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The appropriate adoption of curriculum orientation when designing learning outcome-based curriculum is important in order to ensure the success of Outcome-based Education at Malaysian public universities. In regard to the necessity, a question is raised: Do public university educators adopt the appropriate orientation when designing such curriculum? Although Outcome-based Education is deemed to set the appropriate orientation on designing the learning outcome-based curriculum at public universities, the next challenge is how to make sure the orientation is adopted for such curriculum. For this reason, this study examines curriculum orientation when designing curriculum by administering questionnaires to 506 PhD-qualified educators from 11 public universities in Malaysia. The questionnaire included items from the Curriculum Orientation Inventory along with questions that
reflected age, gender, academic position, field of expertise and years of experience. Descriptive and inferential statistics such as ANOVA, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, and MANOVA were used to answer the research questions. The results revealed that the ‘cognitive process’ \((M=4.13, SD=0.52)\) and ‘curriculum as technology’ \((M=4.11, SD=0.57)\) were the dominant curriculum orientations of Malaysian public university educators when designing curriculum. It indicates that university educators adopted the appropriate curriculum orientation when designing curriculum. This study also discovered moderate relationships among curriculum orientations such ‘curriculum as technology’ with ‘academic rationalism’ \((r(504) = 0.67, p < 0.01)\), ‘curriculum as technology’ with the ‘cognitive process’ \((r(504) = 0.67, p < 0.01)\), ‘curriculum as technology’ with ‘social reconstruction relevance’ \((r(504) = 0.47, p < 0.01)\), and ‘curriculum as technology’ with ‘self-actualisation/humanistic’ \((r(504) = 0.49, p < 0.01)\). These relationships indicate that the design process of inculcating the eight domains of learning outcomes stipulated by the Malaysian Qualification Agency (MQA) is moderately oriented for efficiency. In addition, this study found no significant difference between males and females on their curriculum orientations when designing curriculum, especially on the ‘curriculum as technology’ curriculum orientation \((F(5, 500)=1.02, p>0.05;\) Pillai’s trace=0.01; and partial eta squared=0.01). This shows that the orientation adopted by male and female educators when designing curriculum at public universities is the same towards the Outcome Based Education. Overall, it is hoped that findings of this study may create the awareness of how important curriculum orientation is in making sure the success of Outcome-based Education as well as guidelines for university educators’ training on how to adopt the required orientation when designing learning outcome-based curriculum more efficiently in the future. It is
also hoped that the findings of this study can promote later studies on understanding the aspect of curriculum orientation rather than too focused on the managerial and practical aspects of curriculum when designing as well as the other domains of curriculum.
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Pengaplikasian orientasi kurikulum yang sesuai dalam mereka bentuk kurikulum berasaskan hasil adalah penting untuk memastikan Pendidikan Berasaskan Hasil berjaya dilaksanakan di universiti awam tempatan. Namun persoalannya, adakah pendidik universiti awam menerima pakai orientasi yang sesuai apabila mereka bentuk kurikulum berasaskan hasil? Meskipun Pendidikan Berasaskan Hasil menetapkan orientasi yang sesuai kepada pendidik dalam mereka bentuk pembelajaran berasaskan hasil di universiti awam, cabaran seterusnya adalah bagaimana untuk menentukan adakah mereka menerima pakai orientasi tersebut. Oleh itu, kajian ini telah dilaksanakan untuk menentukan orientasi kurikulum pendidik universiti awam tempatan dalam mereka bentuk kurikulum dengan mentadbir soal selidik ke atas 506 pendidik berkelayakan PhD dari 11 buah universiti
Analisis diskriptif dan inferensi seperti ujian ANOVA, Pearson’s Product Moment, dan MANOVA telah digunakan untuk menjawab persoalan-persoalan kajian. Hasil kajian mendapati cognitive process ($M = 4.13, SD = 0.52$) dan curriculum as technology ($M = 4.11, SD = 0.57$) merupakan orentasi kurikulum para pendidik universiti awam Malaysia yang paling dominan dalam mereka bentuk kurikulum. Ini menunjukkan pendidik universiti awam secara amnya menerima pakai orientasi kurikulum yang tepat dalam mereka bentuk kurikulum berasaskan hasil. Hasil kajian juga memperlihatkan hubungan yang sederhana antara orentasi kurikulum curriculum as technology dengan orentasi kurikulum academic rationalisme ($r(504) = 0.67, p<0.01$), orentasi kurikulum curriculum as technology dengan orentasi kurikulum cognitive process ($r(504) = 0.67, p<0.01$), orentasi curriculum as technology dengan orentasi kurikulum social reconstruction relevance ($r(504) = 0.47, p<0.01$), dan orentasi curriculum as technology dengan self-actualisation/humanistic ($r(504) = 0.49, p<0.01$). Dapatan tersebut menunjukkan bahawa proses mereka bentuk pemupukan lapan domain hasil pembelajaran yang ditetapkan oleh Agensi Kelayakan Malaysia (MQA) adalah berorientasi secara sederhana ke arah efisiensi. Selanjutnya, dapatan kajian mendapati tiada perbezaan yang signifikan tentang pilihan antara lelaki dan perempuan dalam mereka bentuk kurikulum berdasarkan orentasi kurikulum, terutamanya terhadap orientasi curriculum as technology ($F(5, 500) = 1.02, p> 0.05; Pillai’s Trace= 0.01; partial eta squared=0.01$). Ini menunjukkan orientasi mereka bentuk kurikulum para pendidik lelaki dan perempuan di universiti awam ke arah Pendidikan Berasaskan Hasil adalah sama. Secara keseluruhan, adalah diharapkan bahawa dapatan kajian memberi kesedaran tentang pentingnya orientasi kurikulum dalam memastikan kejayaan Pendidikan berasaskan Hasil, dan dapatan ini dijadikan garis panduan
untuk melatih pendidik universiti dalam mereka bentuk kurikulum berasaskan hasil pembelajaran yang lebih efisien kelak. Selain itu, dapatan kajian juga diharapkan dapat menggalakkan kajian untuk memahami aspek orientasi kurikulum dalam mereka bentuk dan domain kurikulum yang lain selain terlalu memberi tumpuan kepada aspek pengurusan dan praktikal kurikulum di masa hadapan.
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