

Original Article

## Evaluation of Paradigmatic Interests of Faculty Members in the Field of Curriculum Studies: An Approach to Study of Science Philosophy

Rahmatollah Marzooghi\*  
Fatemeh Karimi\*\*  
Mehdi Mohammadi\*\*\*  
Maryam shafiei sarvestani\*\*\*\*  
Sosan Jabbari\*\*\*\*\*

### Introduction

Sciences are the main agents of development in the curriculum field according to their philosophical orientations or paradigmatic interests. Therefore, recognizing their paradigmatic interests and approaches can determine their educational, research, and publication orientations. It can also define the paradigmatic direction of science development in the field of Curriculum Studies .

### Methodology

The aim of this descriptive-survey study was to recognize the paradigmatic interest of the faculty members in the field of Curriculum Studies. After calculating the reliability and validity of the instruments, paradigmatic interest of faculty members were studied based on the five Critical, Interpretative, Post-modern, Positivist, and Islamic paradigms with regard to the six paradigmatic assumptions about Ontology, Anthropology, Epistemology, Methodology, Education and Curriculum .The participants of the study were included all the faculty members of the field of Curriculum Studies in all Iranian state universities, 58 of whom chosen by a convenience sampling method.

### Results

Analyzing the results by using the Friedman inferential tests revealed that

---

\* Professor, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.

\*\* Ph.D. Student, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.

Corresponding Author: [fatemeh61karimi@yahoo.com](mailto:fatemeh61karimi@yahoo.com)

\*\*\* Associate Professor, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.

\*\*\*\* Assistant Professor, Shiraz University, Shiraz, Iran.

in the five paradigmic assumptions, Islamic paradigm had the highest mean, and in content and ontological assumptions, Critical paradigm had the highest mean, and in the dimensions of teaching strategies and aims, Interpretative paradigm had the highest mean among the faculty members of Curriculum Studies. Moreover, the results and analysis of variance of repeated measures showed that although there was a significant difference between the approaches of faculty members toward the five paradigms, they did not have a dominant paradigm orientations.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the research findings, it can be claimed that there is no paradigmic coherence among the faculty members of curriculum studies, and they have not a fixed approach in their paradigmic assumptions with regard to ontology, epistemology, anthropology, methodology, education and curriculum elements. Therefore, it can lead to some contradictions in the faculty members theoretical viewpoints, research and educational approaches. The findings also showed that faculty members do not have a dominant paradigm and one paradigm cannot be selected as the main paradigm with certainty. However, it can be generally stated that the faculty members mostly tended to adhere to Islamic and Critical paradigms. Anyway, the final conclusion is that Curriculum studies teachers lack coherence in their paradigmatic interests. It is evident that this lack of coherence can contribute to various consequences in research, education and development of Curriculum Studies field, as development of science, education and research is usually based on paradigmatic bases and criteria. Therefore, if there is no such coherence, the science development process of Curriculum Studies face conflicts and fluctuations, the results of which will appear in the books, studies, translated pieces of work, students' guidance and MA theses. This creates theoretical and paradigmatic problems for the development of curriculum studies. It can show theoretical and practical syncretism in the field of curriculum studies.

**Keywords:** Paradigm- paradigmic interest- faculty members- curriculum studies- Philosophy of Science.

---

**Author Contributions:** Dr. Rahmatollah Marzooghi was responsible for leading the overall research process. Fatemeh Karimi was responsible for compiling theoretical framework, data collection, conclusion, generalization, interpretation and report, and writing the article. Dr. Mahdi Mohammadi was responsible for data analysis. Dr. Maryam Shafei Sarvestani and Dr. Sosan Jabbari were responsible for research consultancy.

**Acknowledgments:** The authors thank all faculty members in the field of Curriculum Studies who helped us in this research.

**Conflicts of interest:** The authors declare there is no conflict of interest in this article.

**Funding:** the study was financially supported by Shiraz University.

---