



# The Invisible Curriculum in Youth's Empowerment to be Creative, Innovative and Resilient Servant Leaders for Achieving Vision 2030

Dinah Katindi Nyamai

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received: 2 April 2018;

Received in revised form:

15 April 2019;

Accepted: 24 April 2019;

### Keywords

Unseen Curriculum,  
Innovative,  
Creative,  
Youth Empowerment,  
Servant Leader.

## ABSTRACT

School reforms highlight the need for young people who make up the bulk (over 70 percent) of most African nations' populations to be empathetic, reflective, creative, innovative and resilient servant leaders. While the formal curriculum plays a key role in achieving these educational goals, there exists other factors that shape students' beliefs, attitudes, intellect and behavioral structure, which this article refers to as the invisible curriculum. A substantial number of scholars suggest that the hidden curriculum accounts for as much as 90% of all students' learning outcomes. Its influences are even visible on students' leadership styles, adaptive response to hardship and the ability to bounce back (resilience), creativity-the act of conceiving something unique, innovation-the implementation of something new, and in general their worldview, even to keeping a job in the future. The stressors associated with 21<sup>st</sup> century young people necessitated an investigation on the role played by the hidden curriculum in students' worldview through a sequential explanatory mixed method design. Four hundred and eighty-six closed-ended questionnaires were distributed to randomly selected undergraduate students. Out of the 486 distributed questionnaires, 417 were filled and returned and the information therein informed the follow-up qualitative phase to explain and enrich the quantitative data. An interview guide was then developed to guide in gathering in-depth explanations from purposively selected 10 students as why some factors were perceived as more influential than others. The results of the research indicated that hidden curricula are manifested through teachers' demeanors and conduct not explicitly prescribed in any formal document but creates lasting impressions on young peoples' worldviews and ultimately their behavior. For this reason, the researchers suggest educators must pay cautious attention to the human climate in formal learning contexts and the society in general if they wish to succeed in nurturing holistic leaders for the accomplishment of Vision 2030.

© 2019 Elixir All rights reserved.

## Introduction

Upright character is more valuable than brainpower. Many talented people easily make it into the limelight, but without virtuous character, they hardly stay there for a long time. This observation is in line with H. L. Hastings, author of "Sold Cheap" in 1866, (as indicated in Kevin Morgan, 2017), who asserted:

The great want of this age is men—men who are not for sale—men who are honest to the bottom—sound from center to circumference; true to the hearts core. Men that fear the Lord and hate covetousness. Men who will condemn wrong in a friend or foe, in themselves as well as in others. Men whose conscience are steady as the needle to the pole. Men who will stand for right if the heavens titter and the earth reels. Men who will tell the truth and look the world and the devil right in the eye. Men who neither swagger nor flinch. Men who can have courage without whistling for it and joy without shouting to bring it. Men in whom the current of everlasting life runs still and deep and strong. Men careful of God's honor and careless of men's applause. Men too large for sectarian limits and too strong for sectarian bounds. Men who do not strive nor cry, nor cause their voices to be heard in the

streets, but will not fail, nor be discouraged till judgement be send in the earth... Men who know their message and tell it—men know their duty and do it—men who know their place and fill it—men who mind their own business. Men who will not lie. Men who are not too lazy to work, nor too proud to be poor. Men who are willing to eat what they have earned and wear what they have paid for. Men who are not ashamed to say 'no' with emphasis, and who are not ashamed to say, 'I can't afford it'... (p.1)

The implication here is that true education is more than just taking students through prescribed course materials—it has to do with the whole person: the psychomotor, the mental, attitude and behavior. As such, the ever-increasing local and worldwide moral ills demands not only passing on cognitive capabilities to the young generation but also creating a conducive environment to holistically nurture them to provide viable solutions to deep-seated political, socio-economic and structural issues which are likely not to disappear via social media regulation or increasing the numbers of police on the streets. Even though formal instructions play a crucial role in inculcating skills, knowledge and behavior in young people, there exists an unstated curriculum which is believed to account for more than 90% in the perpetuation of either

positive or negative learning outcomes (Çubukçu, 2012; Yousefzadeh, 2014 and Azimpour & Khalilzad, 2015). According to Jackson (1983) & Martin (1983), the concept hidden curriculum is an inherent part of every teaching-learning process.

For this reason, the humanistic climate in which young people learn cannot be taken lightly in the process of empowering them to be creative, innovative and resilient servant leaders with civic conscience to proactively seek solutions to social ills like corruption, poverty, youth radicalization and corporate greed. This claim is augmented by the fact that children spend roughly over 4000 hours in a lecture room until the end of primary school, slightly more than 13,000 hours until the end of secondary school and almost 19,000 hours by the end of college/university, more than the time they spent with their parents or guardians. The terms creativity and innovation are frequently used interchangeably but how alike or dissimilar are they? According to Lazzeretti & Capone (2015, p. 1), creativity is coming up with fresh and useful ideas or plans, innovation has to do with successful implementation of novel ideas while resilience is not only the ability to endure hardships and maintain function but also involves the ability to renew and reorganize oneself. Means (2000) defined “a leader as a dealer in hope while servant leadership is a leadership philosophy that implies a comprehensive view of the quality of people, work and community spirit”. Observable signs of stress and even depression among young people suggest empowering them, especially with resilient servanthood is important to overcome a socially entrenched problem-desire to celebrate fruits of success without putting in the necessary effort or sacrifice. In 2 Timothy 3:1-7, especially verse 2, Paul talks of difficulty “times when people will be lovers of self and money, boastful, arrogant, revilers, disobedient to parents, ungrateful and unholy”, our empowered young people can, and some have already taken that root, hence, servant leadership spirit would keep them connected to self, community and above all to God.

The term youth is a more fluid category than a fixed age-group, hence, this researcher broadly defines youth as young people in transition between the age where one leaves mandatory schooling and the age at which one finds his or her first employment, approximately 15 years to 34 years. As noted by UNESCO (2013), the latter age boundary keeps expanding, “as high levels of unemployment and the cost of setting up an independent household continue to put many young people into a prolonged period of dependency”. However, when we empower youth—the pillars upon which every nation’s future is built, we honor God’s creative nature because as God’s creation, whatever we create whether music, knit or crochet, mold or carve sculpture remains God’s grandchild. As such, youth endowments are not their own because talent, time and intellect are but borrowed resources—they belong to God, and every person, as a branch from which God expects fruit, should be helped to put them to the highest use. So, we are all stewards, whose creativity, innovation and capital must yield increase—a light to illuminate the world’s darkness.

Contrary to the common idea that learning institutions are only a cradle of implementing explicit curriculum (Mehrmohammadi, 2009, p. 464), every learning institution teach three curricular simultaneously: explicit or official curriculum, null curriculum and the hidden curriculum. As opposed to the formal curriculum, the unstated curriculum is

inferred and not delivered by instructors (Silveira, Zahra; Mitra Amini & Parisa Nabeiei, 2018). The invisible curriculum is the ad hoc, frequently unspoken learning that happens outside the prescribed set courses via role modeling but is widely believed to be a far more influential teacher compared to the formal curriculum, in shaping students’ beliefs, attitude and behavior (Hafferty, (1998). John Dewey (1916/1966) asserted “perhaps the greatest of all pedagogical fallacies is the notion that a person learns only the particular things he is studying at the time. Collateral learning in the way of formation of enduring attitudes, of like and dislikes, may be and often is much more important than the spelling lesson or lesson in geography or history that is learned...” (Dewey 1938, 48)

While concealed curriculum is indeed powerful in shaping students’ creative and innovative skills, most education reforms are characterized by a quick-fix mentality and single-solution approach as noted by Christle, Nelson & Jolivette (2005), that rarely seeks to unearth subtle elements that negatively shape students’ decisions in life like the kind of life they choose to live, friends they would like to keep and above all whether to follow or reject Jesus Christ. According to (Dodge, 1999), response to troubled young people is usually punitive as depicted in the metaphors used to describe youth antisocial behavior such as “*get tough on youth crime, fight to control adolescent crime, tackle the youth crime challenge, battle against young people’s crime, and attack misbehavior among young people*”, suggest counter-aggressive response (pp. 4-5). The goal seems to eliminate young people’s rebellious behavior through uncompromising strategies rather than to avert or decrease it by creating conducive environments to holistically nurture young people to cope with hardships, remain positively connected to their families and communities and creatively address social ills. Quick-fixes have not and are likely not to turn around youth uncertainties and moral breakdown—we need to be cognizant of the hidden curriculum that implicitly shapes young people’s worldviews. For this reason, every curricular reform must interrogate the hidden curriculum and in so far as is possible align its positive elements with the aspirations of the society because it either hinders or facilitates moral as well as intellectual development which Paulo Freire (1973) refers to as critical consciousness.

Considering the benefits of empowering young people, and the adverse effects of its neglect, it is unfortunate that the newly introduced competence-based curriculum in Kenya has not given an in-depth analysis of how the hidden curriculum in the teaching-learning processes will be enacted and evaluated. This article, then seeks to provoke debates on the still under-researched role of the hidden curriculum in empowering young people to be innovative, creative and resilient servant leaders. The researcher seeks to answer two key questions: “To what degree do learning institutions’ hidden curricula and the circumstances that frames them facilitate or hinder the nurture of capabilities needed by the young generation?” How should educators define and measure effects of the subtle curriculum on youth empowerment? The researcher believes the hidden curriculum is a pedagogical issue which educators can no longer neglect. Even though learning that flows from students’ socialization activities may not directly measurable, this researcher concurs with other scholars that when its positive elements are “constructively aligned with those of the formal curriculum, the potential for more significant and

more transformative learning in the direction educators would hope, is likely to be achieved” (Gerald, 2006).

### Dissecting the Problem

In fact, we do not need scientific surveys to tell us what our eyes and ears are revealing concerning societies becoming wobblier, more aggressive and more promiscuous, with these trends being more apparent among the young generation. As Kinot (1999) noted, something good seems to have disappeared and nothing good has replaced it. As result, our young people, who have the energy and have hearts filled with visions of the future but are hardly old enough to be on their own, are likely and in fact some may be already uncertain about which way to go, like the hyena described by Kinot (1992, p. 73). Kinot narrated an African folktale about a “hyena who was following the general direction of the smell of meat but when his path forked into two he was not so sure which one would lead him to the meat and in his uncertainty, he put his legs astride the two paths and tried to walk along both and unfortunately he ended up splitting in the middle!” The implication here is that immoral attacks on our young generation—the pillars upon which every society and nation are build calls for an intelligent counter-attack—that is to empower them to be creative, innovative and resilient servant leaders, which cannot happen without an in-depth understanding of the, most influential ‘teacher’—the unseen curriculum.

### Overview of the Concept, Hidden Curriculum

Although learning institutions’ curriculum is commonly acknowledged as an overt, mindful, officially planned course of study with explicit objectives, alongside this pedagogical curriculum there exists a far more influential ‘teacher’ that shapes students’ thoughts and behavior comprising a whole range of things that are unplanned. Jackson (1968) saw students “as being exposed to delay and self-denial that goes with being one of a crowd; the constant evaluation and competition with others; and the fundamental distinction between the powerful and the powerless, with the teacher being effectively the student’s first boss”. According to Dreeben (1968), learning institutions’ structural settings as well as social interactions affect students’ learning and the knowledge that is formulated because of the teaching-learning experience.

The unseen curriculum is described as ‘hidden’ because it is generally unacknowledged or unexamined by students, educators, and the wider community. It exists in every learning context (Massialas & Joseph, 2009), whether educators acknowledge it or neglect it. Portelli (1993) identified three possibilities in relation to the hidden curriculum’s hiddenness: first he suggested that X hides himself or herself, that is X is answerable for the hiding, X is an agent; second, X is purposely hidden by someone else (Y); and third X is concealed, X is hidden accidentally. The unseen curriculum’s invisibility cannot be given the first meaning but allocating the second and third meanings to it is probable because it suggests being created by those who experience it within learning contexts.

Citing the Glossary of Education Reform: For Journalists, Parents and Community Members, Jusu (2018) highlighted four places where the hidden curriculum could be hidden: cultural orientation, curricular topics, teaching strategies and institutional rules. Posner (1987) seems to suggest the four places can be collapsed into two levels: the structure of values within learning institutions and the classroom and the actual structure of the overt curriculum.

The structure of values is inherent in managerial corrective measures, learning institutions’ stated goals and class duration (Kern, 2007).

The values’ edifice is also in lecture rooms organization of desks, instructor’s temperament and stated subliminally integral in classroom guidelines and expectations and the educators’ methods of evaluation. The second level of the concealed curriculum as noted by Posner (1987) includes arrangement of subjects like mathematics or business administration as well as how teachers decide to teach the stated subjects.

The term “hidden curriculum” was invented by the educator Philip Jackson in his book “*Life in Classrooms*” in 1968) where he argued that we need to understand education as a socializing process. The concept has, however, had researchers’ and practitioners’ attention for over a century since John Dewey’s (1916), *democracy and education addresses*, where he argued for the advancement of self and society. Over the decades, scholars like Vallance (1973), Meighan (1981), and Cornbleth (1984), among other scholars have focused their attention on what the hidden curriculum is, what it means, and what it does, particularly to learners because its underlying tones have remained a daunting contributing factor in shaping students’ beliefs and values. The term has been defined in various ways according to diverse research agendas and interests of different scholars including ‘interalia’, the latent curriculum (Bloom, 1972, the invisible curriculum (Zais, 1976), the unwritten curriculum (Dreeben, 1976), the unintended curriculum (Martin, 1976), the unstudied curriculum (Cornbleth, 1984), the informal curriculum (Kelly, 1989), the unnoticed curriculum (Portelli, 1993), the implicit curriculum (Wren, 1999), social skills (Endow, 2012) and discourse and ideology (Kirk, 2012). Simply put, the hidden curriculum is what students learn by being in school, not taught by any teacher...something is coming across to learners which may never be spoken in the English lesson or prayed about during chapel sessions (Meighan, 1981). Just from the way a learning context is structured, students, pick-up an approach to living and an attitude to learning. Shaw (2006) believes something as innocent as chairs arrangement in the classroom can reinforce the authority of a teacher stood at the front and emphasize the value of listening respectfully and waiting to be invited to speak, while groups of tables can highlight the value of group discussion. As such, unstated academic and social norms, which thwarts students’ ability to develop independently, often causes young people’s personal anxiety which in turn leads to unsubstantiated conflicts (Snyder, 1970).

Various theorists have taken different points of view in their exploration of how schooling pedagogical practices inform and socialize students. According to functionalists like Emile Durkheim (1961), the hidden curriculum comprises the norms and values necessary for societies to function properly and for the individual to function in that society. As such, the hidden curriculum prepares children to stay peacefully with others in the world. Conflict theorists like Marxists see the subtle lessons as teaching young people to accept the principles of capitalism which perpetuates inequalities as well as prepare students to become docile, obedient and complying workers. According to Illich (1973), the veiled curriculum is an instrument used by capitalists to continue the system that teaches students to become a submissive consumer without control over what teachers teach them. Shaw (2014, p. 82) pointed at “the ‘jug and mug’ principles where the teacher is

assumed to be the only pool of knowledge which needs to be transmitted to empty mugs (the pupils)". According to Bowles and Gintis (1976), the veiled curriculum prepares desired employees by awarding grades based on students' personality and not their performance which enforces acceptance of the hierarchy as students are forced to obey orders without questioning.

Specifically, radical feminists see learning institutions as functioning in a way to kill girls' aspirations, ambitions and expectations. Often teachers give girls different treatment and encourage them pursue certain fields that are traditionally related to their feminine roles at home, hence, perpetuating gender inequalities in the society. Apple (1982) argued that students encounter various norms and cultures in their learning contexts that form their social life in and outside the school. Robert Dreeben (1968) observed that learning institutions' culture teaches students to submerge much of their individual identity and accept the rightfulness of categorical treatment. According to Henry Giroux (2001), learning institutions are inseparably connected to the issues of influence in the society.

From these observations, we can conclude that the hidden curriculum, which is always in process aids in transmitting unspoken messages to students about morality which can either inhibit or advance students learning across a range of dimensions. In consequence, learning institutions mediate and legitimate such social and cultural reproductions of class and gender relations in dominant society which enhance students' understanding of their position in the society. For this reason, a thorough understanding of the unseen curriculum—consisting “of those things students learn through the experience of attending school rather than the stated educational objectives of learning institutions” (Dickerson, 2007), is indispensable in ensuring that all our young people, especially girls are empowered to say NO to ungodliness, YES to Godliness and live responsibly.

The question, therefore, begs: are traditional teaching-learning processes nurturing young people to think for themselves and participate as responsible citizens in a changing world? This question is prompted by the fact that some lessons students imbibe through whatever happens inside and outside the classroom, can and indeed does overwhelm and sometimes discourage them from participating in the development of their societies and nation, especially when it makes them feel small, less or more like vessels to be filled, rather than empower them to feel valued and useful. Some unintended messages in fact diminish students' perceptions of the importance of social life and even human dignity. The accidental lessons are not only transmitted through the content teachers teach but also through the way they deliver the materials, hence, without careful consideration of the hidden curriculum, efforts at official curriculum reform are bound to fail. Accordingly, hidden curriculum in every young people's education program must first be accurately identified because there is no known way of eliminating the hidden unstated curriculum, no matter where and how it functions, but educators can maximize on its positive elements and reduce its negative effects.

According to Killick (2016, pp. 20-21), the hidden curriculum is pervasive and indeed power-laden, but it has not gotten consistent and direct scrutiny, yet it continues to transmit both intended and unintended messages through learning institutions:

1. Services like availability of freedom of expression
2. Students' disciplinary measures like disciplinary measures
3. Young people's powers like the degree of tolerance of their criticism of the management
4. Interpretation of good knowledge acquisition styles (Killick, 2016, pp. 20-21).

For example, when young people are persuaded to think that intelligence is a fixed entity owned by educators and disseminated as the educator pleases, it influences them to be more competitive and performance oriented than learning oriented. As result, such young people tend to be anxious about looking good rather than risk making errors during the teaching-learning process and are prone to giving up when tasks become difficult. In contrast, young people who think that intelligence is flexible are more willing to struggle with thought-provoking assignments and any other responsibility. They are more resilient and innovative and comfortable with challenging tasks (Bransford et al. (2000). For this reason, educators must be observant of behavioral practices characterizes their students, such as:

1. Critical thinking skills like carefully examining issues, whether it is a problem, or a decision, creativity, open-mindedness, problem-solving
2. Considering other people's views and tolerating their personal attitudes;
3. Participating in moral practice; and
4. Keen to alter their own communication style to house other people whose verbal or non-verbal language may be dissimilar to theirs.

While these virtues among others, do not lend themselves to being set out in learning outcomes and assessed in the formal curriculum, they are fundamental to whom young people are, and to how they will choose to live their lives in the world. The messages regarding what counts to be an empowered young person, what is valued as creative, innovative and what matters in resilient servant leadership are transmitted through the hidden curriculum.

### Methodology

The research results presented in the article are from a sequential explanatory research conducted by the researcher between July and August 2018 on the “*Influences of the Hidden Curriculum on Students' worldview.*” In line with Creswell & Plano Clark's (2011) argument, the researcher began with quantitative data collection and analysis phase, which informed the follow-up qualitative phase to explain and enrich the quantitative data. The statistical population of the research included 486 undergraduate students in two Christian universities in Nairobi City County. The researcher used a questionnaire with 64 closed-ended. Out of the 486 questionnaires administered 417 were filled and returned. The researcher went through the filled questionnaires to identify factors tested in the first phase that respondents had perceived as having significant (strongly agree) or not having significant (strongly disagree) influence on their beliefs and norms (worldview) and used them to develop an interview guide with 14 open-ended questions which she used in gathering in-depth explanations from 10 students as to why the factors were perceived as so. According to Patton (2002), in-depth understanding of a phenomenon is not possible through other means of data collection. In this article only results from one of the tested eight hypothesis are reported.

### Discussions of the research Findings

The results of the univariate analysis conducted to test null hypothesis that Christian universities' cultural orientation

has no significant influence on students' worldview indicated a positive and significant relationship between Christian universities' cultural orientation and students' view of reality which in turn affects their individuality and behavior.

Analysis of variance as indicated in table 1 indicated a p value of 0.000 and a beta coefficient of 0.881, which lead to the rejection of the null hypothesis that Christian universities' cultural orientations have no significant influence on students' worldview.

**Table 1. Analysis of variance.**

Indicator	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	289.292	1	289.292	1173.228	.000b
Residual	83.343	338	.247		
Total	372.635	339			

These research results concur with other research findings that hidden curriculum exists in various components of learning contexts and significantly influences the teaching-learning process which in turn affects students' empowerment to be creative, innovative and resilient servant leaders. It is, therefore, important for learning institutions to take into consideration all hidden curriculum elements including educators' perspectives, demeanor and interpretations of the same. The results also suggested that the most preferred strategy for assessing values is students' self-assessment and educators' observation of evidence of values application in students' behaviors. For this reason, there is a need for instructors to have a common understanding of the desired values. This is because values or beliefs held by teachers affect their commitment to values implementation in their learning institutions, hence, it is advisable to expose values teachers cherish. Since hidden curriculum elements are known and extensively explored, their assessment must be integral to the competence-base curriculum introduced in January 2019 in Kenya. In addition, learning institutions' administrators are better advised if they support teachers and students in the practical application of hidden curriculum's positive elements. So, learning institutions must first believe in the competence-based curriculum values at a personal level and then create learning environments that enhance the acquisition of the desired virtues. Findings of the qualitative phase of the research concurred with the quantitative findings in that almost the interviewed participants claimed that:

1. "If it is not a value displayed as important by adults, then I feel it is not something I need to incorporate into my life."
2. "If a value is to be promoted successfully, students must see teachers' enthusiasm for it"

These research findings have a profound implication for learning institutions' since discussed virtues, just like skills and knowledge, constitute a major aim every education curriculum including the recently introduced competence-based curriculum. It therefore, follows that teacher education programmes must integrate the hidden curriculum. This is because when educators understand the hidden curriculum influences on students, they are likely to review their personal demeanor and attitude with students. Most likely they will use the hidden curriculum in their teaching as a strategy to transmit important virtues like cooperation, compassion, creativity, innovation and resilience to students. It is also possible teachers would device formative strategies to assess virtues acquisition that would give a valid indication about the level of students' empowerment. As such, to eliminate negatively entrenched social beliefs and ideas that negatively shape student's worldview, hidden curriculum knowledge

gaps revealed by the research results reported in this article must be addressed through:

1. Bench-marking on the hidden curriculum in recently introduced competence-based curriculum classroom in relation to students' empowerment and values teaching with worldwide practical applications in other countries
2. Strengthening empirical information on students' empowerment and values inculcation through further comprehensive studies that incorporate teachers' and head teacher viewpoints
3. Exploring how learning institutions integrate desired values through management strategies, curriculum implementation and pedagogical practices
4. Determining best-practice for inculcating values as schools progress with the recently introduced new curriculum.

### Conclusion

The conclusion drawn in this article is in line with Gabriel; Lia; Fgberto & Carvallo-Filho (2018) who argued that the hidden curriculum can lead to emotional dissonance and undermine the holistic nurture the formal curriculum seeks to achieve. Inner struggles can trigger defense mechanisms and even cynicism and in turn lead to depersonalization as well weaken one's perception of the quality of life, deteriorate his or her empathy as well as lead to depressive disorder. According to Hafferty (1998), being cognizant of unstated learnings can make students aware of its existence, understand its probable influence on their worldview and ultimately their behavior which would be a crucial step in developing young people's empathy, morality and holistic identity. Awareness of the hidden curriculum is also likely to trigger debate about issues such as power, student centered learning and negative effects of career stereotypes which is likely to help students think critically and make wise choices about which invisible messages to take on board and which ones to discard. For this reason, learning institutions should shift their focus from the formal curriculum (what students are taught in the classroom) to actual education (what students are truly learning). Much of the unstated learning occur outside the lecture room—through the invisible curriculum—where students' identity is forged by observing educators' attitudes, practices, and behaviors on their job and in various non-academic settings such as in the cafeteria.

Since youth empowerment is not just about applying factual knowledge learned in the classroom, rather, it is about facilitating young people's critical thinking capabilities and wise choosing between many conflicting alternatives, this article signals a need for exposing and dealing with the negative elements of the hidden curriculum and aligning its positive elements with the formal curriculum. However, educators are occasionally unconscious about the hidden curriculum and even when conscious of it they do very little about it. Nevertheless, every educator must create and sustain a conducive environment for youth empowerment. The research results reported in this article also indicated that there a link between the hidden curriculum like messages communicated through educators' attitude, beliefs and behavior and students' holistic development and which means sourcing of educators must be strongly guided by the values they cherish. This means providing more data about the hidden curriculum and encouraging its use in empowering youth to be creative, innovative, critical thinkers and servant leaders, is necessary.

Educators must, therefore give much consideration to the veiled curriculum than is usually the situation. In addition, reflections on the following question: “to what extent are learning institutions and the hidden curriculum which they create foster or fight the nurture of creative, innovative and resilient servant leaders needed by our nation? many be beneficial. Simply put, we must modify our teaching-learning processes where modification would bring about a holistic way of being in our generations which is better attuned to God and our global world.

### The Way Forward

We all need men and women of integrity—described in Proverbs 20:7; “the just man walketh in his integrity: his children are blessed after him” (KJV). For this reason, we must empower our young people to be upright, creative, innovative and resilient servant leaders in an ambiguous and ever-changing world. Unfortunately, education systems seem to be failing to holistically nurture young people to provide creative, innovative and biblically sound solutions to persistent social ills. As such, curricula implementers must create conducive learning environments, minimize undesirable hidden curriculum effects while maximizing on its positive effects. In addition, educators must LISTEN to young people. The acronym LISTEN is described by scholars like Luck (2019) as: learn and gain a thorough understanding of young people’s sub-cultures; identify and utilize unique potentials in each young person; have sincere interaction with young people because many often feel misunderstood and isolated which exposes them to radicalized groups; train and empower young people with life skills like healthy self-esteem and decision-making skills; encourage, reassure and engage people in community service activities and finally involve young people in new opportunities to allow them impact other people’s lives. This suggestion is in harmony with ASPEN institute (2016) who suggested that societies must be intentional in the way they incorporate youth into communities—in other words empower young people calls for:

1. Incorporating them in decision-making processes
2. Honoring their voices
3. Understanding and implementing their open opinions
4. Willingly sharing some adult powers and privileges with them to make societies a better place for both young people and adults.

For this reason, every curriculum reform must incorporate strategies and policies for integrating positive elements of the hidden curriculum with the formal curriculum and strategies for mitigating its negative aspects so as to holistically nurture youth—the largest segment of most populations worldwide. If young people are empowered we would significantly abate youth antisocial behavior like radicalization and promiscuous living for their own positive personal development as well as for their societies (Republic of Kenya, 2007a). Inversely, unempowered young people coupled with their sense of being sidelined from key decisions and hopelessness is a ticking time bomb for all the countries worldwide, especially developing countries. This observation concurs with the proverb that; “an idle (unimaginative) mind is the devil’s workshop’ which is one of the many variations of the proverb ‘the devil makes work for idle hands to do’, which dates back at least as far as the 4<sup>th</sup> century theologian St. Jerome. Consequently, empowering young minds and keeping them busy would enable them to

shun irresponsible living to benefit themselves and their societies.

### References

- ASPEN Institute (2016). What does it mean to ‘empower’ youth? <https://www.aspeninstitute.org/blog-posts/mean-empower-youth/>
- Bowles, Samuel and Herbert Gintis (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. NY: Basic Books.
- Christle, Christine A.; C. Michael Nelson & Kristine Jolivette. (2005). Prevention of antisocial and violent behavior in youth: A review of the literature [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266162435\\_Prevention\\_of\\_Antisocial\\_and\\_Violent\\_Behavior\\_in\\_Youth\\_A\\_Review\\_of\\_the\\_Literature](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266162435_Prevention_of_Antisocial_and_Violent_Behavior_in_Youth_A_Review_of_the_Literature).
- Collins S., Coffey M., Morris L. (2010). Social work students: Stress, support and well-being, *British Journal of Social Work*, 2010, vol. 40 (3), pp (pg. 963-82).
- Cornbleth, Catherine. Beyond hidden curriculum? *Journal of Curriculum Studies*. 16.1(1984): 29–36.
- Dewey, John. 1916. *Democracy and education*. The Free Press: New York NY.
- Dickerson, Linda. (2007). A postmodern view of the hidden curriculum. *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Georgia Southern University.
- Dodge, D. (1999). Early prevention and intervention equal delinquency prevention. *Focal Point*, 13 (1), 17-21.
- Dreeben, R. (1968). *On what is learned in schools*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Durkheim, Emile. (1961). *Moral education*. NY: Free Press, 1961.
- Endow, J. (2012). *Learning the hidden curriculum: The odyssey of one autistic adult*. Shawnee Mission, KS: AAPC Publishing.
- Freire, Paulo. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Giroux, Henry A. (2011). *Theory and resistance in education*. London: Bergin & Garvey.
- Hafferty, F. W., & Castellani, B. (2009). The hidden curriculum: a theory of medical education. In C. Brosnan & B. S. Turner (Eds.), *Handbook of the sociology of medical Education* (pp. 15–35). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Illich, Ivan. (1973). *After deschooling, what? In A. Gartner, C. Greer and F. Riessman (eds) After Deschooling, What? (New York: Harper and Row), 1-28*.
- Jackson, Philip. 1968. *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.
- Jinhong Jung; James Ressler & Amy Linder, (2018). Exploring the hidden curriculum in physical education. 8 (2). DOI: 10.4236/ape.2018.82023.
- Jusu, John K. (2018). The impact of the hidden curriculum in teaching, learning and spiritual development, Africa International University, Karen.
- Kern, Diane E. (2007). Cliffs test prep Praxis II: Principles of learning and teaching. Retrieved from <http://www.amazon.com/CliffsTestPrep-Praxis-II-Principles-eBook/dp/B003S9VRDY>
- Killick, David (2016). The role of the hidden curriculum: institutional messages of inclusivity Reflective Analysis, *Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice*, (4(2),20-24.
- Kinoti H. W. (1999). African morality: Past and present. In: Mugambi JNK and Nasimiyu-Wasike A (eds) *Moral and*

- Ethical Issues in African Christianity: Exploratory Essays in Moral Theology (2nd ed.). Nairobi, Kenya: Acton Publishers, pp. 73–82. \_\_\_\_\_.(1994). Hope for Africa and what the Christians can do. Nairobi, Kenya: Aisred.
- Kirk, D. (2012). Defining Physical Education: The Social Construction of a School Subject in Postwar Britain. London: Routledge
- Luciana Lazzeretti & Francesco Capone, (2015). "Resilience,creativity and innovation. The case of Chemical innovations after the1966 Flood in Florence, [https://ideas.repec.org/p/frz/wpmmos/wp2015\\_01.rdf.html](https://ideas.repec.org/p/frz/wpmmos/wp2015_01.rdf.html).Lund, J. L., & Tannehill, D.(2010). Standards-based physical education curriculum development(2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.
- Massialas, Byron &Hurst, Joseph.(2009). The “new social studies–retrospect and prospect. *The Social Studies*. 100, (6), 246-250.
- Meighan, Roland.(1981).A Sociology of educating. Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Mehrmohammadi, Mahmood (2009). Curriculum: opinions, approaches and perspectives. Tehran: Behnashr.
- Metzler, M. (2011). Instructional models for physical education (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). Scottsdale, AZ. Holcomb Hathaway.
- Morgan, Kevin. (2017).Surprising authorship of “The GreatWantofThisAge”.  
<http://advindicate.com/articles/2017/10/30/surprising-authorship-of-the-great-want-of-this-age>.
- Okebukola Alexander Olufemi. (2013). Ethical issues on youth empowerment and christianity Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies. Doi:10.5901/ajis.2013.v2n7p17.
- Patton, Michael Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Perry Shaw. (2014). *Transforming theological education: A Practical handbook for integrative learning*. (UK: Langham.
- Portelli, John.P. (1993). ‘Exposing the hidden curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 25, (4), 343-58.
- Posner, J. (1987). *The hidden curriculum. Education*, (44)1, 83.
- Pooley L. Cohen L. (2010). Resilience: A definition in context, Australian community psychologist, 22 (1), pp. 30-7.
- Republic of Kenya. 2007a. *Kenya Vision 2030: A globally competitive and prosperous Kenya*, Nairobi: Republic of Kenya.
- Rink, J.(2014). Teaching physical education for learning (7<sup>th</sup> Ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Silveiraa, Gabriel; Lia, Campos; Marcelo, Schwellera; Fgberto, Turato; Esther, Helmichc; Marco, Antoniode & Carvalho-Filho. (2018). “Speed up”! The influences of the hidden curriculum on the professional identity development ofmedicalstudents.  
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2452301118301019>.
- Sterling, S. (2001). *Sustainable education: Re-visioning learning and change*. Schumacher Society Briefing no.6, Dartington: Green Books.
- Vallance, Elizabeth. (1973). Hiding the hidden curriculum: An interpretation of language of justification in Nineteenth Century educational reform in Henry Giroux and David Purpel. (Editors) *The HiddenCurriculum and Moral Education*.
- Walker, B.H, C.S. Holling, S.R. Carpenter, & A. Kinzig. (2004).“Resilience,adaptability and transformability in social–ecological systems”. *Ecology and Society* 9 (2):5.