

9-29-1969

## Mao Tse-Tung and Marxistleninist Revisionism

Gabino A. Mendoza

Follow this and additional works at: <https://archium.ateneo.edu/phstudies>

---

### Recommended Citation

Mendoza, Gabino A. (1969) "Mao Tse-Tung and Marxistleninist Revisionism," *Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints*: Vol. 17: No. 3, Article 2.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13185/2244-1638.2215>

Available at: <https://archium.ateneo.edu/phstudies/vol17/iss3/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Ateneo Journals at Archium Ateneo. It has been accepted for inclusion in Philippine Studies: Historical and Ethnographic Viewpoints by an authorized editor of Archium Ateneo.

# philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University · Loyola Heights, Quezon City · 1108 Philippines

---

## **The Business Curriculum and the Faculty for the 1970's**

Gabino A. Mendoza

*Philippine Studies* vol. 17, no. 3 (1969): 436–456

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

---

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at [philstudies@admu.edu.ph](mailto:philstudies@admu.edu.ph).

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>  
Fri June 30 13:30:20 2008

# The Business Curriculum and the Faculty for the 1970's\*

---

GABINO A. MENDOZA

**T**HERE was a time when being a teacher meant leading a quiet, placid, contemplative life, a life unruffled by the tides of controversy that daily shape and change our world. Our change, we reckoned not in days, nor weeks, nor months, nor sometimes even in years. We altered our ways, slowly; we weighed our alternatives, deliberately; we changed gradually.

But no longer.

Controversy has caught up with us; controversy, in the awkward, unfamiliar form of demonstrating students, heady with their first sniff of power. This young world today demands that we, teachers, quicken our pace; that we change as rapidly as the rapidly changing times; that we swiftly respond to the growing needs of our developing country.

What we teachers must do, what we must change, what we, urgently, must improve—this is my subject. Specifically, I propose to discuss the topic, "The Business Curriculum and the Faculty for the 1970's."

---

\* A talk delivered at a seminar on Business Education for the 1970's sponsored by the Philippine Association of Collegiate Schools of Business and held at the University of the East on Sunday, March 23, 1969.

Before we plunge into our subject, however, permit me to make a few preliminary points:

First, to give perspective to what I shall subsequently say, allow me to put on record my realization that the curriculum is only the skeleton of an educational program. What is taught in the specific courses that make up the curriculum and how these courses are taught—these give flesh to the frame. And the faculty—the teachers' dedication, their knowledge, their pedagogical skills, their intellectual integrity—these breathe life into a program; give it dynamism; make it meaningful.

Second, to give focus to our discussion, I propose to concentrate only on the four-year undergraduate curriculum and not the MBA or the MBM curriculum. Moreover, let us agree that we shall look at the undergraduate program, not as a preparation for advanced studies, but as a terminal program. Of the fifteen thousand BSC and BSBA graduates that we turn out every year, only a very small number continue into the master's programs. I dare say that 99% of them go directly into the business world. On them, therefore, their needs, their requirements we shall focus our attention.

Third, let us agree that the primary objective of a terminal undergraduate degree program is not to teach a man the skills that he will need to get his first job. A degree program must have a longer outlook than this; its aim should be to prepare a man for a career in business in such a way that, as new challenges confront him, he will have the capacity to develop himself, to learn new and different skills, to acquire diverse and unfamiliar concepts by building on the knowledge he has picked up in school.

Fourth, in my critique of the present curriculum, I shall prescind from the fact that there are government requirements that the Business Schools must abide by. I shall assume that a proposal to change these requirements from such a responsible and prestigious an organization of educators as the Philippine Association of Collegiate Schools of Business will be favorably acted on by our Government.

Finally, permit me to acknowledge here that many of the ideas that I shall present to you were not originally mine. I have borrowed them not only from outstanding teachers and administrators I have met in the Visayas and Mindanao this past couple of weeks but also from two books—*The Education of American Businessmen* by Pierson and *Higher Education for Business* by Gordon and Howell. Since, however, I modified their ideas as I saw fit, please do not blame them for anything I may say that you do not agree on.

## I

There are at least two major factors that will determine the thrust that the business curriculum should take in the 1970's. The first is our projection of what the business environment will be like in the 1970's and the second is our expectation regarding the state-of-the-art that management theory and practice shall have attained by then. Because they are mutually interdependent, we may discuss these two factors together.

What will business in the 1970's be like? What directions will it take? On what scale will it be conducted? What equipment and technology will it employ?

To answer these questions, we need to review the state of business today; to look at the patterns that are developing; to see what trends are being set. This then, let us do, as briefly as possible.

In marketing, several developments seem to us significant.

First, there is the trend towards a rationalization of distribution channels. We see this in the tendency of many marketing organizations to by-pass Divisoria by setting up their own nation-wide distribution systems that deal directly with retailers. This trend was started in the 50's by the soft drinks and the vegetable oil companies and today is being broadened by a multitude of others like the quality paper products manufacturers, the construction materials industry, and the drug importers and packagers. We see this tendency also in the establishment of the Greater Manila Food Terminal

Market which will enable farmers to sell directly to food wholesalers.

Second, there is the trend towards the establishment of larger and better-integrated retail outlets. This started with the shopping centers such as Cartimar and the Sta. Mesa Market; it may now be seen in the proliferation of super-markets not only in the Greater Manila area but also in Cebu; it may be seen in the establishment of the Mercury and the Commander Drug retail chains; it may be seen in the establishment of the country's first true department store on Avenida Rizal, the Good Earth Department Store.

Finally, there is the possibility of our developing broader export markets for our processed goods. The initiatives that have already been taken by our food processors, our drug manufacturers, and our cement producers to explore markets in Southeast Asia may yet culminate in a massive export drive in the 1970's. Beyond these, there is the possibility of trade with the Communist countries and the establishment of a Southeast Asian Common Market on which the Government is at present feeling out public opinion.

In production, two new directions are being taken.

The first is the tendency towards backward integration into the basic industries, particularly in metals and in chemicals. Perhaps the best way to illustrate this is by pointing to the numerous new projects in these two areas that have been submitted to the Board of Investment (BOI). Undoubtedly, these new projects will call for larger, more complex, and more technologically-oriented organizations.

The second trend, it seems to me, is toward the modernization of agriculture. Already we can see some changes taking place in the thinking of farmers because of the efforts of the RCPCC to propagate "miracle rice." Many farmers today are becoming dissatisfied with their traditional ways of doing things. Not only are they experimenting with improved seeds but also, they are evolving new organizational arrangements that take advantage of the economies of scale available in the use of modern equipment. Then also, we see the beginning of large capitalist groups like the Tuasons, the Escalers, the

Aguinaldos establishing plantations on a professionally managed basis.

In the field of finance, the decade of the 60's has been an eventful one. The establishment of the T-bill market and the consequent development of a vigorous short-term money market, the establishment of the Makati Stock Exchange and the recent rapid expansion of the secondary capital market, the establishment of large development banks like the ADB and PDCP, of investment banks like Bancom and CCP Securities, the rise of the marketing-oriented savings banks—all of these exciting developments have liberated forces that will undoubtedly generate further structural and operational changes in the field of finance.

Then also, we will become more and more involved in the problems of international liquidity that are now racking the countries of the west. Being so very export-oriented, we will, without doubt, be profoundly affected by whatever final decisions are made on such issues as the revaluation of gold, its possible demonetization, the creation of an international currency, the establishment of an Asian Payments Union, to name only a few.

In the field of human behavior and organization theory, we can see several developments that will affect how business will be done in the 70's. Not only is our population growing rapidly, but increasingly we can see a rush of people towards our cities. All of our major cities are growing faster than the rest of the country. The consequences of this we can only guess. Will it mean the eventual break-up of the extended Filipino family? Will it generate unbearably intense competition for jobs in industry? Will it result in the development of an urban proletariat?

Another force that seems to be gathering steam in our contemporary business society is the drive towards mergers and consolidation by some of our leading industrial and financial groups. This is a drive that key figures in the Administration have been pushing and already we have started to see evidence that they may yet succeed. In the drug

industry, the largest manufacturer has unified its efforts with one of the industry's most modern marketing organizations; in the field of banking, there are rumors of an impending merger of two—even three—big banks; in iron and steel, the Puyat, Bacnotan and Elisco groups have pooled their resources to set up a rolling mill; in food processing, we recently saw the consolidation of four companies into one big firm; and, of course, we have the celebrated Benguet Consolidated merger in which, depending on your viewpoint, Benguet either swallowed or was swallowed up by the Grand Bahamas Corporation. The trend definitely is towards bigness. And one wonders what the effect of bigness will be on the Filipino worker. Will he feel insignificant and thus become alienated from society as many in the West have? Or will he, like the Japanese, "adopt" the corporation and consider it his "family"?

The advances in the behavioral sciences have been phenomenal during this past decade. Here in the Philippines, the work of the sociologists, psychologists, and even the political scientists have begun to give us a better picture of what the Filipino is like and what motivates him; in the United States the behavioral scientists have started to gain valuable insights into the personal as well as social forces that affect the working man's conduct in business organizations. There is no doubt in my mind that the questions the social scientists will ask and the answers they will get shall have a great impact on the way businesses will be managed in the 1970's. Anyone, therefore, who would be meaningfully involved in business will have to know of the progress they have made and develop the capability of keeping up with their findings.

The area of managerial information and control systems has also been revolutionized during the past decade. The leading edge of this revolution has, of course, been the growing knowledge and sophistication with which business, not only in the developed countries but also here in the Philippines, has begun to use the electronic computer. During the past couple of years we have seen here in our country the rise of consulting firms that offer to design computerized control systems for

an expanding clientele. As the trend toward big and complex companies develops in the 1970's, I am sure that more and more, the computer and the various quantitatively-oriented management systems that utilize them will become ordinary everyday tools of Philippine management.

At this point let us pause for a while, stand back a little from this hurried picture we have drawn of business in the 1970's so that we may see the forest instead of the trees. Although you may quarrel with some of the details that I have sketched in, I think you will agree, however, that some primary characteristics of the future have started to stand out.

The first one is this: business in the 1970's will be much more complex than it is today. We will have a broader range of industries; they will be much more technologically oriented; marketing their products will demand much greater sophistication; and financing their operations will require much greater expertise. In addition, we will have much larger companies; these necessarily will have to operate more extensively; they will therefore require more formal, impersonal, and structured organizations; consequently, communication with and motivation of employees will assume crucial proportions and will therefore have to become integral components of every planning and control system that will have to be installed in these companies.

The second primary characteristic of the 1970's, I submit to you, will be an acceleration in the pace of change. Business in the 1970's will be much faster, more hectic, and much more kaleidoscopic than it is today. Even now we can already sense the increasing rate at which markets shift from product to substitute product and from brand to brand; we can see the evolution from one type of distribution outlet to another, the wheel of marketing speeding up. Even now, we can observe the rapidity with which technological innovation in the industrialized countries is adopted and adapted in the Philippines. Finally, we can feel the quickening pace with which new financial institutions and instruments are being introduced into the country.

Complexity and constant change—these, then, will characterize the business world of the 1970's. The question that we must ask ourselves is this: how well are we preparing our youthful charges, our business students, to confront, to grapple with, and to master this world?

II

Those of us who have had to interview a whole gaggle of graduates in order to hire one qualified man, I think, will agree, that what we teach them leaves much to be desired. Some of the complaints that I'm sure all of us have heard from business executives, to the point of nausea, are the following:

"They can't write even one grammatically correct sentence in English."

"They don't know how to add."

"You have to explain things to them several times before they can get an inkling of what you're trying to say."

"They're so narrow. They don't know much of what's going on outside their own little worlds."

"They don't read. They can't read."

We could go on and on reciting this litany of our failures—because the failure is ours, make no mistake of it. Of course we can always blame the grade schools, and the high schools, and our two-language system, and our students' indolence, and the anti-intellectual milieu in which we live, and our politics ridden society, and . . . but what's the use? In the last analysis, we have to take what we get and do the best with it that we can; and I submit to you that there is a lot that we can better do.

But before we go into that, let us review what we have been doing. Specifically, let us look at the business curricula of three universities—all of them among the largest in their area—one in Manila, one in Cebu, and the last one in Davao.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Annex I.

This sample, let me admit at once, is a biased one. I submit it only for want of a better alternative (given the time constraints involved) and because I believe that, flawed a sample as it is, it will still give us a rough idea of the way business curricula are structured in our country and some basis for discussing what an ideal curriculum should look like. I might also mention that during the past two weeks, I have had occasion to visit many business schools in the south; my discussions with their administrators lead me to believe that, aside from a few individual differences, the curricula of these business schools are pretty much representative of what may be found throughout our system.

If we accept this assumption, then the following are some of the salient features of our undergraduate business curricula:

1) We offer our students a course of studies which contains about 150 units spread out over eight (8) semesters, each semester containing from 15 to 21 units of load.

2) Of the 150 units, about 60 units (or 40%) are devoted to the student's general education; another 60 units to a professional core of subjects; and the remaining 30 units (or 20%) to either the student's field of concentration or to free electives. This division of the student's time conforms to the 40-40-20 ratio recommended by the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) for undergraduate curricula.

3) Of the 60 units devoted to general education, about 36 units (60%) are in the humanities, 9 units are in the exact sciences (15%) and about 15 units (25%) are in the social sciences. Looking more closely at the details we find: English grammar, composition, literature, and public speaking account for 15 units (one-fourth of the student's general education); Spanish covers 12 units (20%); except for a course on the Life and Works of Rizal, there is a wide divergence of opinion as to what other humanities subjects should be taught; the natural sciences (i.e., Physics, Biology, Chemistry, etc.) are largely ignored; the mathematics courses, if one is to judge by their course names, consist of a re-hash of High School Arith-

metic (usually labeled Business Arithmetic) and some college Algebra; in the social sciences, Elementary Economics accounts for 6 units, and Political Science (or sometimes History) accounts for 3 units.

4) The following seems to be the prevailing composition of the professional core courses which cover about sixty units: management theory accounts for about 9 units (15%); the environmental courses take up 21 units (35%); the functional courses use up 12 units (20%); and the "tool" courses account for the remaining 18 units (30%). Looking more closely at the details, we find that the part allocated to management theory, usually covering an introductory course, a course on human relations, and one on personnel management, is pretty much standard; that the environmental courses, which include advanced economics (6 units), business law (12 units), and taxation (3 units) are also quite standardized with the exception of advanced economics which ranges over subjects as diverse as Economic Development of the Philippines, Principles of Foreign Trade, Economics of Insurance, Economics of Transportation, and Public Finance; that the "functional" courses are usually concentrated in the area of Finance with an occasional concession to Marketing (usually a three-unit course in salesmanship) and Production being largely ignored; that the "tool" courses—usually three units of statistics and 15 units of accounting—are also quite standardized. In effect, there seems to be a great deal of consensus on the part of the business schools as to what ground should be covered in the professional core courses.

5) Of the three schools we looked at, one offered three areas of concentration, another offered six, and the third offered seven. They had three majors in common: Accounting, Banking and Finance, and a general course called either Management or Business Administration. Two of the three schools had a couple of other majors in common: one in Economics and another in Marketing. The uncommon majors were: Taxation and Tariffs, Customs Administration, and Business. (Many of the subjects in this latter field had to do with the management of cooperatives.)

## III

The question we have ask ourselves now is this: If the 1970's will be as challenging, as complex, and as changeable as we have forcast, can a curriculum such as we have described adequately prepare our students to cope with, and to take advantage of, the opportunities that such an environment will bring?

The thesis of this little talk is that it cannot. It cannot because it is unrealistic in its assumptions; it cannot because it is unrealistic in its coverage; it cannot because it is unrealistic in its expectation. It does so little while trying to do so much.

Let's go down to specifics.

We have already had occasion to remark on the similarity of the structure of our curriculum to that recommended by the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB), namely, 40% for general education, 40% for the professional core, and 20% for the field of concentration. The similarity is so close that one begins to suspect a relationship between the two—one, perhaps, of emulation.

But even if this were not true, should one not ask: Why should there be this similarity of structure? One reason of course is that we are trying to achieve a similar goal; we are preparing men for a career in business. Beyond this point, however, I am afraid we start to run out of relevant similarities.

The AACSB curriculum makes a key assumption that we cannot match. They assume that the raw material for their educational process will be American high school graduates. Now there are many major differences between the American and the Filipino high school product. The average American grows up in an entirely different environment; his is an urbanized, affluent, business-oriented, mass-media-saturated society. The Filipino on the other hand grows up in a rural, poverty-stricken, family-dominated, word-of-mouth activated environment. In terms, therefore, of background, of general information, of knowledge of the world beyond his country's

shores, of awareness of the modern scientific miracles that have been revolutionizing our world, in short, in terms of sophistication, a great gap separates the average American student from the Filipino.

In addition, once the Filipino begins his formal schooling, he starts to lose ground. And the reasons for this are simple.

First, in the formal learning process, the American uses his own mother-tongue while the Filipino first has to laboriously learn a second language.

Second, our school system, with all due respects to our nationalist sensibilities, is an inferior system in terms of the facilities that we use—the cramped classrooms, the poorly stocked libraries, the under-equipped laboratories—the textbooks that our students do not have, the education and training that our teachers should have had but could not afford to get, the initiative-sapping poverty in which these under-paid teachers live—but let us not belabor the obvious.

The next result of all this is that by the time the students get to the collegiate level, we are no longer talking of similar things. We are starting off, in effect, with an entirely different kind of raw material. And in this light, I submit to you that we need, we must use an entirely different process; one that is structured differently; one that will recognize the inadequacies of the material that we start off with; one that will broaden the Filipino student's outlook, that will deepen his understanding of the forces that shape the physical world around him, of the ideas and ideals that inspire the people he deals with, of the values, the emotions and the desires that move him. In the last analysis, we must give him a firmer foundation of general knowledge a broader, more humanistic and at the same time, a more scientific education, in short, a more intensive liberal education.

Quite apart from the paucity of units allocated to general education, the present curriculum that we use, in its conception, is not designed to accomplish its purposes.

First, let us focus on the language component of the curriculum. We have to face the fact that English is the

language of business in the Philippines; it will continue as such into the 1970's, especially if, as we project, the Philippines expands its exporting activities. It is, therefore, necessary that we teach English well and effectively in our business schools. There are many fundamental reasons why, despite the fact that we devote a very substantial part of our time teaching English, we have not been very successful at it. I suspect, however, that one of the more important reasons is that we are at the same time trying to teach still another language, namely, Spanish. I realize that a law compels us to do this. I realize also that there is value to students' studying the writings of our poets, novelists, and propagandists of the Spanish Era. But to do this, one need not learn an entirely new language; they can be read in translation in much the same way that the Bible, Homer, Virgil, and Dante are read by most people today. By demanding more than this, we condemn our students to at least three semesters of "wheel spinning." Surely your very influential association can do something about getting the Spanish Law out of our statute books.

Second, a major gap in the education of our business students is the absence of the natural sciences in our curriculum. The physicists, the biologists, and the chemists are continually renewing the face of the business world; the new products that pour out from their laboratories and their pilot plants are flooding our world and are changing the wants and needs of our consumers. Their work, therefore, will be a factor that a businessman in the 1970's cannot afford to ignore; neither can we, the teachers of business.

Third, the world of the 1970's will also be a "numbers-oriented" world. In some of our better grade schools they recognize this; already they have started to teach modern math to our children. Our teaching of mathematics in the business schools will not only have to be intensified, it will have to be drastically changed. Unless we start to develop math courses now—courses which will include not only arithmetic, algebra, and analytic geometry but also elements of set theory, numbers theory, probability theory, complex numbers, and mathe-

matical induction—in the 1970's we may suddenly be confronted with a crop of students more sophisticated in mathematics than our teachers shall be prepared to handle.

Fourth, we spend too much time trying to make our students half-baked lawyers. We pump them full of detailed information about the law on corporations, partnerships, contracts, negotiable instruments, bailments, taxes, etc. . . . when what they actually need is a broad understanding of the legal framework in which business is done.

Fifth, I suspect that we also spend too much time trying to teach all of our students procedural and descriptive accounting details; with the exception of those who intend to become public accountants, most of our students will not need all this detail. What they will need is a knowledge of how accounting may be used as a managerial tool. In the MBM Program at the Ateneo, we have often found it more difficult to teach managerial accounting to bachelor's degree holders in business because we have had first to liberate them from the accounting conventions and procedures that had been pounded into their heads in their undergraduate courses.

Sixth, Production and, sometimes, Marketing are not acknowledged as crucial business functions in our present curriculum. More often than not, they are excluded from the core of professional courses that we offer. I have been told by some school administrators in the provinces that one of the reasons for this is the scarcity of qualified men to teach these courses. I suppose this is a gap that we will have to remedy over a period of time.

Seventh, a serious lack in our curriculum is a subject in the professional core which will integrate all the various elements, functions, and "tools" of business and give the student an opportunity to develop his own conceptual framework of how business, as a whole, operates. Such a course—usually called Business Policy—should be offered in the last year of the undergraduate program.

In summary, I submit to you that our present curriculum cannot fulfill its assigned task because it contains several

serious gaps, because it over-emphasizes unimportant detail while stinting time on fundamental understanding, because it is unbalanced.

There is one final quarrel I have with the present process that we use to produce career businessmen, and it is this: we try to do too much with it without looking realistically at the constraints under which we work. What we have here, in effect, is a problem of allocation. Let us look at the facts.

First, our goal is to produce businessmen who will have the necessary attitudes, intellectual equipment, and managerial skills to cope with the challenge of the complex and fast changing world of the 1970's.

Second, we labor under two constraints. One is the fact that we have to work with sub-standard raw material; the other is that we have only a limited time—four years or 150 semester hours—within which to do our job.

Because of these constraints, we are hard put to develop a product that will adequately meet our goals. Yet, despite this, we still insist on imposing on ourselves a further burden—that of teaching our students a specialization. The result is easy to predict: we neither achieve our goals nor produce a specialist. All we succeed in producing is a storm of complaints from our market which is the business community.

I realize that there are many difficulties involved.

We like to say, for example, that while it is true that our primary goal is to produce flexible business generalists, our graduates must also have a specialization if they are to get their first jobs. The business community, we say, looks for specialists. I wonder, however, — with the exception of accountants — how much truth there is in this truism that we have tended to accept without any solid proof to back it up. In my experience as a marketing consultant, we have found that we have developed top-notch marketing men not so much from marketing majors but from liberal arts graduates.

Also, I have the impression that the firms that actively engage in recruiting also make it a point to visit and to hire

men from the liberal arts colleges. Finally, I have talked with a number of prominent personnel managers and they have told me that they find it easier for a man with adequate background to pick up the specialized skills he needs for a particular job than it is for a poorly trained specialist to broaden himself for a supervisory or managerial position. Perhaps the Philippine Association of Collegiate Schools of Business should undertake a research project to find out if the business community really pays any attention to the "majors" that we give.

The other objection against eliminating the "majors" is that the students insist on taking a major because they want to be "practical." We are truly poor teachers if we cannot convince our students that the most practical thing for them to do is to concentrate on acquiring the fundamental knowledge they need to meet the challenges of the complex and swiftly changing business world of the 1970's.

Finally, let's do a little tidying up. Earlier, I referred to the accounting majors as exceptions. It is my opinion that a degree in accountancy is separate and distinct from a degree in business. They are as distinct as law is distinct from business, though both law and accounting affect the way business is done and serve as tools of business. For this reason, I advocate that we stop giving business degrees with accounting concentrations and instead start granting bachelor's degrees in accountancy.

#### IV

We are now ready to answer one of the questions that we asked at the beginning, namely, "What should the business curriculum for the 1970's look like?"

Very conscious of my limitations as a curriculum-designer, I would like nonetheless to present to you now my idea of what the structure of an ideal curriculum should be.<sup>2</sup>

My basic proposal is this: of the 150 semester hours available, sixty per cent (90 units) be devoted to the students' general education and forty per cent (60 units) to their pro-

---

<sup>2</sup> For details, see Annex II.

fessional subjects; that no specialized fields of concentration be offered.

In the general education portion of the program, I suggest the following structure:

Humanities (English, Literature, Art & Philosophy)	30 units
Sciences (Physics, Biology & Chemistry)	15
Mathematics (Arithmetic, Algebra, Modern Math & Analytic Geometry)	15
Social Sciences (Elementary Economics, Psychology, Sociology, History and Political Science)	30
Total	<u>90 units</u>

For the professional part of the curriculum, I suggest the following subjects:

Management Theory (Human Behavior and Organization Theory & Personnel Administration)	9 units
Environmental Courses (Advanced Economics & Law)	12
Functional Courses (Marketing, Production & Finance)	18
"Tool" Courses (Accounting, Statistics & Managerial Economics)	18
Integrating Course (Business Policy)	3
Total	<u>60 units</u>

Earlier in this talk, I stated that a curriculum is only the skeleton of an educational program. I believe this very strongly. The most essential ingredient in the program is the faculty which gives flesh to it and brings it to life. On the other hand, however, the skeleton, the curriculum will determine to a very large extent what kind of a faculty a school should have. I am fully aware that the curriculum I have proposed, if adopted by our business schools, will mean a very drastic change in their faculty requirements.

For some of our faculty members, it will mean a need to either re-educate themselves in a new field or to give up teaching until the numbers of our students grow much greater than they are now.

For many of our business teachers, it will mean:

First of all, a need to go back to school in order to catch up with the new developments in their chosen field of endeavor since they finished college;

Secondly, a need to broaden their knowledge of other fields so that they may be better teachers in their own areas of competence—so mutually dependent and interlinked have the various areas of business become;

Thirdly, a need to re-examine the courses that they teach and the way they teach these in order to make sure that they fit and become an integral part of the total curriculum;

Finally, if found necessary, to completely redesign and re-build their courses and make them relevant to the new curriculum.

I have noticed that most of our teachers in the undergraduate programs have only a bachelor's degree; in fact, in several provincial business schools that I visited, even the deans of the business faculty did not have a master's degree. Please do not mistake me—I am not, as they say, "hung-up" on degrees. I believe that especially here in the Philippines where very little research has been done and very little has been written on how business really is conducted, a man can learn more by doing business than by sitting in the library reading about business. But let's face it—more and more, in our graduate programs and in our libraries, we are accumulating a lot of knowledge and insight about Philippine business which will not be easy for an individual to pick up on the job. In the 1970's I predict that the master's degree will be an indispensable qualification for teachers in the undergraduate programs and if our present corps of teachers do not keep abreast of this trend, they will gradually be eased out of their jobs by the growing number of young men and women who are starting to pour into our graduate schools of business.

This then, my friends and colleagues, is the challenge that the 1970's pose to us teachers: that we, to paraphrase

the Bible, either "grow in knowledge, wisdom, and in grace" or fall back, obsolete, irrelevant and useless.

**THREE UNDERGRADUATE BUSINESS CURRICULA**  
Manila      Cebu      Davao

**I. General Education**

**A. Humanities**

Languages & Literature

— English

15 units      15 units      15 units

— Spanish

12            12            12

Philosophy

9             6             9

Fine Arts

3             —             —

---

39            53            36

**B. The Exact Sciences**

Physics, Biology, Chemistry

—            —            —

Mathematics

9            9            6

---

9            9            6

**C. Social Sciences**

Economics

3            6            6

Sociology

—           3            3

Psychology

6            6            3

History

3            3            —

Political Science

3            3            3

---

15           21           15

Totals

63 units    63 units    57 units

**II. The Professional Core**

Management Theory

9 units      3 units      3 units

The Business Environment

— Advanced Economics

3            —            9

— Business Law

24          15          12

Business Functions

9            6            15

Management Tools

15          15          21

Business Policy

—           3            —

---

60 units    42 units    60 units

Manila      Cebu      Davao

III. **Business Electives**

Field of Concentration	24 units	24 units	36 units
Free Electives	3	18	3
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	27 units	42 units	39 units
Totals—Business Courses	87 units	84 units	39 units
Grand Totals	150 units	147 units	156 units

PROPOSED CURRICULUM  
FOR AN  
UNDERGRADUATE BUSINESS PROGRAM

I. General Education

A. **Humanities**

English grammar, composition & rhetoric	15 units
Literature—English & Philippine	6
Art (Introduction to Music, Painting, Sculpture, Architecture, the Movies, etc.)	3
Philosophy—History of Philosophy & Logic	6
	<hr/>
	30 units

B. **Sciences**

Physics	3 units
Biology	3 units
Chemistry	3
Laboratory work (Student may elect to take this in either Physics, Biology, or Chemistry)	6
	<hr/>
	15 units

C. **Mathematics**

Arithmetic (review of secondary arithmetic)	3 units
College Algebra	3
Modern Math	6
Analytic Geometry	3
	<hr/>
	15 units

D. **Social Sciences**

Elementary Economics (Principles & Analysis)	6 units
Psychology (Principles & the Philippine Setting)	6
Sociology (Principles & the Philippine Setting)	6
History (World & Philippine)	6
Political Science (Principles & Philippine Government)	6
	<hr/>
	30 units

## II. Business Education

## A. Management Theory

Human Behavior in Organizations	6 units
Organization Theory & Personnel Administration	3
	<hr/>
	9 units

## B. The Business Environment

Advanced Economics (Philippine Economic History & Development Economics)	6 units
Business Law	6
	<hr/>
	12 units

## C. Business Functions

Marketing (Concepts & Cases)	6 units
Production (Concepts & Cases)	6
Finance (Concepts & Cases)	6
	<hr/>
	18 units

## D. Management Tools

Fundamentals of Accounting	6 units
Managerial & Cost Accounting	6
Statistics	3
Managerial Economics	3
	<hr/>
	18 units

## E. Integrating Course (last semester)

Business Policy (cases)	3 units
-------------------------	---------

## III. Summary

## General Education

Humanities	30 units
Sciences	15
Mathematics	15
Social Sciences	30
	<hr/>
	90 units

## Business Education

Management Theory	9 units
The Business Environment	12
Business Functions	18
Management Tools	18
Integrating Course	3
	<hr/>
	60 units

Total

150 units