

Doing School Time: The Hidden Curriculum Goes to Prison

José García and Noah De Lissovoy

University of Texas at Austin, Texas, USA

Abstract

The hidden curriculum is generally understood as the process by which daily exposure to school expectations and routines transmits norms and values of the dominant society to students. In the present, through the regimentation of thought, control of bodies and movement, and proliferation of punishment, contemporary accountability and testing produces the subjective conditions of precarious and servile wage work, as well as social marginalization more generally. Furthermore, we show that the schools, through the development of pervasive pedagogical and disciplinary techniques of control, become locations, like prisons, in which domination is expressed through the appropriation of time. Building from Michael Hardt's (1999) notion of "prison time," we reinterpret these processes in the educational context as "school time." We argue that in the present the hidden curriculum no longer simply prepares students for work. Through both teaching and disciplinary practices it strives as well to injure and demoralize students by restructuring the school day as a sequence of low-intensity pedagogical assaults. In this way, the hidden curriculum anticipates the conditions of domination and abjection that students will encounter not only in the workplace or in prison proper, but also in social life generally.

Key Words: critical theory; hidden curriculum; neoliberalism; precarity; punishment

In his seminal work on the struggle over the purposes of curriculum, Kliebard (2004) argues that the curriculum functions to reproduce the social status quo through informal and explicit processes of socialization. The school curriculum at any given point in time and place is marked by the cultural, political, and economic structure of that particular society. Education has been oriented primarily toward preparing students for the adult vocations needed for society to continue to exist (Dewey, 1944/1997). The hidden curriculum, as the process of inculcating dominant norms, values, and dispositions in students through the everyday

interactions and expectations that organize the ongoing experience of school crucially acts to assure the ideological reproduction of society (Apple 2004). The hidden curriculum is the process of socialization by which youth are prepared, in subjective terms, to enter the workforce of capitalism. In other words, the hidden curriculum, as ideological process, secures the reproduction of the conditions of production (Althusser 1971).

Capitalism in its current stage is marked by structural changes in the process of production along with the rise of a global neoliberal political order. This stage is characterized by the transition to a post-Fordist process of production along with the rise of a neoliberal political project to re-establish the conditions for capital accumulation and to restore the power of economic elites through the crafting of specific political and ideological structures and understandings (Harvey 2005; Wacquant 2012). The school, as an institution within the state, serves to produce the subjects that are required for the novel social conditions of the neoliberal era. The workforce necessary for contemporary conditions of production, characterized by deep instability and pervasive control, is different from the one described by curriculum theorists such as Kliebard and Apple. What sort of subject are the schools of late capitalism in its current formation producing, and what modalities of power operate to produce that subject? This paper explores the reconfiguration of the hidden curriculum in the schools of late capitalism, and its expression in processes of pedagogy, punishment, and surveillance in the context of the accountability regime.

We first develop a theoretical framework which links the conceptual tradition that has investigated the hidden curriculum to contemporary analyses of the precarious conditions of production in the present, as well as of the carceral turn within neoliberalism. Building from Michael Hardt's notion of "prison time," we propose a notion of *school time* which links preparation and demoralization, as the subjectivity of students is organized as much for exclusion as for incorporation into familiar spaces of labor and citizenship. We then apply this framework to a consideration of concrete practices of teaching in the context of accountability, showing that the pervasive control and "speed-up" of pedagogy in schools serving low-income students and students of color lays the groundwork for an orientation of servility in relationship to authority and a condition of precarity in relation to work. It is not only pedagogy proper that organizes—and decomposes—subjectivities, but also processes of punishment and surveillance, and our next section considers how these processes work to injure and demoralize students in addition to disciplining them. Furthermore, we argue that

punishment and pedagogy mutually produce each other in contemporary schools, such that punishment operates as a crucial moment of the hidden curriculum, while teaching under the testing regime becomes its own form of punishment. We should note that in deploying the notion of prison time, this study does not aim to show that schools are simply preparing students for incarceration, but rather that the spaces of school, work, and prison are increasingly continuous, sharing the same modes of regulation and kinds of temporality; within this nexus, we investigate the space of school in particular for the light it sheds on the broader turn to punishment and precarity in neoliberalism.

Reconsidering the Hidden Curriculum under Neoliberalism

Education theory explains that the schools, in part, serve to train young people to meet the requirements of specific socioeconomic and political formations as dictated by dominant groups. In his work on classroom life, Jackson (1968) identified the psychological effects on children of being immersed in the classroom over a period of years. He argued that children must be learning something from simply setting foot in a school, for they know, from extended exposure, the functions of any classroom. The hidden curriculum is essentially the process of socialization that takes place in the school as students are exposed to the routines and rituals that structure classroom culture. Michael Apple (2004) describes the hidden curriculum as “the teaching of norms, values, and dispositions that goes on simply by [students] living in and coping with the institutional expectations and routines of schools day in and day out for a number of years” (p. 13). In a capitalist society, the schools serve to teach the norms, values, and dispositions of this particular socioeconomic and political formation. These norms are eventually carried beyond the walls of the school once students enter other institutions of life and work. This framework remains indispensable; nevertheless, the hidden curriculum in the schools of late capitalism needs to be reconsidered in light of changes in the processes of production and accumulation. In this section, we set out a framework for our inquiry by describing the structure of this hidden curriculum and its relationship to changes in dominant forms of economic and social production.

The Hidden Curriculum in Context

In *Schooling in Capitalist America*, Bowles and Gintis (1976/2011) propose that the schools, through the overt and hidden curriculum, reproduce the social relationships necessary for capitalism to continue to exist. They suggest that employers are interested in hiring workers

with the same sets of cognitive and non-cognitive skills valued by the schools. Bowles and Gintis assert that capitalist production is a social rather than a technical process. It requires workers with specific forms of consciousness, behavior, and personalities to ensure its persistence and reproduction. The essential characteristics of the social relationships that define this system are taught and learned in the schools. Whereas Jackson (1968) proposed that skills learned in the classroom such as attentive listening, patience, and punctuality allowed for the classroom to continue to function, Bowles and Gintis (1976) suggest that these same skills are actually what allows for the reproduction of social relationships necessary for capitalism to continue to exist. Similarly, Anyon (1980) observed differences in learning tasks and curriculum in five socioeconomically different elementary schools. She concluded that through the types of learning tasks predominant in each school, students develop specific relationships to capital. In the case of working class students, they are not only prepared for mechanical and repetitive wage work but also to resist in ways that are akin to factory sabotages and slowdowns, which according to Anyon, turn out to be limited in their effectiveness.

Concretely, the hidden curriculum has been shown to work in schools through systems of tracking (Oakes 1985), through forms of pedagogical engagement (Giroux 1992), through processes of cultural assimilation that organize interactions between students and counselors and administrators (Valenzuela 1999), and through the labeling of students as learning disabled or variously “at-risk” (Artiles & Trent 1994), among other processes. All of these structures and encounters in schools, considered as moments of the hidden curriculum, work to construct student subjectivity in the context of broader sociopolitical relations of production and reproduction. Traditionally, these processes are thought to accustom students to a relationship of alienation and subordination to authority that anticipates the relationships they will later form with supervisors and with other institutional figures of authority, and to prepare them to accept the discipline that will characterize their adult lives as members of a racially segmented working class.

Implicit in this conceptualization is the notion of historicity: that particular forms of subjectivity are related to and produced out of determinate relationships characterizing society in a given historical moment. For this reason, we should be prepared to reconsider the hidden curriculum as these historical relations of social production are transformed. Capitalist production has experienced a passage from Fordism to post-Fordism—that is, from planned

production to market-driven production (Marazzi 2011). A post-Fordist regime of production and accumulation requires a labor force that is flexible, mobile, and precarious. In other words, the labor force has to be highly adaptable to constant innovations in production and willing to move frequently between jobs, and it must understand that stable long-term employment is not guaranteed; this regime also requires specialized and small-scale systems of production. Post-Fordism is characterized by the merging of communication processes with production, of “communicative” with “instrumental” activity, which means the workforce has to have a high level of flexibility and adaptability to constant changes in the rhythms of production based on flows of information (Marazzi 2011). This form of production requires a set of norms, values, and beliefs that is different from those that the school structured under a Fordist system of production taught through the hidden curriculum. Marazzi argues that in this new way of working, participants in the workforce have to show devotion and obedience under threat of losing their jobs; the “servility” of productive labor has increased. In this context, through the hidden curriculum, the schools must discipline students to accept the conditions of servile wage work.

Alongside changes in the process of production, elites launched a neoliberal political project to re-establish the conditions for capital accumulation. The ideology of neoliberalism foregrounds discourses of efficiency, consumerism, choice, and accountability in place of senses of collective responsibility. Spheres of social activity organized on the basis of notions of the public good or social solidarity are branded as inefficient from this perspective, and neoliberalism demands that they be reorganized according to the bottom-line logic of the market (Klein 2007). The school has been one of the crucial sites of the broad neoliberalization of society (Hursh 2005; Saltman 2005). Thus, under the accountability movement, schools, teachers, and students that are labeled as failing can be punished at will by the state, a punishment that is then rationalized as serving the public good. In this context, everything from district policies to daily classroom procedures are shaped by the mechanism of neoliberal discipline, which is the standardized test (Au 2007; McNeil 2000). Thus, in the everyday experiences of the classroom, which are structured around the apparatus of the standardized test and the disciplinary regimes that accompany it, the material ground for the type of subject needed for the neoliberal political project to take root can be found.

Furthermore, we contend that in the current post-Fordist and neoliberal stage of capitalism, the hidden curriculum of the schools has shifted in focus. In the present, the hidden

curriculum in the schools has been reoriented toward the ideological reproduction of the conditions of servility that characterize contemporary conditions of labor. Through the appropriation of school time, standardization of information, regimentation of thought, and control and punishment of bodies, the accountability regime assures the reproduction of carceral social relations. The schools, with the adoption and development of techniques of control that seek at all costs to “maximize learning time” become locations, like prisons, where domination becomes visible. A number of scholars have documented the coarsening of educational discipline in recent years, whether considered as a process of punishment (Dohrn 2001), of class-racial stratification (Lipman 2004), or as the expression of a biopolitical ordering of the space of schools (Lewis 2006). Our purpose, however, is to understand this educational “carceral turn” in broader social context, and in particular to conceptualize how it operates to assure the disciplining of students to accept the new conditions of servile wage work and social marginalization that characterize neoliberalism.

Neoliberalism, the Penal State, and Prison Time

Some scholars argue that rather than simply building consent, the neoliberal state also seeks to dominate through normalizing racialized state violence, affirming its authority to use this violence to discipline its subjects (especially those positioned at the bottom of the social hierarchy), and by enacting a logic of violation that constructs at the same time that it injures identities (De Lissoyoy 2012; James 1996). At the same time, the rise of the penal state, and the hardening of police, judicial, and correctional policies, is a response of neoliberal elites to changes in wage work and the economy (Wacquant 2009). In the present, elites have gotten the upper hand in this struggle and have begun a campaign to reconstruct the state to fit their material and symbolic needs. This reconstruction includes the abandonment of the Keynesian state, which with all of its faults nevertheless aimed to protect the most vulnerable populations, for a state that celebrates competition, individual responsibility, and the disposability of excess and/or “wasteful” functions (Wacquant 2009; Giroux 2012). In particular, the restructuring of the state to fit the requirements of neoliberalism gives rise to a penal apparatus that instead of providing relief *to* the poor, relieves society *of* the poor by disposing of them through the prison system or permanent marginalization. In this context, the hidden curriculum can be understood as working to normalize the construction of students as disposable subjects and as disciplining those positioned at the bottom of the social hierarchy.

Extending this analysis of the convergence of production and punishment in late capitalism, we can begin to reconceptualize the social relationships that the school under neoliberalism reproduces as repeating those of the prison itself. Michael Hardt (1997) argues that the paradigmatic form of punishment in late capitalism is the control of time through the dispersion of what he calls *prison time* across society. In prison, the planning ahead of how time will be used, controlled, and regimented by power signifies the domination over an individual's control of his or her time, and thus his or her freedom and sense of agency. Furthermore, the control and regimentation of time eliminates possibilities for improvisation in daily experiences; nothing is unforeseeable. For Hardt, prison is not a place separated from society. Instead, it is the site within society where power becomes visible. He argues that prison is society in its fully realized form; society is no longer a factory, it is a prison.

Prison time is regimented through the application of repetitive schedules and routines imposed upon the inmates and guards. By these means, power injures inmates and strips them of the agency to do as they wish with their time; time becomes void of meaning and leads to a form of exile from life. According to Hardt, even outside the prison walls, within our increasingly regimented society, we live within a kind of prison time. Thus, in neoliberalism, freedom is understood as choice. We are free to choose between Pepsi and Coca Cola, between Levis and Calvin Klein, between Democrats and Republicans; freedom becomes a matter of consumption. The choices are already prescribed and we express our freedom by choosing from the given options. Life even outside prison has thus become regimented and void of meaning, for we no longer have autonomy to decide what and how to use our time beyond exercising our freedom to consume. Within this seemingly inescapable reality of domination, there are nevertheless moments in which inmates and those outside prison resist the drive of power to control time, in authentic encounters with others and the relationships that arise from such encounters.

The notion of *prison time* brings together our simultaneous emphases on production and punishment, and on preparation and demoralization. As we reconceptualize the operation of the hidden curriculum in the post-Fordist moment, it is important to attend to the complex ways in which it prepares students less for a life of assimilation within the machine of capitalist production, and more for the experience of *precariousness*, within which we are alternately incorporated and expelled, exploited and abandoned, depending on the rhythms and requirements of capital. In approaching the experience of prison time in the educational

context through the notion of *school time*, we suggest that the habits and dispositions that the contemporary hidden curriculum seeks to produce in students are ones that are suited to this prevailing condition of more or less permanent marginalization, and that this process of socialization is at the same time a process of fragmentation which seeks to disorient at the same time that it organizes, assuring the vulnerability of students to the fluid regime of production/punishment that characterizes life under neoliberalism.

Doing School Time: Teaching and Control in the Accountability Era

In the context of the school, the broad processes of preparation and demoralization that we have described above are expressed in the daily rituals and procedures of teaching and learning. It is in the small everyday classroom experiences and interactions that we find the material grounds for the type of consent the neoliberal political project requires. The school of today does not only reproduce subjects or workers; it also imposes domination and a particular way of being in the world upon everyone. Those that do not easily submit to the dictates of power are punished, obscured, and injured (De Lissovoy 2010). Learning and teaching processes are reorganized by the accountability regime as exercises in domination. Processes of punishment in the school have rightfully been focused upon by critical scholars aiming to illuminate the carceral turn in neoliberal education (Saltman and Gabbard 2003), and we discuss these trends in the next section of our paper. However, we argue that the school's resemblance to prison does not develop only from the turn to punishment. Instead, under the accountability regime, the drive to injure, exclude, and marginalize students arises from everyday classroom experiences that appear natural and even as "best practices." Just as prisons are ideologically constructed as the natural places where *bad subjects* are fully stripped of the autonomy to control their time, in the same way, it is in the "proper" disciplining through pedagogy of student subjects that prison time is reproduced in the classroom.

In the first place, with the rise of the standardized testing regime an explicit language of productivity and investment has crept into the school. Ubiquitous discourses of "staying on task" and "maximizing learning time" as well as calls for the efficient use of the classroom are examples of the language of *school time*, as it is manifested in the "best practices" of classroom management (Gettinger and Seibert 2002; McLeod, Fisher, and Hoover 2003). Ultimately, the teaching and learning process, including the arrangement of the classroom

and student movement within the classroom space, are designed to provide a maximum “efficiency” that implies the complete domination of what takes place within the classroom. The process of learning itself becomes less important than the student’s ability to demonstrate proficiency as measured by an exam. While this overall shift in schooling to a paradigm of efficiency has been much commented on (e.g. Au 2011; Peters 2001), the reorganization of education within neoliberalism extends as well to the moment-to-moment experience of *pedagogy* itself.

For instance, in a series of video clips titled “Tight Transitions” (2012) produced by Uncommon Schools, a network of urban charter schools in the Northeastern United States, which is intended to portray best teaching practices, the reconfiguration of the meaning of education in terms of a dominative efficiency can be witnessed. In one clip, a teacher is seen instructing her students to move from their desks to the carpet area. The teacher first asks the students to raise their hands, wiggle their fingers, and then to clasp their hands over their desks. She then counts to five with her fingers and at each number the students perform an action. At one, still sitting down, the students push their chairs back. At two, they stand up. At three, four, and five, the students push their chairs in and stand quietly behind their desks. As they perform the transition in a regimented manner that resembles a military practice, the teacher waves her hand and the students immediately walk towards the carpet. The students are not yet seated on the carpet when the teacher begins her lesson. Uncommon Schools takes pride in the percentage of their students scoring at proficient or advanced levels on state administered assessments (Uncommon Schools n.d.). In this framework, it is imperative that teachers maximize learning time by developing “tight transitions” and beginning instruction immediately. The transition portrayed in the video appears “successful” and efficient, and yet the question arises: Given this control and regimentation of time, what are the students learning through the hidden curriculum? Similarly, in another clip (Uncommon Schools, 2010) featuring the “Teach Like a Champion” approach, a teacher instructs his students to stand with hands behind their backs as they wait to be called on to answer content questions and to recall information. The voice-over states that the students in this classroom are not intimidated by this “cold call” teaching method and that they actually like to be called on using this technique because they like to be challenged. In fact, this pedagogy reconstructs teaching as a process of classroom management that obsessively promotes efficiency and surveillance.

This type of teaching, closely aligned with the standardized testing regime, exemplifies a condition described by Freire (2005): “A situation in which some individuals prevent others from engaging in the process of inquiry is one of violence. The means used are not important; to alienate human beings from their own decision-making is to change them into objects” (p. 85). We would add that there has been a shift in the present from the primarily epistemological estrangement that Freire focused on to an even more thoroughgoing biopolitical control that seeks to govern each movement and discursive interaction in the classroom. The teacher, for the sake of efficiency and academic achievement as measured by a test, has to run his or her classroom as if commanding a troop or instructing inmates to step out of their cells and move to the yard. The teacher, as the representative of power, dictates and controls time, body movements, and interactions. This pervasive control repeats, in a pedagogical register, the apparatuses of security and surveillance that students increasingly confront in school entrances and hallways, and which carefully monitor—especially in students of color—minute deviations from the norm, even down to bodily comportment and facial expressions (Pinnow, 2013). To live within these procedures and apparatuses of control is to do *school time*.

Intensive pedagogical control is at once continuous with the properly disciplinary apparatus that polices student bodies and behavior, as well as an increasingly elaborate structure of *curricular* control at the district and state levels. In a recent in-depth ethnographic account, Alex Means (2013) shows how teachers in one Chicago school must contend with a proliferation of mandated curricular programs, which often work at cross purposes. Teachers’ compliance with these programs is monitored by department review of lesson plans, walk-throughs by administrators or program representatives, and even online review by the district of grade books that must be loaded by teachers into an electronic system. Importantly, the pervasiveness of the control of teachers’ work in this instance is linked to the school’s “probationary” status based on its standardized test performance. In this way, for teachers and whole schools, as for students, assessment becomes increasingly indistinguishable from punishment, and both are expressed in the appropriation of the time itself of teaching and learning. It should be noted that this is something more than a struggle for space within a “standards-based” educational model; even creative teachers who are skilled in tying critical lessons to the standards are hemmed in and frustrated by scripted “drive-by” curricular programs that give them no leeway (Stillman, 2009).

It might seem paradoxical at first that as a national emphasis on accountability ostensibly focuses attention on raising academic performance, very often it is *behavioral* control that comes to be emphasized in “innovative” educational initiatives. In fact, however, under the accountability regime, control and management become watchwords for a reorganization of the student as a whole, in which a moralized notion of responsibility undergirds both the interpersonal and the intellectual. Interestingly, the technical language of auditing that is associated with accountability frameworks at the district or state level increasingly shows up in student-level guidelines for behavior. Thus, a host of educational entrepreneurs have developed packages that aim for this top-to-bottom organization of learning as (self-)control. For instance, one such initiative, based in Arkansas, touts a behavioral instruction element within its broader packaged school improvement and reform plan in which the same “self-management” component and process “occurs at three levels: student, staff and school, and system and district” (Project ACHIEVE 2012). Even regular grading systems within public districts, such as the Austin Unified School District in Texas, already in kindergarten integrate numerical scores for behavioral evaluation criteria within the same rubric as grades for academic performance. However varied the types of engagement or interaction in the space of school, the accountability model promises an ultimate continuity in its (standardized, quantitative) rationality of assessment. In this way, students are accustomed to a relationship to authority constructed in terms of a pervasive experience of monitoring, evaluation, and self-surveillance.

Furthermore, in quite literal fashion, school time is continuously expanded as education reformers propose extensions to the school day under the premise that more learning time is needed to close the “achievement gap” as measured by high-stakes testing or to make up for gaps in literacy or math skills (Silva 2007; Patall, Cooper, and Allen 2010). These proposals suggest that not everyone would benefit from an extended school day; rather, the proper beneficiaries are poor and minority students that lack resources. School-day extensions are being contemplated—or have already been implemented—in districts across the country; the New York Times reports that “a growing group of education advocates is pushing for schools to keep students on campus longer, arguing that low-income children in particular need more time to catch up as schools face increasing pressure to improve test scores” (Rich, 2012). As with other top-down reforms in the accountability era, while nominally framed in term of equity, the extension of the school day ends up deepening the insertion of students and teachers into the standardized testing regime. Here too we see that just as in Hardt’s analysis

of the prison, in which the category of temporality is central to the meaning of punishment, in the contemporary educational accountability regime time becomes a crucial instrument of control and expression of power.

In the examples given above, students are taught to submit not just to basic rules governing behavior and understanding, as the classic version of the hidden curriculum thesis describes, but also to a more or less constant ordering of movement and interaction. At the same time, the ubiquitous control that characterizes the accountability regime also deeply affects the performances of teaching and the identities of teachers (Ball 2003). Stories of the twenty-something idealist and dedicated teacher leaving the school grounds late at night due to the “relentless pursuit of results” have become part of the lore of school reform advocates. The other side of the coin is high turnover and a low retention rate for young novice teachers who last no more than a few years in the profession due to dissatisfaction with working conditions (Stuit and Smith 2012). The type of worker created by these conditions is precisely the ideal in the post-Fordist regime of production and the neoliberal social system; that is, the teacher takes on the identity of the disposable worker who must adjust to short-term contracts, job insecurity, and lack of social protection. In this regard, the vocation of teaching is itself increasingly reorganized by the conditions of precarity and control to which students are introduced through the interactions in the classroom.

The Pedagogy of Punishment

Recent decades have seen the development of a hyperdisciplinary orientation in education, in which the process of punishment insinuates itself ever more intimately into the texture of teaching, especially for students of color. In the context of moral panics over youth, the broader penalization of society, and the ramification of security technologies, schools are increasingly remade as occasions of enforcement rather than inquiry (Giroux 2009; Lipman 2004). The concern with security has led to tighter links between schools and law enforcement and an aggressive surveillance culture that criminalizes students without seeking to incorporate or rehabilitate them according to older disciplinary models (Devine 1996). The emergence of the “school to prison pipeline,” as it has often been called, or the “jailhouse track” (Browne 2003) reconfigures Bowles and Gintis’ correspondence theory in a sinister direction, as the pathologization of students of color by the disciplinary and security apparatuses of schools increasingly appears to set them on a path toward the criminal justice

system proper. Research shows that preferred disciplinary policies such as zero-tolerance act insidiously to obstruct the educational opportunities of students (Browne, Losen and Wald 2001) even in the context of declining rates of youth violence, and that disciplinary referrals and suspensions in schools continue to be disproportionately applied to students of color (Skiba et al. 2011).

Apart from the immediate injustice represented by this intensification of the drive to punish, evidence suggests that it may be an important factor in producing differing achievement levels between white students and students of color (Gregory, Skiba, and Noguera 2010). However, critical accounts of hyperdisciplinarity also point to effects beyond and below the so-called “achievement gap.” Thus, Duncan (2000) argues that the forms of pedagogy confronted by students of color work simultaneously to degrade their economic competitiveness and to construct them as undesirable employees in an increasingly service-oriented economy. In this way, the school to prison pipeline can be understood as an expression of the “tacit intentionality” (Gillborn 2005) that structures schooling as an act of whiteness. In the racialized educational landscapes of neoliberalism, then, the preparation of students through explicit and hidden curricula becomes paradoxically a kind of pernicious deskilling that leaves them vulnerable to surveillance, detention and incarceration.

Hyperdiscipline and Decomposition

These analyses of punishment in education are useful in challenging the color-blind rhetoric of official educational reform, which systematically glosses over its own perverse effects. However, we believe that this understanding of the school to prison pipeline needs to be developed and extended. In particular, we argue that disciplinary processes in schools participate in a process of socialization (and injury) of students that prepares them not only for unemployment and incarceration but also for a broader condition of servility and semi-permanent marginalization—what we have described above, following Michael Hardt, as the *prison time* of late capitalism. With the destruction of public life in the “ownership society” of neoliberalism, and the rendering disposable of vulnerable populations within the new knowledge economy, students increasingly face a form of power that understands them alternately as future participants in a now precarious reserve labor army and on the other hand as no more than mere instances of what Agamben (1998) calls “bare life.” In education, then, the broader prison time of society is anticipated in the encompassing texture of a

punishing *school time*. The time of teaching becomes the time of penalty. Foucault's (1995) formula for modern disciplinary society as the moment in which punishment becomes humanized, rehabilitative, and pedagogical should perhaps now be reversed—as pedagogy itself is overtaken by the impulse to sanction and stigmatize.

We can see this turn to punishment in the first instance in the multiplication of the force and application of discipline in schools. In a remarkable recent report on school discipline procedures (Fabelo et al. 2011), researchers found that the *majority of all students* in Texas schools (59.6%) experienced some form of suspension or expulsion in middle or high school, and that African American students and students qualifying for disability services were even more likely to be disciplined. Others suggest that these results are representative of the U.S. as a whole (Schwartz 2011). Clearly, severe discipline—including suspension and expulsion—has become a regular part of the experience of school for students, especially students of color, for whom the hardening of conditions is compounded by the effect of “racial threat,” in which school personnel are more likely to use punitive disciplinary measures in schools with a higher percentage of students of color (Welch and Payne 2010). Paradoxically, then, *exclusion* comes to be *internalized* as unexceptional within the “learning” experience. In this context, the duration of the disciplinary sentence (the number of days of suspension), anticipates the measure of the prison sentence proper.

But in addition and perhaps more importantly, for those students who have escaped overt discipline for the time being, even the process of regular learning and instruction is similarly hollowed out, as authentic teaching is overtaken by a stultifying proceduralism. This stripped-down pedagogy can be understood as already a kind of *punishment in advance* for students whom the test results will expose as failing. We know that high stakes standardized testing provokes a process of teaching to the test ostensibly aimed at marginally improving scores for low-performing students (Au 2007; McNeil 2000). At this point we should understand this test-based pedagogy not as a *byproduct* of the accountability regime but rather as a crucial aim. Furthermore, just as the meting out of suspensions is racialized, classroom instruction in the present is itself persistently subtractive and demeaning for students of color (Kohli and Solórzano 2012; Valenzuela 1999). The prison time of pedagogy delivers to students—and especially to students of color—the mortification they may appear to have escaped in avoiding the discipline system proper.

In this context, the hidden curriculum as we have known it is itself hidden (or buried) by the multiplication of the disciplinary impulse, which is made the immediate and overwhelming object: not so much to teach students the habits of compliance as to directly control them through a low-intensity pedagogical assault. As we have described above, this process has its effects in terms of beliefs and orientations, but it is important to see how ideological common sense here becomes as much a condition of cognitive and emotional *decomposition* as a positive proposition. If schools aimed simply to incorporate young people into the structure of work and hegemony, they would not seek to push them out through ubiquitous macro- and microaggressions (Fabelo et al. 2011), or to shuttle them around in an effort to improve test scores (Heilig and Darling-Hammond 2008). *School time* simultaneously organizes and disorganizes. It is a process of *(un)preparation* for an *(un)future* not of simple assimilation into the system but rather of continuous injury and intermittent exploitation—that is, for existence under the conditions of precarity, punishment, and “social insecurity” (Wacquant 2009) that characterize the wilderness of post-Fordism.

Security, Surveillance, and the School as Exceptional Space

In addition to increasing rates of punishment, schools are increasingly overtaken in the present by forms of security and surveillance that construct students as potentially criminal or transgressive, and which participate in a broader redeployment of social control. In the last several decades, and especially following a spate of high-profile school shootings (in particular the Columbine High School case in 1999), schools have moved to beef up security personnel, monitor entry and exit more closely, and install surveillance cameras, among other security-oriented strategies (Addington 2009). Already by the 1990s, video surveillance systems had proliferated in schools from Huntsville to Las Vegas, with lunchrooms, playgrounds, corridors, and classrooms all being monitored (Nieto 1997). Importantly, the turn to security measures coincides with increased deference to school authorities from the judicial system, which is less likely to find that protecting student privacy outweighs security concerns (Beger 2003). There is now scholarship documenting the effects of these measures on the experience of students and their orientation to school and school personnel. Above all, the turn to surveillance and security appears to leave youth feeling mistrustful of adults in positions of authority in the school and beyond (Fine, et al. 2003).

A useful framework for making sense of these trends is Giorgio Agamben's (1998) description of the *camp* as the prevailing paradigm for the political ordering of society in the modern period. As Agamben describes, the camp is a space in which power operates directly on bodies, within a grey area in which power announces an exceptional space exempt from the familiar norms and prohibitions of the law: "The camp consists in the materialization of the state of exception and in the subsequent creation of a space in which bare life and the juridical rule enter into a threshold of indistinction" (p. 174). The school does not need to be engulfed in overt violence to resemble Agamben's camp; as an appendix of the modern state, in which the students that daily traverse its space remain at the absolute mercy of others, the school reproduces the order of power of the camp (Lewis 2006). Proliferating surveillance and omnipresent security expose students to the pervasive application of power—an exposure increasingly rationalized by an "emergency time" inaugurated in the school shootings of the Columbine period. As in immigration detention centers, in which citizenship is not recognized but the circulation of people is free within the limits set by the physical space and the sovereign's will (Fassin 2005), within the school a certain limited mobility is allowed, subject to a ubiquitous surveillance.

The physical spaces of schools are themselves increasingly organized by the impulse to security. In a comparative study that looks at the physical structure of two schools, a private school and a public technical high school, Theodoropoulos (2011) shows that school space itself becomes overwritten by the carceral turn. While the private school opens up opportunities for different trajectories of movement, the public school is fenced in and controlled by security guards. This latter school's grey color scheme and warehouse aesthetic contrast with the open spaces and careful landscaping of the private school. In this instance, the school as camp is materialized not just in the technical apparatus of surveillance but even in the architecture that remakes education as a process of internment. The dramatic differences observed by Theodoropoulos can be seen in almost any metropolitan area in the U.S. With the flight of industrial factory jobs from the U.S., schools have turned to warehousing and controlling the increasing ranks of the reserve labor army. In this regard, while the physical space of the urban school is often understood to serve as preparation for factory work, with the rise of a deindustrialized economy it can be argued that students are being prepared instead for the enclosed space of the prison.

While the paradigm of the camp is evocative when applied to contemporary schools, it should be supplemented by a recognition of the continuity between the spaces of schools and society as a whole. Following Harvey and Hardt, our notion of *school time* points not just to the targeting of “bare life” by power in educational spaces, but also to the kinds of subjectivity power aims to produce, and the implication of these forms of subjectivity in the post-Fordist economy. This is where the hidden curriculum meets the broader turn to punishment: in the pedagogical organization of subjects for a newly precarious social condition that leads alternately to servile wage work or to extended incarceration. In addition, whereas Agamben suggests that the camp appears specifically in those moments in which the law is suspended, we follow Hardt in tracking the dispersion of prison time throughout society, through the control and regimentation of time. School and society are continuous, and education becomes a site where power becomes visible through the control and regimentation of temporality.

Conclusion

By accepting as natural the everyday interactions of domination that take place within the classroom under the guise of “best practices,” the values and dispositions of neoliberalism’s conditions of production are transmitted. These conditions are characterized by relationships of servility and obedience to management on the part of the worker, and in the context of schooling, of the student towards the accountability regime, as the results of the test have become synonymous with education. The control of school time to meet the mandates of the standardized testing regime serves to demoralize students as there is less and less opportunity in the rigid structuring of the school day for authentic learning. The participation of students in this type of education anticipates their eventual insertion into the ranks of the *precarariat*: a low waged working class that lives a precarious existence knowing that there is no security in employment, and that has to adjust to the dictates of the market (Standing 2011). Similar to precarious employment, learning under the testing regime is short-lived and serves to fulfill the purposes of the high-stakes test. Thus, the hidden curriculum replicates social conditions of precarity under the gaze of the accountability regime.

Furthermore, the schools of capitalism in its current neoliberal stage are not simply producing workers or preparing students for adulthood, as curriculum theorists understood the process of the hidden curriculum in the past. Through the control of school time and the turn to hyperdiscipline, students are exposed to a drive for domination in the regimentation of

everyday classroom interactions that goes beyond simple efficiency. In the neoliberal context, the hidden curriculum of the school simultaneously controls and injures students by restructuring the school day as a series of low-intensity pedagogical assaults, constructing students as always potentially transgressive and always in need of punishment. In this sense, schooling no longer simply prepares students but rather anticipates the generalized dispersion of prison time that they will encounter in the workplace and social life. In this way, it is not only in the prison itself that time is taken from those who are punished; students, too, are already “doing time.” The success of critical interventions in pedagogy and curriculum depends in part on a recognition of this new hidden curriculum of *school time*, and its articulation with broader processes of production and punishment, and on a commitment to disrupt not only the common senses sedimented within it but also the continuous series of injuries it visits on students in the unremarked moments of everyday classroom life.

References

- Addington, Lynn A. 2009. "Cops and Cameras: Public School Security as a Policy Response to Columbine." *American Behavioral Scientist* 52(10): 1426-1446.
- Agamben, Giorgio. 1998. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Althusser, Louis. 1971. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an investigation)." Pp. 127-186 in *Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Anyon, J. (1980). Social Class and the Hidden Curriculum of Work. *Journal of Education*, 162, , 67-92.
- Apple, Michael W. 2004. *Ideology and Curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Artiles, Alfredo J., and Stanley C. Trent. 1994. "Overrepresentation of Minority Students in Special Education: A Continuing Debate." *Journal of Special Education* 27(4): 410-437.
- Au, Wayne. 2007. "High-Stakes Testing and Curricular Control: A Qualitative Metasynthesis." *Educational Researcher* 36(5): 258-267.
- . 2011. "Teaching Under the New Taylorism: High-Stakes Testing and the Standardization of the 21st Century Curriculum." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 43(1): 25-45.
- Ball, Stephen J. 2003. "The Teacher's Soul and the Terrors of Performativity." *Journal of Education Policy* 18(2): 215-228.
- Beger, Randall R. 2003. "The "Worst of Both Worlds": School Security and the Disappearing Fourth Amendment Rights of Students." *Criminal Justice Review* 28(2): 336-354.
- Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis. 1996. *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York: Basic Books
- Browne, Judith A. 2003. *Derailed: The Schoolhouse to Jailhouse Track*. Washington, DC: Advancement Project.
- Browne, Judith A., Daniel J. Losen, and Johanna Wald. 2001. "Zero Tolerance: Unfair, with Little Recourse." *New Directions for Youth Development* 92: 73-99.
- De Lissovoy, Noah. 2010. "Rethinking Education and Emancipation: Being, Teaching, and Power." *Harvard Educational Review* 80(2): 203-220.
- . 2012. "Education and Violation: Conceptualizing Power, Domination, and Agency in the Hidden Curriculum." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 15(4): 463-484.
- Devine, John. 1996. *Maximum Security: The Culture of Violence in Inner-City Schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Dewey, John. 1944/1997. *Democracy and Education*. New York: The Free Press.
- Dohrn, Bernardine. 2001. "'Look Out Kid/ It's Something You Did': Zero Tolerance for Children." Pp 89-113 in *Zero Tolerance: Resisting the Drive for Punishment in Our Schools*. Edited by William Ayers, Bernardine Dohrn and Rick Ayers. New York: The New Press.
- Duncan, Garrett. 2000. "Urban Pedagogies and the Ceiling of Adolescents of Color." *Social Justice* 27(3): 29-42.
- Fabelo, Tony, Michael D. Thompson, Martha Plotkin, Dottie Carmichael, Miner P. Marchbanks, and Eric A. Booth. 2011. *Breaking Schools' Rules: A Statewide Study of How School Discipline Relates to Students' Success and Juvenile Justice Involvement*. New York: Council of State Governments Justice Center.
- Fine, Michelle, Nick Freudenberg, Yasser Payne, Tiffany Perkins, Kersha Smith, and Katya Wanzer. 2003. "'Anything Can Happen With Police Around': Urban Youth Evaluate Strategies of Surveillance in Public Places." *Journal of Social Issues* 59(1): 141-158.
- Foucault, Michel. 1995. *Discipline and Punish*. Translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Random House.
- Freire, Paulo. 2005. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
- Gettinger, Maribeth and Jill. K Seibert. (2002). "Best Practices in Increasing Academic Learning Time." Pp. 773-787 in *Best Practices in School Psychology IV (1)*. Edited by Alex Thomas and Jeff Grimes. Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Gillborn, David. 2005. "Education Policy as an Act of White Supremacy: Whiteness, Critical Race Theory and Education Reform." *Journal of Education Policy* 20(4): 485-505.
- Giroux, Henry A. 1992. *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. New York: Routledge.
- . 2009. *Youth in a Suspect Society: Democracy or Disposability?* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gregory, Anne, Russell J. Skiba, and Pedro Noguera. 2010. "The Achievement Gap and the Discipline Gap: Two Sides of the Same Coin?" *Educational Researcher* 39(1): 59-68.
- Hardt, Michael. 1997. Prison Time. *Yale French Studies*, 91: 64-79.
- Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heilig, Julian Vasquez, and Linda Darling-Hammond. 2008. "Accountability Texas-Style: The Progress and Learning of Urban Minority Students in a High-Stakes Testing Context." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 30(2): 75-110.
- Hursh, David. 2005. "Neo-liberalism, Markets, and Accountability: Transforming Education and Undermining Democracy in the United States and England." *Policy Futures in Education* 3(1): 3-15.
- Jackson, Phillip W. 1990. *Life in Classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- James, Joy. 1996. *Resisting State Violence: Radicalism, Gender, and Race in U.S. Culture*. Minneapolis, Minn: University of Minnesota Press.
- Klein, Naomi. 2007. *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Kliebard, Herbert M. 2004. *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge.
- Kohli, Rita, and Daniel G. Solórzano. 2012. "Teachers, Please Learn Our Names!: Racial Microaggressions and the K-12 Classroom." *Race, Ethnicity and Education* 15(4): 441-462.
- Lewis, Tyson E. 2006. "The School as an Exceptional Space: Rethinking Education from the Perspective of the Biopedagogical." *Educational Theory*, 56(2): 159-176.
- Lipman, Pauline. 2004. *High Stakes Education: Inequality, Globalization, and Urban School Reform*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Marazzi, Christian. 2011. *Capital and affects: The politics of the language economy*. Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e).
- McLeod, Joyce, Jan Fisher, and Ginny Hoover. 2003. *The Key Elements of Classroom Management: Managing Time and Space, Student Behavior, and Instructional Strategies*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- McNeil, Linda M. 2000. *Contradictions of School Reform: Educational Costs of Standardized Testing*. New York: Routledge.
- Means, A. 2013. *Schooling in the Age of Austerity: Urban Education and the Struggle for Democratic Life*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nieto, Marcus. 1997. *Public Video Surveillance: Is it an Effective Crime Prevention Tool?* Sacramento, CA: California Research Bureau, California State Library.
- Oakes, Jeannie. 1985. *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Patall, Erika, Harris Cooper and Ashley Allen. 2010. "Extending the School Day or School Year: A Systematic Review of Research (1985-2009)." *Review of Educational Research*, 80(3): 401-436.
- Peters, Michael. 2001. "Education, Enterprise Culture and the Entrepreneurial Self: A Foucauldian Perspective." *Journal of Educational Enquiry* 2(2): 58-71.
- Pinnow, R. J. 2013. An Ecology of Fear: Examining the Contradictory Surveillance Terrain Navigated by Mexican Youth in a U.S. Middle School. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 44(3), 253-268.
- Project ACHIEVE. 2012. *Project ACHIEVE Components*. Retrieved from <http://www.projectachieve.info/about-project-achieve/project-achieve-components.html>
- Rich, M. 2012. "School Districts in Five States Will Lengthen Their Calendars." *New York Times*, December 3, p. A14.
- Saltman, Kenneth J. 2005. *The Edison Schools: Corporate Schooling and the Assault on Public Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Saltman, Kenneth J., and David A. Gabbard. 2003. *Education as Enforcement: The Militarization and Corporatization of Schools*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Schwarz, Alan. 2011. "School Discipline Study Raises Fresh Questions." *New York Times*, July 19, p. A14.
- Silva, Elena. 2007. *On the Clock: Rethinking the Way Schools Use Time*. Washington, D.C: Education Sector.
- Skiba, Russell J., Robert H. Horner, Choong-Geun Chung, M. Karega Rausch, Seth L. May, and Tary Tobin. 2011. "Race is Not Neutral: A National Investigation of African American and Latino Disproportionality in School Discipline." *School Psychology Review* 40(1): 85-107.
- Standing, Guy. 2011. *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Stillman, J. 2009. Taking Back the Standards: Equity-Minded Teachers' Responses to Accountability-Related Instructional Constraints. *The New Educator*, 5, 135-160.
- Stuit, David A. and Thomas M. Smith. 2012. "Explaining the Gap in Charter and Traditional Public School Teacher Turnover Rates." *Economics of Education Review* 31(2): 268-279.
- Theororopoulos, Eftyhia. 2011. "Off to School: A Comparative Study of Schools in the U.S." *CEPS Journal* 1(2): 45-58.
- Uncommon Schools. n.d. *State Test Results*. Retrieved from <http://www.uncommonschools.org/results>
- . 2010. *Teach Like a Champion*. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rRQGIBaK9Fc&feature=share&list=PL34E36823F5207BBA>
- . 2012. *Tight transitions*. Retrieved from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lfY_2Y_e2yA
- Valenzuela, Angela. 1999. *Subtractive Schooling*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Wacquant, Loic. 2009. *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press
- Wacquant, Loic. 2012. "Three Steps to a Historical Anthropology of Actually Existing Neoliberalism." *Social Anthropology*, 20(1): 66-79.
- Welch, Kelly, and Allison A. Payne. 2010. "Racial Threat and Punitive School Discipline." *Social Problems* 57(1): 25-48.

Author Details

José García is a doctoral student in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction's program in Cultural Studies in Education at the University of Texas-Austin. His research interests center on the history of Mexican American education; experiences of immigrant students; critical approaches to pedagogy and curriculum; and neoliberalism, education, and social movements. José is the proud son of a *jardinero* and a caring and hard working *mujer*. José is a former elementary school bilingual teacher.

José García

The University of Texas at Austin
Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction
1 University Station D5700
Austin, TX 78712
garcia.jose@utexas.edu

Noah De Lissovoy is Assistant Professor of Cultural Studies in Education at the University of Texas at Austin. His research centers on critical and emancipatory approaches to pedagogy, curriculum and cultural studies. He is the author of *Power, Crisis, and Education for Liberation: Rethinking Critical Pedagogy* and co-author of *Toward a New Common School Movement*. His work has appeared in many journals and edited collections, including *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *Harvard Educational Review*, *Curriculum Inquiry*, *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, *Journal of Education Policy*, *The Urban Review*, and *Discourse*.

Noah De Lissovoy, Assistant Professor

The University of Texas at Austin
Dept. of Curriculum and Instruction
1 University Station D5700
Austin, TX 78712
512-232-1954
delissovoy@austin.utexas.edu