pay attention. They simply wrote down what the instructor said during the lecture and tried to figure out what was likely to be asked in the exam. Even when the students were resistant to certain ideas, they often simply parroted the instructor's thoughts. For example, a female student, Dilek described her strategy:

> I talk bearing the instructor's thoughts in mind. For example, if the lecturer is talking in favor of existentialism, I also bring my thoughts in favor of existentialism.

This student's behavior indicated that she was aware of the perils hidden in the delivered curriculum, and knew that she would be rewarded if she expressed thoughts that were compatible with the instructors' ideas. Because clear and obvious resistance to the teaching staff is likely to result in punishment, students prefer to resist passively. This finding is the same as the results of studies conducted by Burroughs, Kearney & Plax (1989) and Kearney, Plax & Burroughs

(1991).

Gender divisions

The most impressive findings was that instructors discriminate against male students in class. In much of the educational literature, especially feminist studies on gender discrimination in higher education, females generally have been victims of unequal treatment by male teachers (e.g. Hall & Sandler, 1982; Sadker & Sadker 1986; Constantinople, Cornelius & Gray 1988; Cornelius, Gray & Constantinople, 1990; Sadker & Sadker, 1994). In these studies, teachers' expectations for males were higher than for females, and males were more likely to be encouraged in activities and discussions. However, during the observations, the males were more likely to be victims of discrimination. The observers noted that female students were more likely to be called upon and to agree with the instructors. Moreover in the interviews three males accused instructors of discrimination against them and favoring female students.

Gokhan: When the instructors start a discussion in the class, they always initially recognize that the girls have priority as speakers. In turn, the girls become more dominant in class discussions. Thus, the instructors think that the girls are more active in class discussions. I believe that they are also biased when grading our papers.

Sarper, another male student had a more moderate opinion about gender divisions:

I think the instructors behave more tolerantly towards girls. I guess that girls are more suitable for guidance and counseling professions than boys. People in this profession should be easy going and flexible. I think that the girls have those typical characteristics which make them more successful in their jobs. I believe that the instructors agree with me about this. However, this reason can not explain their unfair behavior towards us.

When female students were asked for their opinions, they generally did not deny the existence of gender division in the class. For example, Serpil "blamed the victims":

Unfortunately, division exists in the class. But I do not complain about that, because it's the boys' inappropriate behavior that has caused this division. They do not

study and are undisciplined. Moreover, some boys make fun of our ideas.

In the interview, three male students resisted gender discrimination by adopting a stance of passive resistance. They withdrew and refused to listen in class or participate in class discussions. For example, one male student, Taner, said:

I simply do not listen to the classes. I sometimes do not come to school. I do not participate in the class discussions.

Also, a female student, Serpil, commented that:

The boys generally dislike me because I participate in discussions. They even derisively say 'Shut up'. The more you say the higher marks you get.

Despite a few opposing perceptions, instructors were generally perceived to be favoring females over males. This discrimination is caused by the fact that male students show resistance. This resistance is generally passive.

Ideological and worldview divisions

In this study, all the participants claimed that instructors also treated them unequally in respect to their ideologies or worldviews. Problems arose when instructors' political ideologies and worldviews conflicted with those of the students. From the students' perspective, instructors negatively viewed students whose political views were from the opposite side of the political continuum. Another source of conflict was youth culture versus more traditional expectations about dress and hairstyles. This problem was stressed by eight students in the interviews. For example a female student, Tulay, complained about the unwritten dress code:

I usually wore miniskirts during my first year undergraduate study. But, I felt that it was deemed inappropriate by instructors. So, I gave up wearing these kinds of clothes.

Osman, a male, faced a similar dilemma:

I hate shaving. But I continually have to shave my beard because of my fear of some instructors' reactions.

Bergenhenegouwen (1987) indicated, 'the hidden curriculum

in university can be described as the whole of informal and implicit demands of study and study achievements that are to be met for someone to complete units of study' (p.536). Students have to accept institutions' and instructors' informal and implicit demands for academic success. One of the instructors' demands had to do with dress and facial hair and could be viewed as culturally symbolic. In the Turkish cultural context, dress and facial hair are seen to symbolize certain ideological positions and worldviews. For example, those female students who wear short skirts and put on makeup are considered more liberal, whereas female students who wear long skirts and do not put on any makeup are considered more conservative. Those male students having beards are considered more conservative, and male students who wear ear rings and have long hair are considered more liberal. Both of the above quotations suggest that instructors play significant roles in determining students' dress and body image regardless of gender; students hide their preferences for the sake of academic success. It seems that instructors convey these messages of disapproval subtly and implicitly. For example a female student, Gorkem, carefully explained:

> Instructors do not directly criticize our political views. But their looks sometimes bother me. They generally react to students indirectly. However, when the students talk about their political views and when those views conflict with instructors' views, some strong arguments can arise. Some instructors also do not give permission to these students to participate in class discussions. I also think that they evaluate those students' exam papers more harshly. For example, I actually can not pass some courses if my political views are different from that of many of my instructors. But, my exam papers are good enough to pass. They can not make me fail.

Political conflicts were also part of the classroom culture. Students were aware of the necessity to follow the rules of the hidden curriculum to achieve academic success. However, some students continued to display active or passive resistance even when their academic success or grades were at risk. In the interviews, two students reported such a situation. Clearly this aspect of the curriculum was not well hidden from the students. They were aware of it.

> Taner: I clearly state my thoughts and political opinion in class. I sometimes suffer for my behavior. I clearly resist against instructors who interfere with me. I do not

give up struggling with instructors. I express my opinions even if they are opposite to the instructors' opinion.

In the interviews, 10 students reported that they had avoided conflict with the instructors. They often avoided expressing their real views on any issues, instead presenting ideas that they believed the instructor wanted to hear. Clearly, these students hide their resistance because of fears for their future. For example, a female student, Yasemin explained:

> I am just a student and graduating from the department is a higher priority for me. For this reason, I do not want to have any conflict with the instructors. I keep my dress and hairstyles fairly simple. I keep my ideas to myself and do not state them in class.

Clearly, many students hide their resistance because they fear for their future. Most students avoided conflict with the instructor and accepted hidden curriculum. But some students were resistant. The majority of student resistance was passive, a few instances of active resistance were observed.

Biases about academic and professional courses

Another impressive finding from this research was that although counseling, guidance, and professional teaching courses were taught as central parts of the formal curriculum, the instructors gave more importance to psychology topics of a higher academic nature. Counseling and guidance requires only enough knowledge of psychology to solve the problems of ordinary students through guidance. Therefore, they do not need a deep knowledge of psychology in this field. In all of the interviews students explained that academic psychology content were emphasized more than subjects related to counseling, guidance or teacher education. In the interviews, all students complained that instructors emphasize psychology topics with more enthusiasm, making students feel that these topics were more important than counseling and guidance knowledge. As one student put it:

> Sevim: In our classes, we are learning psychology subjects to a depth that we will not need when we eventually work as counselors. Counselors cannot treat them legally since counselors only have a limited knowledge base on treatment issues. But, in the classes, students are taught how to treat hyperactivity; even the medicines used to treat some psychological disorders are taught.

When the students were asked which lessons they liked most, almost all of them stated that they loved academic psychology-related classes. Four students even mentioned that they wanted to be psychologists, although their program has not been designed to make them eligible for that job:

> Dilek: Psychology is a vast field. On the other hand, psychological counseling and guidance is limited. In psychology classes I always come across subjects that are new to me, and that attract my interest. So, I wish I could be a psychologist instead of working as a counselor, which has a very 'shallow' field of study.

Despite their dreams, PGC graduates will work in schools, and will offer PGC services primarily to parents, students, and teachers. Thus it is essential for the counselors to learn and practice their skills in the teaching - learning process and the operation of the educational system. All students argued that they were not informed well enough about the education system, the teaching profession and educational issues both in Turkey and globally. Curiously, the students with these complaints also noted that they do not consider these classes to be as important as academic psychology courses that are mainly applicable to the immediate concerns of their field. Gorkem who resisted passively and was one of the most successful students of the class put it this way:

> I feel that I know a little about the educational problems of Turkey and general classroom problems. But in the class, few people including myself have a problem with this deficiency.
> Clearly Gorkem was not satisfied with the content of her teaching and learning courses, which were deemed to be significant and important. Sevim described the resistance in her class towards the formal curriculum:
> We do not participate in discussions during the class period, when the instructor starts to talk about pedagogy. So, these classes continue without any participation in the discussions. Usually, our instructors lecture, while we only take notes.

The students stated repeatedly that they receive more information about academic psychology and this consequently resulted in them developing negative attitudes toward counseling-psychology, guidance, and teaching method courses. Furthermore, students showed less resistance towards instructors who focused more on psychology per se, because they believe that counseling and psychological guidance courses are very repetitive. Apparently they get bored and exhibit passive resistance such as criticizing the instructor, not listening to the lesson, being late to the lesson, and not paying attention. The reason for the students' negative behavior seems to be that teaching and counseling psychology and guidance courses are perceived as low status fields while academic psychology is seen as high status knowledge.

This situation is reminiscent of Clark's (1960) concept of the 'cooling- out function in higher education' – except in reverse. The cooling- out function provides under performing students with an alternative status, which is less attractive than the status that has been lost. In the cooling- out process, the student does not fail, unless he or she wishes to define it so, but instead transfers to some more immediate terminal degree. However, academic psychology (to be a psychologist) is more prestigious than teaching, counseling, or psychological guidance (to be a counselor) in Turkey. Therefore, in this study, we observed a 'warming up process'. The instructors seem to be raising students' expectations by giving them an appetite for academic psychology. As a result, the students develop aspirations to become psychologists. However, crucially, PCG students cannot become psychologists according to Turkish law. Although both the instructors and the students in PCG are aware this, the students are 'warmed up' to academic psychology by their instructors, who generally graduated from departments of psychology.

Another explanation for the students' negative attitudes towards counseling- psychological guidance and teaching method courses may be Bourdieu's (1977) concept of 'symbolic violence'. Symbolic violence is defined as a process of gradual and subtle manipulation towards dominant cultural interest. All pedagogic actions and instructional practices are symbolically violent insofar as they impose a system of cultural meanings in the context of 'arbitrary' or natural power relation (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). That is, when instructors exert a taken-for-granted power over socialization practices it is construed as 'violence'. In this study, the instructors subtly inculcated the idea that a career in psychology is more prestigious than becoming a school counselor. By respecting the instructors' messages without resistance students accepted that academic psychology courses were more important and consequently, enjoyed them more.

Exams that are appropriate to a "banking system"

Students in Turkey often do not study to learn; they

study to get high marks on their exams. Regardless of their achievement level, all students reported studying just to pass the exam. The instructors' teaching methods lead students to focus only on getting things right. All students recognized that the exam questions were designed to assess whether they had memorized certain facts or could repeat the ideas that their instructors advocate. For example a student, Serpil:

> In order to be successful, it is necessary to write down exactly what the instructor tells the class and to memorize it. I can not get a high mark if I answer questions in my own way by expressing my own thoughts.

This is a very clear statement of what Paulo Freire (1970) termed the 'banking system' of education:
Narration (with the teacher as narrator) leads the students to memorize mechanically the narrated content. Worse yet, it turns them into "containers," into "receptacles" to be "filled" by the teacher. The more completely he fills the receptacles, the better a teacher he is. The more meekly the receptacles permit themselves to be filled, the better students they are.
Education thus becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor. Instead of communicating, the teacher issues communiqués and makes deposits, which the students patiently receive, memorize, and repeat. This is the "banking' concept of education, in which the scope of action allowed to the students extends only as far as receiving, filing and storing the deposits (Freire 1970: 58)

As with Freire's 'banking system', instructors construct exams that require students to write down exactly what they were told in lectures or told to read in their texts. According to the students, when they included their own thoughts in papers or exams they received low marks. Clearly exam questions were not designed to develop critical and creative thinking.

Not giving enough guidance about scientific research

Scientific research is generally a prominent characteristic of higher education. Students are encouraged to conduct research, and PCG is taught in the light of current university research. Students in the PCG department explained that the instructors encouraged them to conduct research, but they did not give enough guidance. Furthermore, all students claimed

that their instructors sometimes assigned grades without checking their papers in detail. For example, Ilknur described the following problem:

> We are encouraged to do research in our classes. In almost every course, small research projects are assigned as term papers. But we usually do not get any help or feedback from our instructors. None of the instructors have given our term papers back. I do not know what I did right or wrong. Also, I am not sure about the criteria our instructors use when evaluating our papers to assign grades. I think the instructors do not even read our term papers. They give marks based on how the homework looks rather than what its content is. I do not believe this is fair for those students who put a lot of time and effort into the preparation of their papers.

It appears that although the instructors encourage their students to do research, they do not help them to conduct it or provide feedback to improve their learning. The students notice that the instructors do not care about the quality of their research. When the students were asked how they dealt with this, they told us that they prepared their homework to look beautiful but put little emphasis on content. Instead they submitted many computer-decorated pages, and often plagiarized blatantly from various sources.

Conclusion

The goal of this research was to investigate the effect of hidden curriculum on student resistance in an undergraduate PCG. The results of this research indicated that students demonstrate resistance to both the hidden and delivered curricula. The Department of PCG has a delivered curriculum that is considerably different from the formal curriculum. While the students accept and obey some dimensions of the delivered and hidden curriculum, they resist other dimensions of the delivered curriculum, while appearing to accept the more hidden aspects. The devaluing of counseling psychology and teacher education, in the face of high status disciplines such as academic psychology is accepted uncritically, and hints at the true power of a 'hidden' curriculum to avoid provoking resistance.

The findings appear to show that the class climate is not democratic enough. The reasons for that probably come from Turkish culture. In a traditional culture, instructors, like

parents, are considered to be the source of true knowledge and they should be respected. Since instructors are seen as authoritative and respected by Turkish society and students, students cannot easily show active resistance.

How can the student resistance resulting from delivered and hidden curricula be reduced or remedied? Clearly some forms of resistance are rational forms of behavior that can only be reduced by substantive change in the institution and its pedagogical practices. School and classroom settings should be comfortable for the students. Instructors should actually encourage critical thought and treat students' resistance behavior as necessary feedback. That is, they should listen to what the students are telling them. (Burroughs, Kearney & Plax, 1989; Lindquist, 1994).

Finally, it is important to acknowledge the strengths and weaknesses of this study. The strengths are as follows: the use of a case study was selected as the main research method in order to increase the validity and reliability, and to generate an in-depth picture of the phenomena. Data sources include official documents, observations made by two double majored students, and interviews that were completed just before graduation of the participants. Use of these multiple strategies increases confidence in the credibility and reasonableness of the results. In regards to weaknesses, although the topic of this research is very comprehensive, this research is limited to PCG at a university in Turkey. This limitation should be taken into consideration by other researchers. Additionally, longitudinal research that will last four years might illustrate better the phases of the development of students' resistance towards the hidden curriculum. Lastly, not using a quantitatively based methodology limits attributions of causality and direct comparison to research done on this topic in different countries.

References

Alpert, B. (1991). Students' resistance in the classroom. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 22, 350-366.

Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. *Journal of Education*, 162, 67-92

Apple, M. W. (1979). *Ideology and curriculum.* London: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (1982a). *Education and power.* Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Apple, M. W. (1982b). *Cultural and economic reproduction in education: essays on class, ideology and the state.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bailey, K. D. (1987). *Methods of social research.* (3rd ed). New York: The Free Press.

Bergenhenegouven, G. (1987). Hidden curriculum in university. *Higher Education,* 16, 535-543

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (Translated by R. Nice). London: Sage Publications

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America.* New York: Basic Books.

Brookfield, S. D. (1990). *The skillful teacher.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Burroughs, S. D., Kearney, P. & Plax, T. G. (1989). Compliance-resistance in the college students. *Communication Education*, 38, 214-229.

Chan, C. & Treacy, M. J. (1996). Resistance in multicultural courses. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40, 212-221.

Clark, B. R. (1960). The cooling- out function in higher education. *American Journal of Sociology,* 65, 569-576.

Constantinople, A., Cornelius, R. & Gray, J. (1988). The chilly climate: fact or artifact? *Journal of Higher Education*, 59, 527-550.

Cornelius, R., Gray, J. & Constantinople, A. (1990). Student-Faculty interaction in the college classroom. *Journal of Research and Development in Education,* 23, 189-197

Cusick, P. (1992). *The educational system: it's nature and logic.* New York: Basic Books.

Dreeben, R. (1968). *On what is learned in schools.* Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Erickson, F. (1984). School literacy, reasoning, and civility: an anthropologist's perspective. *Review of Educational Research*, 54, 542-546.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan

Erickson, F. (1987). Transformation and school success: the politics and culture of educational achievement. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18, 335-358.

Everhart, R. B. (1983). *Reading, writing and resistance: adolescence and labor in a junior high school.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Evertson, C. M. & Green, J. L. (1986). Observation as inquiry and method. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 162-213). New York: Macmillan

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of oppressed.* (Translated by M. B. Ramos). New York: Seabury Press.

Fuller, M. (1982). Young, female and black. In E. Cashmore

& B. Troyna. (Eds) *Black youth in crisis.* (pp. 87-99). London: George Allen & Unwin.

Gage, N. L. and Berliner, D. C. (1984). *Educational psychology,* (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Gair, M. (2003). Socrates never took attendance: hidden curricula in a teacher preparation program. (Arizona State University Tempe, AZ: Unpublished phd thesis).

Giroux, H. A. (1981a). *Ideology, culture and the process of schooling.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Giroux, H. A. (1981b). Hegemony, resistance and the paradox of educational reform. *Interchange*, 12, 3-26.

Giroux, H. A. (1983a). *Theory and resistance in education. a pedagogy for the opposition.* South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H. A. (1983b). Theories of reproduction and resistance in the new sociology of education. a critical analysis. *Harvard Educational Review*, 53, 257-293.

Gordon, D. (1982). The concept of the hidden curriculum. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 16, 187- 198.

Güven, İ. (2000). *Türkiye'de devlet, eğitim ve ideoloji (The state, education, and ideology in Turkey).* Ankara: Siyasal.

Hall, R. M. & Sandler, B. R. (1982). *The classroom climate: a chilly one for women?* Washington, D.C.: Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges

Helvacioğlu, F. (1994). 1928'den 1994'e ders kitaplarında cinsiyetçilik (Gender discrimination in textbooks from 1928 to 1994) (İstanbul Üniversitesi Istanbul, Turkey: Unpublished master's thesis).

Higginbotham, E. (1996). Getting all students to listen. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 40, 203-211.

İnal, K. (2004). *Eğitim ve iktidar: Türkiye 'de ders kitaplarında demokratik ve milliyetçi değerler (Education and government: democratic and nationalist values in Turkish textbooks).* Ankara: Ütopya.

Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G. & Burroughs, N. F. (1991). An attributional analysis of college students' resistance decisions. *Communication Education*, 37, 54-67.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Smith, V. R. & Sorensen, G. (1988). Effects of teacher immediacy and strategy type on college student resistance to on-task demands. *Communication Education*, 40, 325-342.

Köse, M. R. (2000/ 2001). Gender, branch and father's occupational-status-based variations in school performance, verbal and numerical abilities of high school seniors in

Ankara. *Boğaziçi University Journal of Education* 18, 49-67

Köse, M. R. & Baç, G. (1999). Gender- based expectations, perceptions and attitudes of Turkish Teachers toward their male and female students. *Eğitim ve Bilim* 23, 22-30

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). Establishing trustworthiness. In Y. S. Lincoln & E. G. Guba (Eds.) *Naturalistic inquiry* (pp. 289- 331). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lindquist, B. (1994). Beyond student resistance: a pedagogy of possibility. *Teaching Education*, 6, 1-8.

Mac Leod, J. (1995). *Ain't no makin' it: aspirations and attainment in a low-income neighborhood.* Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Margolis, E. (Ed) (2001). *The hidden curriculum in higher education.* New York: Routledge.

Margolis, E. & Romero, M. (1998). The department is very male, very white, very old, and very conservative: the functioning of the hidden curriculum in graduate sociology departments. *Harvard Educational Review*, 68, 1-32.

Margolis, E.; Soldatenko, E. M. Acker, S. & Gair, M. (2001). Peekaboo: hiding and outing the curriculum In E. Margolis (Ed) *The hidden curriculum in higher education.* (pp. 1-19). New York: Routledge

Martin, J. R. (1976). What should we do with a hidden curriculum when we find one? *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6, 135-151.

McFadden, M. (1995). Resistance to schooling and educational outcomes: questions of structure and agency. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 16, 293-308

McFarland, D. A. (2001). Student resistance: how the formal and informal organizations of classrooms facilitate everyday forms of student defiance. *American Journal of Sociology.* 107, 612- 678.

McFarland, D. A. (2004). Resistance as a social drama: a study of change- oriented encounters. *American Journal of Sociology.* 109, 1249- 1318.

McKeachie, W. J. (1986). *Teaching tips: a guide book for the beginning college teacher.* (8th Ed.). Lexington, Mass: D. C. Heath & Company.

McLaren, P. (1994). *Life in schools: an introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education.* (2nd ed.) New York: Longman.

McRobbie, A. (1991). *Feminism and youth culture: from "jackie" to "just seventeen".* Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Nacon, H. (2005) Productive resistance: lessons from after school about engaged noncompliance. *American Journal*

of Education, 111, 191-210

Öğrenci Seçme ve Yerleştirme Merkezi (Student Selection and Placement Center) (OSYM) (2004). 2004 student selection and placement examination results. Retrieved September, 13, 2004, from http://www.osym.gov.tr/BelgeGoster.aspx?DIL=1&BELGEBAGLANTIANA=1341

Pauly, E. (1991). *The classroom crucible: what really works, what doesn't, and why* New York: Basic Books.

Sadker, M. & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness: how America's schools cheat girls*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Sadker, D. & Sadker, M. (1986). Sexism in the classroom: from grade school to graduate school. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 67, 512-515

Spaulding, A. (1995, April). *A qualitative case study of teacher-student micropolitical interaction: the strategies, goals and consequences of student resistance.* Paper presented to the annual meeting of The American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, USA.

Snyder, B. R. (1971). *The hidden curriculum.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

TC Başbakanlik (Office of the Prime Minister of Turkey) (2000). *Ders kitaplarında cinsiyetçilik. (Gender discrimination in textbooks).* Ankara.

Wexler, P. (1987). *Social analysis of education: after the new sociology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labour: how working class kids get working class jobs.* Farnborough, Eng.: Saxon House.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research. design and methods*. (3rd Ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.