The Influences of Organizational Structure in the Hidde Curriculum: Implications in School Practice

Charl Vince L. Porlares [1,2] , **Emily B. Tan[1]**

[1] University of Santo Tomas, Graduate School, Manila, Philippines

[2] University of Santo Tomas, Senior High School, Manila, Philippines

https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6877-1536

ABSTRACT: The school as a social variable is an important driver and agent of change. At its heart is the curriculum, which gears the school of different teaching-learning experiences as well as supporting activities that also contribute to the overall school experience. Curriculum, as a knowledge, equates to the stakeholders transmitting the content developed to the learners; as a process, involves the stakeholders in the actual teaching-learning practice; and as a product, is what the students have been equipped with—knowledge, skills, and values. All approaches underpin the involvement of various stakeholders in the school as an organization. The relationship between curriculum and stakeholders has been sought out, however, in the deeper context of the unseen curriculum, it is yet to be properly scrutinized. This paper attempts to review the hidden relationship between the school as an organization and the curriculum. An implication and future direction are drawn out from the existing pieces of literature.

KEYWORDS: Curriculum, Curriculum Leadership, Hidden Curriculum, Organizational Structure, School as an organization

INTRODUCTION

The curriculum has played a part in many academic institutions. It is the heart of many classrooms and the soul of the teaching-learning process because it drives many pedagogical and instructional functions within an academic institution. As a driving force, the curriculum tends to be dynamic, permeating in every level and environment within the school: found within the student participation; seen in the teacher-student interactions; among and between the school leaders; and even, in a closer look, the contents of textbooks and teacher learning/lesson plans.

Moreover, the curriculum process is the skeletal makeup of the modern educational system. The dynamism of curriculum development has built a variety of designs and approaches that bridge the learning gap present in society and how this ultimately leads to the development of the nation. This highlights the structural identity of the curriculum in the society and economy: the support and flexibility it provides to characterize the individuals to fit their desired aspirations and goals.

The dynamic nature of the curriculum has long been observed with many series of changes focusing on student competence and learning satisfaction, teacher professionalism, practical, and technical skills, and roles of educational leaders in the curriculum reforms and changes (Van Griethuijsen et al., 2019; Hopkins, Kroning, & Kobes, 2020). All of these point to the vital documented and written area of the curriculum. This is merely the formal side of the curriculum (Mitchell, 2016) and it does not entirely reveal the formation process and the dynamics of holistic learning processes for the stakeholders involved (Borges et al., 2017).

The researcher argued that more than just the formal view of the curriculum, there are other perspectives to which one can view and analyze the construct of the curriculum. Moreover, the researcher argued that, in the more subjective aspect of the curriculum, involving the experiential view of the stakeholders participating in the curricular process (Mitchell, 2016), curriculum holds a much deeper and greater meaning as well as direct and indirect roots to student behavior within an educational institution.

Consequently, this also implies the involvement of various stakeholders in the curriculum beyond what is commonly seen in the face of the teaching-learning process. The involvement of school leaders, managers, and school staff also plays an understated function in the curricular process. The researcher speculates that these stakeholders play both direct and indirect roles in the curriculum through learning support and learning environment. Hence, this paper reviews the published pieces of research about the influences of organizational structure in the hidden curriculum. It explores the constructs of organizational structure and curriculum after which, implications in school practice are drawn and the future directions are provided.

The Influences of Organizational Structure in the Hidden Curriculum: Implications in School Practice

THE SHADOW OF THE LEARNING PROCESS: HIDDEN CURRICULUM

Glatthorn et al. (2019, p. 30) described seven (7) different types of curriculum: (1) the recommended curriculum, (2) the written curriculum, (3) the supported curriculum, (4) the taught curriculum, (5) the tested curriculum, (6) the learned curriculum, and (7) the hidden curriculum. Four of the seven types are grouped and are referred to as the "intentional curriculum" (Glatthorn et al., 2019, p. 30), that is the curriculum consciously prepared, planned, developed, and utilized in schools, they are the written, supported, taught, and tested curriculum. The recommended curriculum pertains to the externally endorsed curriculum by a governing body such as the national government which affects the learned curriculum. The learned curriculum refers to the sum of all the variety of what the learners have learned, a product of all school experiences that are retained and embodied which help in the holistic development of the child as an individual. Lastly, the hidden curriculum, a unique curriculum focusing on the unknown embedded forces (Mitchell, 2016) affecting the learner within the school. Glatthorn et al. (2019) defined it as a feature of education, distinct from all that is planned, that inherently affects the entire cultivation and formation of students.

Borges et al. (2017) alluded that there are informal and implicit demands that are present within schools. This statement presents and poses tacit ideas that (a) schools aren't only involved in the formal processes and interaction; (b) there are needs beyond the systematic and systemic relationship, and (c) there are people involved in the unseen structure of informal processes within the school. This view presents the underlying idea of unseen activities that happen without the involvement of dictated processes and known documents. This provides the picture of a natural process involving school activities. The perspective of the hidden curriculum as a natural process was mentioned by Neve & Collet (2017) as an impromptu beyond the intentional curriculum. Further, Svinicki (2019, p. 11) also referred to this as the "unstated norm of the academia".

Glatthorn et al. (2019) posited the idea that there are unknown factors, independent of what is deliberately thought and acted within the schools, that affect the learning process. While it is known that teachers prepare a repertoire of learning materials, documented and planned, there is another side to this view where the light doesn't shine, the exchange of values, inculcation of principles, the transmission of beliefs. This process was described by Bowles & Gintis (1976, cited in Mitchell 2016) as the inculcation of character and conduct in an individual. Conjointly, Glatthorn et al. (2019) added that what teachers try to convey or express are unconsciously learned, by students; and it is viewed as a constant of the hidden curriculum (Glatthorn et al., 2019).

The series of definitions and descriptions all point out that the main characteristic of the hidden curriculum is its inconspicuousness, the shadow of the learning process, which is another avenue for learning that emerges intrinsically, that needs to be transmitted, and is a constant in school activities. Mitchell (2016) and Glatthorn et al. (2019) supported this by exemplifying the effects of policies, values, self-image, schedule, expectations, and others.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND THE SCHOOL

Ahmady, Mehrpour & Nikooravesh (2016) elucidated that organizational structure has different types. They mentioned two types, which are physical and social structures. Similarly, Ellerbrock et al. (2018) studied three types in their paper, the people (social) structure, the place (physical) structure, and the time structure. Structure of time is a unique type, placing importance on how time is allocated for learning. In the context of this paper, the researcher focuses on the social or people structure of the organization.

School is an organization itself. It is made up of governing bodies, selected and picked to perform specific roles and functions to maintain the daily and regular school activities. As the school grows over time, the organization will grow to a more complex structure. This also reflects on the formalization and control over the environment to maintain the desired order and stability and to identify the responsibilities. Clement & Puranam (2018) described that the formal structure or design of an organization is the established pattern of relationship between the members that are given and/or bestowed with the authority to do so.

Additionally, Kanten, Kanten & Gurlek (2015) defined organizational structure as a means that allows association and interaction among and between individuals having a common function or role, authority, and power. This social stratification highlights the value of hierarchy, that is, the establishment of a line of authority starting from the very top going down (vertical), left to right (horizontal), with a seemingly increasing specification of roles or functions (Sandhu & Kulik, 2018) but with a standard level of understanding and responsibilities per level, that is often aligned with whatever policies, manuals, guidelines or practice a school has (Kanten, Kanten, & Gurlek, 2015). This reflects the distribution of power among groups to maintain order.

The abovementioned statements give the perspective to the common dimensions or aspects of organizational structures: (a) Formalization, (b) Centralization, and (c) Standardization (Sadhu & Kulik, 2018; Kanten, Kanten & Gurlek, 2015). This presents the mechanistic view of the organizational structure of an institution (Sadhu & Kulik, 2018; Kanten, Kanten & Gurlek, 2015). Kanten, Kanten & Gurlek (2015) described the mechanistic view of organizational structure as rigid and bounded, having a clear definition of duties and tasks (Clement & Puranam, 2018), while the organic view of organizational structure as flexible and adaptable to changes because it involves direct communication among the members and stakeholders. This means that the

mechanistic view on organizational structure is bureaucratic while the organic view of organizational structure is consultative (Kirui & Ongiti, 2016).

Furthermore, Ahmady, Mehrpour & Nikooravesh (2016) defined organizational structure as an approach that gives rise to the division, organization, and coordination of the activities within an institution. This posits a notion that organizational structure is a means that helps in the delegation of individuals and distribution of a specific task with integrated and interrelated duties and responsibilities across the organization. This construct reflects the systematic nature and principle of organizational structure (Liddicoat, Scarino & Kohler, 2017; Ahmady, Mehrpour & Nikooravesh, 2016) in education. Consequently, this raises the continuum of organizational structure and its hard and soft elements seen in a similar dimension (Ahmady, Mehrpour & Nikooravesh, 2016). These dimensions, as mentioned by Ahmady, Mehrpour & Nikooravesh (2016), are the hierarchical, functional, and inclusion dimension. These three dimensions are the focus of discussion in the latter section of the paper.

Reflecting this in the context of education, the hierarchical views how units are ranked within the organizational chart, a School Director/Directress or Principal being in the topmost position cascading down to the teaching staff based on existing policies and procedures in the school, and this also reflects the formalization aspect. The functional shows the scopes of responsibilities and duties or the delegated tasks accompanying the position, subject coordinators deal with the curriculum respective to a particular subject while a student coordinator handles students' extra-curricular and co-curricular activities and teachers at the lower hierarchy level have identical teaching duties and responsibilities; and this also reflects standardization aspect. The inclusion dimension views the closeness of an individual to the main organization, the distance between a Teacher to the Principal in the top-down view of the organizational chart, and this reflects the centralization aspect.

Lastly, Dornbusch, Glasgow & Lin (1996) mentioned that school organizational structure can relatively affect its external and internal environment: They stated as follows:

> First, schools are organizations embedded in an external social context that facilitates or constraints the extent
> to which organizational goals are successfully realized. Second, internal structures within a school help shape
> its visible organizational form (Dornbusch, Glasgow & Lin, 1996, p.409).

This posits the notion of how a school structure affects the school and its stakeholders inside and outside of the school premises, as such, school may be observed as an open paradigm, a system affected by its aims and views (philosophy, vision, mission, and goals) and the expectations and values from the society (Turkkahraman, 2015). Consequently, this notion gives the impetus of viewing the school structure variables that affect the school's hidden curriculum because it can also be viewed as the unstated norm within academia and as a transmitted social value.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND THE INTENTIONAL CURRICULUM

Burton & Obel (2018) mentioned that organizational structure plays a role in the determination of different tasks within an institution. This interaction revolves around the governing tasks and their related constructs, and how it oversees the environmental conditions. The governing conditions include patterns, designs, and processes that allow dynamism of effort within the school or an institution. The effort will produce products necessary for the growth and development of the organization. This relationship between the structure and tasking plays a great role in the coordination of responsibilities and duties needed to improve the school environment and direction.

These products, such as policies, school direction (ie. philosophy, vision, mission, goals, and objectives), reports, and similar documentation, affect the school's pedagogical, instructional, evaluative, and curricular nature and aspect. Principals, school directors, or equivalent positions as top managers deliver mandates and rulings that may affect the curriculum, specifically the intentional curriculum, as such, it involves the decision-making process and planning to either improve or interrupt the long-standing curriculum strategy or approach within the school. Both the products and decisions made by the school administrators intrinsically affect the curriculum and this calls for an understanding of the effects of school organization on the curriculum.

Furthermore, Glatthorn et al. (2019) discussed the importance of curriculum enablers in the embodiment of curriculum leaders. Curriculum enablers allow the development and planning of well-thought-out technologically aided implementations suited for the school's environment and direction. This is the characterization of roles of the organizational structure toward achieving a sustainable and adopted curriculum. Moreover, Glatthorn et al. (2019) emphasized the importance of a shared leadership toward curriculum change and improvement. Bövers, & Hoon (2019) described shared leadership, at top management, as a practice of sharing tasks of leadership. Jabarzadeh et al. (2019) concluded that there's a relationship between shared leadership, communication, consensus, and performance. This establishes linkage about the relationship between leadership in the perspective of organizational structure and Glatthorn et al. (2019) believed that such leadership practice is important in reforming a quality

written curriculum. This now reflects the involvement of school leaders and administrators in the implementation of the intentional curriculum and as active agents in the development of the curriculum through guided practice.

Also, in the area of resource acquisition and allocation, administrators are responsible for the curriculum in use (Mitchell, 2016) for the school. Glatthorn et al. (2019) referred to this as the support curriculum which, as the name indicates, are resources that support the school curriculum, specifically, the temporal, personnel, and material needs of the school (Glatthorn et al., 2019). Support curriculum permeates across the different types of curricula, the resources from planning the curriculum up to the point when it needs to be implemented and evaluated, support curriculum is present. School top managers decide on the needed materials and have the discretion to slash or add finances to improve the textbooks and related learning materials and the digital/technological innovations present in the school. Policies may also arise for allocations of such materials and the recipient of such activities or decisions will be those at the bottom of the organizational structure, which, in the case of schools, are both the teachers and the students.

Consequently, these affect the taught, tested, and learned curriculum because support curriculum helps the student to potentially master course contents; enables the teachers to become adequately prepared to deliver the lessons needed, and shows how the students are going to be assessed and evaluated based on what they have learned during the entire process. It is also critical in the 4th Industrial Revolution when and where scientific advances and technological development are so rampant and rapid that it has affected learning situations with the emergence of disruptive technologies and standardization of learning for skill development.

The context of intentional curriculum as influenced by the school social structure plays a character in the formation of the hidden curriculum within the school because it becomes its nesting ground for norm building and values formation. This is viewed from the relational space

For instance, the curriculum leaders of the school would plan the written curriculum in line with the educational philosophies and objectives of the school. In this view, Bovill & Woolmer (2018) examined the relationship of curriculum development and staff-student participation in its creation and argued that more thorough consideration and investigations are needed to view their respective values and transparency about school curriculum. This relationship reflects how school leaders should approach the written curriculum in school as it needs perspectives of a variety of stakeholders. Hence, the value of collaboration and collective effort in understanding the nature of a school curriculum in line with its direction is needed. This in turn reflects a more active but deeper level of curriculum perspective that is not usually observed in a variety of daily school activities. This characterizes the role of written curriculum and school structure towards school valuing of the curriculum, which, according to Mitchell (2016) and Gatthorn et al. (2019), is an unknown but inherent pattern in and among schools.

How the teachers perceive their ability, professionalism, and teaching skills affects students' learning. Mbuva (2017) viewed this self-perception as the line between the real and ideal image of self, the self-esteem. Teacher satisfaction over his/her skills, ability, and professionalism can be identified in a positive and negative continuum (Mbuva, 2017). Further, Mbuva (2017) argued that teachers do not only embody and exemplify learning contents and the subject matter but also their personal view of worth and value. Therefore, teachers who are the main authority and power in the classroom should present themselves accordingly. Such is the same case for school administrators within the school because their image reflects their status within the school

Engendering is an important part of the learning process as it involves emotional and behavioral activities. The taught and learned curriculum both aim for the holistic appreciation of the students and a reflection of desirable personal character growth and development. This also reflects that the values, knowledge, and actions are observed and evaluated to be either positive or negative concerning the image a student or even a teacher tries to seed within themselves as seen or learned from authority. The exchange occurring in the teaching-learning process critically affects the character formation of both the teacher and the students. This seemingly structured channeling of behavior through the teaching-learning process likewise presents another angle in the knots of the hidden curriculum within the school.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM
Picturing the Hierarchy and the Hidden Curriculum
The formation of a structured social hierarchy arises due to the need to manage and govern people. School leaders are important in leading and decision-making activities (Neeleman, 2018; Albashiry, Voogt & Pieters, 2015). This process involves both the people at the top management level as well as those at the lower level of the hierarchy because they both give the idea of how what a school structure would look like, The number of stakeholders determines the number of leader units (Ahmady, Mehrpour & Nikooravesh, 2016) that will manage and organize each individual into a clustered group of similar nature and similar functions, and vice versa. The very nature of school managers and administrators to cluster together different individuals falls on the staffing function of the management and this is seen as an important factor in identifying key hierarchical management responsibilities of school stakeholders.

The Influences of Organizational Structure in the Hidden Curriculum: Implications in School Practice

Liddicoat, Scarino & Kohler (2017) bridged the two dimensions of organizational factors, hierarchy, and functions, in the discussion of the importance of school leaders properly managing their academic staff. Staff structure as identified in their research revolves around the challenges and opportunities of workloads, schedule, and staff recruitment. This gives a picture of how school leaders manage the hierarchy with the different volume of people, from the recruitment to laying off of employees, as well as the distribution of workloads and the degree of task difficulties, and how long the staff/employee has to stay to finish such duties. Liddicoat, Scarino & Kohler (2017) heavily underscored that the way of thinking of the school authorities can change the work nature of the school, thus, also affecting the well-being of each stakeholder.

Many public and private schools pictured their teachers and related academic staff as tired (See et al., 2020). Viewed as a vital entity of the school, these teachers have been delegated with overloaded teaching units exceeding those of what they can endure (Martinez & McAbee, 2020). Moreover, the distribution of these units across a certain timetable can affect teachers' health and daily capacity as some of them are overworked for long periods of hours without proper meals and rest. Retention and recruitment and the working environment may also affect the staffing of school teachers (See et al., 2020; Martinez & McAbee, 2020). The teachers often experience hardships which in turn affect the quality of learning inside the classroom.

This seemingly important picture of the delegated part of the hierarchy reflects on poor working conditions and in turn, affects the overall learning environment. Pieces of research highlight the need for teacher support and care (See et al., 2020; Martinez & McAbee, 2020) which, among schools, are often an undervalued topic. Teachers design and plan the school curriculum, realize the school's pedagogical aspirations, and mold students, hence, they are a very important body for the continuity of learning and school activities. This perspective is often dismissed and now calls for understanding through close examination to find out the real effects on school teaching-learning processes. Teacher management situations and hierarchical polarity as an understated curriculum should indeed be examined.

Viewing the Functions and the Hidden Curriculum
Duties and responsibilities come along with the designated positions across the school hierarchy. A principal's duty differs from those under the hierarchy, hence, they perform different tasks appropriate to their level and title. Usually, people positioned on the top of the hierarchy are the ones who make the decision involving the overall welfare of the organization while those at the bottom level provide direct service and produce outcomes and/or outputs as evidence of the decisions made. This presents another polarity seen in functional dimensions.

Functional accountability and responsible duty management lie in the hands of school authorities and administrators. In the systematic review synthesis conducted by Martinez & McAbee (2020), it alluded that the functional effectiveness of school administrators, seen in different school practices, can affect teacher effectiveness. This means that administrative roles and responsibilities and their efforts to accomplish such may produce a negative or positive impact on the school's stakeholders and determine the overall direction of the school. Furthermore, Tolo et al. (2020) looked into the intelligent accountability, seen through the lens of trusting relationship, in the practice of Assessment for Learning (AfL) identified that school leaders view their role on professional development relatively. This expression of roles has impacted school processes and resulted in a variety of reform implementation processes where leaders either passively function, seek external support, or function alongside his/her teachers collaboratively.

Decision-making functions and roles of the school administrators are important as well. Bursalioglu (2011) stated that decision-making processes are directed to develop and transform the organization, to solve issues and problems, and to affect the stakeholders (cited in Olcum & Titrek, 2015, p.1937). Olcum & Titrek (2015) discussed that the administrators' different decision-making styles can affect teachers' job satisfaction. Nixon (2017) found out, in the context of academic placement, that school principal's decisions may affect a student's postsecondary opportunities and chance. It was discussed in the paper that principals include personal experiences, student's behavioral impacts on the school, and performance when arriving at a proper placement decision.

In school prioritization, it was revealed in the study conducted by Ecija (2020) that public schools in the Philippines deeply consider maintenance expenditures. It was revealed that school heads wisely strategize school assets, and the Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (MOOE) to ensure that learning experiences for students are maximized. Specifically, it was revealed that school heads prioritize things that need spending due to finite resources and that it is used mostly for delivering the best education possible.

The above-mentioned studies showed the wide scope of effects of the school administrator to a variety of stakeholders in terms of innate functions like accountability, decision-making, and prioritization. The way how school administrators identify their functions relative to their position may affect different school-related tasks and activities. It must be remembered that different school tasks affect the learning process and, ultimately, student learning. Therefore, such tasks that equally create and require key underlying processes and responses are implicit needs for the teaching-learning process.

The Influences of Organizational Structure in the Hidden Curriculum: Implications in School Practice

Exploring Inclusion and the Hidden Curriculum

As a content variable (Ahmady, Mehrpour & Nikooravesh, 2016), the inclusion dimension may affect the total structure of an organization. Over time, the educational system has evolved to meet the different needs following globalization and scientific improvement. This has caused several demands in the design of school organizations and a focus on decentralization (Romanowski & Du, 2020; O'Brien, Hartnett & Rawlins, 2019; Geschwind, 2018; Qi, 2017). The centralization of school structure is now being challenged by the current trends in social situations and has raised many investigations and queries.

Concerns regarding decentralization are mainly observed at the governmental level. Decentralization refers to the extent of transfer of power, authority, and decision-making (Romanowski & Du, 2020) to which the confinement within or across an organization is observed (Sadhu & Kulik, 2018). This view highlights the involvement of the government and the education sector in terms of capacitating decisions at the lower level of the organization as opposed to the top management decision-making. The minimized distance present between the lower and upper management in decision-making ensues that coordination and effective work are affirmed and direct, which results in immediate feedback of the tasks. This also presents that the level of decision-making is concentrated at the control of function when a need for a decision arises.

Exploring this as a part of the hidden curriculum, this may be viewed as a "Social System Variable" (Glatthorn et al., 2019, p. 56). Allowing decision-making to be established at the lower layer of the hierarchy accounts for an immediate response to students' needs for a safe and supportive learning environment. School operations that are required to maintain daily school tasks such as cleaning, food services, and student healthcare need to be efficient as it involves the students' well-being.

Conjointly, Channa (2016) discussed that there is a need to identify prerequisites to decentralization. Romanowski & Du (2020) have posited that policymakers and reform implementers should consider the importance of culture in decentralization. Qi (2017) mentioned that understanding power relation is important to clarify school decentralization. Organizational interference and objectives may also impact decentralization (Hamal, 2020). The mentioned prerequisites to decentralization heavily impact school activities. These seemingly mediating requisites may be considered variables affecting the hidden curriculum because such variables are intrinsically related to the formation of the implicit system within the school. Moreover, power as a factor and relationship is highly observed as an important component in the centralization and decentralization of school activities. This, in turn, generates inquiries about the impacts of the power and proximity relationship of the school authorities in managing the school curriculum.

At the school level and viewed as restructuring, Kirui and Ongiti (2016) concluded that in Bomet County, Kenya, organizational structure affects schools' performance through a more mechanistic organizational structure. The researchers discussed that the mechanistic nature of the schools was due to their centralized structure. In the hidden curriculum, this is manifested by the flow of communication from the top authority and the flow of ideas horizontally and vertically within the organization. This also reflects how school-related information processes are decided, transmitted, and disseminated. Moreover, Geschwind (2018) mentioned that organizational restructuring initiated by the school administrators is affected by both internal and external factors such as school quality assurance, reputation-building, and take-over process. The changes observed were characterized by complexity. Restructuring involves a variety of inclusion development such as reduction of unit-to-head reporting, decentralization of operational responsibilities, the appointment of new administrative positions, and joint management, which all impacts the teaching-learning process (Geschwind, 2018).

OTHER HIDDEN CURRICULUM SITUATIONS

Glatthorn et al. (2019) mentioned that extracurricular and co-curricular activities belong to the hidden curriculum. School policies and practices should be intended to support the students to master their skills and abilities (Adhiambo& Ndolo, 2020) and the maintenance of a positive school environment (Sheras & Bradshaw, 2016). Extracurricular and co-curricular tasks related to all school programs are planned and situated in the school context. For instance, catholic schools may endorse celebration days for feast days and related ritualistic and ceremonial activities (masses, praying sessions, and others); some schools may establish institutional activities related to their practices or in line with a national celebration.

Moreover, Glatthorn et al. (2019) mentioned factors related to organizational variables that can affect the hidden curriculum. One of these is the goal of the organization to group students and teachers for instruction. The formation of groups can relate to understanding the governmental concepts related to organizational structure. Mugume & Luescher (2017) viewed it through the lens of student leadership and politics. Teachers try to develop students' leadership skills while the school gives them the venue by allowing proactive and collaborative student organizations. This immersive nature of leadership practice for students allows them to see the procedural process that takes place per level of school structure and within similar authority levels. This also allows them to practice their decision-making skills, as well as strategic, critical, reflective, and creative thinking skills as it involves active participation by designing and planning student programs and activities and collaborating with the school authorities for permission

which gives them a real insight into what happens during paper trails as well as the unspoken mandate about authority-related processes.

The above-mentioned pieces of information provided by the various authors give the researchers a view of a different relationship between organizational structure and the hidden curriculum, i.e, one that focuses on the power relationship and order between the stakeholders and the authority, and the intricacies of the perceived values, especially about responsibility, decision-making accountability, and respect for authority. These overlapping spaces between the direct and indirect role of organizational structure and the school's view of the learning process seem to create a sphere of influence for the hidden curriculum.

IMPACT ON SCHOOL PRACTICE

As stipulated by Glatthorn et al. (2019), the relationships that existed between the different types of curricula all converge in the student's perspective and the period of his/her life inside the school. The driving factors of the curriculum seem to originate at the various levels of the organizational structure, which consists of the main decision-making body and the people who set and drive the direction of and for the school.

This was proven in the study conducted by Hutabarat (2015) on the effects of organizational structure and culture on teachers' work motivation. He concluded that both have direct and indirect effects on teachers' motivation. Drysdale (2018) emphasized the importance of organizational structure in shaping the instructional designs of schools. This can be seen by how the teachers guide and facilitate the learning of the students. Glatthorn et al. (2019) highlighted this in the perspective of teacher's quality and classroom techniques. Reflecting this on the hidden curriculum, this is viewed on how teachers try to connect with and meet the students' needs. This transactional relationship beyond what is documented emphasizes the intrinsic quality of teachers, dwelling on how they try to motivate, care, understand, support, listen to, respect, and dedicate themselves to the students and how these emotional-behavioral qualities will be able to reach the students. It must be noted that it is not only what is written in a teacher's daily lesson plan that is what is taught but also the enhancement of the socio-emotional attitudes and behaviors of the students in a supportive learning environment (Glatthorn et al., 2019).

CONCLUSION: IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The paper does not view all the major aspects of school functions and activities. However, the literature synthesized reveals the direct and indirect roles of organizational structures toward the hidden curriculum and its impact on school practice. Below are some of the implications. School leaders must view how the stakeholders within their organization systemically move, that is how they interact through established and underlying processes, and use this pattern to improve school practice. There is also a need to reflect on the systemic viewing of the organizational structure through the lens of the hidden curriculum, to identify the unseen systemic processes present in the communication channels, paper trails, cross and across department relations, and behavioral channeling. The impact on school practice may require the restructuring of the school organization, especially considering the size of the school population.

The school's organizational structure affects the transmission, communication, and integration of information, and the implementation of processes within and outside the school. This presents a notion that school curriculum, specifically the understated or hidden curriculum, does not only reflect on the students' performance and the teaching-learning process but also the plight of teachers and other stakeholders involved. This critically pinpoints the sociopolitical, moral-political, and politico-educational aspects of learning institutions and how these are viewed, experienced, and lived by these stakeholders.

With the above-mentioned implications identified in this paper, the administrators, teachers, and parents are enjoined to collaborate in school undertakings and in strengthening the school culture in conformity with the vision and mission of the school. Future researchers can apply different qualitative methods to verify the implications drawn in this paper.

REFERENCES
1) Adhiambo, H. A. & Ndolo, M. A. (2020). Effects of school policies on academic performance in mixed day schools in Kenya: A case study of Kisumu East. *International Journal of Current Research, 12*(10), 14183-14189. http://journalcra.com/sites/default/files/issue-pdf/39873_0.pdf
2) Ahmady, G. A., Mehrpour, M., & Nikooravesh, A. (2016). Organizational structure. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 230*, 455–462. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.09.057
3) Albashiry, N. M., Voogt, J. M., & Pieters, J. M. (2015). Curriculum leadership in action: A tale of four community college heads of department leading a curriculum development project. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 40(5),* 401–413. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2015.1065775

4) Borges, J. C., Ferreira, T. C., Borges de Oliveira, M. S., Macini, N., & Caldana, A. C. F. (2017). Hidden curriculum in student organizations: Learning, practice, socialization and responsible management in a business school. *The International Journal of Management Education, 15*(2), 153–161. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2017.03.003

5) Bövers, J., & Hoon, C. (2019). Shared leadership at the top of family firms: How sibling teams engage in successful co-leadership. *Studies on Entrepreneurship, Structural Change, and Industrial Dynamics*, 113–132. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15526-1_7

6) Bovill, C., & Woolmer, C. (2018). How conceptualisations of curriculum in higher education influence student-staff co-creation in and of the curriculum. *Higher Education. 78*, 407–422 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0349-8

7) Channa, A. (2016). Popularity of the decentralization reform and its effects on the quality of education. *Prospects, 46*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-016-9380-7

8) Clement, J., & Puranam, P. (2018). Searching for structure: Formal organization design as a guide to network evolution. *Management Science, 64*(8), 3879–3895. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2017.2807

9) Dornbusch, S. M., Glasgow, K. L., & Lin, I.-C. (1996). The social structure of schooling. *Annual Review of Psychology, 47*(1), 401–429. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.47.1.401

10) Drysdale, J. (2018). The Organizational Structures of Instructional Design Teams in Higher Education: A Multiple Case Study. Digital Commons, *Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Paper 115*. https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1119&context=etd

11) Ecija, J. D. (2020). Maintenance and Other Operating Expenses (Mooe) and School Based Management (Sbm) performance of secondary schools in Samar Island. *LC International Journal Of Stem, 1*(4). http://www.lcjstem.com/index.php/jstem/article/view/45/40

12) Ellerbrock, C., Main, K., Falbe, K., & Pomykal Franz, D. (2018). An Examination of Middle School Organizational Structures in the United States and Australia. *Education Sciences, 8*(4), 168. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci8040168

13) Geschwind, L. (2018). Legitimizing Change in Higher Education: Exploring the Rationales Behind Major Organizational Restructuring. *Higher Education Policy*. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-018-0088-6

14) Glatthorn, A. A., Boschee, F. A., Whitehead, B. M., & Boschee, B. F. (2019). *Curriculum Leadership: Strategies for Development and Implementation*. 5th ed. Sage Publications.

15) Hamal, S. (2020). Decentralization of education in Nepal: A rein in a horse nose. *Social Inquiry: Journal of Social Science Research, 2*(2), 194-215. https://doi.org/10.3126/sijssr.v2i2.33060

16) Hopkins, K., Kroning, M., & Kobes, P. (2020). Leadership's role in curriculum revision. *Teaching and Learning in Nursing*, 1-3. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teln.2020.11.002

17) Hutabarat, W. (2015). Do organizational structure and organizational culture affect teachers' work motivation to some extent? *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research, 20*(2), 350-362. https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v3i3.7357

18) Jabarzadeh, Y., Sanoubar, N., Vahdat, A., & Khosravi Saghezchi, F. (2019). The role of shared leadership and communication in promoting strategic consensus and performance. *Organization Management Journal*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/15416518.2019.1661821

19) Kanten, P., Kanten, S., & Gurlek, M. (2015). The effects of organizational structures and learning organization on job embeddedness and individual adaptive performance. *Procedia Economics and Finance, 23*, 1358–1366. https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671(15)00523-7

20) Kirui, D. K., & Ongiti, O. (2016). Effects of organization structure on academic performance in secondary school: Case of National and County Schools in Bomet County, Kenya. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research, 2*(10), 1301-1315. http://www.onlinejournal.in/IJIRV2I10/165.pdf

21) Liddicoat, A. J., Scarino, A., & Kohler, M. (2017). The impact of school structures and cultures on change in teaching and learning: the case of languages. *Curriculum Perspectives, 38*(1), 3–13. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41297-017-0021-y

22) Martinez, J. & McAbee, S. (2020). School administrator support of teachers: A systematic review (2000-2019). *Educational Leadership Review, 21*(1)*, 230-246. https://www.icpel.org/uploads/1/5/6/2/15622000/elr_volume_21-1_fall_2020.pdf#page=235

23) Mitchell, B. (2016). Understanding Curriculum. *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Studies, 4*(4), 299-311. https://www.ajouronline.com/index.php/AJHSS/article/view/3928

24) Mbuva, J. (2017). Exploring teachers' self-esteem and its effects on teaching, students' learning and self-esteem. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice, 17*(3), 123-134. http://www.na-businesspress.com/JHETP/MbuvaJ_Web17_3_.pdf

25) Mugume, T. & Luescher, T. M. (2017). Student representation and the relationship between student leaders and political parties: The case of Makerere University. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 31*(3), 154-171. https://journals.co.za/doi/abs/10.208535/31-3-639

26) Neeleman, A. (2018). The scope of school autonomy in practice: An empirically based classification of school interventions. *Journal of Educational Change*, 31-55. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-018-9332-5

27) Neve, H., & Collett, T. (2017). Empowering students with the hidden curriculum. *The Clinical Teacher, 15*, 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1111/tct.12736

28) Nixon, L. A. (2017). School Leaders Decision-Making Process for Academic Program Placement: A Phenomenological Study. *Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Paper 3228*. https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/3228

29) O'Brien, R., Hartnett, M., & Rawlins, P. (2019). The centralisation of elearning resource development within the New Zealand vocational tertiary education sector. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 35*(5), 95-110. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.4536

30) Olcum, D., & Titrek, O. (2015). The Effect of School Administrators' Decision-Making Styles on Teacher Job Satisfaction. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 197*, 1936–1946. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.575

31) Qi, X. (2017). Policy and Practice of the Decentralization of Basic Education in China: The Shanghai Case. *Frontiers of Education in China, 12*(4), 445–467. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11516-017-0033-2

32) Romanowski, M. H., & Du, X. (2020). Education transferring and decentralized reforms: The case of Qatar. *Prospects*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09478-x

33) Sandhu, S., & Kulik, C. T. (2018). Shaping and being shaped: How organizational structure and managerial discretion co-evolve in new managerial roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1-4. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839218778018

34) See, B. H., Morris, R., Gorard, S., Kokotsaki, D., & Abdi, S. (2020). Teacher Recruitment and Retention: A Critical Review of International Evidence of Most Promising Interventions. *Education Sciences, 10*(10), 262. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10100262

35) Sheras, P. L., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2016). Fostering Policies That Enhance Positive School Environment. *Theory into Practice, 55*(2), 129-135. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1156990

36) Soare, E. (2015). Using the Complex Learning Situation Model in the evaluation of competences. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 180*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.02.076

37) Svinicki, M. (2019). The Hidden Curriculum. *The National Teaching & Learning Forum, 28*(4), 11–12. https://doi.org/10.1002/ntlf.30205

38) Tan, X., Wang, H., & Tan, W. (2011). Research on teacher training curriculum mode innovation based on Web. *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, 213–220. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-23357-9_39

39) Tolo, A., Lillejord, S., Flórez Petour, M.T., & Hopfenbeck, T. N. (2020). Intelligent accountability in schools: A study of how school leaders work with the implementation of assessment for learning. *Journal of Educational Change 21*, 59–82. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10833-019-09359-x

40) Turkkahraman, M. (2015). Education, teaching and school as a social organization. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 186*, 381–387. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.044

41) Van Griethuijsen, R. A. L. F., Kunst, E. M., van Woerkom, M., Wesselink, R., & Poell, R. F. (2019). Does implementation of competence-based education mediate the impact of team learning on student satisfaction? *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820.2019.1644364