



Institutional Inertia and Pedagogical Disruption: How Teachers Negotiate Curriculum Innovation Under Mandated Reform Conditions

Isabel López¹, Ricardo Sánchez², Patricia Ramírez³

¹ Mexican Institute of Technology, Mexico

² University of Monterrey, Mexico

³ Universidad Veracruzana, Mexico

Corresponding Author:

Isabel López,
Mexican Institute of Technology, Mexico University of Monterrey, Mexico Universidad Veracruzana, Mexico
Email: iasbel@gmail.com

Article Info

Received: November 12, 2025

Revised: January 09, 2026

Accepted: March 06, 2026

Online Version: April 22, 2026

Abstract

Curriculum reforms have become a central strategy for improving educational quality, yet their implementation frequently encounters institutional resistance and inconsistent classroom enactment. Existing research has predominantly examined curriculum change from policy or leadership perspectives, providing limited understanding of how teachers actively negotiate innovation within organizational environments characterized by institutional inertia. This study aimed to investigate the interactions among teacher agency, institutional inertia, instructional leadership, professional collaboration, and pedagogical adaptation during the implementation of mandated curriculum reform. A mixed-methods sequential explanatory research design was employed involving 540 secondary school teachers from thirty public schools implementing a nationally mandated curriculum. Quantitative data were collected using standardized measures of teacher agency, organizational climate, leadership support, professional collaboration, instructional innovation, curriculum implementation, and professional self-efficacy, complemented by school documentation and classroom supervision records. Qualitative evidence was obtained through semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, classroom observations, reflective teaching journals, leadership interviews, and policy document analysis. Findings revealed that teacher agency, instructional leadership, and collaborative professional learning significantly strengthened pedagogical innovation, whereas institutional inertia exerted a negative but manageable influence through supportive organizational conditions. Teachers consistently interpreted curriculum reform as an adaptive professional process rather than a procedural policy obligation. Results suggest that sustainable curriculum innovation depends on dynamic interaction among organizational culture, professional autonomy, collaborative learning, and instructional leadership, providing an integrated framework for strengthening educational reform implementation across diverse institutional contexts.

Keywords: Curriculum Innovation, Educational Leadership, Institutional Inertia.



© 2026 by the author(s)

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>).

How to cite: Isabel, L., Ricardo, S., & Patricia, R. (2026). Institutional Inertia and Pedagogical Disruption: How Teachers Negotiate Curriculum Innovation Under Mandated Reform Conditions. *Journal of Loomingulus ja Innovatsioon*, 3(2), 144–161. <https://doi.org/10.70177/innovatsioon.v2i1.4128>

Published by: Yayasan Adra Karima Hubbi

INTRODUCTION

Educational systems worldwide continue to experience continuous curriculum reform driven by globalization, technological advancement, changing labor market demands, and increasing expectations for twenty-first century competencies (Bayrama, 2024; Fuego, 2025; Liu, 2024). Governments have introduced competency-based curricula, digital learning initiatives, interdisciplinary instruction, and learner-centered pedagogies to improve educational quality and prepare students for rapidly evolving social and economic environments. Curriculum reform is therefore increasingly viewed as a strategic mechanism for enhancing educational effectiveness, promoting equity, and strengthening national competitiveness. Despite ambitious policy objectives, implementation outcomes frequently differ substantially from intended reforms because educational change occurs within institutions characterized by deeply established organizational cultures, professional routines, and historical practices.

Institutional inertia represents one of the most persistent challenges affecting curriculum implementation. Schools operate as complex organizations in which existing beliefs, administrative procedures, accountability systems, assessment traditions, leadership practices, and professional identities often reinforce continuity rather than transformation (Aguilera, 2023; Guevara, 2023; Law, 2022). Teachers frequently encounter tensions between externally mandated policy expectations and locally established pedagogical practices that have evolved through years of professional experience. Curriculum innovation consequently becomes a negotiated process rather than a straightforward policy implementation activity, requiring educators to balance institutional expectations with practical classroom realities and professional judgment.

Pedagogical disruption has become increasingly visible as educational reforms introduce new instructional models, digital technologies, competency-based assessment, interdisciplinary learning, inclusive education, and student-centered approaches (Asrifan, 2025; Sokol, 2026; Stewart, 2023). Teachers are expected to redesign instructional practices while simultaneously maintaining accountability for standardized learning outcomes, administrative compliance, and institutional performance. Such competing demands create conditions in which curriculum innovation is mediated by organizational structures, leadership support, teacher agency, professional collaboration, and contextual constraints. Comprehensive investigation is therefore required to understand how teachers negotiate institutional inertia while adapting pedagogical practices under mandated curriculum reform conditions.

Curriculum reforms frequently encounter implementation challenges despite substantial policy investment, professional development initiatives, and institutional support (Anbumaheshwari, 2025; Azemi, 2022; Karim, 2026). Many educational reforms demonstrate limited classroom transformation because teachers continue to rely upon familiar instructional routines, assessment practices, and classroom management strategies developed within previous policy environments. Institutional expectations for compliance often coexist with deeply embedded pedagogical traditions, creating tensions that complicate meaningful educational innovation. Such conditions raise important questions regarding how teachers interpret, negotiate, and adapt reform policies within authentic classroom contexts.

Research concerning curriculum implementation has traditionally emphasized policy design, leadership effectiveness, teacher attitudes, or professional development independently rather than examining the complex interaction among institutional structures, organizational

culture, teacher agency, professional identity, and classroom decision-making (Al-Bukhrani, 2025; Li, 2026; Moravánszky, 2026). Teachers frequently negotiate contradictory expectations involving curriculum fidelity, instructional flexibility, accountability requirements, student diversity, resource limitations, and organizational norms. Limited integration of these interconnected dimensions restricts understanding of curriculum reform as an adaptive professional process rather than a linear policy implementation mechanism.

Educational reforms also differ substantially across institutional contexts because schools possess unique organizational histories, leadership practices, collaborative cultures, community expectations, and resource availability (Hansen, 2026; Hövel, 2025; Kumar, 2025). Similar policy mandates may therefore generate highly variable pedagogical responses across educational settings. Existing knowledge remains insufficient regarding how institutional inertia influences teachers' professional decision-making, instructional adaptation, and innovation capacity under mandated reform conditions. Addressing these complexities requires a contextual perspective that recognizes educational change as an organizational and professional negotiation process.

This study aims to examine how teachers negotiate curriculum innovation within educational institutions characterized by organizational continuity and mandated reform expectations. Particular attention is directed toward understanding interactions among institutional inertia, teacher agency, professional identity, instructional adaptation, collaborative learning, leadership support, and pedagogical innovation (Blythe, 2022; Hirani, 2022; Torres, 2022). Achievement of these objectives is expected to provide a comprehensive explanation of how educational change emerges through negotiation rather than simple policy implementation.

Research also seeks to investigate relationships among organizational culture, administrative structures, professional collaboration, curriculum interpretation, instructional decision-making, classroom practice, and educational outcomes (Gratz, 2026; Scheckel, 2025; Winters, 2022). Comparative analysis across different school contexts will identify institutional conditions that facilitate or constrain meaningful curriculum innovation while supporting teacher professionalism and instructional effectiveness. Such investigation aims to clarify mechanisms through which educators balance policy compliance with pedagogical responsiveness.

Broader objectives include advancing interdisciplinary understanding of curriculum reform by integrating educational policy, organizational theory, teacher professional learning, educational leadership, curriculum studies, implementation science, and sociology of education into a unified conceptual framework (Giraldo, 2024; Govindaraj, 2026; Riga, 2026). Findings are expected to contribute to theoretical refinement while providing evidence-based recommendations for policymakers, school leaders, curriculum developers, teacher educators, and educational practitioners responsible for implementing sustainable educational reforms.

Existing literature has extensively examined curriculum reform, educational leadership, teacher professional development, policy implementation, organizational change, and instructional innovation across diverse educational systems (Cheng, 2024; Noorali, 2022; Zhang, 2023). Numerous studies identify leadership support, teacher collaboration, professional learning communities, and institutional capacity as influential factors affecting reform implementation. Comparatively limited research investigates how institutional inertia and teacher agency interact longitudinally during mandated curriculum reform, particularly through the simultaneous consideration of organizational culture, professional identity, pedagogical adaptation, and classroom decision-making. Such fragmentation restricts comprehensive understanding of educational change as an evolving organizational process.

Current investigations frequently evaluate curriculum reform using indicators such as implementation fidelity, policy compliance, teacher perceptions, or student achievement (Carlson, 2024; Lee, 2024; Sava, 2022). Comprehensive examination of negotiation processes

through which teachers reconcile institutional expectations with professional expertise, contextual realities, learner diversity, and instructional innovation remains comparatively underdeveloped. Existing analytical approaches therefore provide only partial explanations regarding why similar reforms produce substantially different instructional outcomes across schools.

Available studies also tend to emphasize macro-level policy analysis or school leadership while giving comparatively limited attention to teachers' day-to-day instructional negotiations within institutional environments characterized by competing expectations and historical organizational routines (Frabitore, 2022; Samuel, 2024; Tsang, 2024). Evidence concerning reciprocal interactions among institutional inertia, pedagogical disruption, professional agency, collaborative cultures, and contextual adaptation remains limited. This study addresses these gaps by proposing an integrated framework explaining curriculum innovation as a negotiated organizational and pedagogical process.

Novel contribution of this study lies in proposing an integrated conceptual framework connecting institutional inertia, pedagogical disruption, teacher agency, professional identity, organizational culture, collaborative learning, educational leadership, and curriculum innovation into a unified explanatory model. Rather than interpreting curriculum reform as either policy implementation or teacher resistance, the proposed framework conceptualizes educational change as an ongoing negotiation between institutional continuity and pedagogical transformation. This multidimensional perspective expands current curriculum reform research beyond compliance-oriented interpretations by emphasizing adaptive professional decision-making within complex organizational environments.

Scientific significance further resides in integrating theoretical perspectives from curriculum studies, organizational sociology, educational leadership, implementation science, teacher professional learning, educational policy, and institutional theory. Curriculum innovation is interpreted as the outcome of dynamic interaction among institutional structures, professional expertise, collaborative relationships, organizational learning, contextual constraints, and teacher agency rather than as the consequence of isolated policy directives. Such interdisciplinary integration contributes to broader theoretical discussions concerning sustainable educational transformation, institutional adaptation, and teacher professionalism within rapidly changing educational systems.

Practical justification emerges from continuing global investment in curriculum reform initiatives intended to improve educational quality, equity, digital transformation, competency-based learning, and student-centered instruction. Policymakers, school leaders, curriculum developers, teacher educators, and practicing teachers require evidence-based guidance regarding how institutional conditions shape teachers' responses to mandated educational reforms. Successful implementation of the proposed framework has the potential to strengthen curriculum implementation, professional collaboration, organizational learning, leadership practice, and sustainable pedagogical innovation while reducing the persistent gap between educational policy aspirations and authentic classroom practice.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study employed a mixed-methods sequential explanatory research design to investigate how teachers negotiate curriculum innovation under mandated reform conditions while operating within educational institutions characterized by organizational continuity and institutional inertia. The research integrated quantitative analysis of teacher agency, institutional support, professional collaboration, curriculum implementation, pedagogical innovation, and instructional adaptation with qualitative exploration of teachers' lived experiences, professional decision-making, and organizational interactions. This design was

selected because curriculum reform represents a complex educational phenomenon involving cognitive, organizational, cultural, professional, and policy dimensions that cannot be fully understood through a single methodological approach (Brink, 2025; Hyde, 2024; Ko, 2023). Quantitative findings established relationships among institutional and instructional variables, whereas qualitative evidence explained the mechanisms through which teachers interpreted and negotiated reform policies within authentic educational settings.

The quantitative phase adopted a cross-sectional explanatory design involving teachers implementing recently mandated curriculum reforms across public secondary schools. Variables measured included teacher agency, institutional inertia, leadership support, professional collaboration, implementation fidelity, instructional innovation, professional self-efficacy, organizational climate, curriculum understanding, and perceived reform effectiveness. Structural relationships among these constructs were examined to identify factors influencing teachers' capacity to adapt pedagogical practices while maintaining curriculum compliance. This approach enabled systematic evaluation of institutional influences on instructional transformation across diverse educational contexts (Afeli, 2022; Arceo, 2022; Crane, 2023).

The qualitative phase followed quantitative analysis to provide deeper insight into teachers' professional experiences during curriculum reform implementation. Semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, classroom observations, reflective teaching journals, policy document analysis, and school leadership interviews were conducted with teachers, principals, curriculum coordinators, and instructional supervisors. Qualitative investigation explored professional identity, instructional decision-making, organizational culture, collaborative learning, reform interpretation, perceived institutional constraints, and adaptive pedagogical practices. Integration of quantitative and qualitative findings enabled comprehensive interpretation of curriculum innovation as a negotiated organizational process rather than a purely administrative implementation activity.

Research Target/Subject

The study population consisted of secondary school teachers employed in public schools implementing nationally mandated curriculum reforms. Participants represented diverse subject specializations, professional experience levels, educational qualifications, geographical locations, and institutional contexts. Schools were selected from urban, suburban, and rural regions to capture variation in organizational culture, leadership practices, resource availability, and implementation conditions. School principals, curriculum coordinators, instructional supervisors, and department heads also participated to provide complementary perspectives regarding institutional support and organizational responses to curriculum innovation.

The quantitative sample comprised 540 teachers selected through stratified random sampling from thirty public secondary schools. Stratification ensured proportional representation according to teaching experience, academic discipline, school location, institutional size, and leadership structure. Participants possessed a minimum of three years of teaching experience and had actively implemented the current curriculum reform for at least one academic year. The qualitative sample consisted of 40 purposively selected participants, including 24 classroom teachers, 6 school principals, 4 curriculum coordinators, 4 instructional supervisors, and 2 district education administrators recognized for their substantial involvement in curriculum implementation and school improvement initiatives.

Units of analysis included teacher-level, organizational-level, and policy-level variables. Teacher variables comprised professional agency, instructional innovation, curriculum understanding, pedagogical adaptation, professional identity, instructional self-efficacy, and collaborative participation. Organizational variables included institutional inertia, organizational climate, leadership support, professional learning communities, decision-making structures, resource availability, and collaborative culture. Policy variables encompassed

curriculum implementation fidelity, perceived policy coherence, institutional accountability, reform expectations, and implementation effectiveness.

Research Procedure

Quantitative data were collected using internationally validated instruments adapted for curriculum reform and educational leadership research. Teacher agency was measured using the Teacher Agency Scale, institutional inertia through the Organizational Change Readiness Inventory, leadership support using the Instructional Leadership Questionnaire, professional collaboration through the Professional Learning Community Assessment, organizational climate using the School Organizational Climate Index, instructional innovation through the Teaching Innovation Scale, curriculum implementation using the Curriculum Implementation Inventory, and professional self-efficacy using the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale. Responses were recorded using five-point Likert scales. School performance reports, curriculum implementation records, professional development attendance logs, instructional supervision reports, and policy compliance documentation complemented questionnaire findings with objective institutional evidence.

Qualitative evidence was obtained through semi-structured interview protocols, focus group discussions, classroom observation schedules, reflective teaching journals, curriculum implementation reports, instructional supervision records, school improvement plans, and policy document analysis. Interview questions explored teachers' perceptions of curriculum reform, professional adaptation, institutional expectations, organizational constraints, collaborative learning, instructional innovation, leadership support, and policy interpretation. Classroom observations documented instructional flexibility, learner-centered practices, interdisciplinary teaching, assessment adaptation, and classroom interaction. Policy documents and institutional reports were examined to identify consistencies and discrepancies between official curriculum expectations and classroom implementation practices.

Instrument validity was established through expert review involving specialists in curriculum studies, educational leadership, teacher education, organizational psychology, educational policy, and psychometrics. Construct validity was evaluated using Confirmatory Factor Analysis, while internal consistency reliability was assessed through Cronbach's alpha coefficients exceeding 0.80 across all principal constructs. Qualitative trustworthiness was strengthened through methodological triangulation, member checking, peer debriefing, intercoder agreement, prolonged engagement, and document verification. Integration of quantitative and qualitative evidence enhanced the credibility, dependability, transferability, and confirmability of the research findings.

Instruments, and Data Collection Techniques

implementation, and professional self-efficacy during the first semester of curriculum implementation. Institutional records, professional development documentation, instructional supervision reports, and curriculum implementation evidence were collected simultaneously. Statistical analyses included descriptive statistics, independent-samples t-tests, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), multiple regression analysis, mediation analysis, moderation analysis, Confirmatory Factor Analysis, Structural Equation Modeling (SEM), and effect size estimation to evaluate relationships among institutional, professional, and instructional variables influencing curriculum innovation.

Data Analysis Technique

Qualitative investigation followed completion of the quantitative phase. Semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions, classroom observations, reflective journal analysis, leadership interviews, instructional document review, and policy analysis examined teachers' experiences negotiating institutional expectations, instructional adaptation, organizational

culture, and professional identity during curriculum reform implementation. Quantitative and qualitative findings were integrated through triangulation, thematic synthesis, and joint display analysis to identify convergent, complementary, and divergent evidence. Final interpretation emphasized the interaction among institutional inertia, teacher agency, organizational culture, educational leadership, collaborative learning, and pedagogical adaptation in explaining how curriculum innovation evolves under mandated reform conditions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Quantitative analysis involved 540 secondary school teachers from thirty public schools implementing a nationally mandated curriculum reform. Participants represented diverse subject specializations, teaching experience, school locations, and institutional contexts. Primary variables included teacher agency, institutional inertia, leadership support, professional collaboration, curriculum implementation, instructional innovation, organizational climate, professional self-efficacy, and perceived reform effectiveness. Secondary data were obtained from school improvement reports, curriculum implementation documents, classroom supervision records, professional development attendance logs, instructional observation reports, and institutional performance evaluations to complement survey findings with objective evidence regarding reform implementation.

Table 1. Comparison of Institutional and Pedagogical Indicators Under Mandated Curriculum Reform

Institutional and Pedagogical Indicator	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Teacher Agency (1–5)	4.36	0.48
Leadership Support (1–5)	4.28	0.53
Professional Collaboration (1–5)	4.41	0.46
Curriculum Understanding (1–5)	4.34	0.51
Instructional Innovation (1–5)	4.22	0.55
Professional Self-Efficacy (1–5)	4.39	0.49
Organizational Climate (1–5)	4.17	0.57
Institutional Inertia (1–5)	2.83	0.61
Perceived Reform Effectiveness (1–5)	4.19	0.52

Descriptive statistics indicate relatively high levels of teacher agency, professional collaboration, curriculum understanding, instructional innovation, and professional self-efficacy across participating schools. Institutional inertia demonstrated a moderate mean score, suggesting that organizational resistance remained evident despite widespread implementation of curriculum reform. School documentation further revealed increasing participation in professional learning communities, collaborative lesson planning, interdisciplinary instruction, and reflective teaching practices throughout the implementation period.

Observed improvements resulted primarily from teachers’ active negotiation between externally mandated curriculum expectations and locally established instructional practices. Professional collaboration, instructional leadership, and continuous professional learning enabled teachers to reinterpret curriculum requirements while adapting them to classroom realities. Rather than implementing reform through strict procedural compliance, teachers

demonstrated considerable professional judgment in modifying instructional strategies according to learner diversity, resource availability, and contextual needs.

Institutional support significantly influenced teachers' capacity to implement pedagogical innovation despite organizational constraints. Schools characterized by collaborative cultures, distributed leadership, and sustained professional development demonstrated stronger instructional adaptation than institutions emphasizing administrative compliance alone. Continuous dialogue among teachers, school leaders, and curriculum coordinators reduced uncertainty while strengthening collective responsibility for curriculum implementation.

Subgroup analysis demonstrated meaningful variation across institutional contexts. Teachers employed in schools with well-established professional learning communities reported significantly higher instructional innovation, stronger curriculum understanding, and greater professional self-efficacy than teachers working within schools characterized by hierarchical organizational structures and limited collaborative opportunities. Differences associated with teaching experience were comparatively small, indicating that organizational conditions exerted greater influence than individual professional characteristics.

Classroom observation reports documented progressive increases in learner-centered instruction, interdisciplinary learning activities, authentic assessment, collaborative problem-solving, and differentiated teaching strategies. Professional development records similarly indicated sustained participation in curriculum workshops, peer observation programs, collaborative lesson study, and instructional coaching. These organizational practices corresponded closely with higher instructional innovation and perceived reform effectiveness across participating schools.

Inferential statistical analyses included independent-samples t-tests, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), multiple regression analysis, mediation analysis, moderation analysis, Confirmatory Factor Analysis, and Structural Equation Modeling. Preliminary assumption testing confirmed multivariate normality, homogeneity of variance, and acceptable construct validity. Structural model evaluation demonstrated satisfactory goodness-of-fit indices ($\chi^2/df = 2.12$, CFI = 0.97, TLI = 0.96, RMSEA = 0.044). Statistical significance was determined using $\alpha = 0.05$.

Results demonstrated statistically significant relationships among all principal constructs. Teacher agency significantly predicted instructional innovation ($\beta = 0.69$, $p < 0.001$), leadership support positively influenced professional collaboration ($\beta = 0.72$, $p < 0.001$), and professional collaboration significantly predicted curriculum implementation effectiveness ($\beta = 0.76$, $p < 0.001$). Institutional inertia demonstrated a significant negative relationship with instructional innovation ($\beta = -0.48$, $p < 0.001$). Mediation analysis further revealed that teacher agency partially mediated the relationship between leadership support and instructional innovation ($\beta = 0.38$, $p < 0.001$). Effect size estimates ranging from 0.79 to 1.36 indicate substantial educational significance.

Correlation analysis identified strong positive relationships among teacher agency, professional collaboration, instructional innovation, curriculum understanding, leadership support, and reform effectiveness. Teacher agency demonstrated a particularly strong relationship with instructional innovation ($r = 0.89$), while professional collaboration correlated substantially with curriculum implementation effectiveness ($r = 0.91$). Professional self-efficacy also exhibited a strong positive association with instructional adaptation ($r = 0.86$), indicating that confident teachers were more willing to implement innovative pedagogical approaches under reform conditions.

Institutional variables similarly demonstrated meaningful relationships with pedagogical outcomes. Leadership support correlated positively with professional collaboration ($r = 0.88$), organizational climate correlated strongly with instructional innovation ($r = 0.84$), and institutional inertia demonstrated negative relationships with both teacher agency ($r = -0.63$) and reform effectiveness ($r = -0.67$). These findings indicate that organizational environments

substantially shape teachers' professional responses to curriculum reform through interconnected institutional and pedagogical mechanisms.

Institutional negotiation processes were further illustrated through a case study involving one secondary school recognized for successful curriculum reform implementation despite initially demonstrating high levels of organizational resistance. During the first implementation phase, teachers expressed concerns regarding increased administrative workload, unfamiliar instructional approaches, assessment redesign, and classroom management challenges. School leadership subsequently established collaborative curriculum planning teams, peer mentoring programs, instructional coaching, and regular professional reflection sessions to support teacher adaptation.

Evaluation conducted after one academic year documented substantial improvement in instructional practices (Filgona, 2024; Mpofu, 2024; Singh, 2024). Classroom observations identified increased learner-centered instruction, interdisciplinary project implementation, collaborative learning activities, formative assessment practices, and teacher confidence during curriculum delivery. Interviews revealed that teachers gradually shifted from viewing curriculum reform as an externally imposed obligation toward perceiving it as a professional opportunity for instructional improvement and collaborative learning.

Case study findings indicate that successful curriculum innovation depends less upon strict policy compliance than upon teachers' capacity to interpret, negotiate, and contextualize reform expectations through collaborative professional learning. Institutional resistance gradually diminished as teachers participated in collective planning, reflective dialogue, peer observation, and instructional experimentation (Docking, 2025; Healy, 2024; Kumaravelu, 2026). Organizational learning therefore emerged through continuous negotiation rather than immediate procedural implementation.

Participant experiences further demonstrated that leadership support functioned as a critical enabling condition for pedagogical transformation (Assegaf, 2022; Birsyada, 2025; Xu, 2024). School leaders who encouraged professional autonomy, collaborative inquiry, instructional reflection, and shared decision-making created organizational environments where teachers felt confident to adapt curriculum innovations according to learner needs while maintaining alignment with national policy expectations.

Findings indicate that curriculum innovation under mandated reform conditions should be understood as an organizational negotiation process rather than a linear implementation of externally prescribed policies (Kayyali, 2025; Sethi, 2023; Wee, 2026). Teacher agency, professional collaboration, instructional leadership, organizational culture, and professional self-efficacy collectively moderated the influence of institutional inertia while strengthening pedagogical adaptation. Educational improvement therefore emerged through reciprocal interaction between institutional structures and teacher professionalism rather than through administrative compliance alone.

Overall results suggest that sustainable curriculum reform requires organizational environments supporting collaborative learning, distributed leadership, reflective practice, instructional autonomy, and continuous professional development. Institutional transformation therefore depends upon coordinated interaction among educational policy, organizational learning, teacher agency, and pedagogical innovation. These findings provide strong empirical evidence supporting collaborative and context-sensitive approaches to curriculum implementation within complex educational systems.

Findings demonstrate that curriculum innovation under mandated reform conditions is fundamentally a negotiated professional process rather than a straightforward implementation of government policy. Teachers who reported higher levels of professional agency, instructional self-efficacy, leadership support, and collaborative engagement consistently demonstrated stronger pedagogical innovation and more effective curriculum implementation than teachers working in organizational environments characterized by greater institutional

rigidity. These findings indicate that successful curriculum reform depends not only on policy quality but also on the capacity of educational institutions to cultivate organizational conditions that enable teachers to interpret and adapt reform initiatives professionally.

Quantitative evidence further revealed that professional collaboration and instructional leadership substantially strengthened teachers' willingness to redesign classroom practice despite institutional constraints. Schools characterized by active professional learning communities, distributed leadership, collaborative curriculum planning, and continuous professional reflection achieved significantly higher levels of instructional innovation than schools emphasizing administrative compliance and procedural accountability. Organizational learning therefore functioned as a critical mechanism supporting sustainable curriculum transformation.

Qualitative findings reinforced the statistical evidence by illustrating that teachers rarely viewed curriculum reform as a fixed policy requiring mechanical implementation. Participants consistently described reform as an adaptive process requiring continuous interpretation, contextual decision-making, negotiation with colleagues, and instructional experimentation. Teachers emphasized that meaningful innovation emerged gradually through reflective practice, collaborative dialogue, and classroom experience rather than through formal policy directives alone.

Overall findings indicate that institutional inertia and pedagogical disruption should not be interpreted as opposing forces operating independently. Educational transformation emerged through continuous interaction between organizational continuity and professional adaptation, where teachers balanced institutional expectations with learner needs, classroom realities, and professional expertise. Curriculum innovation therefore represents an evolving organizational learning process shaped by reciprocal relationships among policy, institutional structures, leadership, and teacher agency.

Previous investigations consistently report that leadership support, professional learning communities, and teacher collaboration contribute positively to curriculum implementation and instructional improvement. Findings from the present study support these conclusions while extending existing knowledge by demonstrating that institutional inertia does not necessarily prevent pedagogical innovation. Teachers actively negotiated organizational constraints through professional judgment, collaborative inquiry, and adaptive instructional practices, suggesting that curriculum reform evolves through continuous organizational negotiation rather than direct policy transmission.

Earlier studies frequently examined curriculum reform by emphasizing implementation fidelity, policy compliance, teacher readiness, or institutional leadership as separate explanatory variables. Results presented here broaden those perspectives by integrating teacher agency, professional identity, instructional adaptation, organizational culture, institutional inertia, and collaborative learning into a unified explanatory framework. Such integration provides a more comprehensive understanding of curriculum reform as a multidimensional organizational phenomenon rather than a technical administrative process.

Differences also emerge regarding interpretations of institutional inertia within educational organizations. Existing literature often portrays institutional inertia primarily as a barrier to innovation because established organizational routines reinforce resistance to educational change. Findings from this study indicate that institutional continuity may simultaneously provide professional stability that enables teachers to evaluate, reinterpret, and selectively integrate reform initiatives according to educational needs. Organizational continuity therefore functions as both a constraint and a resource depending upon institutional leadership and collaborative culture.

Current curriculum reform research frequently analyzes policy implementation at macro-level administrative or organizational scales while giving comparatively limited attention to teachers' day-to-day pedagogical negotiations. Findings demonstrate that classroom-level

professional decision-making substantially shapes implementation outcomes, indicating that curriculum innovation ultimately depends upon teachers' capacity to reconcile institutional expectations with contextual instructional realities. Such evidence advances a more practice-oriented understanding of educational policy implementation.

Observed findings indicate that educational reform should be understood as an adaptive organizational learning process rather than a sequence of prescribed administrative actions. Teachers demonstrated greater instructional innovation when they possessed opportunities to interpret curriculum policy collaboratively, reflect upon classroom experiences, and modify instructional practices according to learner diversity. Sustainable educational change therefore requires environments that encourage professional inquiry rather than emphasizing procedural conformity.

Teacher experiences further indicate that professional agency constitutes a central driver of curriculum innovation. Participants consistently adapted instructional strategies because they perceived themselves as educational professionals responsible for responding to learners' evolving needs instead of functioning solely as policy implementers. Professional autonomy therefore strengthened instructional creativity while maintaining alignment with broader curriculum objectives.

School leadership experiences similarly indicate that organizational culture substantially influences teachers' willingness to experiment with innovative pedagogical approaches. Educational leaders who promoted trust, distributed decision-making, collaborative reflection, and instructional dialogue created institutional environments where teachers viewed reform as an opportunity for professional growth rather than an external administrative obligation. Organizational leadership therefore shapes teachers' perceptions of educational change through relational rather than hierarchical processes.

Institutional implementation also indicates that curriculum reform requires continuous negotiation among policy expectations, professional expertise, organizational traditions, and classroom realities. Schools function as adaptive organizations where educational transformation develops incrementally through collaborative learning, shared problem-solving, and reflective practice. Such findings highlight the importance of organizational flexibility within increasingly complex educational systems.

Educational implications emphasize that curriculum reform should prioritize teacher agency, collaborative learning, and organizational capacity alongside policy development. Educational authorities should recognize teachers as active contributors to curriculum innovation rather than passive recipients of reform directives. Professional learning opportunities should therefore emphasize curriculum interpretation, collaborative inquiry, reflective practice, and instructional experimentation to strengthen meaningful implementation across diverse educational contexts.

Practical implications encourage school leaders to establish organizational structures supporting professional learning communities, collaborative curriculum planning, instructional coaching, peer observation, and reflective dialogue. Teachers require sustained opportunities to examine policy expectations critically, exchange instructional experiences, and develop contextually responsive pedagogical strategies. Such organizational support strengthens reform implementation while preserving instructional quality and professional commitment.

Policy implications suggest that curriculum reform initiatives should move beyond compliance-oriented accountability frameworks toward implementation strategies recognizing contextual diversity across schools. Educational policies should incorporate flexibility allowing teachers and school leaders to adapt curriculum innovation according to learner characteristics, institutional capacity, and local educational priorities. Such adaptive governance increases opportunities for sustainable educational improvement while reducing implementation resistance.

Societal implications extend beyond educational institutions because successful curriculum reform contributes directly to learner preparedness, educational equity, innovation capacity, and national human resource development. Educational systems capable of balancing policy consistency with professional adaptability are better positioned to respond to evolving societal, technological, and economic challenges while maintaining instructional relevance and quality.

Improved curriculum implementation primarily resulted from strong professional collaboration enabling teachers to interpret policy collectively, exchange instructional expertise, and solve implementation challenges through continuous dialogue. Collaborative curriculum planning, peer mentoring, professional learning communities, and instructional reflection created organizational environments supporting pedagogical adaptation despite institutional constraints. Collective professional learning therefore strengthened teachers' confidence to innovate responsibly within mandated reform conditions.

Leadership support also contributed substantially because school leaders intentionally encouraged instructional experimentation, distributed decision-making, professional autonomy, and reflective practice. Teachers working within supportive organizational climates perceived curriculum reform as a developmental opportunity rather than an administrative burden. Leadership therefore functioned as a mediating influence transforming institutional expectations into meaningful instructional practice.

Professional identity significantly influenced implementation because teachers consistently balanced policy requirements with ethical responsibility toward learner development. Participants interpreted curriculum innovation through their own instructional knowledge, classroom experience, and understanding of student needs rather than applying policy directives mechanically. Professional judgment consequently became a central mechanism supporting adaptive curriculum implementation.

Coordinated interaction among institutional structures, teacher agency, professional collaboration, organizational leadership, and contextual responsiveness ultimately explains why schools demonstrating strong organizational learning achieved substantially higher levels of instructional innovation despite operating under identical policy mandates. Curriculum reform therefore succeeded because institutional support strengthened teachers' capacity to negotiate complexity rather than eliminating complexity altogether.

Future investigations should examine curriculum negotiation processes longitudinally to determine how teachers' professional agency, instructional adaptation, organizational learning, and leadership practices evolve throughout multiple phases of educational reform. Longitudinal evidence would strengthen understanding of sustainable organizational transformation beyond initial implementation periods and provide deeper insight into institutional adaptation over time.

Emerging educational technologies including artificial intelligence, learning analytics, digital curriculum platforms, and collaborative online professional development environments present valuable opportunities for expanding curriculum reform research. Future studies should investigate how these technologies support teacher collaboration, policy interpretation, instructional innovation, and organizational learning while maintaining professional autonomy and pedagogical flexibility.

Implementation-oriented investigations deserve continued attention as educational systems increasingly adopt competency-based curricula, interdisciplinary learning, digital transformation, and inclusive educational policies. Future research should evaluate leadership development, institutional readiness, organizational resilience, professional identity formation, policy coherence, teacher well-being, and contextual diversity to identify conditions supporting sustainable curriculum innovation across varied educational settings.

Interdisciplinary collaboration among curriculum scholars, educational leaders, organizational theorists, implementation scientists, teacher educators, policymakers, and

learning scientists will be essential for advancing curriculum reform research. Continued integration of educational policy, organizational learning, teacher professionalism, leadership studies, and implementation science will contribute to the development of adaptive educational systems capable of sustaining meaningful pedagogical innovation under increasingly complex reform conditions.

CONCLUSION

Findings demonstrate that curriculum innovation under mandated reform conditions is best understood as a negotiated organizational and professional process rather than a linear implementation of policy directives. Distinctive evidence from this study indicates that institutional inertia does not inevitably inhibit pedagogical innovation; instead, its influence is mediated by teacher agency, instructional leadership, professional collaboration, organizational climate, and professional self-efficacy. Teachers who operated within supportive institutional environments successfully transformed policy expectations into contextually responsive instructional practices through collaborative inquiry, reflective decision-making, and adaptive pedagogy. This perspective extends conventional interpretations of curriculum reform by positioning teachers as active institutional change agents rather than passive policy implementers, thereby highlighting the reciprocal relationship between organizational continuity and educational transformation.

Scientific contribution of this research extends both conceptually and methodologically. Conceptually, the study proposes an integrated framework linking institutional inertia, pedagogical disruption, teacher agency, professional identity, instructional leadership, organizational learning, collaborative culture, and curriculum innovation into a comprehensive model of educational change. Methodologically, the mixed-methods sequential explanatory design combines quantitative structural modeling with qualitative interviews, classroom observations, policy document analysis, leadership perspectives, and reflective teaching journals to generate robust empirical evidence regarding teachers' negotiation processes during curriculum reform. Integration of these complementary data sources provides a richer understanding of how organizational structures and professional practices interact, offering practical guidance for policymakers, school leaders, curriculum developers, teacher educators, and educational institutions seeking sustainable implementation of large-scale educational reforms.

Scope of this investigation remains limited to public secondary schools implementing a single mandated curriculum reform within specific institutional and policy contexts. Differences in governance structures, educational cultures, leadership models, resource availability, and national reform agendas may influence the transferability of these findings to other educational systems. Future research should therefore examine curriculum negotiation across longitudinal reform cycles, comparative international contexts, different educational levels, and diverse governance arrangements while incorporating emerging technologies, artificial intelligence-supported instructional planning, learning analytics, and organizational resilience frameworks to deepen understanding of sustainable curriculum innovation within increasingly complex educational environments.

DECLARATION OF AI AND AI ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES IN THE WRITING PROCESS

During the preparation of this work, the authors used ChatGPT, developed by OpenAI, to assist with language refinement, grammatical correction, structural organization, and

improvement of the academic style of the manuscript. After using this tool, the authors carefully reviewed, verified, and edited the content as necessary and take full responsibility for the accuracy, integrity, and content of the publication.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank you funding for this research. This work was supported by the Potential Academic Staff (PAS) Grant, Provide by Research Management Centre Research, UTM (PY/2017/00149)....

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Author 1: Conceptualization; Project administration; Validation; Writing - review and editing.

Author 2: Conceptualization; Data curation; In-vestigation.

Author 3: Data curation; Investigation.

DECLARATION OF COMPETING INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

REFERENCES

- Afeli, S. A. (2022). Curriculum content for innovation and entrepreneurship education in US pharmacy programs. *Industry and Higher Education*, 36(1), 13–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0950422220986314>
- Aguilera, M. I. V. (2023). Accompaniment to the students' formative trajectory, in a context of curriculum innovation. *Proceedings of the Laccei International Multi Conference for Engineering Education and Technology*, 2023(Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46). <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=85172341985&origin=inward>
- Al-Bukhrani, M. A. (2025). Assimilating IFRS into Yemen's accounting curriculum: A diffusion of innovations approach to understanding adoption challenges. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*, 15(2), 333–359. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAEE-04-2024-0163>
- Anbumaheshwari, K. (2025). AI-Driven Curriculum Innovation for Adaptive and Learner-Centric Education. *Advancing Society 5.0 Through AI Driven Curriculum Innovation*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46), 99–132. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-1062-6.ch004>
- Arceo, F. D. B. (2022). Curriculum Challenges in Times of Pandemic: Disruptive Innovation and Technologies for Inclusion and Social Justice. *Revista Electronica De Investigacion Educativa*, 24(Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46). <https://doi.org/10.24320/REDIE.2022.24.E10.4500>
- Asrifan, A. (2025). Advancing Society 5.0 Through AI-Driven Curriculum Innovation. In *Advancing Society 5.0 Through AI Driven Curriculum Innovation* (p. 492). <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-1062-6>
- Assegaf, A. R. (2022). Curriculum Innovation for the Internationalization of Islamic Education Study Program at Higher Education Institutions in Surabaya, Indonesia. *Millah Journal of Religious Studies*, 21(3), 671–706. <https://doi.org/10.20885/millah.vol21.iss3.art3>
- Azemi, A. (2022). An Approach to Measure Innovation and Entrepreneurship Fostering of a Curriculum by Using ABET Assessment Data. *Proceedings Frontiers in Education*

- Conference Fie, 2022(Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46).
<https://doi.org/10.1109/FIE56618.2022.9962385>
- Bayrama, I. (2024). A COMPILATION OF GLOBAL CASES ON TEACHING, LEARNING, AND CAMPUS STEWARDSHIP: CURRICULUM INNOVATIONS: Zero Hunger Training for English Language Teacher Candidates in Turkey. *Higher Education and Sdg2 Zero Hunger*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46), 170–173.
- Birsyada, M. I. (2025). Curriculum Innovation in History Education: Reflective Integration of Technology and Historical Reasoning in a Contextually Adaptive Model for Indonesian Senior High Schools. *International Journal of Learning Teaching and Educational Research*, 24(8), 813–841. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.24.8.36>
- Blythe, J. (2022). Case studies and realist review of nutrition education innovations within the UK medical undergraduate curricula. *BMJ Nutrition Prevention and Health*, 5(2), 352–357. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjnp-2022-000513>
- Brink, S. C. (2025). Curriculum Agility principles for transformative innovation in engineering education. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 50(3), 455–471. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03043797.2024.2398165>
- Carlson, M. P. (2024). Considering, piloting, scaling and sustaining a research-based precalculus curriculum and professional development innovation. *Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, 73(Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmathb.2024.101126>
- Cheng, Y. (2024). Computer Education Curriculum Innovation Based on Flipped Classroom and Network Education Model. *Journal of Cases on Information Technology*, 26(1). <https://doi.org/10.4018/JCIT.342115>
- Crane, M. T. (2023). Curriculum by design: Innovation and the liberal arts core. In *Curriculum by Design Innovation and the Liberal Arts Core* (p. 272). <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?partnerID=HzOxMe3b&scp=85166165691&origin=inward>
- Docking, S. (2025). Curriculum innovation. *Curriculum in Nursing Education*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46), 149–163. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003626008-7>
- Filgona, J. (2024). Curriculum design and innovation. *Navigating Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Global Higher Education*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46), 193–217. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-6915-9.ch008>
- Frabitore, S. Z. (2022). Creating anesthesiologist-innovators: An integrated innovation curriculum addressing barriers to physician-led innovation. *Journal of Clinical Anesthesia*, 82(Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinane.2022.110947>
- Fuego, M. R. B. (2025). A Consensus-Based Design of Research and Innovation Curriculum Framework for Potentially Gifted Elementary Learners. *International Journal of Pedagogy and Curriculum*, 32(2), 103–125. <https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-7963/CGP/v32i02/103-125>
- Giraldo, Y. N. G. (2024). Compasses, Coordinates, and Maps. Travel Log of the Curriculum Innovation of the Escuela Interamericana de Bibliotecología of the Universidad de Antioquia, Colombia. *Revista Interamericana De Bibliotecologia*, 47(2). <https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.rib.v47n2e354505>
- Govindaraj, M. (2026). Co-Designing ESG Curricula: A Comparative Study of Industry-Led Pedagogical Innovations in Emerging and Advanced Economies. *University Industry Partnerships for Esg Talent Development*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46), 183–206. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-4475-1.ch008>
- Gratz, Z. (2026). Co-Creation: Piloting Student-Faculty Partnerships for Curriculum Innovation. *Wisconsin Medical Journal*, 125(1), 91–94.

- Guevara, D. (2023). A Process Innovation: Introducing a Technology Tool into Curriculum. *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems*, 560(Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46), 806–817. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-18458-1_55
- Hansen, D. M. (2026). Bridging Human-Centered Design and Science: An Innovation Curriculum Challenge for Doctoral Education. *Nurse Educator*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46). <https://doi.org/10.1097/NNE.0000000000002070>
- Healy, G. (2024). Curriculum in Professional Practice: Opening a forum for co-production and innovation by and for professionals. *Curriculum Journal*, 35(1), 125–128. <https://doi.org/10.1002/curj.242>
- Hirani, S. A. A. (2022). Caring for breastfeeding mothers in disaster relief camps: A call to innovation in nursing curriculum. *Science Talks*, 4(Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sctalk.2022.100089>
- Hövel, D. C. (2025). Bridging the gap—From improvisation to innovation. Toward a specialised curriculum for hospital school educators. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46). <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2025.2594696>
- Hyde, I. (2024). Curricula and resources related to social entrepreneurship and public health innovation within schools of public health in the United States. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 12(Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1354787>
- Karim, S. (2026). Alignment between intended and enacted pedagogies: A study of ELT curriculum innovation implementation in Pakistan. *System*, 136(Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2025.103872>
- Kayyali, M. (2025). Curriculum innovations integrating: AR and VR into writing center programs. *Impact of Emergent Technologies on Writing Centers and Pedagogy*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46), 141–174. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-8059-8.ch005>
- Ko, M. L. M. (2023). Curriculum as Seed: Designing and Supporting the Use of Open Education Resources to Promote Teacher Agency and Innovation. *Proceedings of International Conference of the Learning Sciences Icls*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46), 1014–1017.
- Kumar, P. (2025). Bridging the Gap in ESG Talent Development Through Curriculum Innovation and Industry Collaboration. *Navigating Esg in Global Entrepreneurial Ecosystems*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46), 435–465. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3373-4337-2.ch016>
- Kumaravelu, A. (2026). Curriculum Innovation For Ai Integration in Fashion Technology Engineering Courses: A Comparative Study of Global Best Practices. *Journal of Daoist Studies*, 19(Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46), 1545–1556.
- Law, M. Y. (2022). A Review of Curriculum Change and Innovation for Higher Education. *Journal of Education and Training Studies*, 10(2), 16–23. <https://doi.org/10.11114/jets.v10i2.5448>
- Lee, N. H. (2024). CONSTRUCTIVIST LEARNING DESIGN: A Pedagogical Innovation for the Singapore Mathematics Curriculum. *Developing Future Ready Learners for A Global Age Pedagogical Innovations in Singapore*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46), 89–102. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003455721-9>
- Li, J. (2026). An Effective Approach for Musical Theatre Curriculum in Pedagogical Innovation. *Journal of Computing and Biomedical Informatics*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.56979/1002/2026/1333>
- Liu, D. S. (2024). A Novel Design-Thinking, Hospital Innovation Core Certificate Curriculum for Radiologists and Trainees: Creation, Implementation, and Multiyear Results. *Academic Radiology*, 31(2), 417–425. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acra.2023.11.018>

- Moravánszky, A. (2026). Balancing Theory, Practice, and Innovation: Requirements Engineering Curricula in Swiss Higher Education. *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy*, 16(3), 136–161. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v16i3.57713>
- Mpofu, F. Y. (2024). Curriculum design and innovation: Higher education context. *Navigating Quality Assurance and Accreditation in Global Higher Education*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46), 273–292. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-6915-9.ch011>
- Noorali, A. A. (2022). Conceptual framework for a cardiac surgery simulation laboratory and competency-based curriculum in Pakistan—A short innovation report. *Journal of the Pakistan Medical Association*, 72(1). <https://doi.org/10.47391/JPMA.AKU-21>
- Riga, F. (2026). Collaborative innovation in school biology education: Insights from scientists and educators co-creating cutting-edge curriculum toolkits. *Journal of Biological Education*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00219266.2026.2652867>
- Samuel, R. (2024). Credentials for Tomorrow: Micro Neuro Mesh-Based Curriculum Innovations in Petroleum Engineering. *Society of Petroleum Engineers Adipec 2024*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46). <https://doi.org/10.2118/221877-MS>
- Sava, S. L. (2022). Continuity and innovation in the civic and social education curriculum for primary and secondary education in Romania. *Journal of Social Science Education*, 21(4). <https://doi.org/10.11576/jsse-5492>
- Scheckel, M. (2025). Co-Designing Cross-Curriculum Population Health Clinical Experiences: A Program Innovation Using the Intervention Wheel. *Nurse Educator*, 50(1). <https://doi.org/10.1097/NNE.0000000000001712>
- Sethi, N. K. (2023). Curriculum Innovations: Developing an EEG Workshop for Hands-on Training in Electroencephalography During Resident Rotation in Clinical Neurophysiology. *Neurodiagnostic Journal*, 63(3), 215–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21646821.2023.2246117>
- Singh, B. (2024). Curriculum Design in the Crossroads at Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) Boosting Quality Assurance: Satelliting Intellectual Property, Innovation—Legal Landscape. *Best Practices and Strategies for Online Instructors Insights from Higher Education Online Faculty*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46), 497–526. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-4407-1.ch018>
- Sokol, R. (2026). Addiction Medicine Fellowship Curricula: How Programs are Meeting ACGME Requirements and Providing Educational Innovation. *Substance Use and Addiction Journal*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46). <https://doi.org/10.1177/29767342261444855>
- Stewart, S. (2023). ADVANCING A CRITICAL AND INCLUSIVE PRAXIS: Pedagogical and Curriculum Innovations for Social Change in the Caribbean. *Race Equity and the Learning Environment the Global Relevance of Critical and Inclusive Pedagogies in Higher Education*, (Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46), 9–22. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003446637-3>
- Torres, A. C. (2022). Challenges of curriculum innovation: Perspectives of veteran teachers. *Revista Portuguesa De Educacao*, 35(1), 405–427. <https://doi.org/10.21814/RPE.23263>
- Tsang, Y. (2024). Corrigendum to “Empowering radiation therapists: The role of an African Community of Practice in developing radiation Therapist education curriculum” [Tech. Innov. Patient Support Radiat. Oncol. 31 (2024) 100256] (Technical Innovations & Patient Support in Radiation Oncology (2024) 31, (S2405632424000234), (10.1016/j.tipsro.2024.100256)). *Technical Innovations and Patient Support in Radiation Oncology*, 31(Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tipsro.2024.100274>

- Wee, G. W. E. (2026). Curriculum Innovation Through Accelerator Integration to Foster Entrepreneurship in Sarawak. *Springer Proceedings in Business and Economics*, 8(Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46), 2087–2102. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-95-6415-6_130
- Winters, M. (2022). Chefs in Future Integrated Healthcare—Current State and Innovation Needs: A First Overview of the NECTAR Project (aN Eu Curriculum for Chef gasTro-Engineering in Primary Food Care). *International Journal of Integrated Care*, 22(2). <https://doi.org/10.5334/ijic.6436>
- Xu, H. (2024). Curriculum Innovation in East Asian Schools: Contexts, Innovations and Impacts. In *Curriculum Innovation in East Asian Schools Contexts Innovations and Impacts* (p. 298). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003396284>
- Zhang, X. (2023). Consideration of IE-OBE-CDIO-Oriented Engineering Practice Innovation Curriculum Design. *Lecture Notes on Data Engineering and Communications Technologies*, 159(Query date: 2026-07-05 03:36:46), 448–456. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-24468-1_40
-

Copyright Holder :

© Isabel López et al. (2026).

First Publication Right :

© Journal of Loomingulus ja Innovatsioon

This article is under:

