

A Dialectical Critique of Curriculum Foundations for a Postmodern, Just, and Capital-Conscious Era

Meral Yavuz Kartal¹, Elmaziye Temiz^{2*}, Osman Yılmaz Kartal³

¹Ministry of National Education, Çanakkale Governorship—European Union and Foreign Relations Office, Çanakkale, Turkey.

^{2,3}Department of Education Sciences, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Turkey; elmaziyetemiz@gmail.com

Keywords:

Curriculum foundations, Curriculum theory, Juridical foundations, Multidimensional capital foundations.

Abstract. The discipline of curriculum development has traditionally relied on a series of recognized canons that are quite modern (Philosophical, psychological, and sociological foundations) (The main canons of curriculum development), that were thought by the authors of a modern and industrial frame. In this article, the author suggests that the traditional framework, which is the "thesis" of the curriculum, is a fundamentally inadequate solution to the 21st century challenges. The "antithesis" has become even more powerful through the meeting point of the postmodern turn and its opposition to the dominant narratives' ideas, the technological and social paradoxes of Education 5.0, and a very loud, global claim for social and racial justice particularly made by Generation Z. This dual nature of the concept leads to identifying two system-based problems in the curriculum theory: the Juridical Foundation that does not address injustice issues directly, and the Economic Foundation that misinterprets/ interprets only the financial capital. To this end, the paper introduces a theoretical synthesis that incorporates into curriculum development two new pillars. Firstly, it re-imagines the Juridical Foundation, not just as compliance with the law but certainly human rights, fairness, and social justice become the basic principles which normalize non-negotiable things in the process of their design, and in this case, the process shall also incorporate marginalized people. Secondly, the Multidimensional Capital Foundation, as an enlargement of the perspective, is used to give not only the access to financial issues but almost everything, including temporal, social, emotional, infrastructural, and intellectual capital, all playing their respective roles in maintaining the viability and efficiency of the curriculum. In the end, the paper suggests the integrated model where the new foundations do not exclude the traditional ones but they are added to a much more dynamic foundation. The result of this new synthesis, in its turn, becomes much more comprehensive and ethically sound, and it becomes a model by which we can create a just and sustainable curriculum not only effective but ethically sound in a complicated environment in the 21st century.

1. INTRODUCTION

The discipline of curriculum development is a constantly changing field of study that calls for new ways of thinking about the actual structure of educational material as well as the skills and competences of the students. Therefore, the pioneering theorists, Ralph Tyler (1949) and Hilda Taba (1962) whose works were the foundation of curriculum development have established major aspects such as philosophical, psychological, sociological, historical, and later economic foundations of this field, which play a key role in the elaboration of credible curriculums. These foundations served as a disciplined and methodical framework by establishing goals and objectives for education in the case of didactic material, and chose methods for evaluating the success of the course. Notably, they regulated the workings of a modernist, industrialized society that aspired to create an efficient and skilled populace (Looney, 2001), but over the past decades, these Maxims that were structurally restrictive have been under increasing scrutiny and the limitations of relying on only these foundations has become apparent in view of the comprehensive cultural and technological changes of the present world, which have questioned the previous ideas about the curriculum (Slabbert & Hattingh, 2006).

Scholars who represent the contemporary postmodern critique such as Doll (1993) have brought the ideas of procedural and empirical relativism to the forefront and have argued that the postmodern situation is marked by the emergence of a manifold of contesting and conflicting perspectives that render the very idea of a single epistemological framework to govern education problematic. This major intellectual shift has forced educators to question the entrenched notions of universal psychology of learning, and static sociological paradigms and has brought about an awareness of the need for the curriculum to reflect the multiple realities and fragmented identities of today's learners. This is especially important in the context of the digital age that we are living in, where knowledge is vast and constantly contested (Slabbert & Hattingh, 2006). In this context, the disciplines of curriculum theorizing seem much more as a paradigmatic relationship, which entails continued engagement and saturation with the diversity of perspectives in the formulation of what the curriculum should be, and the conscious acceptance of the fragmentation and dispersion of this curriculum.

Resultant to the postmodern critique as well as the continuously changing technological conceivable Education 4.0 and the succeeding conceptualization of Education 5.0 have made certain traditional curricular foundations become unnecessarily beset with complexity. While Education 4.0 stresses the necessity for certain skills that are relevant in a digital economy such as data literacy and connectivity, Education 5.0 is the next phase that creates a shift in learning paradigms by using technology for human-centered purposes, including the focus on sustainability and social good especially with a core emphasis lit upon teaching and learning processes (Ardiyani and Kurniawan 2020). The two paradigms coupled with the dual focus create a complex paradox with a curriculum that emphasizes the need for highly developed technical skills but remains inattentive to humanistic objectives

and social justice (Zipin et al. 2015). Most particularly, existing curricula structures constructed on former paradigms tend to fail in finding a good balance between the urgency of meeting contemporary educational needs and the rapid changes in the society's terrain (Damanik 2023).

Additionally, the socio-political contours of the curriculum are equally shaped by the heightened awareness that comes with issues of equity and justice that are resonating like never before in the wake of global struggles for social, racial, and cognitive justice. These movements for social change have been at the forefront of public conversations, especially among the Generation Z learners who are at the forefront demanding that curricula not only address the existing system inequities but also instill curricular frameworks which fight against these injustices rather than enhance their prevalence (Brake 2023). The reluctance of traditional curricula in matters of concerning these issues is noted as historical inertia while a digital native generation surfaces and becomes intolerable towards any hypocrisy that exists in the institutions and further emphasizes the crucial gaps existing in the existing curricular frameworks (Uljens 2016). The current view shows that the abovementioned education changes and curriculum challenges require an immediate and well-thought-out reaction that is student-centered and seeks to engage critically with today's learning environment as well as giving power back to the learners.

The tension and duality that arise between the traditional structures of modernistic ideology and the changes that are being ushered in by the emerging domain of postmodernism, coupled with the implementation of justice-oriented approaches, reveal the inherent and significance of existent gaps in the citing of various elements in present-day curriculum theory. These gaps clearly support establish the call for a total rewiring of the way in which curricula are designed that recognizes and respects the complexities, multiplicities, and fluidity of academic settings, and in the same breath, attempts to confront the difficulties that has today's learners find themselves by creating inclusive, participative, and dynamic curricula that really reflect these learners' lived experiences (Zipin et al., 2015).

1.1. The Absence of a Juridical Foundation and the Crisis of Justice

The absence of a robust juridical foundation for curriculum development has significant implications for the inclusion of marginalized groups, particularly those affected by incarceration. A conventional curriculum framework, which is predominantly built on the adherence to governmental mandates, is unable to incorporate basic principles such as human rights, social justice, and equity in educational practice. Such an approach leaves people outside the primary curriculum, neglecting the needs of inmates with low education levels or failing to acknowledge their right to education and self-empowerment (Vorhaus, 2014)

There are several problems that inmates experience, and these issues are often aggravated by the circumstances and experiences that they endure. Piper and Berle (2019) acknowledge that the pain brought by imprisonment can develop in the form of terminal diseases, thus creating a perpetual cycle of marginalization. This puts pressure on traditional curricular structures in which inmates are seen through the framework of so-called 'normality' but which fail to address their unique socio-political and psychological aspects that make their correctional experience. Unless the educational process emphasizes their inherent entitlements as inherent, informed by the restorative justice as well as the human rights approach, the curriculum will tend to remain an offshoot of a standard model, incapable of addressing the needs of its client population.

To tackle these deficiencies, it is necessary to address the rights enshrined in various legal instruments that promote the rights of people in custody. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that everyone has the right to education; hence, the educational rights of all individuals must be upheld, even for those in custody (Vorhaus, 2014). Academics argue, for instance, that when the curriculum does not take into consideration rights-based approaches, it may unintentionally deny attention to the educational needs of those who are already marginalized in society (Crane & Pascoe, 2020). Hence, the simple paradox remains: curriculum practitioners who leave out the teaching of human rights in the globalized school systems that surrounds these groups are neglecting an essential challenge to the status quo.

Furthermore, while the effects of imprisonment affect the individual in prison, it is important to note that these effects extend to the society at large. Children for instance, whose parents are serving prison terms and brought up in their absence are at a higher risk of suffering from various mental disorders which need to be taken care of within the learning setting (Castellano-s-jankiewicz, 2024). Therefore, an educational approach that is designed to have a complete juridical foundation should not only look into the individual needs of incarcerated individuals but also the needs associated with the relatives and stakeholders involved in these same individuals' lives. When the relational dynamics of incarceration for the offenders are compared with restorative justice-oriented strategies, it is apparent that a learning, healing, and rehabilitative program is required that can help in improving the lives of those at the periphery and give them new hope (An, 2017).

On the whole, the existing architecture upon which curriculums are developed and founded fails to cater to the needs and aspirations of the subverted and rejected sections of the society like individuals in prisons. The new theoretical focus of the Jurisprudential foundation of the curriculum should shift the focus from the centrality of human dignity, justice as well as equity. This is important as it ensures that issues related to representation and justice guide the decisions of curriculum; thus, breaking away from the visible marginalization that existing educational paradigms reinforce.

1.2. The One-Dimensionality of Economic Foundations and the Neglect of Multidimensional Capital

The discussion concerning the under-theorization of the economic foundations of educational curricula is pivotal in understanding the multifaceted nature of effective curriculum design. Traditional interpretations tend to restrict the concept of "economic foundation" to financial capital—an approach that overlooks numerous non-monetary resources essential for fostering educational success. This reductionist view presents a curriculum as mere financial allocations rather than as a dynamic and intricate ecosystem that interacts with varied forms of capital, as articulated by sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1986). The foundation of this discourse underlines the need to transition to what can be termed a Foundation of Multidimensional Capital.

Temporal Capital is an essential dimension that emphasizes the finite nature of learners' time within educational settings. The mismatch between curriculum design and the available time frames of learners, particularly in contexts like vocational retraining, demonstrates the need for curricula to be more responsive to temporal constraints. If a curriculum presupposes a full academic year when only five months are available, it constitutes a failure of design and relevance. Effective temporal resource management can facilitate more efficient learning outcomes, as illuminated by research on educational settings that adapt to the temporal capacities of students.

Social Capital, another critical factor, refers to the networks and relationships that provide a supportive educational environment. The literature illustrates that low levels of trust and reciprocity among students, teachers, and administrators can

severely undermine educational efforts. A curriculum developed within a high-trust environment is capable of yielding better engagement and outcomes, whereas one functioning in a low-trust context is likely to experience resistance and disengagement, as seen in research on social dynamics in educational settings (Sumanarathna et al., 2020; Snel et al., 2022). The interplay between social capital and educational effectiveness is evident in studies that connect supportive relationships with emotional and behavioral regulation in learning (Durlak et al., 2011; Williford et al., 2013).

The underlying academic capital, in this regard, creates a very qualitative element as it endorses those students come with different emotional challenges that could considerably affect their learning experience. Thus, it is noted that Curricula, which do not cater to the emotional demands of their learners, are at a greater probability of fostering a state of chronic disinterest and despair. It is highlighted that linking students emotional status to the success in the learning context leads to a rise in motivation and resilience of learners in educational institutions (Aithal & Aithal, 2023; Liu et al., 2024). As a concept, emotional capital takes into account the overall emotional disposition, feelings, and psychology placed in learning processes which culminate in a view that at any given time, not only should an education system equip students with knowledge to enhance their cognitive faculties but that its emotional state also ought to be improved to impact positively on learning and teaching processes (Cottingham, 2016; Neve et al., 2022).

On top of this, it is crucial to note that there are other kinds of capital, for example, Stakeholder Capital- referring to how it arises from the support of all stakeholders-, Infrastructural Capital-in regard to the characteristics of the teaching materials and technology used-and Intellectual Capital, which refers to the prior knowledge that teachers and other stakeholders have concerning the curriculum that aim is to provide for capital. Still, the currently popular frameworks for educational capital rely solely on the analysis of financial information and thus ignore the essential and vital dimensions, forms of complexity, and forms of capital, all of which are critical in determining educational outcomes and attaining equity and productivity in the education system (Boamah & Laschinger, 2014).

1.3. Aim of the Study

In light of the new conditions presented by the postmodern world and the emerging vision of Education 5.0, the primary aim of this theoretical paper is to demonstrate the insufficiency of traditional curriculum foundations and, in response, to propose and conceptualize two new foundational frameworks essential for contemporary curriculum development: the Juridical Foundations of Curriculum and the Multidimensional Capital Foundations of Curriculum. This study seeks to argue that the integration of these new analytical lenses is no longer optional but is imperative for designing curricula that are relevant, just, and effective in the 21st century.

To achieve this primary aim, the paper will pursue the following specific objectives:

1. To briefly analyze the historical development of the canonical curriculum foundations (philosophical, psychological, sociological, etc.) and to situate their origins within the modernist, industrial paradigm.
2. To argue why the confluence of postmodern thought, the technological and societal shifts of Education 4.0/5.0, and the distinct expectations of Generation Z collectively renders the traditional foundations inadequate, thereby necessitating a paradigm shift in curriculum theory.
3. To construct the theoretical framework for the Juridical Foundations of curriculum. This involves defining its scope—encompassing educational law, children's rights, human rights principles, and theories of social justice—and illustrating how this foundation would mandate the systematic and proactive inclusion of marginalized and disadvantaged groups (such as incarcerated persons) within the curriculum design process.
4. To theorize the Multidimensional Capital Foundations as a comprehensive concept that radically expands the narrow economic view of resources. This objective includes defining and elaborating on its constituent sub-dimensions—such as temporal, social, emotional, stakeholder, and infrastructural capital—and demonstrating how a systematic analysis of these capitals would profoundly impact a curriculum's design, feasibility, and ultimate success.
5. To make a distinct theoretical contribution to the field by discussing how these two proposed foundations would integrate with, rather than simply replace, the existing foundations, ultimately arguing for a more holistic, dynamic, and ethically-grounded framework for curriculum development.

1.4. The Established Paradigm and Its Cracks

In order to validate the original argument that proposes "juridical and capital foundations" it is essential to have a proper understanding of the foreground of contemporary curriculum theory upon which it will be constructed. A forward-thinking proposal cannot be borne of an ideology emptied of any historical context but rather must begin to conquer the established paradigm through a process of deconstruction in order to locate the subtle assumptions, the logic, and the limitations that were posed within its structures. This is not to mention that we cannot appreciate why our educational instruments are no longer sufficient to solve the challenges some existing problems if we do not know the origin and biases of these instruments. Thus, the first part of this paper will perform the groundwork by constructing a systematic analysis of the curriculum's established foundations.

It has become a common teaching to refer to a philosophical base, a psychological base, and a sociological base of curricula all of which have for nearly a century past been the guidance of curricular practice as eternal truths. However, as we shall demonstrate these bases are nothing more or less than the profound intellectual inheritance of the modernist era with its imperatives of order, rationality and social cohesion. These modernist foundations are comprehensively examined for how they have been constructed within a set of relations which formulated an agreement of what is to be taught and before whom and also how it is to be taught. The present analysis seeks to outline the major findings of this intellectual quest and to provide a solid ground for the argument that the modernist traditional curricular discourse is unable to address the demands of the radically different postmodern context and the emerging social orders. Dealing with these conceptual and contextual conflicts is not only theoretically necessary and educationally useful, but has also important implications for the transformation of curricula.

2. THE MODERNIST INHERITANCE: DECONSTRUCTING THE CANONICAL FOUNDATIONS OF CURRICULUM

For many years, the realm of curriculum studies has an academic discipline that evolved to become an essential field of study. Tracing its roots in the 20th century, it adopted many of the principles associated with modernity. These ideals include

rational planning, systematic organization, and an order-and-structuring of knowledge. These principles reflect the greater modernist project that seeks to impose order on and structure the various areas of knowledge acquisition, including education. The modernist principles suggest that curriculum can be systematically created based on clearly articulated end-state objectives and unequivocal assumptions about the nature of knowledge, the learner, and society (Cantoni et al., 2017; Li, 2024). Therefore, critical examination of the philosophical, psychological, and sociological foundations upon which curriculum rests is necessary in order to reveal the underlying ideologies and their effects on and implications for educational practice. These fields of study deal with knowledge, truth, and learners. They also deal with society, socialization, and the philosophy of knowledge and are used in the argument of this paper.

First consideration is given to the philosophical foundation of curriculum studies. The philosophical basis of curriculum studies is influenced by the ideologies that assume the superiority of one form of knowledge over others, highlighting the ideologies that influence educational practices and what is included in the curriculum. Furthermore, it is the reason behind many decisions made in the classroom that are to do with teachers that incorporate cultural ideologies in their decision-making processes. An illustration of these points is the work of Shkedi and Nisan that while educators may prioritize some texts and knowledge as valuable, they may not be aware of the ideological influences that infiltrate their teachings and curriculum (Shkedi & Nisan, 2006). In addition, the philosophical choices made by And, to such effects, Wang and Zhu argue that it is necessary to situate the ideological underpinnings curriculum and illuminate the need for a critical examination of these philosophical choices since education is never neutral but always political (Wang & Zhu, 2022). It is important to note that the implementation of such curriculum is laden with ideological values and also carries risks of legitimizing oppression and hegemonic ideologies depending on what is excluded or included in that process. Culturally sensitive texts and knowledge systems are also included in the culturally relevant curriculum of the kind that shows how philosophical positions have lived implications for educational practice, for instance, in teaching practices and inclusive policies in education. This empower and carve visible spaces in the curriculum for such marginalized positions as well as peoples and create an education project that is more humane and responsive

On the psychological front, it can be observed that assumptions regarding the learner's capabilities and cognitive development are truly entrenched in a modernist view that puts a premium on logic and a high level of personal achievement. Liu and Jia's earlier studies reveal that the currently existing educational reforms that are undertaken in the colleges to a great extent reflect these modernist frameworks, thus taking the talent education on a path that signifies some ideological goals that find their roots in these assumptions and beliefs (Liu & Jia, 2023). Since there seems to be only one way of thinking about how education is to be done, this direction may in reality limit other pedagogy methodologies that are born out of different philosophical traditions that exist today thus depriving the possibility of establishing more inclusive and broad-minded educational paradigms for our time.

On the sociological front, it is clear that curriculum development does not occur in isolation; rather, it operates within a web of social norms, power structures, and cultural contexts, all of which can serve to reproduce existing social injustices and inequalities. These ideological differences in the curriculum are particularly pronounced in contexts such as South Africa where differences within the field and the interpretation of curriculum components lead to unsteady educational results that vary between institutions (Mnguni, 2024). Such findings echo the work of Cantoni et al. (2017) who show how higher educational content addresses the influence of political ideologies and social beliefs on the individuals, pointing out that it is a crucial intersection between curricular development and the structures of society. A detailed investigation of how these ideological frameworks are made in the curriculum, shows the limitations of modernist philosophy; thus, a reevaluation of the way in which education may cater for a wider range of social and cultural realities and, therefore, avoid the dangers of perpetuating the ideologies of dominant groups emerges.

In this light, the critical examination of the ideological underpinnings of these foundations is crucial in recognizing their limits and the factors that support and challenge them in the educational situation. Continuous research implies that it is indispensable to appreciate the adjusting interpretations of the above foundations across a range of environments, emphasizing the utmost imperativeness of evolution in curriculum that goes beyond the already established modern strategies. It has been indicated by educational researchers that fostering civic virtues and moral cultivation through education requires a curriculum that is flexible on the basis of the intricacies of the present-day society and is not rigidly based on modernist groups' principles and ideologies (She, 2024; Ramulumo & Mnguni, 2023).

Thus, to really understand the relevance of the aforementioned traditional foundations of the curriculum, it is of paramount importance to apprehend the reality of these ideological commitments, considerably interrogating and deconstructing them. This critical inquiry can facilitate the development of a more reflective and inclusive curriculum that honors the plurality of knowledge and acknowledges the dynamic interactions between ideology and education and the particular needs of society. By looking at these foundations through a critical lens, we are able to shed light on the assumed authenticity of the relations that shape the present and future educational landscape in the context of socio-cultural changes such as globalization, decolonization, and the further evolution of technology that we are facing.

2.1. The Philosophical Foundation: The Pursuit of a Universal, Rational Order

Curriculum development that was done in the early years shows a great influence of philosophy from the Enlightenment period characterized by a Cartesian rationalism and Kantian universalism. This influence in the philosophical sense puts more emphasis on a soldier for order in the learning systems, coherence, and to some certainty that is confirmed in the whole education in general pointing the attention to a need for students to engage in explicit and organized propositional knowledge given in step-by-step curricula. Ralph Tyler in the year 1949 carried out an inquiry into the educational goals that were said to be representative of this particular methodology as he stated that education should aim at identifying highly measurable and categorized purposes to be employed in many different educational contexts (Kothari et al., 2011).

This modernist perspective has several implications. First, from this, it will be observed that the emphasis on the knowledge that can easily be expressed has ignored challenges based on how knowledge can be known or subjective knowledge that includes the tacit; aesthetic; and intuitive forms of knowledge. In curriculum development, the use of controlled and comprehended kinds of knowledge has made curriculums more technical. Instead of focusing on the ways in which people go about knowing knowledge – the assumptions they make or do not make about what knowledge is and how they interact with it, it has focused more on “facts” and “principles”. It is indeed true for higher education where knowledge is focused on and examined rather than experienced by Lynn with personal activity such as a process of learning a language that is not taken into account (Dhanaraj et al. 2004; Shah & Mahmood, 2016). There exist many other dimensions of knowledge that are important

since they concern what people really consider as knowledge (Wong & Radcliffe, 2000). Ignoring the importance of tacit knowledge leads to a form of curriculum that is fundamentally flawed in terms of the perception of any genuine learning. The implication is that the kind of curriculum that is expressed in the words that could be taken as learned is a fundamental limitation, in the sense that it cannot account for the many possibilities of actual learning such as intuitive knowledge and knowing as that “although I do not know precisely” (Cowan, 2000). The limitation can be detrimental since it works towards inducing a syndrome of “once you know it all”: no need to seek out knowledge in a society where everybody is supposed to work.

Secondly, the commitment to a universalist perspective, particularly in education, carries profound cultural implications that tend to downplay the valuable cultural and personal specificities of different learning experiences. The common image of the “ideal graduate” or the “good life” embraced in this paradigm reflects the philosophy of the local and mainstream culture thus largely excluding, marginalizing, or distorting the more available alternatives (Bhatt & Gupta, 2005; Nurhayati & Pitaloka, 2022). Such a situation implies a hegemonic role of the curriculum in which marginalized cultures are rendered invisible or considered as “others” in the context of education (Zhang et al., 2012). Consequently, the modern educational curriculum, while being an agent of knowledge transfer, also promotes certain cultural power structures competing with other kinds of knowledge for recognition and acceptance in society (Nonaka & Krogh, 2009).

After all, the legacy of the Enlightenment in the development of educational curricula which can be effectively summarized by Tyler's work presents a dilemma; in the quest for clarity and rationality, it also tends to exclude the complexity and ambiguity of knowledge itself, which is an issue that has constituted (and continues to constitute) the education realm able to put other kinds of knowledge into silence and enhance the feeling of obscurity for those who do not belong into that group.

2.2. The Psychological Foundation: Engineering the Predictable Learner

In reality, the philosophy is acknowledged as a set of concepts through which the existence of reality can be deciphered logically whereas psychology provides the exactly prescribed methodology through which the educational establishments can make that existence real. Behaviorism, which emphasizes the focus on a learner based on the potentiality to forecast and parameterize the results of the learning process, as well as the significance of developmentalism besides other factors frequently direct the design of the curricular and learning program based on one of the two ideologies, which further elaborate two approaches that emphasize a systemic focus.

Swayed by shallowly physical interpretation of the learning process postulated mainly by the distinguished behaviourists like Thorndike and Skinner, which vigilance to see and measure only those behaviors which are only visible and discernible, behaviorism imparted learning a systematic and structural view indexed to such universal laws of learn through conditioning, comparable to producing an attitude in animals in behavior modification, continuous further again and again practice and routine rituals (Pace, 2003). When one considers that educational practices emitted from the industrial age were largely predicated on the principles of efficiency, this produced a framework within which the education system clung to practices that guaranteed that the education was standardized and uniform. Given the fact that learners were envisioned as learners that can possess certain features and, in fact, be treated like a moldable unit, it has led to the understanding of the educational values that could be produced to meet certain expectations, most of the time leaving aside the significant singularity of internship or the subjective learning process (Eccles & Roeser, 2011; Sinervo et al., 2021).

In a similar vein, developmental psychology drew a contrast between the predominant behaviorist paradigm and the postulation of the equally notable notion of fixed developmental stages of learning as pioneered by Jean Piaget, rendering it intricate. Through the developmentalism approach, Piaget (1954) noted that all children develop according to a certain sequence of development or group progression or learning. It follows that if the approach nurtured by expansionists believes in this principle, then there would be a tendency for a one-size-fits-all sort of education. Though a sincere charity in the attempts by differential education of knowledge to different levels that coincides with and accommodates the corresponding natural age characteristics for every child, Piaget's theory unwittingly mirrors the reduced image of the “ordinary child” as representative of the “normal” child (Lozančić & Tot, 2020). From this, it is clear that other children who do not conform to this way of thinking may either be ignored or failure to learn may be pinned down to failure in progressing through these stages. Further, it has been observed that the ideal of a “natural” child is just that, an ideal and a socially constructed idea that varies from place to place in history and is employed by various social institutions to control and regulate learners and learning (Catacutan, 2014). It is crucial to take into account that these two approaches: behaviorism and developmentalism, developed together in the modernist agenda, formulated the ideological basis for the efficient management of learners within the education systems; however, such an attitude ignores complexity, integral cultural aspects of individual learners, varying subjective experiences and pluralistic approaches to meaning-making in the context of teaching and learning in the classroom (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002; Lindén et al., 2017).

In learning and development that hath thine behaviorist technique and the theory developmental keep on going, education is engineered that are sometimes regimented and much too predictable. These systems did not permit a chance for individual interpretation, and they did not allow the personal and cultural problems that may be encountered to be regarded, thereby curtailing the possibilities for the creative thought and critical thinking processes in issues of pedagogy at this as Garcia Moya et al (2014) put it. The constructivists may be credited with trying to come up with quality changes in education, asserting views that go against the usual approaches of behavioral and developmental approaches thus attracting the need to look back and examine the assumptions surrounding the current approaches in education (Kuyk, 2011). An analysis of the curriculum could help advantageously widen education's learning experience, making it flexible while also embracing the addition of the many dimensions of human experience.

2.3. The Sociological Foundation: Forging Cohesion and Reproducing the Social Order

A detailed inquisition into the pertinacious theoretical foundation that gives an account of the basic delivery inquires into the biological aspects of human beings and how they learn and develop intellectually. Emile Durkheim and Talcott Parsons were sociologists who advanced the notions of education as one of the most important parts of any society in teaching the core morals and beliefs that would build a collective mind in a nation (Parsons, 1959; Durkheim, 1956). The curriculum is, therefore, selectively designed to promote skills and knowledge deemed necessary for individuals to effectively participate in the existing social order, thereby ensuring that the cultural and economic frameworks of society function smoothly.

In the course of instruction, and on the part of the students, either consciously or unconsciously, there are some expected

behaviors that ought to take shape in the students. The method of instruction prefers contents that are focusing on the realities of societies instead of explicating the situations that create the social order for one to critically think on the wrongs of such order. These arguments have further been supported by the various theorists of conflict who have posed that many of the schools do teach subjects which are just a fair representation of history and what the society has gone through, with furthering awareness of these tendencies causing marginality and conformity to through acceptance and propagation of the present systems as normal (Gürsoy & Kara, 2023; Mills et al., 2021).

Further, in spite of the expressed fruits of education, and intentionally or not, there exists a hidden curriculum that amusingly forms those values and norms that offer undue support to the existing hierarchies and unfair treatment (López et al., 2020; Losioki & Mdee, 2023). Excessively inculcating in learners such norms as discipline, hard work, and putting effort instead of roses in education does not cater for the minority who are in the society. As a result, nurturant culture on the students to be initiates of their own social systems leaves no room for self-conscious and scrutinizing manipulation of the prevailing discriminations. They become classes of people that are civil, respectful of authorities, and accustomed to following laws and policies, the description of being a good citizen in this world entails compromising individuals for their own society (Jacobs et al., 2020).

In the final analysis, it is argued that the traditional education system is not a systematic collection of knowledge; rather it is a structural set of practices that were built on the modernist rhetoric of homogeneity and symmetry which fails to recognize the complexities and diversities of contemporary society. Other aspects of modernism like top-down management by rationality and stress on forecasting have built a system that is not strong enough to deal with a postmodern world that is characterized by diversity, complexity, and urgent demands for the regulation of social injustices. Thus, educational theorists and practitioners face the dilemma of redefining the underlying functions of curriculum, and there is recognition that it is essential to promote transformative practices, which will engage such inequalities and shape a diverse, inclusive, and equitable educational space in its own right (Paterson, 2020; Mapuya, 2023). The teaching and learning process thus necessitates a deep reflection on the ways of integrating social justice and education, along with making it relevant to all students, and creating an inclusive and equitable environment of education.

3. THE 21ST CENTURY RUPTURE: FORCES DEMANDING A NEW CURRICULAR LOGIC

The modernist foundations of curriculum, with their robust internal logic and alignment with the industrial age, provided a century of stability. However, the cohesive world they were built to serve has fractured. The turn of the 21st century did not bring a gentle evolution but a seismic rupture—a convergence of intellectual, technological, and socio-political forces that has rendered the old curricular logic not merely outdated, but profoundly inadequate. These forces do not simply demand minor adjustments to the existing framework; they challenge its core assumptions and expose its inherent limitations, necessitating a fundamentally new logic for curriculum theory and development. This section examines the three primary forces constituting this rupture: the philosophical challenge of postmodernism, the techno-societal demands of Education 5.0, and the socio-political imperative for justice.

3.1. The Postmodern Challenge to Universal Truths

The postmodern approach to curriculum development has emerged as a fundamental challenge to traditional educational paradigms that have dominated throughout the modern era, particularly because of its rejection of grand theories and its ability to question the epistemological bases of knowledge. One of the critical aspects of this process can be found in Jean-François Lyotard's (1979) central thesis, where he believes that postmodernism can be defined by the suspicion of so-called 'metanarratives'. This perspective does not only bring into the limelight the universality and objectivity that is often postulated by traditional curricula, but it also questions the validity of its present outlook. This epistemological skepticism exposes the fact that what has been plastered as a standard curriculum has predominantly been a Western-centric, mainly importation of certain historical perspectives; this has left out a number of voices and views especially people from the Global South, indigenous groups, and non-Western epistemologies. Thus, the analysis has been given by the work of Pacini-Ketchabaw and Pence (2011), Boboc (2012) which underpins the position supported in this paper.

The recognition of the already existing power dynamics in relation to the process of the design of the curriculum has also become an important point to be put across in this article. In the theory propounded by Michel Foucault (1975), the relationship between knowledge and power has been deemed to be an important idea since it illustrates that knowledge is a social product configured through the practice of relations, a reflection of the same structures of power that characterize the different administrative practices in the educational milieu. It is in this light that the curriculum can be seen as powerful 'power/knowledge' apparatus which can also be found to keep on reproducing certain values that can be considered to be appropriate in that society while deliberately silencing or rendering others invisible. This position has also been articulated by Tetikçi, et al. (2024); Wilson (2018) who further explain how this relationship brings about a more reflexive perspective in curriculum development. It has, therefore, been brought forth in this article that far from being a neutral process of assembling useful knowledge for learners, the selection of the curriculum content is a clearly political process that serves to define and reshape subjectivities and societal norms, offering a particular configuration of empowering and marginalizing practices. It is for this reason that the work of Duboc (2013) has been brought forth to support the position that recognizes the power matrix in the process concerned.

As a solution to these complexities, proponents of postmodern theory advocate for what has become known as a "curriculum of difference" in education, where the emphasis is placed on plurality and critical inquiry rather than on the quest for singular truths. This approach does not simply acknowledge diverse perspectives but also promotes teaching and learning practices that are thoughtful and sensitive to the distinct and complex social realities of students (Cui, 2023; Wilkinson, 2023). Pinar (2011) call for a curriculum that also embraces the complexities of identity and power structures in society resonates with this need for educational transformation. By prioritizing critical engagement and reflexivity over purely content delivery, the postmodern curriculum aims to develop the capacities of students to navigate and comprehend the ambiguities, tensions, and contradictions that are characteristic of our increasingly pluralistic world (Slabbert & Hattingh, 2006).

In conclusion, the postmodern critique makes a strong case for a radical overhaul of educational practices, breaking away from traditional forms of education characterized by linear progression and universal truths and moving towards a more nuanced and democratic conception of knowledge that takes into account the inseparable connections between power, culture, and identity in educational processes. This change is not merely theoretical; it calls for the involvement of educators and learners in

the active construction of curricula that appreciate the multiplicity of human experiences (Adha et al., 2021; Ryan & Grieshaber, 2005).

3.2. The Demands of Education 5.0 and the Digital Citizen

The advent of Education 4.0 serves as a catalyst for significant transformation in educational paradigms, driven by the increasing demands of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR), whereby technology, automation, and artificial intelligence redefine skill requirements. This shift has rendered traditional educational models focusing on a stable and canonical body of knowledge obsolete, necessitating a foundational change in curricula towards "how to learn" instead of "what to know" (Ilori & Ajagunna, 2020). However, as institutions begin embracing a more technical and vocational educational response, many face significant limitations in emphasizing essential human skills.

As schools grapple with navigating this digital transformation, there needs to be a recognition that simply replanning the present curriculum does not solve all issues. These issues appear even more significant in Education 5.0, which cites an integral point that original Education 4.0 forgot to put into consideration the re-employment of the human being. This human focus notwithstanding, the importance of how to empower learners in creativity, critical thinking, teamwork, and socio-emotional intelligence (Balmes, 2022) is thus re-emphasized both from research and past experiences. The emphasis placed by scholars on technologically competent, responsible citizens capable of using this knowledge for common good; people who will be able to embrace technology without losing their human touch as well as societal interests for the common good remains vital (Balmes, 2022). It is becoming clear that the ideal graduate is not just a competent technician, but also a person of ethical reflection, innovative creation (Balmes, 2022) and caring attitude, which are vital capabilities in an increasingly complex digital world.

The dual demand for advanced technical skills alongside humanistic sensibilities creates a paradox that existing educational frameworks struggle to address. Traditional educational models, which were originally designed to cultivate predictable behaviors suitable for a stable industrial context, are inadequate in fostering the creative and adaptive thinking necessary to navigate sociotechnical challenges, such as misinformation and digital divides. Unpredictable behaviors are the order of the day today, and it then follows logically that Education does not conform to such features of predictability as conformity, passivity or uniformity. New theories acknowledged that traditional paradigms rooted in functionalism, which emphasize social cohesion through assimilation, fail to provide the ethical guidance essential in a diverse and digitized society (Oluwaseyi, 2024). New curricula must be designed to integrate technology and the art of human touch: teachers must be encouraged with diverse teaching materials, instructional methods and assessment techniques. This cannot only prepare graduates who are technically competent but also those who have the audacity to question boundaries, create new frontiers of knowledge, and above all, give the modern world something moral to look up to.

The upward thrust in the advancements of the curricula and its design must acquire and immerse itself in practicing the complex interrelations between technical proficiency acquisition and humanistic educational philosophy on the one hand, and on the other, the realistic situations of the requirements for efficient manpower in the 21st century to address the ever-changing demands of technological changes and, at the same time, to develop in the students the need for coping with change and being flexible and open to possibilities. This evolution indicates the great necessity for the design and implementation processes in education to constantly analyze and reflect on their actions in future or presently emerging pertinent social issues and to re-orient educational strategies to make sure their respondents are future ready (Akins et al., 2019). The current revolution in education characterized by what has been popularly referred to as the fourth industrial revolution requires the involvement of all relevant stakeholders; they include the educators, policymakers, legislators, and industry practitioners in a bid to create a vibrant and resonant curriculum that meets the challenges of the modern world and balances efficiency in technological advancement and the ethical and creative training of learners. Specific care must be taken to include as diverse a representation of the population as is possible such that cutting across gender, race, economic classes, and interest groups would ensure holistic development of the curriculum.

3.3. The Imperative of Justice and the Voice of Generation Z

The call for justice echoed worldwide from the grassroots level signals a momentous change in socio-political relations, which connect with the changing demands of today's education systems. With the demands for social, racial, environmental, and cognitive justice that are becoming more and more prevalent day by day, this movement is gradually acknowledged to be instrumental in the ongoing national conversation. Current educational frameworks that have been built on functionalism and assimilation are now being pushed to properly reflect these changes. For a long time, public education has usually been expected to maintain the existing order; however, the demand for just education is a moral awakening of simultaneously questioning and rethinking the role of education in society, to have it as an instrument of social change and not just as a means of reinforcing the current hierarchies (Cates et al., 2018; Estrela & Lima, 2024).

Critical pedagogy has deeply helped shape this new consciousness of education whereby the likes of Paulo Freire, Henry Giroux, and bell hooks have championed the need for classroom practices that empower learners to become more critical and engage in social change. Their writings highlight the need for education to be informed by a pluralistic view and strongly engaged in the decolonization process. The curtain separating students from the truths of the historical past, against a background of ameliorated mists consisting of prejudices and colonial legacies that pervade the indoctrination system, needs to be lifted so that it can pave the way for a more equitable and just society (Estrela & Lima, 2024). All these processes state that it is the role of the teaching institutions to provide the much-needed space to empower the learners to be socially responsible in a way that appreciates the need for social reform. The Generation Z cohort, who are keenly aware of technological innovation and deeply rooted in the reality of socioeconomic disparities, illustrates the importance of having a justice-centered practice in education. They entrust educational institutions with a responsibility to rethink their educational practices, and being proposed to develop curricula that will produce calls for active involvement in the processes of change and growth, and not just formal statements (Cook, 2022).

As this conversation deepens, it becomes increasingly clear that the traditional modernist education model is becoming outdated. This model is rooted in rationality, predictability, and a cohesive societal narrative that is no longer applicable in this era of diversity and choice. The knowledge fragmentation and alternative epistemologies we are currently facing call for a complete redesign of the educational system's curricula to make it reflect the complexities of modern life; a design that breaks from the norm. This is echoed in a move made by postmodernist critics, who point out the need for a more diverse, inclusive,

and representative epistemology as education (Krueger, 2020; Guillén, 2001). The implications of such diversity establish that a single, rigid educational narrative is inadequate and points towards an ever-adaptive, responsive mode of learning that accounts for the social situation of learners in the present time (Hattab & Abidin, 2023).

Moreover, the new curricular is needed to guide principles that embrace fluidity, inclusivity, and a focus on justice-led methodologies. More than ever before, modern educational frameworks should embrace transformation for the sake of raising a generation of citizens who possess both the skills of critical thought and “the courage to act morally” (Wildan, 2022). This being a reaction against the passive reproduction of the status quo, it articulates a need to develop students who have the power, agency, and ability to influence change in society. Summing up, the intertwining of social movements for justice on the one hand and educational reform on the other leads to a picture of the curriculum as one that develops a critical consciousness and gives students a sense of power to produce discourses for a more just and equitable world (Estrela & Lima, 2024).

3.4. Forging New Foundations: A Proposal for a Responsive Curriculum Theory

Having mapped the profound rupture between the modernist curricular paradigm and the demands of the 21st century, the task of this paper now shifts from critical deconstruction to theoretical construction. It is no longer sufficient to merely catalogue the inadequacies of the old foundations; a responsive and relevant curriculum theory must forge new ones. This second part of the paper, therefore, accepts this challenge directly by proposing two new foundational pillars designed to guide curriculum development in a manner that is both ethically responsible and contextually viable.

These pillars are not intended as wholesale replacements but as essential, non-negotiable supplements that address the most critical gaps identified in the preceding analysis. The first, the Juridical Foundation, directly confronts the crisis of justice by embedding principles of rights and equity into the very DNA of curriculum design. The second, the Multidimensional Capital Foundation, addresses the crisis of practical relevance by offering a more holistic and realistic framework for assessing the resources that truly determine a curriculum's success or failure. To begin building this new framework, we must start with the most urgent moral imperative. We therefore turn first to the pillar that recalibrates the ethical compass of the discipline: the Juridical Foundations of Curriculum.

4. THE FIRST PILLAR: THEORIZING THE JURIDICAL FOUNDATIONS OF CURRICULUM

One of the significant flaws in the canonical inferred curriculum frameworks is a crucial forgetfulness of these frameworks, which is fundamental in the first process of an education system, if we are talking about the democratic education systems. In that current state of affairs and through the purported logical and structured presentation of knowledge, learners, and society, these undertakings fail to reckon one basic condition which all legitimate educational enterprises in a democratic society must put into practice: that is an explicit commitment to justice and fundamental human rights. The Juridical Foundation is what is being suggested here as a measure that can help sort out this critical deficiency in the curriculums. It is not just a mere compulsion that requires a certain curriculum to be in accordance with already established statutes or administrative codes, which is a matter that is inherently linked to the question of school law and policy. Rather it looks at the possibilities of uplifting the invisible justice, equality, and rights in this society, which were never considered to be as 'real' as the ideals of education themselves, from an aspect of compliance to a concept of an essential attribute of diverse curriculum theory and practice. In a sense, it acts as the 'first screen', a moral and ethical filter that any other curricular decision should go through as per the right course of action. By integrating it within the curriculum designing process, the job of the curriculum developer changes from being an impersonal technician of learning to a subtly but significantly involved genesis of a more just state of affairs in the social arena.

4.1. Beyond Compliance: From Educational Law to a Principle of Justice

The traditional understanding of "law" within educational contexts portrays it as an assortment of rules which can be used for the design of courses and education-related practice. This approach often coined as curricular legalism tends to concentrate on the needs dictated by law such as state content standards and anti-discrimination statutes thereby leaving out the more profound ethical responsibilities to which the law can give rise within educational contexts. On the contrary, the proposed Juridical Foundation aims to go beyond this form of model compliance and instead concentrates on grounding educational practice in the kind of rigorous legal and philosophical foundations that are underpinned by concepts like social justice or equitable treatment. This framework emphasizes not merely perusal of legal obligations but also the incorporation of consideration of fairness into curriculum design and implementation.

At the core of this foundation lies John Rawls' theory of justice with particular reference to "the difference principle" which asserts that all social institutions should be aimed at the benefits of the least advantaged members in society as mentioned in (Takshashila et al. 2024). In the field of education, this principle raises questions about how the contents of educational courses can be structured to promote and uplift the members of these communities. For example, applying a curriculum that is both culturally relevant and sustaining can serve to improve academic performance for students of color as well as help them develop a critical consciousness about their life in society (Seider et al., 2023). By focusing on marginalization and learning from local history, educators can build a curriculum decision that not only serves the needs of such communities but also proves to be an ethical responsibility that embodies equity on all levels of education.

Furthermore, it appears that in all relevant contexts, the Educational Juridical Foundation adheres to the principles of human rights education (HRE) because it emphasizes that educational practices should empower and safeguard the rights of every learner in the world (Schusler et al., 2021). Education ought to impart knowledge of human rights and the establishment of an enabling environment that allows students to stand up for themselves and their fellows. In agreement with this consideration is the assertion that education should be intrinsically linked with social justice, calling for this curriculum to be designed to confront and dismantle systemic inequities and injustices in all aspects of society (Strickland et al., 2023).

Theoretical frameworks of critical theory and critical pedagogy inform the second aspect of this Juridical Foundation which calls for educators to recognize how the law and education systems perpetuate social and economic inequality (Aronson & Laughter, 2016). The curriculum that has its roots in critical legal consciousness analyzes how curricular practices could inadvertently sustain forms of oppression, which inappropriateness may manifest as biased content or marginalization of particular student groups or passages in the assessment tools themselves (Alrasheedy, 2020). This method offers a way of

reconceptualizing the curriculum from only being a passive means of cultural transmission to actively determining the shape of the minds and the material conditions for social change (Snyder, 2014).

In general counterpoint, the Juridical Foundation proposes a curriculum that is not only legalistically compliant but that also harbors a deep sense of moral purpose informed by the overarching principles of justice. It is a moral and philosophical endeavor to imagine, shape, and implement a fundamentally different curriculum, which, with the help of political philosophy, human rights education, and critical pedagogy, urges educators to put the interests of marginalized learners in the forefront of their design and implementation whilst pinning the tail of intricacy of social injustices firmly on the donkey. In other words, this is an ethical demand to interrogate and challenge the entire educational system, shifting its current focus towards perpetuating inequalities and oppressive structures and moving instead towards a truly inclusive and emancipatory framework, which will ultimately benefit not only the marginalized groups of learners but the entire society.

4.2. Application in Praxis: Making the Marginalized Visible in Curriculum Design

Putting into consideration the need for a Juridical Framework in developing curricula for those behind the bars in prisons has been noted which arises from the acknowledgment that the traditional educational strategies used do ignore the complicated situations faced by these people. The students who are incarcerated should have the right to education, and because of this, they should follow the international legal frameworks like The Nelson Mandela Rules, which are based on the commitment to rehabilitation as well as human dignity in the affected societies as brought to light by the reliable authors. According to the UN's Nelson Mandela Rules (Drucker, 2019), every prisoner has a right to an education that is not only basic but also respects and upholds their dignity and embraces their reintegration back into society for his betterment and lives of those around him. Thus, the matter of rights emerges as a relevant launching pad for all educational contexts when interventions are being organized for educational development in prisons.

Further going, the use of a Juridical Basis does challenge educators to see curricula not just as simple support services but changes that can actually be used as tools for restorative justice. This new shift comes from the fact that the conventional type of punishment-based education has failed to address essential and fundamental issues of imprisonment that include inequitable distribution of resources in society and systemic racism with regard to education (Yin, 2024; Cox, 2019). For instance, numerous studies have shown that members of the marginalized communities such as people of color and those from lower socio-economic brackets are faced with higher chances of exclusion and denial of educational opportunities thus transecting and being caught in a vicious cycle of incarceration (Yin, 2024). Thus, through the adoption of empathy and accountability-oriented curricula, educators are capable of effecting healing and bringing back to the society prisoners and enabling them to take back not only their lives but their Places in the society and take active roles in their communities (Watson et al., 2020; Bryan et al., 2022). Curricula, which are right and just, have the capacity to transform the lives of prisoners and in turn, the society at large by giving attention to their needs and resolving the challenges that faced them rather than punishment.

Furthermore, addressing systemic injustices is pivotal in creating a curriculum that genuinely resonates with the lived experiences of incarcerated learners. By embedding sociological critiques into educational frameworks, a curriculum can actively confront and engage with the issues that shape the current experience of many learners such as racial bias and economic inequality that contribute to incarceration rates (McMillan & Bryan, 2024; Martensen, 2012). Involving the learners in the curriculum is, therefore, a key aspect of ensuring ethics in education.

As the new paradigm in education, a Juridical Foundation promotes a shift from a view of education as mainly compensatory and erasing the past narration of factors contributing to the negative view of the learner, to one that is much more persistent and redemptive, where the curriculum becomes the first and a continuous aspect for restoring the lost agency, voice and civic identity of the learners. This concept not only counters the narrative of the victimization often associated with incarceration but also inspires a sense of self-advocacy among incarcerated individuals which could only move them to greater heights if properly implemented (Bishop, 2024). Empirical studies, including those done in various parts of the world, indicate that education has the potential to significantly reduce recidivism rates, while emphasizing the development of prescriptive educational practices that facilitate the holistic and personal development of the learners rather than mere compliance with institutional expectations (Maiden & Schwartz, 2017). When the curriculum is based on social justice and focuses on rehabilitation and empowerment there are higher chances of success in the end.

Finally, theorizing a Juridical Foundation for curriculum development in correctional settings is an ethical imperative that ensures a commitment to social justice and equity, respect for the rights of all human beings, and educational transformation. By prioritizing the educational rights and needs of incarcerated individuals, fostering restorative justice principles, addressing systemic injustices, and empowering learners and trainers towards an affective, multi-faceted, and inclusive vision of learning, this framework endeavors to reshape the educational landscape and create a new personal and institutional culture that serves marginalized populations. Ultimately, it positions education not merely as a remedial tool to fix what is already perceived as wrong within the landscape but as an active and reactionary tool for justice that is consistent with the democratic ideals of human rights and dignity (Kajawo & Johnson, 2024; Bryan et al., 2022). By committing to a Juridical Foundation for incarcerated education, society can move towards a more just and equitable educational system that serves and empowers all individuals and that interrupts the cycle of poverty and inequality, renewing the promise of the kingdom of God in this world.

5. THE SECOND PILLAR: THEORIZING THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL CAPITAL FOUNDATIONS

In the craftsmanship of its curriculum development, the Juridical Foundation is the moral compass that cuts through a wall of tenacity, paving way for the growth and retraining of the relevance of curriculum by the Multidimensional Capital Foundation. An apt, though distorted, picture of the traditional economic base of curricula is to see this concept solely as the financial and other material resources needed for developing the curriculum which invariably fails to capture the breadth of the pertinent factors in university education as the other conflict of an economic nature with regard to the modernization of education. This has persistently suggested the perilous illusion that the only relevant inputs in the curriculum implementation process are cash. This difference has opened a wider abyss between the ideal curriculum as presented in a rich, thoughtful, theoretical proposal and the lived, effective, and equally complicated and often distressing actual curriculum that is applied to the students and schools.

The Multidimensional Capital Foundation in combating this misleading reductionism proposed an all-embracing and organic model for examining resources while creating a complete and full-fledged consideration of factors responsible for successful curriculum implementation.

5.1. Mapping the Ecosystem: An Analysis of Essential Capitals

To critically analyze the curriculum beyond its visible surface, it is vital that theorists acknowledge and evaluate a plethora of capital types that play a decisive role in charting out and executing educational programs. This nuanced perspective corresponds to the doctrines of Bourdieu's (1986) theoretical constructs that throw light on how different capital forms such as social, emotional, infrastructural, intellectual, pedagogical, and symbolic constitute intertwined forces that shape the attainment or failure of curricular goals. The multiple types of capital presented above stimulate thinkers of curriculum and its development to appreciate different kinds of knowledge, information, links or associated curricula and teachers as well as the social relations taking place in the classroom or school.

The issue of temporal capital centers on how time boundedness should not be viewed as a fixed, singular quantity, but rather as an active substance that gives shape and color to teaching. It is especially important in the present context for curricula to be made having clearly defined within itself the time pressures for teachers and learners. If there is an attempt to condense a full-year curriculum into a hectic five-month period, it can syllabicate the students and the efforts of the teacher to make sense out of the spectrum of curriculum components at times of high levels of stress (e.g., exams) (Bloomfield et al., 2022). The choreography of curriculum delivery in harmony with students' life rhythms, or "chronopedagogy," is of utmost significance, therefore (Outhwaite & Ferri, 2017). Considering, in this regard, how to honor or utilize such time factors appears to be an imperative of the theorists of curriculum.

Social capital within an educational context can be understood as the relationships, networks, and trust that are built and nurtured within the educational environment. It is one of the most critical inputs for both constructing and implementing any curriculum program. According to Bourdieu (1986), an adequate level of social capital in the form of mutual willingness to collaborate, trust, and a high degree of social connectedness among individuals in schools hastens any change in curricular activities. Yet low amounts of social capital can create environments that are opposed to new innovations and goals and can adversely affect curriculum implementation (Matemba, 2021). Curricula that function within the prescriptive and effective set of circumstances – where the level of trust is high, as in the case of the adoption of independent training tracks – are very much likely to hit a dead end when attempted to be carried out in settings with low levels of trust, which is why when designing a curriculum one should first analyze the existing social capital (Sin, 2013). So, the first thing that has to be done at the initiation of curriculum development is to assess the state of social capital and find the areas and levels of trust that can be integrated into the curriculum.

Emotional Capital: Emotional capital consists of the branch of emotional states and feelings that change between students, teachers and other participants in the learning process as well as in the whole educational system. It is instrumental for achieving desired learning outcomes to employ a curriculum that pushes individuals to take calculated risks within an academic milieu steeped in a positive emotional ethos (Outhwaite & Ferri, 2017). Therefore, it is paramount that the current state of emotion in the institution is examined, and an understanding of how they either bolster or impede the learning process is made. The nurturing of positive psychological qualities such as resilience and empathy is more than just desirable; it is an absolute necessity if any achievement is to be possible in actualizing the objectives defined for the curriculum implementation (Yang, 2022).

Infrastructural Capital: This broad category of infrastructural capital encompasses the diverse physical and digital resources that help promote curricular activities. The degree to which pedagogical practice is not affected by physical boundaries can be seen by the availability of flexible environments for learning and an efficient digital infrastructure. A project-based learning curriculum, for example, could hardly be successful in such a system that is bogged down by bureaucracies and rigidly set timelines (Paterson-Young et al., 2021). Consequently, the effective theorization on curricula must put relevant infrastructural capabilities into perspective to enhance the target teaching and learning results in view and to prevent developing oblivious theoretical models that do not correlate with the current environment (Azaola, 2012).

Intellectual and Pedagogical Capital: Teachers on the ground are the real gatekeepers and determinant of the curriculum success in an educational setup. To ensure the successful implementation of the curriculum, the accumulated knowledge, skills, and morale of the teaching force should match the demands of the curriculum. To ensure that a curriculum that uses inquiry-based teaching methods is effective, it is crucial to have staff members who are trained and prepared properly to implement this teaching method (Matiki et al., 2023). To this end, envisaging a critical appraisal of teacher competencies and their suitability in foreseen curriculum demands is very vital for the future reforms in curriculum implementation as they affect the wider educational systems as well as individual lives and learning achievements (Sin, 2013).

Symbolic capital encompasses the value imbued with a curricular design by society, the prevailing, institutional priorities, and values in the placement of what context because all kinds of conflict happen. A thorough comparison of Honors, Advanced Placement and Career technical education module, as discussed by Whigham et al. (2019), shows that the effect of symbolic capital of that nature either helps the students to form desirable education or makes them despair about what their communities think of that schools. It is such a tool that has not lost its potential to control the learners and the general populace and influence the socioeconomic mobility of individuals depending on the organizations that facilitate the process. Therefore, as significant structural predictors of educational policy, it is the assumption of curriculum theorists that the socio-symbolic phenomena of their particular courses ought to be subject to close scrutiny and developed in way that would induce individualities that are contrary to the cultic behavior of any particular group of systems (Clegg, 2011).

In conclusion, a synthesis of various concepts of forms of capital is a critical aspect of professional development for strengthening realization and delivery of the creditable and transformative curricular. By considering the key elements which go into unraveling and codes, educators can effectively create and deliver curricula that are not only theoretically sound but also contextually relevant and sensitive to the needs of the learners that are being taught. In so doing, faculties can help in this way through the interpretation of the philosophies of education so that learners may be active participants in transformative learning which supports their needs and leads to their full economic potential. By creating transformative learning-centric curricula, educators also ultimately create an equitable and conducive environment for students to pursue their academic passions and realize their aspirations.

5.2. Conclusion: Towards A More Holistic and Responsive Curriculum

This paper has gone through a significant moment in the history of curriculum theory, where the continuous deconstruction of the modernist curriculum theory is analysed in this paper in the context of the age of the 21st century in the paper and a new vision for the theory is developed based on two new foundational pillars, which include the Juridical Foundation and

Multidimensional Capital Foundation for 21st century curriculum theory. The conclusion of the paper, therefore, is an important section that takes into account the need to integrate the two dimensional pillars into a coherent and systematic model for contemporary curriculum creation.

It is crucial for the readers to understand that the focus on these new views is not about rejecting the traditional foundations. It cannot be doubted that the Philosophical, Psychological, and Sociological issues, the foundation of the discipline for almost one hundred years, have continued to be a significant concern; however, the time is not for their applications separately without the backing of pivotal moral and contextual framework for curriculum. Therefore, it is crucial to offer a new framework for theorizing a fresh connection between these two segments, and indeed the aim of this section is to provide such a frame. At this point of the argument, we can begin to consider the process of integration of the two types of foundations into a unified, dynamic, and multi-faceted framework for curriculum theory that has an enhanced capacity to adapt to the changing nature of education. This model is characterized by its flexibility, integration and prioritization of curricular as human rights.

5.3. Synthesizing the Old and the New: A Dynamic Model of Foundations

Developing new foundations in our current state of curriculum development may lean towards creating yet another addendum which forms an endless list that retains the very same linear and mechanistic thought processes that have been the hallmark of curriculum development since the Tyler Rationalization. Nevertheless, productive synthesis does not just entail an addition but rather a complete revolution of how all the constituent elements of the curriculum are viewed and understood. Contrary to the approaches of the modernist paradigm which viewed the foundations as a linear, relatively flat set of filters, the dynamic model of the foundations proposed in this piece advocates a re-organization of the foundations into a nested, recursive, and dialogical framework one that gives due consideration to the ethical aspects, as well as the contextual matters before attending to the actualities of the educational design endeavor. Viewing the foundations in this way, as a set of interactions rather than as a straightforward linear narrative, opens up the possibility for a far more interesting and intricate understanding of curriculum.

5.4. The Primacy of the New Foundations: Establishing the Ethical and Contextual Boundaries

In this current paradigm that is being considered, Juridical Capital and Multidimensional Capital foundations are established as a critical principle of curriculum evaluation as compared to the more traditional pillars which nevertheless are still relevant and are just as significant. For all practical reasons, they border on the outer realm of curriculum studies and contain a lot of necessary materials that should be examined in the course of any curriculum development process. The primary consideration that should be taken into account by any curriculum developer right from the onset is very much correct and acceptable to clarify that Juridical Foundation is a moral or ethical boundary based on which all other curriculum theories can be built and should be accepted as correct and obeyed during all times.

In applicable terms, this foundation is considered to be the primary and central form of selection that is capable of establishing the criteria for curriculum development in terms of philosophical discussions and psychological methodologies. The basic question, which one should and actually could employ in the design of a curriculum, is: "Is my program prepared to serve the needs and rights of each diverse learner?" This calls for a certain paradigm which resembles the idea put forward by John Rawls and can be regarded as a little veil of ignorance, pragma of children, and societal members that are the weakest elements within a society in normal situations. Any proposal, objective, content, or practice can be easily deemed illegitimate and wrong if it is against the principles of non-negotiable rights and wrongdoings, segregation, and other forms of oppression, and moreover, if they do not take into consideration the part of a community that is not reflected in a curriculum whatever its theoretical or psychological validity may be.

It should be the basis of all the curriculums because if they are built on premises that deny certain groups of learners the moral basis of any socio-political buildings, society, and its advanced humanization, the structures will be shaky and fragile and fall apart quite easily. Based on the above views, the Multidimensional Capital Foundation serves as a reminder. That is implied to be the case, as soon as one has cleared the first screen, as one has passed the ethical boundary, the second and more difficult question arises: "Is it really possible to implement this worthwhile and fundamentally just curriculum in the present-day reality of the given specific situation?" This foundation compels a most thorough examination and robust consideration of all the situational specificities that prevail in various contexts and of the various types of existing warrants. There is a distinction to be made between a just curriculum in the abstract and a just curriculum that has in practice been rendered impossible because of the lack of some essential resources, people, or any other means or facilities. The development of any curriculum that fails to take into consideration the specific conditions, limitations, and affordances of the group for which it was meant cannot be called design. It is the process of imagining curricular changes that are not only sweeping but are often valid, but this kind of thinking can hardly be called pedagogy as it will invariably lead to being inefficient and doing nothing but breed skepticism in learners and teachers alike.

Last but not least, as detailed in these two foundational bases of the Juridical and Multidimensional Capital, a proper curriculum must rest on intention and is meant to be of use, something that is possible to achieve in given and present configurations

5.5. The Re-Situated Role of the Canonical Foundations: A Dialogical Engagement

In today's educational climate, the emphasis on social justice is resolutely insistent; therefore it is only reasonable that the traditionally established foundational lenses can be employed in the development of curriculum or any educational program after they have been subjected to thorough scrutiny on the grounds of their ability to either enhance justice and holistic development of human capital. In a sophisticated, mirrored experiential approach, these prior methodologies of education are reconceptualised. Instead, they have the rich and diverse character of dynamic fields of inquiry for humanized and democratically inclusive discourses. The relevant, significant questions that can be generated from these systems and analyses are no longer questions of the "ultimate best" in terms of educational practice; rather the questions that invoke critical examination of ethical and contextual modes of possibilities that are open for implementation as far as education is concerned.

Let us take a look at the philosophical aspect: In place of asking, "which philosophy will be used?" the probing question becomes, "in accordance with our undeterred view of educational justice and an understanding of what in statute is doable what plausible philosophical traditions (like pragmatism, phenomenology, critical theory, post-humanism) can facilitate and inform our work with our unique subject matter and audience?" The philosophical underpinnings that guide the educational practice are no

longer regarded as a universal theory but are typically situated, practical and reflect the local conditions' specificity and educational realities.

Let us now turn towards the examination of the psychological field of inquiry: The commonly asked question "How do learners learn?" is in turn reconstructed as a sensitive and inquiring query: "What diverse representations of learning and learning applicable understandings of human development (such as socio-cultural approach, constructivism, psychoanalytical, but not limited to cognitive) can help us achieve our ethically bounded, contextually grounded goals for these specific learners?" The question focuses on the existing theoretical perspectives and calls on a spectrum of approaches, which can guide the design and implementation of appropriate education for these particular students. In effect, the sphere of psychology becomes one of creativity and critical debates, whereby the opted for theories should serve such a long-term approach to education that not only involves the needs of the students but also ensures their full professional and personal growth as well as independence in the sophisticated modern world.

In the realm of sociology, the functionalist question, "How does this curriculum serve society?" is inverted into a critical approach: "Given our analysis of the existing social order and its injustices, how can this curriculum empower learners to critically analyze and responsibly transform their society?" The sociological foundation is thus repurposed from a tool of reproduction to an engine of critique and transformation.

This model is not linear but recursive and hermeneutic. Insights generated during the dialogical inquiry with the canonical foundations feedback to enrich the understanding of the outer layers. For instance, a psychological exploration might reveal deep-seated emotional trauma (a deficit in Emotional Capital), which in turn raises new Juridical questions about the school's duty of care and the learners' right to a safe educational environment. A philosophical commitment to pragmatism might highlight the need to build new forms of Social Capital. This creates a constant, dynamic feedback loop, where the ethical, the practical, and the theoretical are in perpetual conversation.

In essence, this synthesis dismantles the factory-line model of curriculum development and replaces it with an ecological one. It moves the discipline from a technical, managerial enterprise to a profoundly ethical, political, and context-aware practice. The foundations cease to be a static checklist and become a dynamic, dialogical web of inquiry, better suited to navigating the immense complexities of educating for an uncertain and demanding future.

REFERENCES

- Adha, M., Ulpa, E., & Wijaya, A. (2021). Book review: Slattery, Patrick. *Curriculum development in the postmodern era* (1995). *Jurnal Ilmiah Mimbar Demokrasi*, 20(2), 98–104. <https://doi.org/10.21009/jimd.v20i2.18181>
- Aithal, P., & Aithal, S. (2023). How to increase emotional infrastructure of higher education institutions. *International Journal of Management Technology and Social Sciences*, 8(1), 356–394. <https://doi.org/10.47992/ijmts.2581.6012.0307>
- Akins, E., Giddens, E., Glassmeyer, D., Gruss, A., Hedden, M., Slinger-Friedman, V., ... & Weand, M. (2019). Sustainability education and organizational change: A critical case study of barriers and change drivers at a higher education institution. *Sustainability*, 11(2), 501. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11020501>
- Alrasheedy, A. A. (2020). Multidisciplinary integrated pharmacotherapy curriculum in a doctor of pharmacy program: Educators' perceptions, views, and perspectives. *Journal of Medical Education and Curricular Development*, 7, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2382120519897279>
- An, S. (2017). AsianCrit perspective on social studies. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 41(2), 131–139. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jssr.2016.06.002>
- Ardiyani, D., & Kurniawan, D. (2020). Policy and curriculum of study program of German language education at the State University of Malang in welcoming the needs of German language teachers in Indonesia in the era of industrial revolution 4.0. *KnE Social Sciences*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v4i4.6465>
- Aronson, B., & Laughter, J. (2016). The theory and practice of culturally relevant education: A synthesis of research across content areas. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(1), 163–206. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315582066>
- Azaola, M. C. (2012). Revisiting Bourdieu: Alternative educational systems in the light of the theory of social and cultural reproduction. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 22(2), 81–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09620214.2012.700187>
- Balmes, S. (2022). Technology integration and transformative innovation in education. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 106(1). <https://doi.org/10.47119/ijrp1001061820223743>
- Bhatt, G. D., & Gupta, J. N. D. (2005). Interactive patterns of knowledge management in organisations: Insight from a fashion company. *International Journal of Information Technology and Management*, 4(3), 231–243. <https://doi.org/10.1504/ijitm.2005.006784>
- Bishop, S. (2024). The voices of hope: A traveling miracle. In K. Norton & E. M. Morgan-Ellis (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Community Singing* (pp. 607–624). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197612460.013.31>
- Bloomfield, C., Harreveld, B., & Fisher, R. (2022). 'You don't have to feel trapped': Architectural discourses of youth engagement in a community-based learning environment. *Smart Learning Environments*, 9(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-022-00208-8>
- Boamah, S. A., & Laschinger, H. K. S. (2014). Engaging new nurses: The role of psychological capital and workplace empowerment. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 20(4), 265–277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987114527302>
- Boboc, M. (2012). The postmodern curriculum in a modern classroom. *International Journal of Education*, 4(1), 67–75. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ije.v4i1.1167>
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood Press.
- Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic status and child development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 371–399. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135233>
- Brake, N. (2023). Evolution to critical race theory: Kentucky legislative curriculum bans in 1922 and 2022. *Educational Policy*, 38(6), 1418–1448. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08959048231202703>
- Bryan, N., McMillian, R., & LaMar, K. (2022). Prison abolition literacies as pro-Black pedagogy in early childhood education. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*, 22(3), 383–407. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14687984221122990>
- Cantoni, D., Chen, Y., Yang, D., Yuchtman, N., & Zhang, Y. (2017). Curriculum and ideology. *Journal of Political Economy*, 125(2), 338–392. <https://doi.org/10.1086/690951>

- Castellanos-Jankiewicz, L. (2024). A new history for human rights: Conflict of laws as adjacent possibility. *Journal of the History of International Law / Revue d'histoire du droit international*, 26(2), 119–160. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718050-bja10095>
- Catacutan, R. (2014). Education in virtues as goal of business ethics instruction. *African Journal of Business Ethics*, 7(2), 43–55. <https://doi.org/10.15249/7-2-37>
- Cates, R., Madigan, M., & Reitenauer, V. (2018). 'Locations of possibility': Critical perspectives on partnership. *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 2(1), 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.15173/ijpsap.v2i1.3341>
- Clegg, S. (2011). Cultural capital and agency: Connecting critique and curriculum in higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 32(1), 93–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2011.527723>
- Cook, E. (2022). A narrative review of graduate employability models: Their paradigms, and relationships to teaching and curricula. *Journal of Teaching and Learning for Graduate Employability*, 13(1), 37–64. <https://doi.org/10.21153/jtlge2022vol13no1art1483>
- Cottingham, M. (2016). Theorizing emotional capital. *Theory and Society*, 45(5), 451–470. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11186-016-9278-7>
- Cowan, R. (2000). The explicit economics of knowledge codification and tacitness. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 9(2), 211–253. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/9.2.211>
- Cox, R. (2019). Applying the theory of social good to mass incarceration and civil rights. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 30(2), 205–218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049731519872838>
- Crane, J., & Pascoe, K. (2020). Becoming institutionalized: Incarceration as a chronic health condition. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, 35(3), 307–326. <https://doi.org/10.1111/maq.12621>
- Cui, X. (2023). Educational leadership at Chinese universities: Exploring new perspectives from postmodernism and Maslow's hierarchy of needs. *Educational Research and Innovation*, 3(2), 138–145. <https://doi.org/10.61866/eri.v3i2.59>
- Damanik, F. (2023). The importance of Merdeka curriculum in sociology and anthropology learning. *Literatus*, 5(2), 359–366. <https://doi.org/10.37010/lit.v5i2.1437>
- Dhanaraj, C., Lyles, M. A., Steensma, H. K., & Tihanyi, L. (2004). Managing tacit and explicit knowledge transfer in IJVs: The role of relational embeddedness and the impact on performance. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35(5), 428–442. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400098>
- Doll, W. E. (1993). *A post-modern perspective on curriculum*. Teachers College Press.
- Drucker, E. (2019). Incarcerated people. In B. S. Levy (Ed.), *Social injustice and public health* (3rd ed., pp. 175–194). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190914653.003.0009>
- Duboc, A. (2013). Teaching with an attitude: Finding ways to the conundrum of a postmodern curriculum. *Creative Education*, 4(12), 58–65. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2013.412a2009>
- Durkheim, É. (1956). *Education and sociology*. The Free Press.
- Durlak, J., Weissberg, R., Dymnicki, A., Taylor, R., & Schellinger, K. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, 82(1), 405–432. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x>
- Eccles, J., & Roeser, R. (2011). Schools as developmental contexts during adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21(1), 225–241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00725.x>
- Estrela, E., & Lima, L. (2024). Towards a democratic curriculum: The narrative paradigm to achieve a state of viscosity. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 44(2), 155–165. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41297-024-00238-x>
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Pantheon Books.
- García-Moya, I., Brooks, F., Morgan, A., & Moreno, C. (2014). Subjective well-being in adolescence and teacher connectedness: A health asset analysis. *Health Education Journal*, 74(6), 641–654. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0017896914555039>
- Guillén, M. F. (2001). Is globalization civilizing, destructive or feeble? A critique of five key debates in the social science literature. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27(1), 235–260. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.235>
- Gürsoy, İ., & Kara, D. (2023). A systematic literature review on curriculum studies addressing social inequalities. *Kuramsal Eğitim Bilim*, 16(1), 72–106. <https://doi.org/10.30831/akukey.1141332>
- Hattab, M., & Abidin, M. (2023). Development of Arabic language curriculum with integration-interconnection paradigm referring KKNi and SN-Dikti. *Sustainable: Jurnal Kajian Mutu Pendidikan*, 6(2), 421–431. <https://doi.org/10.32923/kjmp.v6i2.3412>
- Ilori, M. O., & Ajagunna, I. A. (2020). Re-imagining the future of education in the era of the Fourth Industrial Revolution. *Worldwide Hospitality and Tourism Themes*, 12(1), 3–12. <https://doi.org/10.1108/WHATT-10-2019-0066>
- Jacobs, C., Schalkwyk, S., Blitz, J., & Volschenk, M. (2020). Advancing a social justice agenda in health professions education. *Critical Studies in Teaching and Learning*, 8(2), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.14426/cristal.v8i2.272>
- Kajawo, S., & Johnson, L. (2024). Why not us? Experiences of incarcerated women on education access in Malawi prisons. *Advanced Journal of Social Science*, 13(1), 25–39. <https://doi.org/10.21467/ajss.13.1.25-39>
- Kothari, A., Bickford, J., Edwards, N., Dobbins, M., & Meyer, M. (2011). Uncovering tacit knowledge: A pilot study to broaden the concept of knowledge in knowledge translation. *BMC Health Services Research*, 11, Article 198. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-11-198>
- Krueger, J. I. (2020). Prediction and explanation in a postmodern world. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, Article 597706. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.597706>
- Kuyk, J. (2011). Scaffolding – How to increase development? *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 19(1), 133–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1350293x.2011.548965>
- Li, Y. (2024). Study on curriculum ideological and political construction and implementation strategy in nursing education. *Meds Public Health and Preventive Medicine*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.23977/phpm.2024.040103>
- Lindén, J., Annala, J., & Coate, K. (2017). The role of curriculum theory in contemporary higher education research and practice. In *Researching Higher Education* (pp. 137–154). Emerald Publishing Limited. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S2056-375220170000003008>
- Liu, Y., & Jia, T. (2023). Research on the pattern of college curriculum education based on curriculum ideology and politics in the new era. *Journal of Education and Educational Research*, 1(3), 73–76. <https://doi.org/10.54097/jeer.v1i3.4802>
- Liu, Y., Ma, S., & Chen, Y. (2024). The impacts of learning motivation, emotional engagement and psychological capital on academic performance in a blended learning university course. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15, Article 1357936. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1357936>
- Looney, A. (2001). Curriculum as policy: Some implications of contemporary policy studies for the analysis of curriculum policy,

- with particular reference to post-primary curriculum policy in the Republic of Ireland. *The Curriculum Journal*, 12(2), 149–162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585170121749>
- López, D., Monge, M., Morón-Monge, H., & López, J. (2020). The treatment of socioeconomic inequalities in the Spanish curriculum of the compulsory secondary education (ESO): An opportunity for interdisciplinary teaching. *Social Sciences*, 9(6), 94. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci9060094>
- Losioki, B., & Mdee, H. (2023). The contribution of the hidden curriculum to gender inequality in teaching and learning materials: Experiences from Tanzania. *Asian Journal of Education and Training*, 9(2), 54–58. <https://doi.org/10.20448/edu.v9i2.4706>
- Lozančić, A., & Tot, D. (2020). Creativity and creation in early childhood and preschool education curriculum. *Croatian Journal of Education – Hrvatski Časopis za Odgoj i Obrazovanje*, 22, 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.15516/cje.v22i0.3839>
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1979). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Maiden, R., & Schwartz, J. (2017). Editors' notes. *Dialogues in Social Justice*, 2(2), Article 719. <https://doi.org/10.55370/dsj.v2i2.719>
- Mapuya, M. (2023). Exploring social justice issues that inform the 21st-century curriculum in higher education: Lecturers' voices and experiences. *Research in Educational Policy and Management*, 5(3), 108–127. <https://doi.org/10.46303/repam.2023.26>
- Martensen, K. (2012). The price that US minority communities pay: Mass incarceration and the ideologies that fuel them. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 15(2), 211–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2012.681165>
- Matemba, Y. (2021). Religious identity, social space, and discourses of religious education reform in Scotland and Malawi: A Bourdieusian analysis. *Journal of Religious Education*, 69(2), 219–238. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40839-021-00139-5>
- Matiki, D., Chibambo, M., & Divala, J. (2023). A comparison of teacher's involvement in curriculum development in developing and developed countries: A case study of Namibia. *Frontiers in Education*, 8, Article 1243573. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1243573>
- McMillan, R., & Bryan, N. (2024). The good cops, bad cops, bullets, and wounds: Toward culturally sustaining prison abolition literacies in early childhood education. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 60(1), 1–25. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.586>
- Mills, M., Riddle, S., McGregor, G., & Howell, A. (2021). Towards an understanding of curricular justice and democratic schooling. *Journal of Educational Administration & History*, 54(3), 345–356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2021.1977262>
- Mnguni, L. (2024). The curriculum ideologies underlying the AFRIMEDS curriculum framework for undergraduate medical and dental education in South Africa. *International Medical Education*, 3(1), 44–61. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ime3010005>
- Neve, D., Bronstein, M., Leroy, A., Truyts, A., & Everaert, J. (2022). Emotion regulation in the classroom: A network approach to model relations among emotion regulation difficulties, engagement to learn, and relationships with peers and teachers. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 52(2), 273–286. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-022-01678-2>
- Nonaka, I., & Krogh, G. (2009). Perspective—Tacit knowledge and knowledge conversion: Controversy and advancement in organizational knowledge creation theory. *Organization Science*, 20(3), 635–652. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1080.0412>
- Nurhayati, T., & Pitaloka, W. (2022). The role of knowledge management on learning organization capacity and job performance. *Indonesian Journal of Sustainability*, 1(1), 73–90. <https://doi.org/10.30659/ijsunissula.1.1.73-90>
- Oluwaseyi, S. (2024). Effect of information and communication technology on curriculum delivery in tertiary institutions in Nigeria. *Sumerianz Journal of Social Science*, 72, 15–20. <https://doi.org/10.47752/sjss.72.15.20>
- Outhwaite, D., & Ferri, G. (2017). Critical reflections on modern elite formation and social differentiation in the International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme in England. *Oxford Review of Education*, 43(4), 402–416. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054985.2017.1329719>
- Pace, J. L. (2003). Revisiting classroom authority: Theory and ideology meet practice. *Teachers College Record*, 105(8), 1559–1585. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9620.00300>
- Pacini-Ketchabaw, V., & Pence, A. (2011). The postmodern curriculum: Making space for historically and politically situated understandings. *Australasian Journal of Early Childhood*, 36(1), 4–8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/183693911103600102>
- Parsons, T. (1959). The school as a social system: Some of its functions in American society. *Harvard Educational Review*, 29(4), 297–318.
- Paterson, L. (2020). Curriculum and opportunity in Scottish secondary education: A half-century of expansion and inequality. *The Curriculum Journal*, 31(4), 722–744. <https://doi.org/10.1002/curj.55>
- Paterson-Young, C., Bajwa-Patel, M., & Hazenberg, R. (2021). 'I ain't stupid, I just don't like school': A 'needs' based argument for children's educational provision in custody. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 25(4), 452–469. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13676261.2021.1900553>
- Piaget, J. (1954). *The construction of reality in the child*. Basic Books.
- Pinar, W. F. (2011). *The character of curriculum studies: Bildung, currere, and the recurring question of the subject*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137015839>
- Piper, A., & Berle, D. (2019). The association between trauma experienced during incarceration and PTSD outcomes: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Forensic Psychiatry and Psychology*, 30(5), 854–875. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2019.1639788>
- Ramulumo, M., & Mnguni, L. (2023). A qualitative comparison of the intended curriculum ideologies of STEM subjects in South Africa. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 43(2), 145–155. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41297-023-00205-y>
- Ryan, S., & Grieshaber, S. (2005). Shifting from developmental to postmodern practices in early childhood teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(1), 34–45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487104272057>
- Schusler, T., Espedido, C., Rivera, B., Hernández, M., Howerton, A., Sepp, K., ... & Chaudhary, V. (2021). Students of colour views on racial equity in environmental sustainability. *Nature Sustainability*, 4(11), 975–982. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-021-00759-7>
- Seider, S., Henry, D., Edwards, E., Huguley, J., Diaz, B., & Daza, K. (2023). Investigating the relation between critical consciousness and academic achievement for adolescents of color and white adolescents. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, 29(4), 516–529. <https://doi.org/10.1037/cdp0000613>
- Shah, S., & Mahmood, K. (2016). Contributing factors in knowledge sharing for performance of university students in teachers' training programs. *Library Management*, 37(8/9), 496–506. <https://doi.org/10.1108/lm-09-2016-0067>

- She, C. (2024). The influence mechanism of curriculum ideology politics on college students' national identity: The role of cultural confidence and school climate. *Journal of Education and Educational Research*, 7(1), 137–142. <https://doi.org/10.54097/9dprn731>
- Shkedi, A., & Nisan, M. (2006). Teachers' cultural ideology: Patterns of curriculum and teaching culturally valued texts. *Teachers College Record*, 108(4), 687–725.
- Sin, I. (2013). Cultural capital and distinction: Aspirations of the 'other' foreign student. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 34(5–6), 848–867. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2013.816030>
- Sinervo, L., Kork, A., & Hasanen, K. (2021). Challenges in curriculum development process aimed at revising the capabilities of future public financial managers. *Teaching Public Administration*, 41(2), 243–256. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01447394211051878>
- Slabbert, J., & Hattingh, A. (2006). 'Where is the post-modern truth we have lost in reductionist knowledge?' A curriculum's epitaph. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 38(6), 701–718. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270600608023>
- Snel, E., Engbersen, G., Boom, J., & Bochove, M. (2022). Social capital as protection against the mental health impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 7, Article 728541. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2022.728541>
- Snyder, M. (2014). Emancipatory knowing: Empowering nursing students toward reflection and action. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 53(2), 65–69. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20140107-01>
- Strickland, C., Ramírez-Salgado, A., Weisberg, L., Chandler, L., Domenico, J., Lehman, E., ... & Israel, M. (2023). Designing an equity-centered framework and crosswalk for integrated elementary computer science curriculum and instruction. *Journal of Computer Science Integration*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.26716/jcsi.2023.4.17.46>
- Sumanarathna, N., Duodu, B., & Rowlinson, S. (2020). Social capital, exploratory learning and exploitative learning in project-based firms: The mediating effect of collaborative environment. *The Learning Organization*, 27(4), 351–364. <https://doi.org/10.1108/tlo-03-2020-0033>
- Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: Theory and practice*. Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Takshashila, J., Chelsi, K., Ankita, K., Pooja, R., & Shehrenanu, S. (2024). Social justice in higher education. *International Research Journal of Advanced Engineering and Management*, 2(11), 3396–3404. <https://doi.org/10.47392/irjaem.2024.0500>
- Tetikçi, İ., Erim, G., & Baykan, K. (2024). The perspectives of visual arts teachers on postmodernism. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE)*, 13(2), 960–970. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v13i2.25270>
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. University of Chicago Press.
- Uljens, M. (2016). Non-affirmative curriculum theory in a cosmopolitan era? *Revista Tempos e Espaços em Educação*, 9(18), 121–132.
- Vorhaus, J. (2014). Prisoners' right to education: A philosophical survey. *London Review of Education*, 12(2), 162–174. <https://doi.org/10.18546/lre.12.2.02>
- Wang, J., & Zhu, M. (2022). Research on the construction of college English reading courses based on ideology and politics curriculum. *Scientific and Social Research*, 4(1), 181–185. <https://doi.org/10.36922/ssr.v4i1.1334>
- Watson, M., Turner, W., & Hines, P. (2020). Black lives matter: We are in the same storm but we are not in the same boat. *Family Process*, 59(4), 1362–1373. <https://doi.org/10.1111/famp.12613>
- Whigham, S., Hobson, M., Batten, J., & White, A. (2019). Reproduction in physical education, society and culture: The physical education curriculum and stratification of social class in England. *Sport, Education and Society*, 25(5), 493–506. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2019.1619545>
- Wildan, T. (2022). Traditional dayah education in Aceh in the perspective of perennialist philosophy. *At-Tafkir*, 15(2), 238–251. <https://doi.org/10.32505/at.v15i2.5120>
- Wilkinson, J. (2023). Postmodernist ideas and their translation into a critical pedagogy for young children. IntechOpen. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.103747>
- Williford, A., Whittaker, J. V., Vitiello, V. E., & Downer, J. T. (2013). Children's engagement within the preschool classroom and their development of self-regulation. *Early Education and Development*, 24(2), 162–187. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10409289.2011.628270>
- Wilson, G. (2018). Global consciousness in art education: Utility and problematics of curriculum development within a critical postmodern relational praxis. *Journal of Cultural Research in Art Education*, 35(1). <https://doi.org/10.2458/jcrae.4860>
- Wong, W., & Radcliffe, D. (2000). The tacit nature of design knowledge. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 12(4), 493–512. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713698497>
- Yang, L. (2022). The dilemma of education for ethnic minority girls in rural China: A perspective based on Bourdieu's theory of social reproduction. In *Proceedings of the 2022 6th International Seminar on Education, Management and Social Sciences (ISEMSS 2022)* (pp. 1383–1392). https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-31-2_164
- Yin, S. (2024). Systemic factors leading to incarceration and its impact on marginalized communities. *Studies in Law and Justice*, 3(4), 42–54. <https://doi.org/10.56397/slj.2024.12.05>
- Zhang, X., Chen, W., Tong, J., & Liu, X. (2012). Relational mechanisms, market contracts and cross-enterprise knowledge trading in the supply chain. *Chinese Management Studies*, 6(3), 488–508. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17506141211259159>
- Zipin, L., Fataar, A., & Brennan, M. (2015). Can social realism do social justice? Debating the warrants for curriculum knowledge selection. *Education as Change*, 19(2), 9–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16823206.2015.1085610>