

Education (Im)Possible: An Exploration of the Vulnerability of the Business Curriculum

Japie Heydenrych

Milpark Business School
South Africa

Email: [Japie.Heydenrych\[at\]milpark.ac.za](mailto:Japie.Heydenrych[at]milpark.ac.za)

ABSTRACT---- *Contemporary curricula are blamed for the many crises of today’s world. The perception is that with improved curricula, better-equipped, more competent and responsible candidates will take their position in society. However, in this discussion it is pointed out that the curriculum is inherently imperfect and that it cannot possibly address all expectations. Any curriculum may turn out to be something very different from what it was intended to be. Every graduate will enter the world with a different curricular experience, inadequate understanding and partially relevant knowledge. The curriculum can never be perfect if we recognize the uncertainty, unpredictability and complexity of human systems. The curriculum is vulnerable by default.*

Keywords--- Curriculum, policy, knowledge, learning, teaching, complexity, postnormal

1. INTRODUCTION

After the Global Financial Crisis of 2007, authors such as Podolny (2009), Rayment and Smith (2010), Martell (2008), Casey (2010) and James (2009) contributed to a flood of criticism against management education and business degree programmes like the MBA. The perception at the time was that there was an over-reliance on neatly packaged content in the curriculum, that the curriculum was unresponsive to business challenges and that programmes were unable to produce properly qualified candidates.

More recently, Nkomo (2015) argues for relevance in local business curricula. According to her, it is essential that business schools develop theory relevant to the South African context for inclusion in curricula. From an international perspective, Khurana in Holstein (2016) questions the relevance of business education at this time and is of the view that business schools have become “everything and nothing to everyone at once”. For him, there is a lack of development in general management knowledge that can be added to the curriculum.

Andrews (2013) alleges that employers in general are no longer happy with today’s graduates. A degree alone does not make a good graduate. Co-curricular activities are suggested to address the problem. In the immediate aftermath of the #FeesMustFall movement in South Africa, Shay (2016) also raises concerns about the relevance of the curricula: the curriculum may not be relevant to today’s students, it is lagging behind in a fast-changing world and students’ voices must be heard.

The above views highlight an apparent inability of business curricula to address all the needs of stakeholders. Before exposing the possible problematic tenets of the curriculum and its execution, it is worthwhile to provide brief overviews of the definitions of curriculum, curriculum perspectives and to identify possible inherent conflicts.

1.1 Defining curriculum

Four types of definitions have been found in the literature: prescriptive, descriptive, “fragmented” and integrated. Prescriptive definitions aim at addressing the plan or the policy outlining a program of study. McBrien and Brandt (in Glatthorn *et al.*, 2011) see the curriculum as a written plan outlining what students will be taught (a course of study). Descriptive definitions tend to focus more on the actual classroom learning experience and how learning is guided. For Tanner and Tanner (2006), the curriculum is the “... reconstruction of knowledge and experience that enables the learner to grow in exercising intelligent control of subsequent knowledge and experience.” Fragmented definitions are those that contain grouped alternative definitions – reference will be made to policy, content selection and the classroom experience, for example, as separate options to define the curriculum (Belbase, 2011: 2; Kumari & Srivastava, 2005: 3; Parkay *et al.*, 2014: 2–3; Ornstein and Hunkins, 2014: 8–9). Integrated definitions address all elements included in the curriculum without focusing too much on either (prescribed) content or the classroom experience. According to Kumari & Srivastava (2005: 15), the curriculum develops through the dynamics of action and reflection. The curriculum is not

“simply a set of plans to be implemented, but rather is constituted through an active process in which planning, acting and evaluating are all reciprocally related and integrated into the process”.

1.2 Curriculum perspectives

Philosophical perspectives inform approaches to curriculum development and can have a profound influence on the design and execution of the curriculum. However, it is not always feasible to isolate a single perspective that informs curriculum development in a particular context. Perspectives can be divided into two groups based on Ornstein (1982) and Parkay *et al.*'s (2014: 301) overviews: perspectives that inform a subject content-centred curriculum and perspectives that lean towards a student-centred curriculum. Approaches informed by a content or consensus orientation tend to be informed by realist and/or idealist views on the world and knowledge (perennialism, essentialism and functionalism). Those who support the more student-centred approaches (humanism, progressivism and reconstructivism) tend to be more pragmatic (Ornstein, 1995: 8). Muneja (2013: 32) is of the opinion that more than one perspective may be inspiring the curriculum in a particular context – he identified elements of perennialism, essentialism and pragmatism in the Tanzanian school system, for example.

1.3 Prescribed versus open curricula

Watkins and Kritsonis (2008: 6) identify two streams of closed prescribed curricula: one based on a fragmented view of subject matter and another based on the integration of subject matter (note that these are both content based). The first focuses on individual academic disciplines based on facts, concepts and generalisations. There is no effort to forge relationships between different fields. The second sees different subject fields as interdependent. According to Watkins and Kritsonis (2008: 6), the latter will ensure deeper understanding.

In contrast to the content-based approach, the more open student-centred curriculum focuses on students' needs and interests. A student-centred curriculum does not support lecturers drilling facts into the heads of students. Ono (2010: 1) argues for change in curriculum content to make it more culturally relevant and to accommodate students' needs. Balbase (2011: 13) describes how he desired to move away from the curriculum as content to the curriculum as a programme of activities – he wanted his work to be more student centred.

From the definitions and perspectives, a conflict is emerging: there is a possible focus on either planned (closed) curricula and interactive (open) curricula. It seems as if a choice is made between prescribed content and freedom in the classroom.

1.4 Can business curricula be perfect?

With the above conflict between content and student engagement emerging from the definitions and perspectives, the question arises as to whether one can apportion significant blame to the curriculum when the relevance of business education is discussed. Can a curriculum be constructed and executed perfectly as intended? Or is the curriculum much more than the sum of its parts?

The assumption is that the more dynamic a curriculum is, the less contained or ideal it can be. Therefore, from the perspective of the critics of current business curricula, a new more acceptable curriculum may just be a fleeting image in a particular context or moment which can be as problematic as the current stagnant “silo-based” curricula.

A review will be conducted to uncover the influences on the curriculum in order to address the reasons for its apparent “poor performance”. Such influences will be related to the challenges in the delivery of contemporary business education in order to draw conclusions about the possibility to achieve an improved curriculum.

Note that the term *teacher* is used interchangeably with the term *lecturer* and that the term *school* can also include higher education institutions. The terms *curriculum* and *the curriculum* will be used with the same meaning implied.

2. THREE DIMENSIONS

According to Kumari and Srivastava (2005: 9), it is important to keep in mind that the curriculum is a process in respect of its conceptualization and implementation – as a result, it cannot be viewed as fixed from outline to implementation. In this regard, three dimensions are discussed here, namely the intended curriculum, the implemented curriculum and the achieved curriculum. A view of the interplay within and between these dimensions provides valuable information on how dynamic a curriculum can be.

2.1 The outline — the intended curriculum

The *intended curriculum* comprises the *recommended* and the *written curriculum* (Bloom (2006). Kumari & Srivastava (2005: 31) refer to the latter as the *explicit curriculum*. The written curriculum is informed by the *recommended* or *rhetorical curriculum*. It is inspired, to a large extent, by individual scholars, professional associations, policy-making groups and governments (Kumari & Srivastava, 2005: 33; Glatthorn *et al.*, 2011: 9). The rhetorical curriculum is in essence ideological and provides direction in terms of what ought to be taught (Glatthorn *et al.*, 2011: 6) – it is supposed to constitute what societies envisage as important. The written curriculum is usually presented in official documents, such as subject curricula/syllabi, relevant and helpful learning materials, textbooks, teacher guides and assessment guides. The written curriculum is also called the *official curriculum*. The core curriculum, based on official expectations, has come under recent criticism for confining the learning experience to standard silos of academic content (Heydenrych, 2016).

Some programmes may continue to teach certain content because it is regarded as foundational or core. The intended curriculum includes the *core curriculum* (Kumari & Srivastava, 2005: 23). The core curriculum informs a series of basic intellectual competencies that are essential to the learning process (for example, reading, writing, speaking, critical thinking and computer literacy). Sometimes learning objects, as part of standard written curricula, are mapped semantically to measure compliance and cross-disciplinary relevance (Patrizi *et al.*, 2013) and as a way of ensuring compliance with outcomes. Patrizi *et al.* (2013) call this practice the “cross-curricular consumption of content”.

The *null curriculum* (Sheikhzade, 2011) or the *absent curriculum* (Wilkinson, 2014) consists of intended, applied and experienced parts. During curriculum planning at national policy level, some necessary parts of the student experience may be intentionally or unintentionally omitted. The *intended null curriculum* or the *unselected curriculum* (Wilkinson, 2014) is a result of the authors of textbooks or politicians deleting some parts of the content and curriculum because of its apparent incongruence with the needs of students and society.

According to Ornstein (1982: 407), the curriculum must reflect the changes in society in order to be relevant. However, “changes made in the name of relevance have led to a watered-down curriculum.” Relevance can also refer to what the students expect to learn (Ornstein, 1982: 407).

2.2 Teaching — the implemented curriculum

Lecturers play a very important role in the implemented curriculum. They have the complex task of interpreting the extent of policy and enabling the curriculum in the classroom. According to Handler (2010), lecturers are required to package the written curriculum into lesson plans that can affect the outcome once again.

At classroom level, the intended curriculum may be altered through a range of complex classroom interactions, and what is actually delivered can be considered the *implemented*, the *applied* or the *taught curriculum* (Glatthorn *et al.* (2011: 15)). Those who develop the intended curriculum should have all these different dimensions of the curriculum in view. Kumari and Srivastava (2005: 34) and Cuban (1992) describe this dimension as the “curriculum in use” – it is explicit, delivered and operational. It is also possible to include the *perceived curriculum* under the banner of the implemented curriculum – this is how lecturers view their work in the classroom and what they think they are achieving (Koutselini & Agathangelou, 2014: 53). During the process of delivering the taught curriculum, or implemented curriculum, lecturer beliefs begin to change the curriculum. The extent to which consonance exists between the written curriculum and the taught curriculum seems to vary considerably (Glatthorn *et al.* (2011: 15).

The implemented curriculum is enabled through the *supported curriculum* (Glatthorn *et al.*, 2011: 12) in terms of the resources allocated. The supported curriculum is that part of the written curriculum that comes to be implemented because it is sufficiently resourced. In South Africa, the Department of Higher Education and Training determines resource allocation to different types of institutions and delivery modes. Delivery modes may impact on the curriculum in different ways. While some highly interactive delivery modes (contact learning and online learning) may influence the curriculum substantially in terms of lecturer and student contribution, others such as distance learning in its conventional form (texts with moderate support) may impact on the curriculum in the opposite way.

As part of the *applied null curriculum*, or what Wilkinson (2014) refers to as the *unenacted curriculum*, lecturers omit parts of the curriculum based on their judgement of what is in the interests of the students, in finalizing the curriculum. The applied null curriculum may also be contributed to by lecturers not having the skills to incorporate relevant content or experience that is within their mandate, due to a lack of training.

2.3 Learning – the achieved curriculum

Koutselini and Agathangelou (2011: 53) refer to the *experienced curriculum* as that which students actually receive in the classroom. It is also called the *achieved, learned, attained or received curriculum* (Kumari & Srivastava, 2005: 34). The experienced or learned curriculum denotes all the changes in values, perceptions, and behaviour that occur as a result of school experiences (Glatthorn *et al.*, 2011: 15).

Glatthorn *et al.* (2011: 15) also identify the *tested curriculum* that refers to the assessment of the outcomes of the curriculum at different levels. What students experience goes beyond what can be assessed based on learning outcomes. According to Cuban (1992), the gap between what is taught (what students receive) and what is learned is substantial, and it is both intended and unintended. Similarly, Koutselini and Agathangelou (2011: 53) call for lecturers' awareness of how students experience what they teach and what is learned eventually. Such an awareness can be counteracted by lecturers when they allow students to give input on their teaching and on the content covered. In this regard, Sweeney (2013) reports on the interaction between Karen Brennan, assistant professor of education at Harvard, and her students. She allows students to "prescribe" some readings to her: "You get to assign us readings. It's only fair that we give you readings."

Glatthorn *et al.* (2011: 25) draw our attention to the classroom as a delivery space.

This space is normally busy, many students are present and the lecturer exercises different control techniques to direct learning. The lecturer uses his or her power to control the selection of content, the methods of learning, movement in the classroom, and the flow of classroom discussion. The behaviour of lecturers in the classroom can activate parts of the *hidden curriculum* in terms of conveying social and moral messages. Bloom (2006) provides the example of when a lecturer has his or her desk at the front of the classroom and then "teaches" from this position; the message being learned by students is that the lecturer is in control and he/she is the hub of knowledge. In this space, the most striking aspects of the hidden curriculum are enabled. Bloom (2006) refers to this dimension as the *implicit curriculum*.

Students learn many skills unconsciously under classroom conditions. Humes (2005) makes the following statement: "It is perhaps a chastening thought for teachers and lecturers to think that what we do not consciously plan for may have a more profound influence on our students than all our well-intentioned efforts." Yuksel (2005: 332) highlights Kohlberg's thoughts on the hidden curriculum: it relates to social relationships in schools and it is the most effective and elaborate curriculum in the moral development of students. Reporting from the medical context, Liao *et al.* (2014) argue that educators are trying to achieve objectives through formalized curricula only. They recommend paying attention to a different teaching force: "This force, described more than a decade ago by Frederic Hafferty, is collectively termed the hidden curriculum. It refers to the messages transmitted implicitly on the job through everyday vocabulary, practices, and habits, all of which have powerful effects on individual attitudes and practices."

The influences brought to the classroom from society are referred to as the *societal curriculum* (Cortes, 2002). It is about the unintended development of personal values and beliefs of learners, lecturers and communities; the unexpected impact of a curriculum and the unforeseen aspects of the learning process (Kumari & Srivastava, 2005: 31). The *concomitant curriculum* is what is taught or emphasized at home, or at church, for example, and is sanctioned by these institutions. There is also another dimension that we can add to the hidden curriculum – that of the *internal curriculum* (Kumari & Srivastava, 2005: 34). Each student combines his or her experiences and realities with what is being taught to create new knowledge. According to Ornstein (1982: 407), the values of the student peer group constitute an important part of the curriculum, but this aspect is often left out during curriculum planning. In this regard, Henriksson (2012) reports that failure may not be related to cognitive knowledge and proficiency, but to the feelings the students experienced and a weak formative relationship between lecturers and students.

The *experienced null curriculum*, informed by the absent and unselected parts of the curriculum, is where the students ignore or pay little attention to some parts of the curriculum because it does not relate to or represent them. There should be as much concern about what is taught as there is about what is not taught – if not, we are sending messages that some parts of what there is to know are not important. Wilkinson (2014) uses the case of 295 British Muslim boys who disengaged from learning history because it was not relevant to them. He concluded that the absent curriculum suggests to certain groups of students whose stories are missing from the national curricula that they are insignificant citizens in the community and the nation.

As part of the achieved curriculum, the hidden curriculum is a side effect of education – lessons that are learned but not intended (Martin, 1983: 122). According to Mahood (2011: 983), we "are sometimes unconscious of the hidden curriculum, but even when conscious of it we are silent or reluctant to act. There is a need for a frank dialogue with students, residents, and each other about the lived experience...".

3. DISCUSSION

The curriculum appears to be a complicated space from outline to experience with stakeholders impacting on the different dimensions. There are gaps between what is outlined, what lecturers see as relevant and what students experience as relevant. These gaps are at the heart of the problem with education (Ornstein, 1982: 407). Influence comes equally from identified and unidentified, and recognized and unrecognized sources. Such influences can direct the curriculum away from relevance.

3.1 *Policy and influence*

The curriculum can never escape the influence of politics in the form of governments and regulatory agencies. Levin (2009: 9) is of the opinion that the politics of curriculum require an understanding of the factors that affect elected governments and especially the powerful constraints that limit both understanding of what to do and the capacity to act. Policy about curriculum is influenced by public opinion, public beliefs, ruling party interests, discipline boundaries, teaching conventions, regulators and so-called peer benchmarking. These examples of influence can affect content selection and can determine the nature of the learning experience in terms of pedagogy, teaching and learning. Levin (2009: 17) warns about “the formal control system” that keeps watch over the curriculum. In this regard, Apple (1992:222) is of the opinion that the curriculum is “never simply a neutral assemblage of knowledge somehow appearing in the texts and classrooms of a nation”. The selection is influenced by politics and power, and what is seen as legitimate knowledge may have been influenced by a dominant group’s views. For example, when governments or ruling parties are in trouble, they want to be seen to be doing something good: “In a time of loss of government legitimacy and a crisis in educational authority relations, the government must be seen to be doing something about raising educational standards.” (Apple, 1993: 230)

Political influence has indeed left South African education curricula with serious deficits. The youth of South Africa now want education to represent who they are and what they need. In addition, the relevance of qualifications and courses based on historical legacy can be questioned. Makgoba (2015) states: “They (students) are tired of the current system that... continues to reproduce inequality by whatever measure you look at.” Letsekha (2013) is of the opinion that higher education courses in South Africa are often taught without due recognition of the historical context and cultural practices of the students enrolling.

The development of standards for qualifications can be seen as another attempt to enforce a certain standard curriculum. For example, the newly developed MBA standards (CHE, 2015) in South Africa provide a strong indication of what the regulators expect from this qualification regardless of how innovative certain business schools may be. Although there may be standard content in most MBAs, through official standards the curriculum is dictated to a certain extent. This can be seen as part of the official curriculum. A very radical, but effective MBA curriculum, for example, may not receive favourable reviews as it will find itself distanced from the official curriculum.

3.2 *Whose knowledge?*

Relevance can also refer to what the students are expected to learn (Ornstein, 1982: 407). From an official point of view, the question remains how relevant the curriculum can be within the confines of the written curriculum provided in the business studies classroom.

After the Crisis of 2007, critics blamed business schools for teaching standardized bland academic content in silos (Heydenrych, 2016). It was claimed that the challenges present in the business sector are not represented on a practical level in business curricula. Underlying the curriculum process is the problem that its result is dependent on selected prescribed subject discipline content. However, there has to be recognition for the fact that there is no simple and unified objective truth that we must all learn to become competent. In addition, the action of prescribing content is problematic as it can never be neutral. Selection and prescription will have the interests of certain groups at heart. Prescription contributes to exclusion – the knowledge that is outlined is seen as sufficient to address the needs of the students. Students find themselves receiving knowledge without critically interacting with it and adding their relevant interpretations and experience to it as the learning experience unfolds in the classroom.

The learning experience also cannot be completely progressive in that all knowledge is supposed to be generated during the taught and participative experience itself. A certain level of affirmation has to be provided in recognition of established discipline-based knowledge. The standard MBA curriculum, for example, does contain a number of core disciplines supplemented with related fields. There is still a strong expectation with regard to what a good MBA is based on the incorporation of the core disciplines (Heydenrych, 2016). Alternatively, the classroom experience should be the hub for the real learning that has to take place. Collectively, students bring a wealth of knowledge and experience to the classroom that impacts on the curriculum as highlighted in the discussion of the dimensions. Students can interact

productively with the curriculum by integrating their knowledge or experience, and/or they can ignore parts of the curriculum if they feel that it is prescriptive and does not address their realities. We have to accept that there will be a contribution from the classroom experience in different forms and degrees.

3.3 *The contribution of the lecturer*

According to Evans (2013: 334), research-based knowledge presents itself as superior and it is regarded by policy-makers and educational bureaucrats as the only knowledge capable of producing the required effects. To maintain the scope of prescribed knowledge, it becomes essential to train lecturers to do the tests and assessment, and for them to teach with these goals in mind. Levin (2009: 17) discusses “teacher proof” curricula. Lecturers follow the rules and execute the assigned curricula, and their contribution is minimized. They are trained to do exactly what is expected – in the process they become trained, but not educated – the real lecturer cannot emerge. The unique and creative efforts of knowledge construction in the classroom are stultified. According to Evans (2013: 337), it is expected that lecturers become ventriloquists – they have to recite texts that were assigned to them – pedagogical instinct and feelings are pushed aside by the need for “facticity”.

With policy mostly developed outside of the classroom, and enforcement through training and evaluation, the lecturers’ contribution may be reduced. Teacher proofing has gone too far, according to Evans (2013: 329): “The space for teachers and their teaching has been narrowed to the vanishing point.” Lecturers may feel no connection to programmes and the related assessment methods. Standardized teaching and measurable results are threatening the contribution of creativity and innovation in the classroom. In the end, teaching may be about working with neatly outlined academic knowledge through an assigned identity. According to Levin (2013: 332), lecturers are not able to speak the “overburdened language of strategies and technique.” Lecturers need to be able to live and feel the learning experience in order for it to acquire any meaning for them.

Evans (2013: 337) suggests that lecturers’ experience with rule-based practice “must be experienced as a type of mental and spiritual imprisonment...”. The role of the lecturer becomes undermined in this repressive world of prescription and monitoring. Lecturers may disconnect from the knowledge they are required to teach – this disconnection may have a negative effect on the quality of classroom teaching. In addition, students may be at a disadvantage, as they have to digest prescribed content without the opportunity to integrate their own experience and needs. Alternatively, lecturers need to test their assumptions in the classroom and leave students mindful of the different challenges in the world out there (Khurana in Holstein, 2016).

The applied null curriculum may also be contributed to by lecturers not having the skills to incorporate relevant content or experience that is within their mandate, due to a lack of training. In this case, some lecturers may find themselves in a comfort zone with no connection to current events. The curriculum will be applied as intended. According to Freebersyser (2014: 150), lecturers who find themselves liberated from the confines of the official or written curriculum may change the curriculum substantially in the classroom. This may be an opportunity to make the curriculum more relevant as events in the business world unfold.

It may certainly be a disturbing idea for some, but if our design and teaching approach can account for the mix of experiences that we have with our students, we may have a far more relevant and intense experience. Such a commitment can more closely emulate the challenges of a fast-paced, ever-changing business environment.

3.4 *The postnormal curriculum*

From the definitions, perspectives, inherent conflict, and intended and unintended influences, it seems as if the curriculum is at least in part in conflict with itself and unable to respond adequately to what is called “relevance”. Today’s world is one of risk, imperfection and uncertainty. What may be deemed necessary in this context and at this time may not be relevant somewhere else or sometime later. Sardar and Sweeney (2016: 1) are of the opinion that “the changes that we face today are not incremental and isolated but occur simultaneously and are connected and interconnected”. Carsetti (2013) highlights the interrelatedness of complexity, causality, meaning, emergence and intentionality in the acquisition of knowledge.

The curriculum appears unable to be a perfect response to what we need to know in postnormal times. What was regarded as a normal curriculum in the past is now inadequate as the complexity of interactive human systems is recognised. According to Osberg *et al.* (2008: 204–206), the complexity of the world we live in makes the curriculum problematic as we are no longer able to represent complex phenomena accurately. The curriculum can only attempt to respond to a fast-changing world full of uncertainty. From a complexity perspective, knowledge emerges from people’s transactions with the world, and the world also changes as people interact with it — knowledge is always *emergentist*

(Osberg *et al.*, 2008: 213). Based on this view, there are therefore no final answers and no accurate representations: “There is always a part of the system that we cannot account for and that does not make its appearance in representation. Complexity chance is always already at work in complex systems, thereby spoiling the show for representations.” (Osberg *et al.*, 2008: 214).

It is possible to state that curricula will increasingly appear multipolar (Khurana in Holstein, 2016) as aspects of the different dimensions expand and contract due to pressure from stakeholders. Expecting functionality, familiarity and stability in curricula may be increasingly unrealistic. A postnormal curriculum is not about policy, management and control (Sardar and Sweeney, 2016: 11), but it is about an awareness of our unavoidable ignorance in producing imperfect curricula that will leave our students only partly prepared.

4. CONCLUSION

The curriculum development process always has to deal with the dichotomy of facts versus construction. From the literature, it is clear that there are concerns about the ease of selection and prescription. It does lend itself to abuse for political and economic purposes. If there were a dominance of influence in prescribed content in education, then it would be possible to say that these curricula are problematic in that they are not representative.

Trying to contain the curriculum at all costs through politics, policy and prescription will be a futile effort. Different interest groups influence what is taught and experienced in the classroom. Some excluded parts may be overt (written and taught) while others are invisible (hidden or absent). Even if the intended and written curriculum were to be near-perfect, it would end up being an imperfect experience to some extent, because it may change in the hands and minds of lecturers and students. Depending on stakeholders and the stages of development and implementation, the curriculum inevitably progresses into something unquantified.

While there may always be opportunity for improvement, the curriculum cannot be perfect in an age of uncertainty. The new normal will be imperfection. The conclusion one has to come to is that the well-planned curriculum will always be affected during execution as it is part of a human system. Every graduate will enter the world with a different curricular experience behind him/her. The response to the critics in the introduction is that there isn't really a perfect curriculum. The experienced curriculum will never enable students to respond adequately to every challenge. The curriculum remains vulnerable to critique – it can never be everything to everyone at once.

5. REFERENCES

- Andrews, M. 2013. Why our students need co-curricular, not extra-curricular, activities. *The Guardian*, 22 January. Accessed at <https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/blog/2013/jan/22/student-development-university-curriculum-design> on 12/9/2016.
- Apple, MW. 1993. The politics of official knowledge: Does a national curriculum make sense? *Teachers College Record*, 95(2): 222–241.
- Belbase, S. 2011. *Radical versus Social Constructivism: Dilemma, Dialogue, and Defense*. Accessed at <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED525159.pdf> on 15/07/2016.
- Bloom, J. 2006. *Selected Concepts of Curriculum*. Accessed at <http://www.jeffbloom.net/docs/SelectedConceptsOfCurriculum.pdf> on 25/04/2014.
- Carsetti, A. 2013. *Epistemic complexity and knowledge construction: Morphogenesis, symbolic dynamics and beyond*. Berlin: Springer.
- Casey, C. 2010. Some Masters of the Universe have MBAs but end up with feet of clay. *Irish Independent*, 13 May.
- CHE. 2015. *Qualification standard for Master of Business Administration*. Pretoria: Council for Higher Education.
- Cortes, C. 2002. *The making and remaking of a multiculturalist*. New York: Multiculturalist Education Series, Teachers College Press.

- Cuban, L. 1992. Curriculum stability and change, in *Handbook of research on curriculum* (A project of the American Educational Research Association). New York: MacMillan.
- Evans, R. 2013. Does practice itself know nothing? Probing teachers' felt experiences of mandated practice. In Irby, BJ; Brown, G; Lara-Alecio, R and Jackson, S (eds), *The Handbook of Educational Theories*. Charlotte (NC): Information Age Publishing.
- Freebersyser, W. 2014. A narrative of one teacher's journey toward conscientization. *Journal of Philosophy & History of Education*, 64(1): 149–163.
- Glatthorn, AA, Boschee, FA, Whitehead, BM & Boschee, BF. 2011. *Curriculum Leadership: Strategies for Development and Implementation*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Henriksson, C. 2012. What did you learn in school today? *Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology*, 12 (May).
- Handler, B. 2010. Teacher as Curriculum Leader: A Consideration of the Appropriateness of that Role Assignment to Classroom-Based Practitioners. *International Journal of Teacher Leadership*, 3(3): 32–42.
- Henriksson, C. 2012. What did you learn at school today? *Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology*, 12 (Special Edition): May.
- Heydenrych, JF. 2016 Education (im)possible: is content to blame for the state of the MBA, in proceedings of 10th International Business Conference, Club Mykonos, Langebaan, South Africa. 25–28 September.
- Holstein, WJ. 2013. *The multipolar MBA. Strategy and business*, 21 January. Accessed at http://www.strategy-business.com/article/00164?gko=093cf&utm_source=itw&utm_medium=20160901&utm_campaign=fixed on 12/09/2016.
- Humes, W. 2005. Never discount the hidden curriculum. *TESS*, 25 February. Accessed at <http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=2076639> on 01/03/2014.
- James, A. 2009. Academies of the apocalypse? *The Guardian*, 7 April.
- Koutselini, M. & Agathangelou, S. (2014). The gap between teachers' understanding of their teaching and students' experiences, In: Sandra Chistolini (ed). *Citizenship education in five countries*. Saarbrücken: Lambert.
- Kumari, S. & Srivastava, DS. 2005. *Curriculum and instruction*. Delhi: Isha Books.
- Letshekha, T. 2013. Revisiting the debate on the Africanisation of higher education: an appeal for a conceptual shift. *The Independent Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 8.
- Levin, B. 2009. Curriculum policy and the politics of what should be learned at schools. In *The Sage Handbook of Curriculum and Instruction*, Conelly, FM, Fang, M & Phillion, J (eds). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Liao, JM, Thomas, EJ & Bell, SK. 2014. Speaking up about the dangers of the Hidden curriculum. *Health Affairs*, 33(1): 168–171. Accessed at <http://content.healthaffairs.org/content/33/1/168.full> on 24/04/2014.
- Mahood, SD. 2011. Medical education: Beware the hidden curriculum. *Canadian Family Physician*, 57 (September): 983–985.
- Makgoba, M. 2015. Higher education crisis: We are our own solution. *City Press* (10/11/2015). Accessed at <http://city-press.news24.com/Voices/higher-education-crisis-we-are-our-own-solution-20151110> on 4/05/2016.
- Martell, Janette. 2008. Socially responsible business schools: Collective stakeholder voices demand urgent actions. *Journal of the World Universities Forum*, 1(6).
- Martin, J. 1983. What Should We Do with a Hidden Curriculum When We Find One? In *The Hidden Curriculum and Moral Education*, edited by H Giroux & D Purpel. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation (122–139).

- Muneja, M. 2013. Evaluation of Tanzania curriculum: An analysis using Ornstein’s view on education philosophy. *Studies of Changing Societies: Educational Integration: Theory, Practice, Cases*, 1(11).
- Nkomo, S. 2015. Challenges for Management and Business Education in a “Developmental” State: The Case of South Africa. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14(2): 242–258.
- Null, JW. Nd. *William C Bagley (1874–1946) — Early Career, Teachers College*. Accessed at <http://education.stateuniversity.com/pages/1780/Bagley-William-C-1874–1946.html> on 24/04/2014.
- Ono, Y. 2010. Bridging the Gap between Intended and Implemented Curriculum: Japanese Education Development from Curriculum Implementation Perspective.
- Papers presented at the Africa-Asia Experience Sharing Seminar in Ghana, Efforts towards improving the quality of education, 19–21 January, Accra, Ghana.
- Ornstein, AC. 1982. Curriculum Contrasts: A Historical Overview. *Phi Delta Kappan*, February.
- Ornstein, AC. 1995. Philosophy as a Basis for Curriculum Decisions. In Ornstein, A & Behar, L (eds), *Contemporary Issues in Curriculum*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ornstein, AC & Hunkins, F. 2014. *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues*. New York. Pearson.
- Osberg, D., Biesta, G. & Cilliers, P. 2008. From representation to emergence: Complexity’s challenge to the epistemology of schooling. In *Complexity theory and the philosophy of education*, M. Mason (ed.) Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Podolny, JM. 2009. *The buck stops (and starts) at business school*. Harvard Business Review, June.
- Parkay, FW, Anctil, EJ & Hass, G. 2014. *Curriculum leadership: Readings for developing quality educational programs*. New York: Pearson.
- Patrizi, C, Ice, P & Burgess, M. 2013. Semantic mapping of learning assets to align curriculum and evidence learning effectiveness in business education. *Business Education & Accreditation*, 5(1): 117–128.
- Rayment, J & Smith, J. 2010. The current and future role of business schools: Research report. Cambridge/Chelmsford: Anglia Ruskin University.
- Sardar, Z & Sweeney, JA. 2016. The three tomorrows of postnormal times. *Futures*, 75: 1–13.
- Sheikhzade, M. 2011. Intended, applied and experienced null curriculum. Paper delivered at the 7th Global Conference of Inter-Disciplinary.Net: A Global Network for Dynamic Research and Publishing, Mansfield College, Oxford, United Kingdom.
- Accessed at <http://www.inter-disciplinary.net/at-the-interface/education/creative-engagements-thinking-with-children/project-archives/7th/> on 24/04/2014.
- Shay, S. 2016. Urgent strategy needed to decolonise university curricula. *The Mail & Guardian*, 20 June. Accessed at <http://mg.co.za/article/2016-06-20-00-urgent-strategy-needed-to-decolonise-university-curricula-no-longer-a-luxury-but-a-necessity/> on 12 September 2016.
- Sweeney, S. 2013. Close reading. *Harvard Gazette*, 20 December. Accessed at <http://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2013/12/close-reading/> on 14/05/2016.
- Tanner, D & Tanner, L. 2006. *Curriculum development: Theory into practice*. New York: Macmillan.
- Watkins, D & Kritsonis, A. 2008. Developing and designing an effective school curriculum: Enhancing student achievement based on an integrated curriculum model and the ways of knowing through the realms of meaning. *Focus on Colleges, Universities, and Schools*, 2(1): 1–15.
- Wilkinson, MLN. 2014. The concept of the absent curriculum: The case of the Muslim contribution and the

English National Curriculum for history. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1(22): 1–22.

- Yuksel, S. 2005. Kohlberg and Hidden Curriculum in Moral Education: An Opportunity for Students' Acquisition of Moral Values in the New Turkish Primary Education Curriculum. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, 5(2): 329–338.