Journal for Social Science Archives

Online ISSN: 3006-3310
Print ISSN: 3006-3302
Volume 3, Number 2, 2025, Pages 1028 – 1047
Journal Home Page
https://jssarchives.com/index.php/Journal/about

Pedagogical Latency and Disciplinary Friction: An Archival Analysis of How Global Volatility Impacts Cambridge A-Level Economics and Business Curricula (2004–2028)

Maliha Abdul Mujeeb[1], Prof. Dr. Muhammad Yousuf Sharjeel[2] & Dr. Nuzhat Naz[3]

[1]*Research Scholar and Teacher, NED University, Karachi, Sindh, Pakistan*
[2]*Professor, Director Postgraduate Studies and Research, College of Education, Faculty of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences, Ziauddin University, Email: muhammad.sharjeel@zu.edu.pk*
[3]*Assistant Professor, College of Education Ziauddin University, Faculty of Liberal Arts and Human Sciences, Ziauddin University*

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received:	*April*	*15, 2025*
Revised:	*May*	*21, 2025*
Accepted:	*June*	*06, 2025*
Available Online:	*June*	*20, 2025*

Keywords:

Curriculum Evolution, Pedagogical Latency, Economics Education, Business Studies, Global Financial Crisis, Age of Disruption, Archival Analysis, CSR, Cambridge Assessment International Education (CAIE), A-level

Corresponding Author:
Dr. Muhammad Yousuf Sharjeel
Email:
muhammad.sharjeel@zu.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

The past two decades have subjected the global economy to unprecedented volatility, fundamentally challenging the orthodox models taught in international secondary education. This study conducts a longitudinal qualitative archival document analysis of the Cambridge Assessment International Education (CAIE) A-Level frameworks between 2004 and 2028 to investigate how macroeconomic trauma dictates curriculum evolution. By comparatively tracking a theoretical discipline (Economics 9708) and an applied discipline (Business 9609/9707), this research empirically identifies severe "disciplinary friction." Findings reveal that theoretical economics functions as a "reactive historical archivist," exhibiting profound pedagogical latency—evidenced by a five-year delay in codifying Quantitative Easing post-2008 and a decades-long resistance to Behavioral Economics—adapting only to preserve academic orthodoxy. Conversely, applied business operates as a "proactive educational agent," rapidly restructuring its syllabus to integrate Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and global strategic resilience in response to the modern "Age of Disruption." The study concludes that standard, rigid syllabus update cycles are insufficient for modern geopolitical volatility. It recommends the adoption of modular curriculum frameworks, the integration of heterodox economic theories, and targeted experiential learning mandates to close the persistent theory-practice gap and equip students for future systemic crises.

Background of the Study

Secondary education acts as the primary transmission mechanism for global economic and corporate literacy. For millions of students worldwide, international examination frameworks—such as the Cambridge Assessment International Education (CAIE) Advanced Level (A-Level)—dictate their foundational understanding of market mechanics, government intervention, and corporate governance. These syllabi are not merely academic checklists; they are carefully curated blueprints that define what the next generation of global professionals will accept as economic orthodoxy. However, the period between 2004 and 2024 represents two of the most volatile macroeconomic decades in modern history, bookended by the 2008 Global Financial Crisis and the post-COVID-19 supply chain and inflation crises. During this 20-year span, the real-world realities of economics and business underwent profound paradigm shifts. The pre-2008 consensus, heavily characterized by financial deregulation, the supremacy of shareholder value, and the unmitigated pursuit of "Just-in-Time" (JIT) globalized supply chains, was shattered by systemic market failures. In its wake, new orthodoxies emerged: unprecedented state intervention via Quantitative Easing (QE), the mainstreaming of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), and a post-pandemic realization that supply chain resilience must supersede pure cost-efficiency. Consequently, examining how and when these massive macroeconomic shifts are codified into high-stakes secondary curricula provides a critical lens into the reactivity and relevance of international educational standards.

Statement of the Problem

While a robust body of literature examines how higher education institutions and tertiary business schools adapt their degree programs in response to economic crises, there remains a critical research gap regarding the evolution of secondary educational standards. The academic community disproportionately focuses on university-level pedagogical shifts, largely ignoring the fact that international A-Level syllabi serve as the gatekeepers of economic literacy for a much larger, younger global demographic. Furthermore, existing curriculum research tends to treat disciplines in isolation. It remains unclear whether different, yet adjacent, academic disciplines react to the same macroeconomic shocks with the same urgency. Specifically, there is an absence of longitudinal, cross-disciplinary archival analysis tracking how a highly theoretical subject, such as A-Level Economics (9708), adapts its foundational models compared to a highly applied, corporate-focused subject like A-Level Business (9609, formerly 9707). Without a side-by-side textual analysis spanning multiple syllabus iterations, policymakers, curriculum coordinators, and educators cannot determine whether global exam boards operate as proactive agents preparing students for future market realities, or merely as reactive archivists cataloging corporate history long after a crisis has concluded.

Significance of the Study

This study holds substantial theoretical and practical significance for the fields of educational sociology and curriculum development. Theoretically, it expands upon curriculum theory by establishing a "timeline of pedagogical latency"—measuring the exact duration it takes for a real-world macroeconomic shock to become a mandated, examinable standard for 16-to-18-year-olds. Practically, the findings offer vital diagnostic data for international educators, curriculum coordinators, and examination boards. By contrasting the evolutionary pace of Economics versus Business syllabi over a 20-year timeline, this research highlights the friction between teaching abstract market models and managing dynamic corporate realities, ultimately guiding future curriculum reform to be more responsive to global financial volatility.

Research Aims and Objectives

The primary aim of this study is to critically evaluate how global economic crises and corporate paradigm shifts dictate the evolution of advanced secondary curricula. To achieve this, the study outlines the following specific objectives:

- To trace the chronological integration of major economic disruptions (e.g., the 2008 financial crash, the 2020 pandemic) into the official learning objectives and examiner reports of Cambridge A-Level syllabi between 2004 and 2028.
- To comparatively analyze the "pedagogical reactivity" of theoretical macroeconomic models (Economics 9708) versus applied corporate strategies (Business 9609/9707).
- To evaluate the shifting thematic priorities within these disciplines, specifically regarding the role of state intervention, supply chain resilience, and corporate social responsibility.

Research Questions

This longitudinal archival analysis is guided by the following central research questions:

- **RQ1:** How do global macroeconomic shocks dictate the evolution, addition, or omission of learning objectives within international A-Level Business and Economics curricula over a 20-year period?
- **RQ2:** In what ways do the adaptation timelines and thematic priorities of theoretical Economics (9708) diverge from those of applied Business Studies (9609/9707) when responding to the same global events?
- **RQ3:** Does the Cambridge examination framework operate as a proactive educational agent equipping students for future volatility, or a reactive archivist recording corporate shifts retrospectively?

Literature Review

Pedagogical Inertia and the Gradual Evolution of Economic Instruction

The construction and revision of high-stakes academic curricula are inherently complex processes, often characterized by a profound resistance to rapid paradigm shifts. A historical review of economic instruction over the past half-century demonstrates that foundational academic standards exhibit a strong tendency toward pedagogical inertia (Hoyt & McGoldrick, 2019). While real-world financial markets operate in a state of continuous volatility, educational frameworks—particularly at the introductory and secondary levels—are historically slow to integrate contemporary economic phenomena. Current research into educational curriculum development reveals that global financial crises frequently prompt severe academic and public criticism of existing syllabi. However, this external pressure rarely translates into immediate, systemic curriculum reform. Instead, examination boards and educational institutions typically engage in only "gradual and partial change" when updating foundational economics courses. Consequently, a temporal gap—or pedagogical latency—emerges, wherein the orthodox theories taught in the classroom become increasingly divorced from the operational realities of the global economy (Muijnck & Tieleman, 2021). To accurately measure this latency within the Cambridge A-Level framework, it is necessary to first examine the academic literature surrounding the most disruptive macroeconomic event of the modern era: the 2008 Global Financial Crisis.

The Post-2008 Paradigm: The Crisis of Economic Orthodoxy

The 2008 Global Financial Crisis (GFC) represented a structural failure of deregulated financial markets and triggered a profound crisis of faith within orthodox economic education. A robust body of literature argues that the mainstream economics curricula utilized prior to 2008 were fundamentally inadequate; they provided educators and students with extremely limited theoretical tools to either explain, predict, or mitigate systemic financial instability (Bowles & Carlin, 2020; Harris, 2015). Leading economists explicitly called for a radical redesign of how economics was taught, arguing that the pre-crisis reliance on assumptions of perfect market rationality had left graduates intellectually unprepared for the realities of modern financial volatility (Shiller, 2010).

Despite these urgent calls for reform, curriculum analyses indicate a paradoxical response from educational authorities. While the *critique* of mainstream economics rose significantly post-2008, the actual *content* of introductory and K-12 standards changed very little (Adams, 2019; Du, 2021). Empirical reviews of contemporary textbooks and foundational standards reveal that crucial post-crisis mechanisms—specifically advanced monetary policy, financial instability, and the mechanics of quantitative easing—were largely omitted or marginalized (Ihrig & Wolla, 2022). This institutional resistance to modernizing economic curricula is further corroborated by Mearman, Guizzo, and Berger (2018). In their evaluation of the new Subject Benchmark Statement for economics in the United Kingdom, they concluded that regulatory and examination bodies actively preserved pre-crisis economic assumptions. The updated standards heavily neglected emerging critical fields, most notably the deep integration of modern finance and the ecological impacts of economic growth. The literature therefore establishes a clear consensus: theoretical economics education is highly insulated against external macroeconomic shocks, systematically delaying the integration of disruptive realities to preserve established neoclassical models.

The "Age of Disruption": Geopolitics and the Redefinition of Business Strategy

While theoretical economics relies on deeply entrenched mathematical models that resist external shocks, the applied discipline of Business Studies is inherently tied to contemporary market realities. The academic literature demonstrates that over the past two decades, rising geopolitical tensions and macro-environmental crises have forced a fundamental rethinking of how international business strategy is taught. Contemporary pedagogical research indicates that the late-20th-century assumption of "stable globalization" has been entirely abandoned in higher education. Instead, international business is now explicitly framed as operating within an "Age of Disruption" (Hasse, 2025). Volatile political and economic environments are no longer treated as peripheral anomalies; they have become central to modern course design (Berg, 2020; Paik, 2020; Tarba et al., 2023). Educators are increasingly utilizing specific geopolitical fractures—such as Brexit, the US-China trade war, and the escalating climate crisis—as primary teaching contexts to explain modern trade policy and corporate strategy (Sweeney & Mollan, 2022). Furthermore, sudden geopolitical conflicts are rapidly integrated into business literature to illustrate the fragility of globalized operations. For example, Ratten (2022) highlights how the Russia-Ukraine conflict serves as a critical paradigm shift, forcing curricula to address how warfare immediately reshapes international business strategies, supply chain viability, and corporate reputation. Consequently, the literature reflects a structural shift in curriculum content: modern business courses must now explicitly link geopolitics, national power, and global governance directly to corporate risk management and sustainability (Belhoste & Dimitrova, 2023; Gregersen-Hermans, 2021). Operations management, previously focused on the pure cost-efficiency of Just-In-Time (JIT) manufacturing, is now increasingly taught through the lens of supply chain resilience and crisis mitigation (Katsaliaki et al., 2021).

The Theory-Practice Gap and the Lag in Emerging Technologies

Despite the clear academic consensus that business education *must* evolve in response to global disruptions, empirical evaluations of current curricula reveal a persistent friction between academic intentions and classroom realities. Nanjundaswamy et al. (2024) establish a strong correlation between rapid business transformation and the urgent need to adapt corporate and accounting curricula to reflect current market trends and sustainability mandates. However, translating these complex market trends into standardized educational frameworks has proven difficult. Recent evaluations of business studies curricula highlight a severe and persistent "theory-practice gap," which leaves learners poorly prepared for the realities of the modern workplace (Mngwengwe et al., 2025). While the macro-level focus on geopolitics has increased, the micro-level integration of emerging corporate mechanics remains highly deficient. Mngwengwe et al. (2025) note that traditional, mid-20th-century topics heavily dominate standardized business education. For instance, marketing curricula frequently remain fixated on the traditional "4Ps" and basic promotional theory, drastically underrepresenting the modern realities of digital marketing, e-commerce, and data analytics. Similarly, critical emerging paradigms such as Artificial Intelligence, advanced Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), and systemic sustainability are frequently cited as being weak, entirely missing, or treated as peripheral "add-ons" rather than core operational strategies (Mngwengwe et al., 2025). The literature suggests that standard professional development for business educators is often generic, lacking the targeted focus required to teach complex applied problems in entrepreneurship and technological integration. Therefore, while business studies as a discipline is highly sensitive to geopolitical disruption, its standardized curricula struggle to rapidly operationalize new technological and ethical paradigms.

The Research Gap

The current body of research successfully establishes two distinct realities: theoretical economics resists integrating the lessons of financial crises (Ihrig & Wolla, 2022; Mearman et al., 2018), while business studies struggle to close the theory-practice gap amidst an era of rapid geopolitical and technological disruption (Tarba et al., 2023; Mngwengwe et al., 2025). However, the overwhelming majority of this literature focuses exclusively on tertiary education—specifically university-level economics departments and MBA programs. There is a glaring absence of longitudinal research evaluating how these distinct disciplinary frictions manifest in high-stakes *secondary* education. International A-Level syllabi dictate the foundational economic and corporate literacy for millions of global students, yet it remains unmapped how these specific frameworks reacted to the 2008 financial crash, the rise of CSR, and the "Age of Disruption." By conducting a two-decade archival analysis contrasting the evolution of Cambridge A-Level Economics (9708) with A-Level Business (9609/9707), this study addresses this exact gap, measuring the precise pedagogical latency of secondary examination boards in the face of global volatility.

Research Methodology

Research Design

To systematically investigate the "pedagogical latency" of international secondary curricula in response to global macroeconomic shocks, this study employs a Qualitative Longitudinal Archival Document Analysis. Archival analysis is a highly rigorous historical methodology utilized to trace the evolution of institutional priorities, epistemological frameworks, and official knowledge over an extended timeframe. This specific design was selected because it allows the researcher to move beyond cross-sectional observations (which only capture a single moment in time) to map the continuous trajectory of curriculum adaptation over two of the most economically volatile decades in modern history (2004–2028). By comparatively evaluating the parallel timelines of a theoretical discipline (Economics) and an applied discipline (Business), this design effectively isolates "disciplinary friction" as a primary variable influencing curriculum reform.

Sampling Strategy and Scope

The study utilizes a purposive sampling strategy, specifically targeting the official curriculum frameworks and examination artifacts published by Cambridge Assessment International Education (CAIE). The CAIE Advanced Level (A-Level) system was deliberately selected as the focal dataset because it acts as a highly centralized, globally recognized benchmark for secondary economic and corporate literacy, effectively dictating the foundational knowledge of millions of international students. The timeframe for the archival sample spans 24 years of documented history, effectively capturing the academic consensus prior to the 2008 Global Financial Crisis, the immediate post-crisis reaction, and the contemporary "Age of Disruption" marked by global pandemics and geopolitical fracturing. The sample is stratified into two comparative disciplinary tracks:

- **Track 1: Theoretical Macroeconomics:** Documents corresponding to Cambridge A-Level Economics (Syllabus Code 9708).
- **Track 2: Applied Corporate Strategy:** Documents corresponding to Cambridge A-Level Business (Syllabus Codes 9707 and the updated 9609 framework).

The Epistemological Value of Examiner Reports

A critical methodological innovation of this study is its reliance on historical Principal Examiner Reports for Teachers (e.g., 2004, 2005, 2006) alongside the official published syllabi. In traditional curriculum research, a syllabus is often treated as the sole artifact of study. However, educational sociologists distinguish between the *intended curriculum* (what the syllabus states) and the *enacted curriculum* (what is actively taught and tested). While an official syllabus outlines broad pedagogical intentions, it often obscures the nuances of how theories are applied to contemporary realities. Conversely, Examiner Reports act as high-fidelity historical records of the *enacted* curriculum. By analyzing the examiner commentaries from 2004 and 2005 (e.g., reports detailing student struggles with "Just-in-Time" manufacturing or assumptions of market equilibrium), this study gains precise empirical data regarding what global examination boards actively valued and penalized during those specific historical epochs. These historical reports serve as an incredibly accurate diagnostic baseline, proving what was considered "correct" economic orthodoxy immediately prior to the 2008 financial crash.

Data Collection Procedure

Data collection was conducted through a systematic digital archival retrieval process. Primary documents were sourced directly from CAIE digital repositories, historical examination databases (such as Papa Cambridge), and institutional summaries detailing longitudinal curriculum shifts. The finalized dataset includes:

1. **Historical Examiner Reports:** Sourced from 2004 to 2010 (e.g., *9707_s04_er*, *9708_w06_er*) to establish the pre- and immediate post-2008 pedagogical baselines.
2. **Transitional Syllabi and Update Manifests:** Documents specifically outlining structural subject changes, notably the *2013 Syllabus Updates* and the critical transition of Business Studies from syllabus code 9707 to the modernized 9609 framework in 2016.
3. **Contemporary Syllabi:** The actively enforced learning standards for 2022, 2023–2025, and the forward-looking 2026–2028 frameworks for both 9609 and 9708, utilized to assess the integration of modern geopolitical and technological disruptions.

Data Analysis

The accumulated archival data was subjected to an inductive Thematic Document Analysis. This strategy allows the researcher to trace specific economic theories as they are added, marginalized, or redefined over the 20-year span. The analysis was conducted in three distinct phases:

1. **Baseline Coding (2004–2007):** Historical examiner reports and syllabi were coded to establish the dominant pre-crisis orthodoxies. Specific attention was paid to the prevalence of neoclassical market assumptions in Economics and the dominance of shareholder primacy/operational efficiency in Business.
2. **Longitudinal Tracing (2008–2028):** The dataset was chronologically mapped to trace the introduction of disruptive paradigms. Codes were generated to track the exact dates when concepts such as "Quantitative Easing," "Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)," and "Market Failure" were officially mandated as examinable content.
3. **Cross-Disciplinary Comparative Synthesis:** In the final phase, the adaptation timeline of the Economics (9708) syllabus was structurally contrasted against the Business (9609) syllabus. This allowed the researcher to measure the exact pedagogical latency of each subject and determine whether the Cambridge framework operates as a proactive educational agent or a reactive historical archivist.

The longitudinal archival analysis of the Cambridge A-Level Economics (9708) and Business (9609/9707) syllabi reveals a stark contrast in how theoretical and applied disciplines react to macroeconomic volatility. The data organically synthesizes into three chronological and thematic domains: (1) The Pre-Crisis Orthodoxy, (2) The Post-2008 Reaction and Disciplinary Friction, and (3) The "Age of Disruption" and the Shift to Strategic Resilience.

Establishing the Pre-Crisis Orthodoxy (2004–2007)

To accurately measure the pedagogical latency of the Cambridge examination framework, it is first necessary to establish the pedagogical baseline that existed immediately prior to the 2008 Global Financial Crisis. An analysis of the historical Principal Examiner Reports for Teachers between 2004 and 2007 reveals an educational ecosystem deeply entrenched in neoclassical economic stability and localized operational business mechanics, largely devoid of systemic risk analysis.

Theoretical Economics (9708): The Dominance of Neoclassical Mechanics

The archival data from the 2004 and 2006 Economics (9708) examiner reports demonstrates a curriculum hyper-focused on the mechanics of free markets and assumptions of equilibrium. The *9708 November 2004 Examiner Report* explicitly rewards candidates who can demonstrate the pure theoretical "characteristics of market systems." The examiner notes that high-scoring candidates successfully explained the existence of "abnormal profits in oligopoly" and understood the traditional barriers to entry that dictate why "in some markets firms remain small while in others the market is dominated by large companies." Furthermore, macroeconomic testing during this era relied on highly traditional, functionalist views of state intervention. The *9708 November 2006 Examiner Report* highlights testing on the "aims of government economic policy," specifically asking students to weigh employment, healthcare, and education against "the balance of payments or gross domestic product." Crucially, throughout these pre-2008 reports, the language of systemic market failure, financial contagion, or unconventional monetary policy is entirely absent. The enacted curriculum of this era treated the macroeconomy as a predictable engine managed through standard fiscal adjustments and the traditional "concept of the multiplier," perfectly reflecting the stable, pre-crisis neoclassical consensus.

Applied Business (9707): Shareholder Primacy and Operational Focus

Parallel to the Economics syllabus, the pre-crisis Business Studies (9707) curriculum evaluated corporate strategy through a highly localized, operational lens. The data reveals that the modern concepts of widespread Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and Stakeholder Theory were still in their infancy within secondary education, often causing friction for students who were trained strictly in shareholder profit maximization. This friction is explicitly documented in the *9707 June 2004 Examiner Report*, where the examiner notes a persistent "confusion between 'stakeholders' and 'shareholders' which hampered some candidates." The 2004 examination heavily prioritized operational efficiency, testing candidates on the "synergistic advantages to the merger of shoe retailers" and pure "economies of scale." When broader social impacts were tested, they were framed strictly as localized public relations hurdles rather than systemic global imperatives. For instance, the *9707 June 2005 Examiner Report* required candidates to analyze a localized case study of a school attempting to satisfy various groups. The examiner explicitly guided teachers to focus on the "genuine conflicts" of stakeholder management, rewarding candidates who framed the evaluation as a "short run versus long run" profit analysis. The report states that top marks were awarded to students who argued that while profits "might be hit by satisfying student/parents interests" in the short run, it could "generate increase revenue and profits for the owners" in the long run.

Synthesis of the Pre-Crisis Era

The baseline data confirms that prior to 2008, the Cambridge examination framework operated on an assumption of global stability. Economics (9708) students were trained to view financial systems as self-correcting mechanisms governed by pure supply and demand. Simultaneously, Business (9707) students were trained to view corporate expansion, mergers, and globalization merely as operational hurdles designed to maximize long-term ownership profits. The systemic fragility of the global financial system and the geopolitical risks of international supply chains were entirely absent from the officially enacted curriculum.

The Post-2008 Reaction and Disciplinary Friction (2008–2016)

The 2008 Global Financial Crisis (GFC) provided a stress test for the reactivity of international examination boards. If secondary curricula functioned as proactive educational agents, the post-

2008 syllabi should have immediately reflected the collapse of deregulated banking and the rise of stakeholder capitalism. However, the archival data reveals severe "disciplinary friction": the theoretical discipline (Economics) exhibited massive pedagogical latency, actively resisting change, while the applied discipline (Business) underwent structural acceleration.

Economics (9708): The Lag in Theoretical Adaptation

The immediate post-2008 examination data for Economics demonstrates a striking disconnect between global financial realities and the enacted curriculum. While central banks globally were executing unprecedented bailouts and emergency interventions in 2008 and 2010, the CAIE Economics syllabus remained remarkably static.

An analysis of the *9708 June 2008 Examiner Report* reveals that the examination board continued to test highly traditional monetary mechanics. Candidates were asked to explain the "three motives for holding money" based on traditional Liquidity Preference theory, and to discuss the effect of an increase in the money supply on interest rates and national income using "the concept of the multiplier." Similarly, the *9708 November 2010 Examiner Report* focused heavily on the theoretical "investment multiplier" in developing versus developed nations. In the immediate aftermath of the greatest financial market failure of the century, the examinations were still asking 18-year-old students to calculate theoretical multipliers, entirely ignoring the real-world collapse of the banking sector that was dominating global headlines.

The archival data proves that the formal integration of post-crisis realities suffered from a pedagogical latency of over five years. It was not until the publication of the *9708 Syllabus Updates for Cambridge Schools (for examination from June 2013/2014)* that the curriculum finally acknowledged the shifted paradigm. A textual analysis of this update manifest reveals critical, reactionary additions. Under "The Price System," the board explicitly added "market failure." Under "Macroeconomic Problems," the syllabus added the "Laffer curve," "work disincentives," and, most crucially, "Quantitative Easing (QE)." The explicit addition of QE in 2014—six years after the US Federal Reserve initiated the policy—perfectly encapsulates the stubbornness of theoretical economics. The discipline only codified the intervention after it had become an undeniable, long-term historical fact, proving the CAIE Economics framework operates as a reactive archivist rather than a proactive agent.

Business Studies (9707 to 9609): The Acceleration of Corporate Strategy

In stark contrast to Economics, the Business Studies syllabus demonstrated a rapid and structural evolution during this same period, driven by the intense corporate fallout of the GFC. The data tracks a definitive shift away from pure operational efficiency toward holistic risk management, culminating in the complete retirement of the 9707-syllabus code.

The transition documents, specifically the *Syllabus Changes March 2014 (v1.0)* and the *Key Updates and Changes* manifesto, detail the replacement of "9707 Business Studies" with "9609 Business" for examinations starting in 2016. The CAIE board explicitly noted that the name change was "to reflect the maturity of the subject." This maturity is evident in the structural overhaul of the content. The new 9609 framework dramatically elevated the importance of "Strategic Management," integrating key elements of strategic decision-making directly into the foundational AS Level content rather than reserving it solely for A2 students. Furthermore, the enacted curriculum shifted its definition of corporate success. The final iterations of the 9707 syllabus (2013–2015) and the newly launched 9609 framework heavily integrated Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as a mandatory learning objective. The *Key Updates* document highlights a stronger emphasis on "the dynamic external environment" and the need for students to navigate stakeholder complexities. Unlike the 2004/2005 era—where stakeholders were viewed as short-term obstacles to long-term shareholder profit—the post-2008 business curriculum codified CSR and strategic risk management as essential survival mechanisms for the modern firm.

Synthesis of Disciplinary Friction

The comparative data from 2008 to 2016 empirically validates the theoretical concept of disciplinary friction. A-Level Business (9609) rapidly absorbed the lessons of the financial crisis, forcing students to analyze businesses as vulnerable entities operating in a dynamic, risky external environment. A-Level Economics (9708), however, actively insulated itself from the crisis, waiting half a decade to formally introduce Quantitative Easing and Market Failure. This divergence proves that within the same examination board, an 18-year-old business student was being educated for a volatile future, while an 18-year-old economics student was still being tested on the stable models of the past.

The "Age of Disruption" and the Shift to Strategic Resilience (2020–2028)

The contemporary era of global business and economics is heavily defined by what Hasse (2025) and Tarba et al. (2023) term the "Age of Disruption." Punctuated by the COVID-19 pandemic, severe supply chain fracturing, and escalating geopolitical conflicts (Ratten, 2022), this period rendered static, mid-20th-century market models obsolete. An analysis of the most recent Cambridge syllabi iterations (2023–2025 and 2026–2028) reveals a final, critical evolutionary phase: both disciplines have been forced to abandon their traditional assumptions of stability, structurally reorienting their curricula around resilience, behavioral unpredictability, and global risk management.

Applied Business (9609): The Mainstreaming of Geopolitics and Strategy

The documentary evidence from the modern A-Level Business (9609) framework demonstrates a curriculum that has fully embraced the complexities of global disruption. Unlike the 2004 era, which isolated business decisions to local operational efficiency, the 2023–2025 and 2026–2028 syllabi explicitly require students to navigate international volatility.

A textual review of the *Key Updates and Changes* manifest reveals profound structural shifts designed to accelerate strategic thinking. Most notably, the Boston Consulting Group (BCG) Matrix—a core tool of multi-national corporate strategy—was explicitly moved from the A2 (Year 13) curriculum down to the AS Level (Year 12). By forcing younger, first-year students to evaluate diverse product portfolios and strategic divestment immediately, the examination board formally acknowledges that strategic agility is no longer an advanced, tertiary-level concept; it is a foundational prerequisite for modern corporate literacy (Sweeney & Mollan, 2022).

Furthermore, the modern Business framework attempts to close the theory-practice gap identified by Mngwengwe et al. (2025) by revolutionizing its approach to Human Resource Management (HRM) and Operations. The *9609 2023-2025 Syllabus* explicitly mandates the study of Daniel Goleman's "Emotional Intelligence" alongside traditional theorists like Taylor and Herzberg. This addition reflects a modern corporate reality: managing human capital during global crises requires empathetic leadership, not just scientific management. Similarly, operations management has fundamentally shifted from a pure focus on "efficiency" to a dual focus on "efficiency and effectiveness," mandating deep evaluations of supply chain resilience. The modern Business curriculum, therefore, functions as a highly reactive, proactive agent, training students to view businesses as fragile entities operating within an interconnected, hostile geopolitical landscape.

Theoretical Economics (9708): The Fall of the Neoclassical Monopoly

While Business Studies accelerated its strategic focus, the most profound pedagogical shift in the entire 20-year archival dataset occurred within the modern Economics (9708) framework. For decades, as established in the baseline analysis of the 2004/2006 examiner reports, the CAIE Economics syllabus aggressively defended the neoclassical assumption of "perfect human rationality" and the infallibility of the price mechanism (Muijnck & Tieleman, 2021). However, the compounding failures of these models to predict the 2008 financial crash and the economic fallout of the 2020 pandemic finally overwhelmed the discipline's inherent pedagogical latency. The *Key Updates* document for the *9708 Economics 2023–2025 Syllabus* marks a historic paradigm shift: the formal introduction of Behavioral Economics into the standardized secondary curriculum. For the first time, A-Level students are explicitly required to study the irrationality of economic agents. The updated curriculum mandates the teaching of "nudges" and "choice architecture," acknowledging that consumers do not always maximize utility and that markets are frequently driven by psychological bias rather than mathematical logic. This single curriculum update effectively answers the decade-old critiques published by Shiller (2010) and Bowles and Carlin (2020), who argued that teaching pure rationality left students blind to real-world financial instability. By codifying Behavioral Economics, the CAIE 9708 syllabus finally dismantled the absolute monopoly of neoclassical theory, admitting to secondary students that traditional economic models are inherently flawed.

Synthesis of the Modern Era

The documentary evidence from 2023 to 2028 illustrates a fascinating curriculum convergence. To survive the "Age of Disruption," both subjects had to discard their mid-2000s orthodoxies. Business Studies (9609) adapted by expanding its focus outward, integrating macro-level geopolitical strategy, emotional intelligence, and global supply chain resilience. Economics (9708) adapted by collapsing its focus inward, integrating micro-level psychological realities and admitting that human irrationality fundamentally alters global markets. Ultimately, the archival data proves that while examination boards possess severe pedagogical latency, sustained macroeconomic volatility will eventually force even the most stubborn theoretical frameworks to align with contemporary realities.

Discussion

The primary objective of this longitudinal archival analysis was to critically evaluate how global economic crises and corporate paradigm shifts dictate the evolution of advanced secondary curricula. By analyzing two decades of syllabus updates and examiner reports through the theoretical lens of pedagogical latency, this study establishes that international educational frameworks are profoundly shaped by external macroeconomic trauma. The findings directly address the study's central research questions, demonstrating a severe friction between the preservation of academic orthodoxy and the demands of modern global volatility.

The Dictation of Curriculum by Macroeconomic Shocks (Answering RQ1)

The first research question sought to understand how global macroeconomic shocks dictate the evolution, addition, or omission of learning objectives within A-Level Business and Economics curricula over a 20-year period. The archival evidence strongly confirms that macroeconomic shocks act as the primary, albeit delayed, catalysts for structural curriculum reform. When real-world market behavior violently deviates from textbook models, examination boards are eventually forced to abandon outdated paradigms to maintain the intellectual legitimacy of their qualifications. The data tracking the aftermath of the 2008 Global Financial Crisis perfectly illustrates this mechanism. As established in the literature, the 2008 crash represented a catastrophic failure of deregulated financial markets, prompting scholars like Bowles and Carlin (2020) and Shiller (2010) to argue that existing curricula lacked the tools to explain systemic instability. The archival data reflects this exact trajectory. The crisis dictated the explicit *omission* of models relying purely on perfectly self-correcting markets, and forced the *addition* of state interventionist mechanics. The mandated inclusion of "Market Failure" and "Quantitative Easing" in the 2013/2014 Economics (9708) syllabus update empirically validates Ihrig and Wolla's (2022) thesis regarding the urgent need to update monetary policy standards. The shock of 2008 dictated that students could no longer simply learn how markets work; they had to be formally examined on how and why they fail.

Similarly, more recent macroeconomic and geopolitical shocks have dictated an entirely new era of curriculum additions. The transition into what Hasse (2025) and Tarba et al. (2023) identify as the "Age of Disruption"—characterized by the COVID-19 pandemic and global supply chain fracturing fundamentally rewrote the Business (9609) syllabus. The archival data shows that these shocks dictated the *omission* of simplistic, mid-2000s models that viewed corporate expansion purely through the lens of cost-efficiency and short-term shareholder profit. Instead, the curriculum was forced to *add* complex frameworks of resilience. The mandated downward shift of the BCG Matrix to the AS Level, the integration of Emotional Intelligence into Human Resources, and the prioritization of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) confirm that the syllabus evolved directly in response to external volatility. Perhaps the most profound evidence of macroeconomic shocks dictating curriculum evolution is the recent addition of Behavioral Economics to the 2023–2025 Economics (9708) framework. For decades, the CAIE board defended the neoclassical assumption of absolute human rationality. However, the compounding psychological and economic panics of the last twenty years finally broke this orthodoxy. By mandating the study of "nudges" and irrational consumer behavior, the syllabus officially concedes that traditional mathematical models are insufficient for navigating modern economic crises. Ultimately, the data answers RQ1 by proving that curriculum evolution is not an arbitrary academic exercise; it is a direct response to systemic trauma. Macroeconomic shocks dictate the syllabus by forcibly highlighting the obsolescence of old theories and demanding the codification of new survival mechanics for the next generation of global professionals.

Disciplinary Friction and Divergent Pedagogical Timelines (Answering RQ2)

The second research question investigated the ways in which the adaptation timelines and thematic priorities of theoretical Economics (9708) diverge from those of applied Business Studies (9609/9707) when responding to the same global events. The comparative archival data unequivocally confirms the existence of severe "disciplinary friction" within the Cambridge examination framework. When subjected to the exact same macroeconomic timeline (2004–2028), the two disciplines exhibited fundamentally divergent adaptation behaviors. Economics operates under profound pedagogical inertia, adapting only retrospectively to preserve established models, whereas Business Studies adapts concurrently to maintain its utilitarian relevance.

The Insulated Theory: Why Economics Resists Adaptation

The archival evidence—specifically the five-year latency period between the 2008 financial crash and the formal inclusion of Quantitative Easing in the 2013/2014 Economics (9708) syllabus—perfectly illustrates the pedagogical inertia identified by Hoyt and Mcgoldrick (2019). The data proves that theoretical economics is structurally insulated against rapid change. Because the 9708 syllabus is built upon foundational, mathematical models of neoclassical orthodoxy (such as pure price mechanisms and perfect rationality), any rapid alteration is viewed as a threat to the discipline's core identity. As Muijnck and Tieleman (2021) argue in the literature, this resistance often causes standard economic teaching to become divorced from the operational realities of the global economy. This is evident in the CAIE 2008 and 2010 Examiner Reports, where the board continued to test candidates on stable "investment multipliers" while the real-world banking system was collapsing. Furthermore, this latency aligns directly with the findings of Mearman, Guizzo, and Berger (2018), who noted that regulatory bodies actively seek to preserve pre-crisis economic assumptions. The divergence timeline reveals that theoretical Economics only integrates new realities (like Behavioral Economics or Market Failure) when the failure of the old models becomes historically undeniable. Its thematic priority is the preservation of academic orthodoxy.

The Utilitarian Application: Why Business Strategy Accelerates

Conversely, the A-Level Business curriculum evolved at a radically accelerated pace. The retirement of the 9707 syllabus and the launch of the modernized 9609 framework demonstrate a discipline that derives its educational legitimacy from its immediate applicability. As established by Nanjundaswamy et al. (2024), there is a mandatory correlation between business transformation and the need to adapt curricula to current market trends. The Business syllabus cannot afford pedagogical inertia; if it fails to teach the strategies currently being utilized by multi-national corporations, it instantly loses its value to future employers.

This explains the rapid thematic divergence seen in the archival data. While Economics was still testing traditional liquidity preference, Business Studies was aggressively prioritizing Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and moving advanced strategic tools (like the BCG Matrix) down to first-year students. This rapid thematic shift confirms Sweeney and Mollan's (2022) assertion that modern corporate education must rapidly integrate geopolitics and crisis management. The Business syllabus adapts concurrently with global trauma, actively attempting to equip students with the tools to survive an ongoing "Age of Disruption" rather than waiting for the disruption to end.

The Theory-Practice Gap in Applied Business

However, the data also reveals a critical nuance within this rapid adaptation, directly supporting the findings of Mngwengwe et al. (2025). While the macro-level structure of the Business (9609) syllabus modernized quickly to include global strategy and resilience, the syllabus still struggles to close the "theory-practice gap" regarding specific operational mechanics. Even in the latest 2026-2028 iterations, while students are taught high-level Emotional Intelligence and CSR, the micro-level mechanics of modern digital operations remain underrepresented compared to traditional manufacturing theories. This indicates that while applied disciplines are highly reactive to thematic paradigm shifts (like the need for resilience), they still struggle to rapidly operationalize emerging technologies into standardized testing formats.

Synthesis of the Divergence

Ultimately, RQ2 is answered by recognizing that the divergence in adaptation timelines is a feature of disciplinary architecture, not a flaw in the examination board. Economics diverges because its primary goal is to establish foundational, enduring laws of market behavior; it waits for the dust of a crisis to settle before recording the result. Business Studies diverges because its primary goal is vocational utility; it must rewrite its rules mid-crisis to reflect how corporations are surviving the immediate chaos.

Proactive Educational Agent or Reactive Historical Archivist? (Answering RQ3)

The third research question sought to determine whether the Cambridge examination framework operates as a proactive educational agent equipping students for future macroeconomic volatility or merely as a reactive archivist recording corporate shifts retrospectively. Synthesizing the 20-year archival dataset with contemporary pedagogical literature reveals that a monolithic classification of the examination board is impossible. Instead, the framework operates as a deeply bifurcated entity: the theoretical discipline (Economics) functions strictly as a reactive historical archivist, while the applied discipline (Business) attempts to operate as a proactive educational agent, albeit constrained by structural limitations.

Economics as the Reactive Historical Archivist

The longitudinal data conclusively demonstrates that A-Level Economics (9708) does not prepare students to anticipate or mitigate future crises; it serves as an academic archive of past orthodoxies. The defining characteristic of an archivist is retrospective cataloging, which perfectly describes the five-year pedagogical latency following the 2008 Global Financial Crisis. While central banks were actively rewriting the rules of global finance, the CAIE board continued testing 18-year-olds on static, pre-crisis investment multipliers. This retrospective posture is heavily supported by the literature. As Bowles and Carlin (2020) and Harris (2015) argue, mainstream economic curricula inherently lack the predictive tools required to foresee systemic instability. Because the discipline demands rigorous academic consensus before altering its foundational mathematical models, it cannot teach students how to navigate the unknown. The belated addition of Quantitative Easing in 2014 and Behavioral Economics in the 2023–2025 syllabus were not proactive warnings about future market irrationality; they were formal, historical acknowledgments that neoclassical models had already failed in the past. Therefore, the Economics syllabus functions to document what the academic establishment *previously* believed to be true, making it a highly reactive historical archivist.

Business Studies as the Proactive Educational Agent

In stark contrast, the evolutionary trajectory of Business Studies (9707 transitioning to 9609) demonstrates a systemic effort to function as a proactive educational agent. An agent equips its subjects with tools to survive future, undefined environments. The archival data shows that rather than waiting for academic consensus, the Business syllabus rapidly internalized the chaos of the post-2008 and post-COVID eras.

By restructuring the entire 9609 framework around "Strategic Management," pushing advanced portfolio analysis (the BCG Matrix) down to first-year students, and prioritizing Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), the examination board fundamentally altered its pedagogical intent. It shifted from teaching students how to run a stable factory to teaching them how to survive an unpredictable global market. This aligns perfectly with the contemporary literature. As Hasse (2025) and Ratten (2022) establish, modern international business education must be anchored in the realities of the "Age of Disruption" and geopolitical conflict. By teaching emotional intelligence, supply chain resilience, and crisis management, the CAIE Business syllabus actively attempts to equip students with proactive survival mechanics, preparing them for future volatility rather than just testing them on past corporate successes.

The Hybrid Reality of International Frameworks

Answering RQ3 ultimately requires acknowledging this structural hybridity. The Cambridge Assessment International Education system is an examination board attempting to satisfy two fundamentally different pedagogical mandates. It relies on the Economics syllabus to anchor its academic prestige in deeply entrenched, stable theoretical models, accepting the inevitable pedagogical latency that comes with being a historical archivist. Simultaneously, it relies on the Business syllabus to maintain its modern, utilitarian relevance, forcing it to act as a proactive agent that rapidly absorbs the shocks of the "Age of Disruption."

However, as Mngwengwe et al. (2025) caution regarding the persistent theory-practice gap, even the proactive Business syllabus is constrained by the nature of standardized testing. While it can proactively teach the *philosophy* of resilience, the bureaucratic speed limit of international syllabus publication means it will always struggle to test the real-time *application* of emerging technologies. Ultimately, the framework is a delayed reflection of global trauma; it does not predict the future, but through its applied disciplines, it increasingly attempts to give students the armor to survive it.

Recommendations

The findings of this longitudinal archival analysis demonstrate that the current regulatory mechanisms governing international secondary curricula are structurally insufficient for an era defined by continuous macroeconomic and geopolitical volatility. To mitigate pedagogical latency and bridge the persistent theory-practice gap, examination boards (such as CAIE), institutional policymakers, and educators must fundamentally re-evaluate how syllabus content is designed, updated, and enacted. Based on the empirical data and theoretical literature synthesized in this study, the following strategic recommendations are proposed:

Implementing Modular Curriculum Frameworks to Reduce Pedagogical Latency

The primary structural flaw identified in this study is the severe pedagogical latency inherent in theoretical economics, evidenced by the five-year delay in codifying Quantitative Easing post-2008. International examination boards must transition away from rigid, five-to-seven-year static syllabus update cycles. Instead, institutions like CAIE should adopt "modular curriculum frameworks." While the core foundational theories (such as basic microeconomic price mechanisms) can remain static, the syllabus must include mandated, dynamic "contemporary application" modules that are updated biennially. This would allow boards to rapidly integrate emerging monetary policies, global supply chain disruptions, and systemic risk factors without requiring a complete overhaul of the foundational textbook, thereby transforming the syllabus from a reactive historical archive into a proactive, living document (Ihrig & Wolla, 2022).

Bridging the Theory-Practice Gap via Targeted Experiential Learning

While the Business (9609) syllabus has successfully modernized its macro-level strategic focus, it continues to suffer from a severe theory-practice gap regarding micro-level technological implementation. To address the deficiencies identified by Mngwengwe et al. (2025) and Nanjundaswamy et al. (2024), educational institutions cannot rely solely on the examination board to modernize the enacted curriculum. Secondary schools must mandate targeted professional development for business educators that moves beyond generic pedagogy, focusing specifically on the application of emerging corporate realities (e.g., digital marketing, e-commerce analytics, and applied Artificial Intelligence). Furthermore, the curriculum must explicitly require experiential learning mandates, such as project-based assessments that pair students with local industries, ensuring that abstract concepts like Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) are operationalized rather than merely memorized.

Modernizing Theoretical Economics: Embracing Heterodoxy

To survive future systemic shocks, the A-Level Economics (9708) framework must permanently abandon its monopoly on neoclassical orthodoxy. The delayed introduction of Behavioral Economics in the 2023–2025 syllabus was a vital first step, but it is insufficient. Answering the decade-old critiques of Shiller (2010) and Bowles and Carlin (2020), examination boards must formally integrate heterodox economic theories into the secondary curriculum. Students must be taught ecological economics, the financial instability hypothesis, and advanced systemic risk management *alongside* traditional equilibrium models. By explicitly teaching 18-year-olds that markets are inherently fragile and ecologically bounded, the curriculum can finally equip students with the critical intellectual tools required to navigate—and potentially prevent—future global financial crises.

Reforming High-Stakes Assessments to Reflect the "Age of Disruption"

Finally, the archival data reveals that traditional assessment formats frequently insulate students from real-world volatility. Testing theoretical "multipliers" during a banking collapse (as seen in the 2008 examiner reports) is an educational failure. Examination boards must shift the weighting of high-stakes assessments away from pure knowledge recall and mathematical equilibrium derivations. Instead, assessments in both Business and Economics should heavily prioritize "scenario planning" data response questions. By forcing students to apply economic models and corporate strategies to active, unresolved geopolitical crises such as the supply chain fractures resulting from the Russia-Ukraine conflict (Ratten, 2022) assessments will accurately measure a candidate’s strategic resilience rather than their ability to recite historical orthodoxy.

Conclusion

The past two decades have subjected the global economy to unprecedented volatility, bookended by the catastrophic failure of deregulated financial markets in 2008 and the systemic supply-chain fractures of the post-pandemic "Age of Disruption." As the primary transmission mechanisms for global economic literacy, international secondary examination frameworks face immense pressure to equip the next generation of professionals with the tools to navigate this instability. However, as this longitudinal archival analysis of the Cambridge Assessment International Education (CAIE) framework demonstrates, the institutional response to macroeconomic trauma is neither immediate nor uniform. Instead, curriculum evolution is strictly bounded by "disciplinary friction" and severe pedagogical latency.

By tracking the divergent evolutionary timelines of a theoretical discipline (A-Level Economics 9708) and an applied discipline (A-Level Business 9609/9707), this study empirically proves that examination boards operate as highly bifurcated entities. Theoretical economics, anchored by its foundational mathematical models, functions primarily as a "reactive historical archivist." It actively resists external shocks to preserve neoclassical orthodoxy, evidenced by its five-year delay in acknowledging Quantitative Easing and its decades-long refusal to formalize Behavioral Economics. It only adapts when the failure of its established models becomes an undeniable historical fact. Conversely, applied business education functions as a "proactive educational agent." Stripped of theoretical insulation, its legitimacy relies entirely on its vocational utility. Consequently, the Business syllabus adapted concurrently with global trauma—retiring the localized 9707 framework and structurally elevating strategic resilience, Corporate Social Responsibility, and geopolitical crisis management within the modernized 9609 curriculum. Ultimately, this study establishes that international examination boards do not predict the future of the global economy; rather, they serve as delayed, institutional reflections of its most recent traumas. While this study provides critical foundational data regarding the structural evolution of economic pedagogy, it is bound by specific methodological limitations. As a qualitative archival document analysis, the findings inherently represent the *intended* and *examined* curriculum rather than the holistically *enacted* curriculum. Official policy frameworks, syllabus update manifests, and even Examiner Reports—while highly accurate diagnostics of institutional priorities—do not perfectly capture the localized realities of the classroom. The data proves what the CAIE board penalized or rewarded on high-stakes examinations, but it obscures the micro-pedagogical decisions made by individual teachers. A syllabus may lag by five years, but an astute educator may have been teaching their students about the 2008 banking collapse long before the board officially mandated it. Therefore, future research must build upon this structural analysis by conducting primary, qualitative field investigations. Semi-structured interviews and longitudinal observational studies with international secondary educators are urgently required. This subsequent research will illuminate how teachers actually negotiate the "theory-practice gap" in real-time, particularly when forced to teach outdated orthodoxies while living through a contemporary crisis. Furthermore, future studies should investigate how rapidly emerging technological paradigms—specifically Artificial Intelligence and advanced data analytics—are being operationalized within these frameworks, as technology currently outpaces the traditional five-year syllabus update cycle.

In conclusion, navigating the modern "Age of Disruption" requires a fundamental departure from the assumption of educational stability. If international examination boards continue to rely on slow, reactive curriculum development, they risk cultivating a generation of students who understand the mechanics of the past but are entirely defenseless against the crises of the future. By transitioning toward modular syllabi, embracing heterodox economic realities, and prioritizing strategic resilience over pure knowledge recall, global educational frameworks can finally close the gap between textbook theory and real-world survival.

References

1. Acquah, B., & Owusu, A. (2021). Vertical articulation and content relevance of the senior high schooleconomics curriculum: Case of Ghana. *Asian Journal of Education and Training*, *7*, 169–178. https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.522.2021.73.169.178
2. Adams, E. (2019). Twenty years of economics curriculum: Trends, issues, and transformations? *The Social Studies*, *110*, 131–145. https://doi.org/10.1080/00377996.2019.1581725
3. Aggarwal, R., & Wu, Y. (2021). Teaching international business in Europe and Latin America. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, *32*, 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1080/08975930.2021.1922868
4. Belhoste, N., & Dimitrova, A. (2023). Developing critical geopolitical awareness in management education. *Management Learning*, *55*, 617–640. https://doi.org/10.1177/13505076231185970
5. Berg, D. (2020). Preparing students for the “next” global: The responsibilities and tools of international business education. *AIB Insights*. https://doi.org/10.46697/001c.13437
6. Bowles, S., & Carlin, W. (2020). What students learn in Economics 101: Time for a change. *Journal of Economic Literature*. https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.20191585
7. Brant, J., & Panjwani, F. (2015). School economics and the aims of education: Critique and possibilities. *journal of Critical Realism*, *14*, 306–324. https://doi.org/10.1179/1572513815y.0000000004
8. Calma, A., Suder, G., & Kenworthy, T. (2023). Focus on education: Taking stock of key themes, topics, trends and communities in international business and international

management education research. *The International Journal of Management Education*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100902
9. Chai, L., & Liu, J. (2025). A study of teaching strategies for a bilingual course in "International Business Trade" in the aspect of integrating research and education.
10. Cortinhas, C. (2023). Rethinking the economics curriculum: Strengths and weaknesses of the CORE Econ project. *Advances in Economics Education*. https://doi.org/10.4337/aee.2023.02.02
11. Delgado, S. (2022). Students struggle towards curriculum change in economics education. *Annals of Social Studies Education Research for Teachers*. https://doi.org/10.29173/assert40
12. Du, X. (2021). The evolution of financial intermediary theory and the redesign of undergraduate finance course content system. *Frontiers in Educational Research*. https://doi.org/10.25236/fer.2021.040119
13. Gregersen-Hermans, J. (2021). Toward a curriculum for the future: Synthesizing education for sustainable development and internationalization of the curriculum. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *25*, 461–481. https://doi.org/10.1177/10283153211031033
14. Gultekin, O. (2025). Navigating the intersection of international politics and international education. *Journal of International Students*. https://doi.org/10.32674/4vqsg045
15. Hameed, S., & Lingard, B. (2023). Shrewd marketization: The impact of internationalization policies on curricula practices in a Singaporean and an Australian school. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *45*, 763–777. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2023.2208764
16. Harris, J. (2015). New macroeconomics teaching for a new era: Instability, inequality, and environment. E*uropean Journal of Economics and Economic Policies: Intervention*, *12*, 236–242. https://doi.org/10.4337/ejeep.2015.02.09
17. Hasse, V. (2025). International business education in the age of disruption. *AIB Insights*. https://doi.org/10.46697/001c.143158
18. Hoyt, G., & McGoldrick, K. (2019). 50 years of economic instruction in the Journal of Economic Education.*The Journal of Economic Education*, *50*, 168–195. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220485.2019.1582388
19. Ihrig, J., & Wolla, S. (2022). Closing the curriculum gap by updating content standards and guidelines for teaching monetary policy. *The American Economist*, *67*, 183–194. https://doi.org/10.1177/05694345221085678
20. Klarin, A., Inkizhinov, B., Nazarov, D., & Gorenskaia, E. (2021). International business education: What we know and what we have yet to develop. *International Business Review*, 101833. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ibusrev.2021.101833
21. Mearman, A., Guizzo, D., & Berger, S. (2018). Is UK economics teaching changing? Evaluating the new subject benchmark statement. *Review of Social Economy*, *76*, 377–396. https://doi.org/10.1080/00346764.2018.1463447
22. Mngwengwe, S., Govender, S., & Mokoena, S. (2025). Evaluating the business studies curriculum for contemporary business practices. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*. https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i3.5745
23. Muijnck, S., & Tieleman, J. (2021). *Economy studies*. https://doi.org/10.1787/g22beb1a8-en
24. Myrzaly, N., Muzdybayeva, K., Rakhymzhan, R., Abdimanapov, B., & Berdygulova, G. (2024). Geopolitics in school education: Assessing the perception of key aspects by secondary school students in Kazakhstan. *Pedagogy and Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.51889/2960-1649.2024.60.3.005

25. Nanjundaswamy, A., Divyashree, M., Suraj, N., Kulal, A., Rahiman, H., & Kodikal, R. (2024). Adapting accounting education to evolving business paradigm—an Indian perspective. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*. https://doi.org/10.1108/jarhe-04-2024-0202
26. Nguyen, N. (2020). On geopolitics and education: Interventions, possibilities, and future directions. *Geography Compass*, *14*. https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12500
27. Paik, Y. (2020). The value of international business education: How to achieve transformative learning for students. *AIB Insights*, *20*, 13439. https://doi.org/10.46697/001c.13439
28. Puertas-Aguilar, M., Sipols, A., & De Lázaro-Torres, M. (2023). Web GIS to learn geopolitics in secondary education: A case study from Spain. *European Journal of Geography*. https://doi.org/10.48088/ejg.m.pue.14.2.015.031
29. Ratten, V. (2022). The Ukraine/Russia conflict: Geopolitical and international business strategies. *Thunderbird International Business Review*. https://doi.org/10.1002/tie.22319
30. Shiller, R. (2010). How should the financial crisis change how we teach economics? *The Journal of Economic Education*, *41*, 403–409. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220485.2010.510409
31. Surjanti, J., Prakoso, A., Musfidah, H., & Kamalia, P. (2023). An analysis of curriculum development for economics: A study on senior high school economics subjects. *AL-ISHLAH: Journal Pendidikan*. https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v15i4.1695
32. Sweeney, S., & Mollan, S. (2022). Geopolitics and business: The implications for management education. *8th International Conference on Higher Education Advances (HEAd'22)*. https://doi.org/10.4995/head22.2022.14622
33. Tarba, S., Frynas, J., Liu, Y., Wood, G., Sarala, R., & Fainshmidt, S. (2023). Strategic agility in international business. *Journal of World Business*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2022.101411
34. Tran, L., Nguyen, D., Blackmore, J., He, B., & Vu, H. (2023). COVID-19, geopolitics and risk management: Towards framing a reciprocal, coordinated, responsive and empathetic international education sector. *Policy Futures in Education*, *21*, 423–444. https://doi.org/10.1177/14782103231163480
35. Walstad, W. (2001). Economic education in U.S. high schools. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, *15*, 195–210. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.15.3.195
36. Weiler, T., & Grant-Smith, D. (2024). Embracing alternative pedagogies for integrating global ethics into the business curriculum. *Journal of Global Ethics*, *20*, 373–380. https://doi.org/10.1080/17449626.2024.2371819
37. Wendt, J., Myrzaly, N., & Rakhymzhan, R. (2025). Values formation in schoolchildren through global strategic studies: Quantitative study results. *Pedagogy and Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.51889/2960-1649.2025.62.1.005
38. Xie, S., Dai, L., & Liu, L. (2025). Economics and economics education. *Education as Change*. https://doi.org/10.25159/1947-9417/18870
39. Cambridge International Examinations. (2013). *Syllabus: Cambridge International AS and A Level Business Studies 9707 for examination in June and November 2015*.
40. Cambridge International Examinations. (2014). *Syllabus changes March 2014: Business 9609*.
41. Cambridge International Examinations. (2014). *Syllabus: Cambridge International AS and A Level Business 9609 for examination in 2016, 2017 and 2018*.
42. Cambridge Assessment International Education. (2019). *Syllabus: Cambridge International AS & A Level Business 9609 for examination in 2022*.
43. Cambridge Assessment International Education. (2020). *Syllabus: Cambridge International AS & A Level Business 9609 for examination in 2023, 2024 and 2025*.

44. Cambridge University Press & Assessment. (2023). *Syllabus: Cambridge International AS & A Level Business 9609 for examination in 2026, 2027 and 2028*.
45. Cambridge International Examinations. (2013). *Syllabus updates for Cambridge schools 2013: Economics 9708*.
46. Cambridge International Examinations. (2014). *Syllabus: Cambridge International AS and A Level Economics 9708 for examination in 2016, 2017 and 2018*.
47. Cambridge Assessment International Education. (2020). *Syllabus: Cambridge International AS & A Level Economics 9708 for examination in 2023, 2024 and 2025*.
48. Cambridge University Press & Assessment. (2023). *Syllabus: Cambridge International AS & A Level Economics 9708 for examination in 2026, 2027 and 2028*.
49. University of Cambridge International Examinations. (2010). *Syllabus: Cambridge International A & AS Level Business Studies 9707 for examination in June and November 2013*.
50. University of Cambridge International Examinations. (2004). *Principal examiner report for teachers: 9707 Business Studies (June 2004)*.