

Analysis of Attitudes towards Curricular Innovation in Higher Education Staff

Análisis de las actitudes hacia la innovación curricular en el personal académico de la Educación Superior

Galia Meneses¹ 

Jaime Balladares² 

Martín Navarro-Ibáñez² 

¹Universidad de Tarapacá, Chile

²Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile

Recibido: 08 de Noviembre 2024 | Aceptado: 23 de Abril 2025 | Publicado: 30 de Junio 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4067/s0718-50652025000100213>

Abstract

Curricular innovation in higher education is crucial in addressing academic and societal demands. However, its implementation depends significantly on faculty engagement. This study explores faculty attitudes toward curricular innovation, focusing on the interplay between personal factors, institutional support, and willingness to participate. Specifically, the study aims to identify the attitudes that promote or hinder curricular innovation and to examine how personal factors, such as professional background and experience, influence these attitudes. Through a quantitative approach and a retrospective descriptive design, the study analyzed the responses of 174 participants using a questionnaire with a Likert scale. The results show that the teaching staff has a positive attitude toward innovation. However, the institution states that it does not provide them with prompt information nor favor their active role. The results underscore the importance of integrating organizational and personal factors into innovation processes to foster engagement and enhance the likelihood of sustained change and continuous improvement. These findings contribute to discussing enhancing institutional strategies for curricular development and innovation in higher education.

Keywords: higher education, curricular innovation, teachers' attitudes, organizational culture.

Resumen

La innovación curricular en la educación superior es fundamental para responder a las demandas académicas y sociales. No obstante, su implementación depende en gran medida del compromiso del profesorado. Este estudio explora las actitudes del cuerpo docente hacia la innovación curricular, poniendo énfasis en la interacción entre los factores personales, el apoyo institucional y la disposición a participar en estos procesos. Específicamente, se propone identificar las actitudes que favorecen o dificultan la innovación curricular, así como examinar cómo factores personales, como la trayectoria profesional y la experiencia, influyen en dichas actitudes. A través de un enfoque cuantitativo y un diseño descriptivo retrospectivo, se analizaron las respuestas de 174 participantes mediante un cuestionario con escala Likert. Los resultados muestran que el profesorado manifiesta una actitud positiva hacia la innovación; sin embargo, también indican que la institución no les proporciona información oportuna ni favorece su rol activo. Los hallazgos subrayan la importancia de integrar factores organizacionales y personales en los procesos de innovación, con el fin de fomentar la participación y aumentar la probabilidad de cambios sostenidos y mejora continua. Estos resultados aportan al debate sobre el fortalecimiento de estrategias institucionales para el desarrollo e innovación curricular en la educación superior.

Palabras claves: educación superior, innovación curricular, actitudes del profesorado, cultura organizacional.

*Corresponding author: gmeneses@academicos.uta.cl

1 Introduction

Higher education has been challenged to become a space for growth and social mobility, providing young people with opportunities to train and develop within today's society. This challenge, strained by educational crises such as the pandemic, has led to new movements, interests, and commitments to address issues related to the quality of this type of education (UNESCO, 2022) and has also begun revising and transforming teaching to meet the quality requirements in the training of future professionals.

Innovation has been conceived as a prerequisite for fostering productivity, raising quality and access to goods, and supporting inter-university cooperation and academic mobility (Mykhailyshyn et al., 2018). In this sense, innovation is crucial for maintaining and enhancing the quality of education, as it transforms learning and teaching to meet the evolving needs of institutions and individuals (Barger et al., 2022).

Educational innovation is a deliberate and planned process intended to solve problems that enhance the quality of education and student learning, extending beyond academic knowledge and a passive conception of learning (Mykhailyshyn et al., 2018). It aims to develop an interactive, constructed, intentional, and long-term learning experience that generates positive transformations in learning, the environment, organizational culture, and society (Jerez & Silva, 2017); this implies the internalization of a new way of acting, in addition to the institutionalization of this approach through multiple stages, where organizations gradually transform their ideas to improve the quality of the entire system (Educational Innovation Network [EIN], 2018). Consequently, educational innovation brings about symbolic and material changes within the institutional culture (González & Cruzat, 2019), which implies a process of continuous review and improvement (Parejo et al., 2022).

Higher education institutions should now incorporate new ways of acting into their cultures through multiple stages, in which organizations gradually transform their ideas to improve the quality of the entire system (Trowler & Trowler, 2020; EIN, 2018).

Curricular innovation, which refers to the reconceptualization and modernization of the curriculum (Gonta & Tripon, 2020), is not limited to designing plans and programs that meet institutional requirements. It must also include conditions such as commitment, empowerment, and understanding. In this context, it is crucial for higher education institutions not to underestimate factors that could impact curricular innovation, particularly those related to university staff (Onyura et al., 2022).

In this context, university academics are crucial in the processes of curricular innovation, as they hold specific attitudes and beliefs toward these changes (Meneses & Balladares, 2022; Zou et al., 2023). Therefore, investigating these attitudes is essential to ensure their participation and the success of curricular innovations, as understanding their perspectives can significantly influence the effective development and implementation of new educational approaches.

1.1 Literature review

Higher education institutions are increasingly required to adapt to the structural changes and demands posed by the knowledge society. Today, its main purposes are conducting research, developing human capital, and curricular innovation (Simeoni & Caballero, 2024). The latter has required the installation of a culture of change on a historically complex ethos to transform.

According to the International Forum for University Innovation (FIIU - as it stands for Spanish), one of the three axes of innovation is the curricular and pedagogical areas (Villa, 2016). The term refers to decisions concerning the revision of curricula and the associated teaching and pedagogical models in response to social, cognitive, and economic demands (Gonta & Tripon, 2020; González & Cruzat, 2019). This improvement enables the educational environment to address the challenges of a complex world. Additionally, it may create competitive organizations that attract available resources and offer better educational services. This is particularly pertinent given the imperative for higher education to stay current in today's rapidly evolving world, especially in response to the challenges left by the pandemic, the rise of digital education, and the imminent advent of artificial intelligence and its associated implications (Crompton & Burke, 2023). Accordingly, it is essential to view educational innovation as an opportunity to incorporate new methodologies, formats, and technologies that enhance the quality of education.

For example, the Chilean higher education system has undergone significant reforms, such as imple-

menting a quality assurance system. A growing mobility of academics and students has been promoted through the implementation of competency-based teaching and curricular innovation projects, together with the incorporation of the transferable credit system (SCT as it stands for Spanish) (Brunner, 2015; Guzmán et al., 2015). Chile's higher education system is remarkably consolidated in terms of quality assurance mechanisms. However, demands and expectations have emerged, fundamentally rooted in attention to diversity and inclusion in everyday training (Infante, 2010; Krause, 2019).

Due to the social demand for increased quality, Chilean higher education institutions have taken on the challenges related to innovations in various areas, including the development of new graduate profiles that emphasize the notion of professionals who can continuously learn and adapt to meet social demands (Burgos et al., 2018). However, to ensure these innovative processes can be implemented, new strategies involving all actors in higher education should be developed, particularly those related to deep and autonomous learning among students (Zou et al., 2023).

In this scenario, public policies have been developed to activate these processes, granting universities the freedom to adopt different management approaches linked to a central dimension that involves the strategic transformation of institutional processes (Guzmán et al., 2015; Vicente et al., 2020). The approach to educational innovation should focus primarily on the organizational structure, as this social process responds to the diverse representations, values, beliefs, and styles that shape daily actions in the context of innovation and pedagogical work. In this context, it is crucial to consider how academic organizations operate to ensure they effectively interpret and value reforms and innovations (Olaskoaga et al., 2015). Understanding these dynamics allows institutions to better align their strategic transformation processes with their academic environments' unique cultural and operational characteristics (Guzmán et al., 2015; Vicente et al., 2020).

Regarding the role of academics in curricular innovation processes, it is expected that professionals will show an open attitude toward innovation, allowing for better adaptation to social changes and their demands and facilitating more active participation in these processes (Meneses & Balladares, 2022; Zou et al., 2023). It has been suggested that "teachers' attitudes and behavior are the most influential conditioning factors in innovation processes" (Betrián & Jové, 2013, p. 79); this leads to the assertion that traditional reforms are doomed to failure unless teachers are involved in shaping and evaluating the policies and the various strategies implemented for change (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2014).

Positive and open attitudes from academics are closely linked to participation through a reflective and permanent practice based on change (Gómez-Trigueros et al., 2024). Attitudes reflect a positive or negative tendency about the object of the attitude and obey a tripartite conception between a) the cognitive (which determines the degree of knowledge, beliefs, opinion, and thoughts that the subject possesses of the object of the attitude); b) the affective, (feeling about the social object); and finally, c) the behavioral component, which refers to the particular tendency of reaction that characterizes the activity of the attitude (Ajzen, 2001). These interconnected components show that comprehensive and multifaceted attitudes significantly impact the adoption and success of curricular innovations.

Although extensive knowledge about curricular and educational innovation exists, studies examining academics as key actors in these processes remain limited, particularly in national contexts. While this topic has received greater attention in some European settings, further exploration is still needed to understand how academics perceive and enact their roles within innovative processes. Who are these actors? How do they drive innovation? What values and norms do they share with their peers? Moreover, do they perceive institutional coercion as influencing their actions?" (Hasanefendic et al., 2017)

Regarding these issues, Lašáková et al. (2017) studied ten European universities to determine the obstacles that affect innovation processes from the perspective of the actors involved. The authors concluded that the limitations were related to institutional factors associated with the absence of a general vision of innovation, the presence of weak strategies and rigid human resource management actions, and individual factors corresponding to the lack of preparation for change on the part of faculty members, together with a lack of willingness to innovate with new forms of teaching. These findings are consistent with other regional studies, suggesting that the disconnect between curricular innovation processes and the perceived effects on the educational community can be an impediment (Barger et al., 2022).

Another relevant study by Hasanefendic et al. (2017) examined innovative academic practices among

professionals from universities in Portugal, the Netherlands, and Germany. The authors observed some innovative, profound, and transformative practices with a high level of motivation in certain groups of academics who, in turn, showed openness and interest in change, leadership, and a broad knowledge of the experiential field, internal and external, and a strategic use of networks. Despite this, academics reported institutional barriers that limited change. These findings are consistent with studies in the United States that highlight the importance of motivation and commitment among faculty members in encouraging their participation in curricular innovation processes (Jacobson & Cole, 2020).

Finally, a study conducted in Chile concurred with the importance of faculty commitment and motivation but also highlighted the significance of understanding the political context, institutional tensions, and the meanings and assessments of innovation as critical factors to consider in the innovation processes (Meneses & Balladares, 2022).

Academics often find it challenging to implement innovations in their classroom settings. When changes are implemented, they are frequently mechanical and superficial because the underlying beliefs remain unchanged (Guskey, 2020). Thus, reforms "depend on the extent to which they meet their value scales" (Olaskoaga et al., 2015, p.116).

Gil (2016) stated that in innovation processes, there are two categories: the "late majority," which is characterized by higher levels of incredulity and prudence about innovation from the point of view of academics. These professors, rather than exhibiting a negative attitude towards innovation, might show some resistance to the proposed challenges, expecting changes to adapt to their priorities. The second category refers to the most resistant teachers who do not want to change and remain within their comfort zones. These teachers tend to have conservative views and resist change, which often causes tension. Counterintuitively, although the second group is more traditional and skeptical about change than their peers in the first group, they ultimately adopt new practices over time once they engage with innovations.

Therefore, it is advisable to assume that resistance to change is an unavoidable factor in the process of curricular innovation and that to overcome it, institutions must promote reflection and cohesion among the actors, developing strategies that promote a culture of change and permanent improvement (Fullan, 2020; Harris & Jones, 2020)

1.2 The present study

In the context of the transformation underway in Chilean higher education, universities have initiated curricular innovation processes to address the demands of an ever-changing society and the need to train human capital capable of meeting the challenges of the knowledge society.

Within this framework, the institution under study has implemented substantial modifications to its curricula, shifting them towards a competency-based approach and adopting transferable credits to provide a thorough training program that meets the demands of the labor market and is consistent with its academic quality goals. However, implementing curricular innovation faces significant challenges, particularly regarding faculty readiness and attitudes, as faculty play an essential role in effectively adopting these changes. Despite efforts in training and advisory support, progress in curricular renewal has been limited within the institution under study, with a prevailing climate of uncertainty regarding the regulations and objectives of the proposed transformations.

This study aims to understand how faculty perceive and value the process of curricular innovation in higher education, identifying factors that facilitate or hinder its adoption. By examining the personal dimensions of faculty, particularly those related to teaching and learning processes, the study seeks to develop strategies that foster a culture of change and enhance faculty commitment to educational transformation. Analyzing faculty attitudes toward innovation is crucial, as teachers are the primary agents of change in education, and their attitudes directly influence the implementation and success of these policies at the university level.

Objective

This study explores the faculty members' attitudes toward curricular innovation by examining the interplay between personal factors, their attitudes, and the role of institutional support in fostering willingness

to participate in innovation processes.

Specific Objectives

1. Identify the attitudes that elicit curricular innovation in faculty members.
2. Examine the relationship between personal factors and their attitudes toward curricular innovation.
3. Analyze the influence of the institutional support dimension on participants' willingness to engage in curricular innovation processes.

Given this study's exploratory and descriptive approach, which aims not to test causal or predictive relationships but to describe perceptions and trends, it is unnecessary to formulate hypotheses.

2 Method

2.1 Study design

The study follows a quantitative approach with a descriptive and exploratory nature, using a retrospective non-experimental design.

2.2 Participants

This study analyzed the responses of 174 academics who develop teaching functions at a state university in northern Chile—the number of academics represents a significant portion of the faculty of the institution in question. Regarding gender, the sample consists of 58.0% males and 41.4% females. 7.5% of the participants hold a bachelor's degree, 43.7% have obtained an MA degree, 12.6% are PhD students, and 31.0% have already completed a PhD. Regarding contracts, they are distributed in three categories: 46.6% are full-time professors, 43.1% are part-time professors, and 10.3% are contracted for specific subjects and do not have a formal work relationship with the university.

Table 1. *Sociodemographic features of the participants*

	n	Frequency
Location of workplace		
Venue 1 (headquarters)	164	94.8%
Venue 2	9	5.2%
Gender		
Male	101	58.6%
Venue 1 (headquarters)	72	41.4%
Academic achievement		
B.A.	13	7.5%
Master	76	43.7%
Ph.D. (c)	22	12.6%
Ph.D.	54	31.0%
Other	9	5.2%
Contract type		
Full-time professor	81	46.6%
Part-time professor	75	43.1%
Hourly	15	10.3%

2.3 Instruments

A questionnaire was used to measure teachers' attitudes towards curricular innovation. This instrument has been previously validated in Chile (Meneses & Tomás, 2017) and underwent a series of iterations, including an exhaustive literature review, validation by expert judgment, and subsequent piloting. The analysis employed exploratory factor analysis (EFA) followed by confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). The results were adequate for the observed variables.

The questionnaire is composed of 20 items, distributed in three dimensions: 1) “Disposal to curricular change” (7 items), 2) “Changes in the institution, structure, and functioning” (7 items), and 3) “The professor as an agent of curricular change” (6 items). A 5-point Likert scale (5 strongly agree, and 1 strongly disagree). The instrument showed adequate psychometric properties (Ferrari et al., 2020), with reliability ranging between 0.73 and 0.79 for each dimension and a Cronbach's alpha of 0.83 for the total scale.

2.4 Procedure

A careful data collection procedure was implemented. First, all participants were provided with a comprehensive document detailing the research objectives, including informed consent, emphasizing the relevance of their contribution. Additionally, it emphasized the voluntary nature of their participation, allowing participants to opt out of the study at any time.

Then, emphasis was placed on the confidentiality of the data collected, assuring participants that their answers would be handled only by the research team and with the utmost discretion to protect their identity and privacy.

Finally, the informed consent document required participants to sign, complying with ethical standards for research in the Social Sciences and respecting the fundamental rights of subjects participating in scientific research (Festinger et al., 2023). The questionnaire was then administered and took approximately 30 minutes to complete. The questionnaire was self-administered and completed by the participants at work.

Data analysis was conducted using the SPSS statistical package, version 22.0. In addition to descriptive analyses, mean comparison tests were performed using the student's t-test tool and ANOVA (Mishra et al., 2019).

3 Results

In the dimension “Disposal to curricular innovation”, the results showed a mean of 38.87 (SD = 4.76; range: 17-50), while in the dimension “Change in institution, structure, and functioning,” the mean was 37.61 (SD = 4.63; range: 27-51). Finally, in the dimension of “The teacher as a curricular agent,” the results show a mean of 28.21 (SD = 4.08; range: 11-35).

The differences in scores between the different dimensions of the questionnaire were evaluated using a one-way ANOVA to compare means.

Table 2 presents a comparison of means among the three dimensions. The results show a significantly lower score for the dimension “The teacher as curricular agent” [mean 28.2 (4.1) compared to the other two dimensions.

Table 2. Means, Standard deviation, and comparisons among dimensions of the instrument.

Dimensions	Mean (M)	Standard deviation (SD)	range	F	p-value
Disposal towards curricular innovation	38.87	4.76	17-50	38.87	<0.001**
Change in the institutions, structure, and functions	37.61	4.63	27-51		
Teacher as curricular agent	28.21	4.08	11-35		

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .001$

Then, to determine the specific differences between the dimensions, Bonferroni's post hoc test was used, which revealed significant differences between the dimensions of “Disposal to curricular innovation” and “The teacher as curricular agent” ($p < 0.036$).

The relationship between age and the three dimensions (“Disposal towards curricular innovation,” “Change in institutions, structure, and functions,” and “The teacher as curricular agent”) was determined using ANOVA to assess the impact of age on these variables. The ANOVA results, as depicted in the table, reveal a statistically significant influence of age on the scores of the third dimension (“The teacher as curricular agent”), with a p-value of 0.040, indicating that age does affect the outcomes in this specific dimension. The F-statistic of 2.824 further supports the significance of the differences among groups. In contrast, the first and second dimensions did not demonstrate statistically significant differences, with p-values of 0.177 and 0.080, respectively; this suggests that age does not significantly impact the scores in these dimensions. Overall, the findings suggest that age plays a role only in the variability observed in the third dimension. At the same time, it appears to have no significant effect on the first two dimensions.

Table 3. ANOVA Results for Age Impact on Dimensions

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Disposal towards curricular innovation					
Between groups	1.194	3	.398	1.663	.177
Within groups	39.481	165	.239		
Totals	40.674	168			
Change in the institutions, structure, and functions.					
Between groups	1.1885	3	.628	2.291	.080
Within groups	45.246	165	.274		
Totals	47.131	168			
Teacher as curricular agent					
Between groups	2.480	3	.827	2.824	.040*
Within groups	48.301	165	.293		
Totals	50.781	168			

A matrix of items was developed to analyze teacher attitude trends, differentiating between attitudes' affective and cognitive components based on favorable or unfavorable trends. Three categories emerged: positive affective component (PAC), cognitive positive component (CPC), negative affective component (NAC), and negative cognitive component (NCC) (see Table 4).

Table 4. Components and questionnaire items

Components	Items
Positive-affective component	1. I appreciate the idea of incorporating innovations into the curriculum. 2. I feel comfortable with the institution's curricular innovation processes. 3. I feel comfortable participating in work teams for curricular innovation. 4. I believe that innovations are essential to keep the curriculum current. 5. I feel comfortable when academics make decisions and autonomously adapt the curricular innovation according to their situation. 6. I appreciate that the teacher is the primary change agent in any innovation process.
Positive-Cognitive component	7. I would like to receive training to enhance my teaching of the subject. 8. Curricular innovations must be part of the institution's pedagogical model. 9. Curricular innovation impacts the whole institution. 10. The curricular innovations proposed by the institution should be transferred to the classroom settings. 11. I am innovating when I update the curriculum in my classroom. 12. Curricular innovation benefits from the use of available technology to enhance teaching and learning processes. 13. Curricular innovation must be guided by research in the area. 14. Curricular innovation involves addressing deficiencies and identifying the needs identified by teachers in their actual classroom settings.

Negative-Affective component	15. I am concerned that curricular innovation does not improve how things are done.
	16. I do not like the institution not considering academics when planning the curricular innovation process.
	17. I do not like the institution that does not consider the teacher's reflective awareness of the curricular innovation process.
Negative-Cognitive component	18. I believe that curricular innovations will not lead to constant improvements in the long term.
	19. The institution centralizes curricular innovation and does not disseminate it effectively.
	20. My colleagues' participation in the curricular innovation process is irrelevant.

Finally, a mean comparison was conducted to analyze differences among the components of attitude according to their valuation tendency. The results showed a significant difference in favor of the positive affective element compared to the negative affective component scale ($t_{164} = 91.05$, $p < 0.001$).

4 Discussion

The results indicate that teachers generally exhibit a positive attitude towards curricular innovation in both affective and cognitive aspects. Consequently, their disposition is characterized by positive emotions and cognitions. These findings are consistent with De Vocht et al. (2017) study on teachers from 10 European countries, who concluded that positive attitudes towards new ideas and proposals represent the qualities of the most effective teachers. In alignment with the first objective, these findings provide insights into the affective and cognitive components of faculty attitudes, showing a generally positive disposition towards innovation, which supports the importance of these components for successful curricular change.

On the one hand, curricular innovation should be incorporated into the institutional pedagogical model, with teachers' participation as a key element in promoting continuous improvement that reaches the classroom level. At the same time, academics should feel that innovating is a positive way to meet social demands. These results align with previous empirical studies (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2014; Rodríguez, 2015). Concerning the second objective, the analysis indicated that age plays a significant role in shaping attitudes toward innovation, particularly in the dimension of "Teacher as an Agent of Curricular Change." This suggests that personal factors, like age, may influence how faculty perceive their role in innovation processes.

On the other hand, negative evaluations of attitude are concentrated on aspects related to how institutions manage curricular innovation. Results indicate that there is a perception that the institution has not effectively communicated the purposes or reasons for the change. As a result, academics and university staff are uninformed about how the curricular innovation process is being carried out. The faculty members consider that the institution has not sufficiently considered their views when planning the innovation process, which ultimately does not guarantee long-term change or continuous improvement (Olaskoaga et al., 2013); this aligns with the third objective, highlighting that insufficient institutional support is perceived as a barrier to faculty participation, emphasizing the need for stronger organizational backing to enhance faculty engagement in innovation processes.

Thus, curricular innovation is a complex process. It is related to the meaning that academics attribute to them and how the institution promotes, implements, and manages demands and consequences (Ramsey & Kahn, 2021). In this sense, although teachers' willingness is an important element for curricular innovation, it is not the only factor ensuring its implementation success. This study demonstrates the presence of factors associated with the institution, which are accompanied by problems, needs, tensions, and uncertainties that influence the change process (Jiménez et al., 2020; Meneses & Tomás, 2017).

Universities must manage and promote the necessary conditions to improve their teams' understanding of the meanings of curricular innovation. On the contrary, curricular innovation will likely be encapsulated and understood as an asynchronous and external process, reducing it to technical issues, the fulfillment of stages, bureaucratic procedures, and superficial dialogue. These findings are consistent with the literature

in the area (Lašáková et al., 2017; Fullan et al., 2015).

Transformation requires an organizational culture because institutions manage the guidelines between those who propose curricular innovation and the protagonists of change. In this sense, proposals should be constructed among members of different areas of the organization (Zhu & Engel, 2014) to give them a fundamental understanding of change in higher education. This understanding will enable these participants to focus their skills on understanding the new curricular proposal and exploring effective improvement solutions. There is a close relationship between the teaching staff's attitude and the institution's cultural and contextual dimensions, particularly regarding the values and specific organizational environment in which the change occurs (González et al., 2023; De La Cruz, 2019).

Institutions that develop political and organizational management skills in response to change processes must create the space and time conditions to facilitate dialogue, reflection, and understanding of the proposed changes they intend to implement (Ramírez-Pérez, & Lee-Maturana, 2024). Consequently, when the responsibility for implementation is entrusted to academics, they should have the chance to design their programs and subjects in a situated, dialogic, and idiosyncratic way; this will enable them to enhance their involvement, empowerment, openness, and disciplinary and professional development through a continuous dialogue with the current needs and demands of training, thereby reducing resistance and ensuring the permanence of innovation and the ongoing improvement of training processes (Rodríguez, 2015).

The results of this study indicate that academics perceive change as being influenced by personal, cultural, organizational, and political factors. While academics are expected to innovate and adapt teaching strategies to students' needs (Olaskoaga et al., 2013), institutions also play a critical role by understanding the faculty staff's unique personal and professional dimensions and equipping them to embrace change. This approach supports curricular innovation and enhances the institution's commitment to quality in the educational process (Jiménez et al., 2020; Sáinz & Barberá, 2019).

This study provided insight into teachers' attitudes within their context, revealing how they valued their readiness for curricular change and their perceptions of the institution's organization and management of this change. Additionally, it underscored the importance of teachers feeling and perceiving themselves as transformative agents in the classroom, in their professional and personal dimensions.

The implications of these findings suggest that the institution should develop targeted policies focusing on improvement actions that encourage greater teacher involvement in implementing curricular innovations. This involvement should extend beyond the teachers' interest to become an institutional priority (Bajaj, 2019).

One of the study's limitations is that one of the researchers works as an academic at the university where the study was conducted. Although ethical safeguards were taken to avoid bias in the participants, there is still the possibility that the role of this academic has directly or indirectly influenced some responses about attitudes towards curricular innovation. While strategies such as participant anonymity and data confidentiality were adopted to mitigate this concern, a researcher with a direct connection to the institution in question could have generated distinct dynamics that influenced participants' responses or perceptions.

Future studies should explore the reasons underlying teachers' attitudes toward curricular innovation. Although this study focused on their attitudes towards the subject, it did not investigate the reasons for the positive and negative attitudes that this type of curricular transformation promotes. Exploring the reasons behind teachers' attitudes towards curriculum innovation could provide valuable insights into teachers' personal experiences and perceptions of innovation, including previous experiences with curriculum changes. How do they perceive these changes regarding their workload, autonomy, and ability to achieve teaching objectives?

Studying the reasons behind teachers' attitudes could also help identify possible obstacles that hinder the adoption of innovative practices. Understanding potential underlying barriers could help design effective training and support strategies that address teachers' legitimate concerns and promote innovation.

Another study should include other stakeholders, such as students or university administrators. Thus, there will be a more complete and balanced view of attitudes towards curricular innovation in higher

education; this will enable informed decision-making on how to design and implement effective changes to the curriculum that benefit all stakeholders and enhance the quality of higher education overall. This comprehensive approach will strengthen higher education and prepare the agents who participate in these training processes more effectively for the challenges of curricular innovation.

5 Funding

This research was funded by the Major Scientific and Technological Research Projects program of the Universidad de Tarapacá (UTA Mayor 5746-23).

References

- Ajzen, I. (2001). Nature and operations of attitudes. *Annual Reviews Psychology*, 52(1), 27-58. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.27>
- Bajaj, M. (2019). Conceptualizing transformative agency in education for peace, human rights, and social justice. *International Journal of Human Rights Education*, 2(1). <https://repository.usfca.edu/ijhre/vol2/iss1/13>
- Barger, A. P., Leffel, K. G., & Lott, M. (2022). Plotting academic innovation: a content analysis of twenty institutional websites. *Innovative Higher Education*, 47(1), 95-111. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-021-09568-4>
- Bernauer, J. A., Fuller, R. G., & Cassels, A. M. (2024). Transforming courses across teaching modalities in higher education. *Current Issues in Education*, 25(1). <https://doi.org/10.14507/cie.vol25iss1.2157>
- Betrián, E., & Jové, G. (2013). La inestabilidad docente y la homeostasis de la innovación educativa. *Estudios sobre educación*, 24(1), 61-82. <https://doi.org/10.15581/004.24.2024>
- Brunner, J. (2015). Medio siglo de transformaciones de la educación superior chilena: Un estado del arte. En A. Bernasconi (Ed.), *La educación superior de Chile. Transformación, desarrollo y crisis* (pp. 21-107). Ediciones Universidad Católica de Chile.
- Burgos, C., Pávez, K., Hidalgo, Y., & Olivares, M. (2018). Caracterización del discurso sobre innovación curricular en FID en universidades de Chile. *Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales*, 34(86), 201-234.
- Chen, Q., & Li, Y. (2019). Mobility, knowledge transfer, and innovation: An empirical study on returned Chinese academics at two research universities. *Sustainability*, 11(22), 6454. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11226454>
- Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: The state of the field. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1), 22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00392-8>
- De La Cruz, M. L. (2019). Organizational culture and its impact on school performance. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research and Innovations*, 7(4), 6-12. <http://www.researchpublish.com>
- De Vocht, M., Laherto, A., & Parchmann, I. (2017). Exploring teachers' concerns about bringing responsible innovation to research European and science classrooms. *Journal of Sciences Teaching Education*, 28(8), 326-346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2017.1343602>
- EIN. (2018). *Perspectives of educational innovation in universities in Mexico: Experiences and reflections of the EIN 360*. <https://educatic.unam.mx/avisos/perspectivas-innovacion-educativa-en-universidades-mexico.pdf>
- Ferrari, L., Galletti, F., & Mancini, T. (2020). Psychometric properties and a preliminary validation study of the Italian brief version of the Communication Styles Inventory (CSI-B/I). *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1421. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01421>
- Festinger, et al. (2023). Informed Consent to Research. En *The Cambridge Handbook of Research Methods and Statistics for the Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Vol. 1). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108349383.010>
- Fullan, M. (2020). *Leading in a Culture of Change: Achieving the Impossible*. Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M., & Quinn, J. (2020). *How do disruptive innovators prepare today's students to be tomorrow's workforce? Deep learning: Transforming systems to prepare tomorrow citizens*. Inter-American Development Bank.
- Fullan, M., Rincón, S., & Hargreaves, A. (2015). Professional capital as accountability. *Education policy analysis archives*, 23(15), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v23.1936>
- Gil, H. (2016). *Formas de adopción generadas en los profesores ante la práctica educativa de un currículum innovador* [Tesis doctoral, Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona]. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/educar>.

- Gómez-Trigueros, I. M., Ruiz-Bañuls, M., Esteve-Faubel, J. M., & Mareque León, F. (2024). Teacher motivation: Exploring the integration of technology and didactics in the narratives of future teachers. *Social Sciences*, 13(4), 217. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13040217>
- Gonta, I., & Tripon, C. (2020). An analysis of curricular innovation in higher education: Challenges and a possible solution. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 21(2), 87-100. <https://doi.org/10.35923/jes.2020.2.06>
- González Cardona, J. A., Naranjo-Valencia, J. C., & Calderón Hernández, G. (2023). Relationship between organizational culture and school performance: A study in elementary, middle, and high school institutions. *Desarrollo Gerencial*, 15(2), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.17081/dege.15.2.6414>
- González, C., & Cruzat, M. (2019). Innovación educativa: La experiencia de las carreras pedagógicas en la Universidad de Los Lagos, Chile. *Educación*, 28(55), 103-122. <https://doi.org/10.18800/educacion.201902.005>
- Guskey, T. R. (2020). Professional development and teacher change: Implications for practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 89, 103021.
- Guzmán, M., Maureira, O., Sánchez, A., & Vergara, A. (2015). Innovación curricular en la educación superior: ¿Cómo se gestionan las políticas de innovación en los (re) diseños de las carreras de pregrado en Chile? *Perfiles Educativos*, 37(149), 60-73. <https://doi.org/10.22201/iisue.24486167e.2015.149.53121>
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2014). *Capital profesional: Transformar la enseñanza en cada escuela*. Ediciones Morata.
- Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2020). *Leading Systemic School Improvement: Navigating the Road to Change*. Routledge.
- Hasanefendic, S., Birkholz, J. M., Horta, H., & Sijde, P. van der. (2017). Individuals in action: Bringing about innovation in higher education. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 7(2), 101-119. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2017.1296367>
- Hernández, E., & Medina, R. (2014). Análisis de los obstáculos y barreras para el cambio y la innovación en colaboración en los centros de secundaria: un estudio de caso. *Revista de Investigación Educativa*, 32(2), 499-512. <https://doi.org/10.6018/rie.32.2.172041>
- Infante, M. (2010). Desafíos a la formación docente: inclusión educativa. *Estudios Pedagógicos (Valdivia)*, 36(1), 287-297. <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052010000100016>
- Jacobson, W., & Cole, R. (2020). Motivations and obstacles influencing faculty engagement in adopting teaching innovations. *To Improve the Academy*, 39(1), 137-159. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-019-09490-2>
- Jerez, O., & Silva, C. (Eds.). (2017). *Innovando en la educación superior: Experiencias clave en Latinoamérica y el Caribe 2016-2017. Volumen 1: Gestión curricular y desarrollo de la docencia*. Facultad de Economía y Negocios, Universidad de Chile. <https://doi.org/10.34720/fsrp-ze78>
- Jiménez, M., Martínez, A., & Fernández, E. (2020). Actitudes del profesorado sobre la innovación con herramientas TIC multisensoriales en entornos inclusivos. *Revista Latinoamericana de tecnología Educativa*, 19(2), 29-45. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17398/1695-288X.19.2.29>
- Jung, C., & Shen, H. (2021). Innovation in higher education: Enhancing access and quality through cross-border academic cooperation. *Journal of Global Education and Research*, 5(1), 40-55. <https://doi.org/10.30560/jger.v5n1p40>
- Krause, A. (2019). Diversidad y calidad: Desafíos de la inclusión en universidades chilenas. En M. J. Lemaitre (Ed.), *Diversidad, autonomía, calidad. Desafíos para una educación superior para el siglo XXI* (pp. 105-109). Centro Interuniversitario de Desarrollo (CINDA).
- Lašáková, A., Bajžíková, L., & Dedze, I. (2017). Barriers and drivers of innovation in higher education: Case study-based evidence across Ten European Universities. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 54(4), 69-79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.01.003>
- Meneses, G., & Balladares, J. (2022). Desafíos en la innovación curricular en la formación universitaria desde la mirada de los académicos. *Interciencia*, 47(5), 181-190.
- Meneses, G., & Tomás, M. (2017). Validación de un cuestionario para evaluar las actitudes del profesorado universitario ante la innovación curricular. *Acción Pedagógica*, 26(1), 106-119.
- Mishra, P., Singh, U., Pandey, C. M., Mishra, P., & Pandey, G. (2019). Application of student's t-test, analysis of variance, and covariance. *Annals of Cardiac Anaesthesia*, 22(4), 407-411. https://doi.org/10.4103/aca.ACA_94_19
- Mykhailyshyn, H., Kondur, O., & Serman, L. (2018). Innovation of Education and Educational Innovations in Conditions of Modern Higher Education Institution. *Journal of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University*, 5(1), 9-16. <https://doi.org/10.15330/jpnu.5.1.9-16>

- Olaskoaga, J., González, X., Marúm, E., & Onaindia, E. (2015). Reformas organizativas en las instituciones de educación superior, condiciones laborales y reacciones de los académicos. *Revista iberoamericana de educación superior*, 6(17), 102-118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rides.2015.07.003>
- Olaskoaga, J., Marúm, E., Rosario, V., & Pérez, D. (2013). *Universidades en movimiento: El debate acerca de la gestión de la calidad y las actitudes del profesorado ante las transformaciones universitarias*. Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior (ANUIES).
- Onyura, B., Lass, E., Lazor, J., Zuccaro, L., & Hamza, D. M. (2022). Vitalizing the evaluation of curricular implementation: A framework for attending to the "how and whys" of curriculum evolution. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 27(2), 553-572. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-021-10083-6>
- Parejo, J. L., Revuelta-Domínguez, F. I., Guerra-Antequera, J., & Ocaña-Fernández, A. (2022). An analysis of educational innovation culture by a Delphi expert panel. *Frontiers in Education*, 7, 926. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2022.991263>
- Ramírez-Pérez, M., & Lee-Maturana, S. (2024). Positive organizational psychology research in Chile: A systematic literature review. *LÍMITE Revista Interdisciplinaria de Filosofía y Psicología*, 19.
- Ramsey, P., & Khan, S. (2021). Dilemmas, emotion and innovation in tertiary education. *Innovative Perspectives in Education and Teaching*, 58, 250-260. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2020.1733046>
- Rodríguez, D. (2015). *Gestión del conocimiento y mejora de las organizaciones educativas*. La Muralla.
- Rodríguez-Esteban, A., & González-Mayorga, H. (2023). Influencia del profesorado en las actitudes hacia la inmigración de los alumnos: Evidencias desde PISA 2018. *REICE. Revista Iberoamericana sobre Calidad, Eficacia y Cambio en Educación*, 21(3), 85-100. <https://doi.org/10.15366/reice2023.21.3.005>
- Schartner, A., & Young, D. (2020). Cultural adaptation and transitions within international higher education: University students' experiences of studying abroad during the 2020 Coronavirus pandemic. *PLOS ONE*. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0244594>
- Simeoni, I. A., & Caballero, R. (2024). Curricular innovation in the knowledge society. *Seminars in Medical Writing and Education*, 3, 58. <https://doi.org/10.56294/mw202458>
- Trowler, P., & Trowler, V. (2020). Institutional cultures and the transformation of higher education: Strategies for improving the quality of higher education systems. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(2), 288-302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2019.1677672>
- UNESCO. (2022). *Driving a global movement to transform education: Key moments of 2022*. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/driving-global-movement-transform-education-key-moments-2022>
- Vicente, P., Lucas, M., Carlos, V., & Bem-Haja, P. (2020). Higher education in a material world: Constraints to digital innovation in Portuguese universities and polytechnic institutes. *Education and Information Technologies*, 25(6), 5815-5833. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10258-5>
- Villa, A. (2016). *Innovación en la formación del profesorado universitario*. <http://www.foroinnovacionuniversitaria.net/foroant/innovacion-en-la-formacion-del-profesorado-universitario/>
- Zhu, C., & Engels, N. (2014). Organizational culture and instructional innovations in higher education: Perceptions and reactions of teachers and students. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 42(1), 136-158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143213499253>
- Zou, T. X. P., Lee, J. C. Y., & Yu, K. S. (2023). Faculty members' perceptions and students' experiences of research-based curricula: A multiple case study of four undergraduate programmes. *Higher Education*, 86(3), 703-723. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01166-x>