Assessing Faculty Members' Curriculum Orientations: A Case Study of University of Kurdistan

Article info

Abstract

Authors:

Jamal Salimi [1*]

The purpose of the present study is to measure the dominant curriculum orientation of faculty members at University of Kurdistan. In terms of purpose, this is applied study, and in terms of data collection methods, it is a descriptive survey. The target population consisted of all faculty members who were teaching during the 2014-2015 academic year at University of Kurdistan. To collect the data, the census method was employed due to the limited number of the participants. The data collection tools were the "curriculum orientations inventory (COI)" developed by Cheung and Wong (2002) and modified by Mahlios, Rice and Thomas (2004). The results of the study showed that cognitive process and academic rationalism were the most dominant orientations of the faculty members. The results also showed that there is a positive relationship between the faculty members' curriculum orientation and their expertise.

Affiliations:

1. Department of Education, University of Kurdistan.
   Corresponding author email: J.salimi@uok.ac.ir

Introduction

Higher education plays a crucial role in determining all national and international strategies and in achieving sustainable development in any society (Constantin, 2013). In other words, higher education, as an important institution, is considered as the main human resource developer and the most important factor in achieving sustainable development based on global considerations (Balderston, 2000). So, to tackle such a task and accomplish such a vital mission, it needs suitable and powerful educational and curricular programs. Design and development of curriculum is one of the oldest strategies for trying to influence classroom education. While many curricula are designed for routine education, reformers often use materials as a means of shaping what learner trying to learn. (Bruner, 1960; Dow, 1991).

Furthermore, a curriculum is the main element of the higher education system and the most fundamental tool in providing knowledge, experience and skill to supply the community with enough services. As the heart of the system, curriculum plays an important role in achieving the goals and objectives of the institution and implementing its plans. The importance of this is due to the significant role of curriculum in improving the quality of higher performance (Karami, Bahmanabadi & Esmaili, 2012). In other words, the curriculum is one of the main elements or sub-systems in higher education which has played an effective role in helping the higher education system to achieve its goals and missions in terms of both quality and quantity (Maleki & Salimi, 2017).

Additionally, educators (teachers / trainers) are the key elements of the curriculum planning, and the teacher' role in the curriculum enterprise has been widely discussed. Connelli (1972), based on his review of the subject literature, concludes that teachers are highly act independently of curriculum materials and plans that pre-designed curriculum. There is no evidence to support the view that by increasing control over teachers or attempting to create teacher proof curricula their independence may be eliminated. Based on McLaughlin and Marsh (1978), commentary on Randy's report, a new curriculum in a local context is done in two comparative and exploratory ways. That is, it is either fully implemented (Fidelity Approach) or their teachers appear in the implementation process as an effective factor(Mutual Adaptation) .Randy's study also confirmed the view that teachers are professional people who must participate actively in the decision-making about curriculum activities, designing the goals of the training projects and the successful implementation of these projects. for this purpose Schwab(1973) has also offered four commonplace of curriculum making. He believes that there must be four main elements in the curriculum making process, that include subject matter, learner, teacher, and milieu. He emphasizes on the coordination between these four elements and believes that as a condition for the realization of a balanced curriculum.

Among the other aspects of teacher characteristics that can influence the implementation of curriculum, such as scientific abilities and capabilities, teachers' professional field etc., what is more important is the teacher's beliefs or orientation. The beliefs and orientations of teachers are examined by various researchers and in various dimensions. Various studies confirm that the type of teacher's view about curriculum, learner, teaching, learning and evaluation processes determine the main behaviors in schools, and intensified teachers' influence on what students learn(Calderhead, 1996; Clark & Peterson, 1986; Pajares, 1992; Thompson, 1992;).

What teachers believe about one area of schooling (e.g., teaching or curriculum) impacts on practices and beliefs in other important domains (e.g., assessment or learning) (Brown & Rose, 1995; Cheung & Ng, 2000; Cizek, Fitzgerald, Shawn, Rachor, 1995; Dahlin, Watkins & Ekholm, 2001; Delandshere & Jones, 1999; Nespor, 1987; Kagan, 1992; Rex & Nelson, 2004). Their belief systems reflect personal theories about the nature of knowledge and knowing that, in turn, influence teachers' curriculum decision making, teachers' judgments about teaching approaches and the teaching-learning process (Hofer & Pintrich, 1997; Lovat & Smith, 1995; Pajares, 1992; Artzt & Armour-Thomas, 1996; Bas, 2013).

Curriculum orientations are considered as major aspects of the twenty-first century reform. Although it is generally accepted that there are different curriculum orientations in the curriculum literature, bout how much teachers are familiar with these curriculum orientations or how doctrinal curriculum orientations are documented, Not well reported over the world (with the exception of the United States, Hong Kong, and South Korea; Quoted from Ashour et al , 2012).

Today, these reform plans have not been fully effective, because none of them are focused on important parts of the curriculum that constitutes the teacher's belief, thinking, or philosophy about the ultimate goal of the curriculum that in the literature of the curriculum Mentioned as curriculum orientations. In the curriculum literature, it is well-documented that all people who are active in the school system have a type of thinking or belief about nature and purpose of the curriculum .(Eisner, 1985; Eisner and Vallance 1974; Schubert, 1986; Tanner and Tanner 1995). These curriculum orientations may shape the teachers' thinking about curriculum content, expected competencies, curriculum orientations (goals, objectives, and learning activities), educational strategies and evaluation strategies (Cheung & Wong, 2002; Schubert, 1986). Curriculum orientations may also influence students because the underlying values and beliefs of each orientation not only influence what is taught, but also how and why it is taught (Eisner 2002).

The current research was conducted at the University of Kurdistan. Located in south of Sanandaj, this university is the largest university in the Iranian province of Kurdistan. The University of Kurdistan was ranked as the eighth top university in Iran (categorized by quantity and quality of research activities) in the 2007-2008 academic year, and it was ranked as the first top developing university in Iran in the 2006-2007[1] academic year. The university began its activity in the autumn of 1974 as *The Supreme Training College of Sanandaj* and for the first time accepted students in Math major. In the autumn of 1976 the college became a branch of Razi University and began accepting students in Chemistry and English language in addition to Math. In the winter of 1976 it also accepted students in Persian Language and Literature and continued its educational activities. In 1991 the Iranian Ministry of Science, Research and Technology recognized the College as an independent university: University of Kurdistan.[2] Since then, various majors have been added to the university's education list. University of Kurdistan has 7 faculties (Faculty of Science; Faculty of Literature and foreign languages; Faculty of Humanities and social sciences; Faculty of Engineering; Faculty of Agriculture; Faculty of Natural Resource; Faculty of Art and Architecture) and 42 departments. Apart from undergraduates student (in over 100 fields of study), now the University accepts graduate students (MA/Sc. and Ph.D.) in more than 50 fields of study.

In the literature of curriculum studies several types of classified orientations have emerged which can be presented as follows:

-        *Eisner* & Valance (1974) have given rise to four curriculum orientations that have been named as cognitive development, academic rationalism, self-actualization and social reconstruction.

-        *Schubert (1986) offers an orientation classification, in his book entitled " Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility", which includes* intellectual traditionalism, social behaviorism and experimentalism.

-        Kliebard and Herbert (2004) speak about four categories of orientations when they wrote their book, *"The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958 ". They include:* Humanist (or mental disciplinarians); Social Efficiency; Developmental mentalist (or child study); Social Meliorist.

-        Ornstein and Hunkins (2009) Introduced a new classification of curriculum orientation which includes Technical-Scientific Approaches: Behavioral Approach (Bobbitt, Charters, Tyler, Taba); Managerial Approach (William Alexander, Robert Anderson, Leslee Bishop, John McNeil, Arthur Lewis, Gerald Firth); Systems Approach (George Beauchamp); Academic Approach (Boyd Bode, Henry Morison); and Nontechnical-Nonscientific Approaches: Humanistic Approach (Harold Rugg, William Kilpatrick, Francis Parker, Charles Judd, John Dewey); Reconceptualist Approach (George Counts, Harold Benjamin, Harold Rugg; William Pinar, Michael Apple).

So we can say that in this area there are several categories that reflect the diversity of how the curriculum, the learner and the nature of learning have been viewed. Cheung (2000) presented another classification of curriculum orientations that has been shown in Table 1. Inspired by categories of curriculum orientation mentioned, Cheung & Wong (2002) identified five curriculum orientations: Cognitive Process; Curriculum as Technology

---

[1] . https://www.uniref.ir/University79
[2] . https://en.uok.ac.ir/EN.aspx

(Behavioral); Curriculum for Self-actualization (Humanistic); Curriculum for Social Reconstruction; and Academic Rationalism. In this study, the classification has been selected based on Chang and Wang (2002), and their data collection tools have been adapted to conduct the research.

The aim of this study was to evaluate the educational beliefs of the academic members of University of Kurdistan to determine their curriculum orientation types. Another goal of the study was to investigate the relationship between staff's specialized subject areas (humanities and social sciences, science, engineering and technical fields) and their curriculum orientations.

Methodology

This study is a quantitative, non-experimental, descriptive study. The population of the present study included all faculty members (full-time) in University of Kurdistan (200 people). Due to the limited number of the participants, the census method was used. Another element was selecting a tool for collecting the data. In this respect, when the related literature was reviewed, it was seen that many studies have been conducted to determine the curriculum orientations favored by teachers both on a national basis and on an international basis (Ashour et al, 2012; Cheung & Ng, 2000; Crummey, 2007; Foil, 2008; Horn, 2011; Jenkins, 2009; Reding, 2008; Van Driel et al, 2008; Wang, Elicker, & McMullen, 2008).

Table 1. Example of Curriculum Orientations by the Hypothesized Educators

Source	Orientations to curriculum
Longstreet & Shane (1993)	Society-oriented Child-oriented Knowledge-centered Eclectic
McNeil(l996)	Humanistic Social reconstructionist Technological Academic subject
Miller (1983)	Behavioral Subject/disciplines Social Developmental Cognitive processes Humanistic Trans personal/holistic
Pratt (1994)	Cultural transmission Social transformation Individual fulfillment Feminist pedagogy
Schubert (1986)	Intellectual/traditionalist Social/behaviorist Experimentalist
Vallance (1986)	Cognitive processes Curriculum as technology Social reconstruction-relevance Academic rationalism Personal success Personal commitment to learning

In all of these studies, conducted on national and international scales, it was seen that the "curriculum orientations inventory (COI)" developed by Cheung and Wong (2002) and modified by Mahlios, Rice and Thomas (2004) was used. So the data collected in this research is based on the participants' responses to the modified version of Curriculum Orientation Inventory (COI) developed to measure the five curriculum

orientations of colleges' staff with six questions addressing each orientation using a stricter viewpoint regarding the intent, content and organization.

Results and Discussion

Before discussing the results of the study, the statistical aspect of the variables was calculated. The results have been shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Mean and standard deviation of Variables (curriculum orientations)

Variable (curriculum orientations)	Min	Max	Mean	standard deviation
Cognitive Process	15.00	30.00	25.07	3.029
Curriculum as Technology (Behavioral)	11.00	30.00	20.36	3.924
Social Reconstruction	7.00	30.00	21.87	4.121
Academic Rationalism	10.00	30.00	22.97	3.917
Self-actualization (Humanistic)	12.00	30.00	21.90	3.686

Inferential statistics

Q1: What kind of curriculum orientation (focusing on the core elements of the curriculum orientation of college staff - intent, content, organization) is dominant?

Table 3. Friedman test for the curriculum orientation

Variable (curriculum orientations)	Rating Mean	Chi (X²)	df	Sig.
Cognitive Process	4.12			
Curriculum as Technology (Behavioral)	2.09			
Social Reconstruction	00.001	191.47	4	2.85
Academic Rationalism	3.25			
Self-actualization (Humanistic)	2.67			

The data in table 3 suggests that the significant level of difference between the curriculum orientation means is less than 0/05. It shows that the means of curriculum orientation of the respondents are not the same. Based on the observed average rating, and the cognitive processes with an average rating of 4.14, the dominant orientation of the faculty staff are academic rationalism and social reconstruction respectively.

Q2: What is the curriculum Orientation of the staff regarding the curriculum content?

Table 4. Friedman test for staff orientation regarding the content of curriculum

Variable (curriculum orientations)	Rating Mean	Chi (X²)	df	Sig.
Cognitive Process	3.66			
Curriculum as Technology (Behavioral)	2.70			
Social Reconstruction	00.001	140.06	4	2.91
Academic Rationalism	3.54			
Self-actualization (Humanistic)	2.20			

As shown in Table 4, the significant level of difference between staff orientation means, regarding the curriculum content, is less than 0/05. It shows that the means of staff orientation regarding to curriculum content are not the same. The highest average rating belongs to cognitive orientation (3.66). Social Reconstruction and Academic Rationalism are the second and third more frequent orientations.

Q3: What is the curriculum Orientation of the staff regarding the curriculum organization?

Table 5. Friedman test for staff orientation regarding the curriculum organization

Variable (curriculum orientations)	Rating Mean	Chi (X²)	df	Sig.
Cognitive Process			3.49	
Curriculum as Technology (Behavioral)			2.28	
Social Reconstruction	00.001	98.53	4	2.81
Academic Rationalism			3.28	
Self-actualization (Humanistic)			3.15	

Friedman test results (table 5) show that the significant level of difference between staff orientation means regarding the curriculum organization is less than 0/05, and this represents the difference between the staff's orientations about organization of the curriculum. Cognitive Process Orientation (with a mean rating of 3.49) is a prevailing curriculum orientation among the staff's curriculum orientations with regard to curriculum organization.

Q4: Is there a significant relationship between staff Study subjects and the type of curriculum orientation?

To answer this question Box's M tests was used. Analysis results showed that the significance level of M test is less than 0/05, so the assumption of equality of variances is rejected (table 6).

Table 6. Box's M tests results

Box's M	df1	df2	F	P12
132.02	75	617.51	1.54	0.002

Failing to confirm the assumption, the researcher used Pillai's trace test. This test is used quite often because of its power and robustness. Pillai proposed the trace test for the following three tests: (a) equality of mean vectors of *p*-variate normal distributions with the common but unknown covariance matrix, (b) independence between two sets of variates distributed jointly as a normal distribution with unknown mean vector, and (c) equality of covariance matrices of two *p*-variate normal distributions with unknown mean vectors (DasGupta, 2005).

Table 7. Multivariate Tests result

source	Pillai's trace	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.
intercept	0.985	256.388	5.00	190.00	.0000
group	0.5200	4.504	25.000	970.000	.0000

The result shows that the significance level for linear combination means differences of curriculum orientation types is less than 0.05, so with 95% confidence the null hypothesis is rejected. We conclude that orientations of college staff with different areas of expertise are not the same. To assess the relationship between staff expertise and their curriculum orientation, one-way ANOVA was used (table 8)

Table 8. One-way ANOVA Tests result

source	variable	SS	df	MS	F	p
Group	Cognitive Process	115.435	5	23.087	2.619	.0260
	Behavioral	129.308	5	25.862	1.709	.1340
	Social Reconstruction	967.297	5	193.459	15.552	.0000
	Academic Rationalism	113.679	5	22.736	1.500	.1920
	Humanistic	273.532	5	54.706	4.365	.0010
Error	Cognitive Process	1710.440	194	8.817		
	Behavioral	2935.047	194	15.129		
	Social Reconstruction	2413.323	194	12.440		
	Academic Rationalism	2940.686	194	15.158		
	Humanistic	2431.349	194	12.533		
total	Cognitive Process	127577.000	200			
	Behavioral	86011.000	200			
	Social Reconstruction	99040.000	200			
	Academic Rationalism	108609.000	200			
	Humanistic	98657.845	200			

As can be seen in Table 8, significance level of cognitive processes orientation, the social reconstruction and humanism is less than 0.05. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected with 95% confidence and thus curriculum orientations of faculty members, according to their field of study (specialty), are not the same. To take a closer look at these differences Turkey test was used for the three orientations (mentioned above) .

Table 9. Results of Turkey test for cognitive orientation

Department (I)	Areas of expertise(J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Social sciences and Humanities	literature	-1.3021	1.00511	0.787	-4.1952	1.5910
	art	-.0521	1.12034	1.000	-3.2769	3.1727
	agricultural	-.4815	.65189	.977	-2.3579	1.3949
	Engineering	.5916	.76128	.971	-1.5997	2.7829
	Science	1.1626	.65189	.479	-.7138	3.0390
Literature and linguistics	humanities'	1.3021	1.00511	.787	-1.5910	4.1952
	art	1.2500	1.30934	.931	-2.5188	5. 0188
	agricultural	.8206	.94030	.953	-1.8860	3.5272
	Engineering	1.8937	1.01919	.431	-1.0400	4.8273
	Science	2.4647	.94030	.097	-.2419	5.1713
Art	humanities'	.0521	1.12034	1.000	-3.1727	3.2769
	Literature and linguistics	-1.2500	1.30934	.931	-5.0188	2.5188
	Agriculture	-.4294	1.06258	.999	-3.4879	2.6292
	Engineering	.6437	1.13299	.993	-2.6175	3.9049
	Science	1.2147	1.06258	.863	-1.8439	4.2732
Agricultural sciences	humanities'	.4815	.65189	.977	-1.3949	2.3579
	Literature and linguistics	-.8206	.94030	.953	-3.5272	1.8860
	art	.4294	1.06258	.999	-2.6292	3.4879
	Engineering	1.0731	.67339	.604	-.8653	3.0114
	Science	1.6441*	.54669	.035	.0705	3.2177
Engineering	humanities'	-.5916	.76128	.971	-2.7829	1.5997
	Literature and linguistics	-1.8937	1.01919	.431	-4.8273	1.0400
	art	-.6437	1.13299	.993	-3.9049	2.6175
	agricultural	-1.0731	.67339	.604	-3.0114	.8653
	Science	.5710	.67339	.958	-1.3673	2.5093

The results of Table 9 show that there is a significant difference between the faculty members of Faculty of Science and Basic Sciences is less than 0.05. It can be said that due to direction of the difference, the mean of cognitive orientation in agriculture faculty is higher than the Sciences Faculty Members'.

Table 10. Results of Tukey test for social reconstruction orientation

Department (I)	Areas of expertise(J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Social Sciences and humanities science	literature	4.4167*	1.19390	.004	.9801	7.8532
	art	2.9722	1.33077	.227	-.8583	6.8027
	agricultural	2.8178*	.77433	.005	.5889	5.0466
	Engineering	5.7155*	.90427	.000	3.1126	8.3184
	Science	6.1737*	.77433	.000	3.9449	8.4026
Literature and linguistics	humanities'	-4.4167*	1.19390	.004	-7.8532	-.9801
	art	-1.4444	1.55527	.939	-5.9212	3.0323
	agricultural	-1.5989	1.11691	.708	-4.8138	1.6161
	Engineering	1.2989	1.21062	.892	-2.1858	4.7835
	Science	1.7571	1.11691	.617	-1.4579	4.9720
Art	humanities'	-2.9722	1.33077	.227	-6.8027	.8583
	Literature and	1.4444	1.55527	.939	-3.0323	5.9212

	linguistic					
	agricultural	-.1544	1.26216	1.000	-3.7875	3.4786
	Engineering	2.7433	1.34579	.325	-1.1305	6.6171
	Science	3.2015	1.26216	.119	-.4315	6.8345
Agricultural sciences	humanities'	-2.8178*	.77433	.005	-5.0466	-.5889
	Literature and linguistic	1.5989	1.11691	.708	-1.6161	4.8138
	art	.1544	1.26216	1.000	-3.4786	3.7875
	Engineering	2.8977*	.79988	.005	.5953	5.2001
	Science	3.3559*	.64938	.000	1.4868	5.2251
Engineering	humanities'	-5.7155*	.90427	.000	-8.3184	-3.1126
	Literature and linguistic	-1.2989	1.21062	.892	-4.7835	2.1858
	art	-2.7433	1.34579	.325	-6.6171	1.1305
	agricultural	-2.8977*	.79988	.005	-5.2001	-.5953
	Science	.4582	.79988	.993	-1.8442	2.7606

The results (table 10) show that the Social reconstruction orientation's mean is higher in Humanities Faculty compared with literature, agriculture, engineering and science faculties. Also, the mean of agricultural faculty is higher than engineering and science faculty.

Table 11: Results of Tukey test for Humanistic orientation

Department (I)	Areas of expertise(J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Social sciences and humanities'	literature	.8854	1.19835	.977	-2.5639	4.3348
	art	1.3299	1.33573	.919	-2.5149	5.1747
	agricultural	2.9476*	.77722	.003	.7104	5.1847
	Engineering	2.9429*	.90764	.017	.3303	5.5555
	Science	3.0712*	.77722	.002	.8340	5.3083
Literature and linguistics	humanities'	-.8854	1.19835	.977	-4.3348	2.5639
	art	.4444	1.56106	1.000	-4.0490	4.9378
	agricultural	2.0621	1.12108	.443	-1.1648	5.2891
	Engineering	2.0575	1.21514	.538	-1.4402	5.551
	Science	2.1858	1.12108	.375	-1.0412	5./4127
Art	humanities'	-1.3299	1.33573	.919	-5.1747	2.5149
	Literature and linguistic	-.4444	1.56106	1.000	-4.9378	4.0490
	agricultural	1.6177	1.26686	.797	-2.0289	5.2643
	Engineering	1.6130	1.35081	.839	-2.2752	5.5012
	Science	1.7413	1.26686	.742	-1.9053	5.3879
Agricultural sciences	humanities'	-2.9476*	.77722	.003	-5.1847	-.7104
	Literature and linguistic	-2.0621	1.12108	.443	-5.2891	1.1648
	art	-1.6177	1.26686	.797	-5.2643	2.0289
	Engineering	-.0047	.80286	1.000	-2.3156	2.3063
	Science	.1236	.65180	1.000	-1.7525	1.9998
Engineering	humanities'	-2.9429*	.90764	.017	-5.5555	-.3303
	Literature and linguistic	-2.0575	1.21514	.538	-5.5551	1.4402
	art	-1.6130	1.35081	.839	-5.5012	2.2752
	agricultural	.0047	.80286	1.000	-2.3063	2.3156
	Science	.1283	.80286	1.000	-2.1827	2.4393

Results of Table 12 show that Humanistic orientation among the members of Social Sciences and Humanities faculties, compared with agricultural, Engineering and Science faculties has a higher mean.

Conclusion

Years ago, Herbert Spencer (1859) raised one of the most important and most fundamental questions in the field of education: "What knowledge is most valuable?" This question is apparently simple but not easy to answer (Jenkins, 2009). To answer to that, Spencer said it is the knowledge needed to pursue the leading kinds of activity which constitute human life. He wrote: [These activities] may be naturally arranged into: " those activities which directly minister to self-preservation; 2) those activities which, by securing the necessaries of life, indirectly administer to self-preservation; 3) those activities which have for their end the rearing and discipline of offspring; 4) those activities which are involved in the maintenance of proper social and political relations; 5) those miscellaneous activities which fill up the leisure part of life, devoted to the gratification of the tastes and feelings (spencer, 1861)."

The main question is what the basis of the classification provided by Spencer is and what is the basis for it? What is certain is that the various elements could affect the answer to Spencer's question. Social conditions, social dominant philosophy, values and who determines these values, and other issues (such as: Whether these values are fixed or variable? How a value is generated? How they survive and are transmitted?) can affect the answer to this question. Another question is - Following Spencer- If the necessities of life are considered as factors which affect the evaluation of knowledge, are the needs of society - with all the different social, economic and cultural bases- the same? As noted by Ralph Tyler, the answer to Spencer's question is a value judgment (Tanner and Tanner 1995), and values stem from deeply held personal beliefs. Schubert (1986) notes that the tie between philosophy and education is most evident in the curriculum, as curricula are the practical application of personal beliefs.

Teachers as a key factor in curriculum, their attitudes, beliefs and teacher education approaches can be effective in shaping curricula. What counts most is our answer to these questions: What is the nature of learning? What is the nature of learner- as human?

Since Tyler offered his curriculum model, setting the "Education *objectives*" has become one of the main elements of the curriculum. But what is important is the determination of the basic source from which the objectives can be derived: students' needs, the community's needs or the subject matter? Any decision in this area includes the curriculum orientation of the educators. The significance of this research is based on the importance of the faculty members and their role in determining the level of performance, success or failure of the curriculum. The results include some noteworthy points. First, each individual educator, willingly or unwillingly, because of their choices in the selection of the content to educate, the way they organize the content, implement the curriculum, and assess their learners, prefers a specific curriculum orientation and education program and follows the framework of that orientation. Secondly, there is a direct relationship between the individual's orientation and his field of study (specialty) in such a way that the dominant forms of collegiate in social sciences and humanities are humanistic, cognitive process and social reconstruction orientations. However, the staff of science and technical faculties prefer behavioral orientation. Other key findings of this study identify opportunities for further research. Specifically, it would be of value to discover the nature and the extent of the differences between Faculty members at different levels (assistants or associated professors and professors) and faculty members of different genders and experiences. Additionally, the results show a significant difference among faculty members with different specialties. Curriculum orientations of faculty members, according to their field of study (specialty), are not the same. To take a closer look at these differences, Tukey test was used for the three orientations (mentioned above) .The results showed a significant difference between the Agricultural Sciences faculty members and the Science faculty which was is less than 0.05. It can be said that due to the direction of the difference, the mean of cognitive orientation in Agricultural Sciences faculty is higher than the Sciences faculty .Finally, based on the results of the data analysis, the orientation of Humanistic among Social Sciences and Humanities' faculty Members, compared with agricultural, Engineering and Science Faculties, has a higher mean. After determining the faculty members' curriculum orientation; one of the results of this study, by the request of university officials and to learn Faculties about the curriculum, the

role of them in decision making about that, factors of curriculum process, etc., organized training courses and workshops.

References

Artzt, A., F, & Armour-Thomas, E. (1996). Evaluation of instructional practice in the secondary school mathematics classroom. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Ashour, R., Khasawneh, S., Abu-Alruz, J., & Alsharqawi, S. (2012). Curriculum orientations of pre-service teachers in Jordan: A required reform initiative for Professional development. Teacher Development, 16 (3), 345-360.

Balderston, A., J. (2000). Knowledge & University. Innovative Higher Education, Vol. 26, No, 1.

Bas, G. (2013). Curriculum Design Orientations Preference Scale of Teachers: Validity and Reliability Study. Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice - 13(2): 981-991.

Brown, D. F. & Rose, T.D. (1995). Self-Reported Classroom Impact of Teachers' Theories about Learning and Obstacles to Implementation. Action in Teacher Education, 17(1), 20-29.

Bruner, J. (1960). The process of education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Calderhead, J. (1996). Teachers: beliefs and knowledge, in: D.C. Berliner & R.C. Calfee(Eds) Handbook of Educational Psychology, 708–725 (New York, Simon & Schuster Macmillian)

Cheung, D, & Wong H. (2002). Measuring teacher beliefs about alternative curriculum designs. The Curriculum Journal. 13(2): 225-248.

Cheung, D. (2000). Measuring Teachers' Meta-Orientations to Curriculum: Application of Hierarchical Confirmatory Factor Analysis. The Journal of Experimental Education, 68:2, 149-165. To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220970009598500

Cheung, D., & Ng, P. H. (2000). Science teachers' beliefs about curriculum design. Research in Science Education, 30: 357–75.

Cizek, G. J., Fitzgerald, S., Shawn, M., & Rachor, R. E. (1995). Teachers' assessment practices: Preparation, isolation and the kitchen sink. Educational Assessment, 3: 159-179.

Clark, C. M., & Peterson, P. L. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In Wittrock, M. (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching. New York: Macmillan.

Connelly, F. M. (1972). The functions of curriculum development. Interchange, 3(2 & 3): 61-77.

Constantin, C. (2013). The necessity to improve quality to improve quality inhigher education services: case of Romania. Polish journal of management studies, Vol 8: 57-65.

Crummey, M. A. (2007). Curriculum orientations of alternative education teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas the Graduate School, Kansas. Retrieved January 28, 2010, from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses database. (Publication No. AAT 3297623)

Dahlin, B., Watkins, D. A., & Ekholm, M. (2001). The role of assessment in student learning: The views of Hong Kong and Swedish lecturers. In D. A. Watkins & J. B. Biggs (Eds.), teaching the Chinese learner: Psychological and pedagogical perspectives. (pp. 47-74). Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong, Comparative Education Research Centre.

DasGupta, S. (2005). Pillai's trace test. Encyclopedia of Biostatistics. Published Online: 15 JUL. DOI: 10.1002/0470011815.b2a13067

Delandshere, G., & Jones J. H. (1999). Elementary teachers' beliefs about assessment and mathematics: A case of as assessment paralysis. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 14(3): 216-240.

Dow, P. (1991). Schoolhouse politics, Lessons from the Sputnik Era. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Eisner, E. & Vallance, E. (1974). Five conceptions of curriculum: their roots and implications for curriculum planning, in Eisner, E. and Vallance, E. (eds.) Conflicting conceptions of curriculum. California: Mc Cutchan Publishing Corp.: 1-18.

Eisner, E. (1985). Five basic orientations to the curriculum. In the educational imagination: on the design and evaluation of school programs'. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Eisner, E. (2002). The Educational Imagination on the Design and Evaluation of School Programs (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Foil, J. (2008). Determining the curriculum orientations of public school administrators using the modified curriculum orientation inventory. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas the Graduate School, Kansas.

Hofer, B. K., & Pintrich, P. R. (1997). The development of epistemological theories: beliefs about knowledge and knowing and their relation to learning. Review of Educational Research, 67, 88– 140.

Horn, N. (2011). Curriculum orientation of virtual teachers: A basic interpretive study of secondary teachers' development of curriculum orientations. In M. Koehler, & P. Mishra, (Eds.), Proceedings of society for information technology and teacher education international conference (pp. 1857-1860). Chesepeake, VA: AACE.

Jenkins, S. B. (2009). Measuring teacher beliefs about curriculum orientations using the Modified-curriculum orientations inventory. The Curriculum Journal Vol. 20, No. 2, June 2009, 103–120.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. Educational Psychologist, 27(1), 65-90.

Karami, M., bahmanabadi, S., & esmaili, A. (2012). optimal decision making structure of the curriculum of higher education: the perspective of faculty and curriculum experts. Research on curriculum planning, Volume II, No. 7, 92-104. (In Persian)

Kliebard, H. (2004). The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Longstreet, W. S., & Shane, H. G. (1993). Curriculum for a new millennium. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Lovat, T., Smith D. (1995). Curriculum: Action on Reflection Revisited (3rd edn). Sydney: Social Science Press.

Mahlios, M., S., Rice, & K. Thomas. (2004). Teachers' views of curriculum: the hedgehog v. the fox. Thirty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Educational Studies Association, November 3–7, in Kansas City, Missouri.

Maleki, H, & Salimi, J. (2017). Interdisciplinary curriculum in higher education (Basics, Principles, Approaches and Patterns) .2 edition, Tehran: SAMT publication. (In Persian)

McLaughlin, M. W., & Marsh, D. D. (1978). Staff development and school change. Teachers College Record, 80 (I): 69-94.

McNeil, J. D. (1996). Curriculum: A comprehensive introduction (5th Ed.). New York: HarperCollins.

Miller, J., P. (1983). The education spectrum: Orientations to curriculum. New York: Longman.

Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19:317-328.

Ornstein, A., & Hunkins, F. (2009).Curriculum: Foundations, Principles, and Issues (Fifth Edition). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Pajares, M., F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. Review of Educational Research, 62(3): 307- 332.

Pratt, D. (1994). Curriculum planning: A handbook for professionals. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.

Rex, L. A., & Nelson, M. C. (2004). How teachers' professional identities position high-stakes test preparation in their classrooms. Teachers College Record, 106(6): 1288-1331.

Schubert, W. H. (1986). Curriculum: Perspective, paradigm, and possibility. New York: Macmillan.

Schwab, J. J. (1973). The practical 3: Translation into curriculum. School Review, 8i, 50I-522.

Spencer, H. (1861). Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical. London, Williams and Norgate. Reprinted in 1932 with an Introduction by F.A. Cavenagh. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Tanner, D., & Tanner. L. (1995) Curriculum development: Theory into practice (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill.

Thompson, A. G. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and conceptions: A synthesis of the research. In D. A. Grouws (Ed.), Handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning (pp. 127-146). New York: MacMillan.

Vallance, E. (1986). A second look at conflicting conceptions of curriculum. Theory into Practice, 25:24-30.

Van Driel, Jan H., Astrid, M. W. Bulte, & Nico, V. (2008) Using the curriculum emphasis concept to investigate teachers' curricular beliefs in the context of educational reform. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 40, 1, 107–122.