



## **Innovating within Constraints: Basic School Teachers' Experiences with Pedagogical Reform**

**Benjamin Takyi**

University of Education, Winneba, Ghana, 8240430010@st.uew.edu.gh

**Samuel Korankye**

University of Education, Winneba, Ghana, 8230430015@st.uew.edu.gh

**Victoria Akolbila**

University of Education, Winneba, Ghana, 220020367@st.uew.edu.gh

Ghana's adoption of a standards-based curriculum grounded in 21st-century pedagogy presents a paradox: while teachers are trained in innovative, learner-centered methods, the classrooms they inhabit remain largely rigid, overcrowded, and under-resourced. This study investigates how basic school teachers navigate these tensions, implementing pedagogical innovations in traditional classroom environments. Using a parallel convergent mixed-methods design, the study engaged 97 basic school teachers through electronic surveys and in-depth interviews. Anchored in Rogers' Diffusion Innovation Theory, the study reveals that while pedagogical innovation is taking root at the cognitive and attitudinal levels, its full realization is obstructed by contextual constraints. The findings underscore the need for systemic reform beyond curriculum change, including infrastructure development and targeted teacher support. The study calls on educational policymakers to align pedagogical reforms with investments in physical learning environments to ensure sustainable and equitable educational transformation.

Keywords: innovative pedagogy, standards-based curriculum, basic education, pedagogic reform, Ghana

### **INTRODUCTION**

Pedagogical practices in the 21st century have undergone significant transformations (Gyawali & Mehndroo, 2023; Siregar, 2020), generating increased demand for innovative approaches that emphasize learner engagement, critical thinking, and collaboration. They capitalize on students' innate tendencies such as curiosity, creativity, and playfulness, while anchoring learning experiences in relevance and authenticity (Paniagua & Istance, 2018). While the potential of such instructional practices to foster lifelong learning, adaptability, and problem-solving is widely acknowledged (Benade, 2020), their success depends not only on curriculum reform but

**Citation:** Takyi, B., Korankye, S., & Akolbila, V. (2026). Innovating within constraints: Basic school teachers' experiences with pedagogical reform. *International Journal of Instruction*, 19(2), 219-236. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2026.19212a>

also on the environments and conditions in which teaching and learning occur. In resource-constrained regions like Sub-Saharan Africa, where public schools often grapple with limited infrastructure and teacher training deficits, the scalability and sustainability of such approaches become critical concerns (Hassler et al., 2018). Without such systemic and holistic support, their transformative potentials are likely to remain unrealized.

The classroom environment of schools plays a critical role in shaping the effectiveness of pedagogical innovations (Aldhilan et al., 2024). French et al. (2020) argue that incongruence between pedagogical methods and classroom design disrupts optimal instructional practices. Traditional classrooms, characterized by rigid teacher-centered structures and rote memorization, fail to support interactive, student-centered learning (Paniagua & Istance, 2018). Thus, it is unequivocal to emphasize that innovative learning environments can significantly improve students learning outcomes. A study by Swanzy-Impraim et al. (2023) found that innovative classroom environments foster creativity and critical thinking among learners. Similarly, that of Byers et al. (2018) revealed that students in flexible, technology-rich classrooms reported higher engagement, motivation, and overall performance than their peers in traditional settings. This underscores the transformative potential of aligning pedagogy with physical space.

Global evidence shows that countries investing in innovative classroom design tend to reap substantial educational benefits. In Australia, Byers et al. (2018) and Closs et al. (2022) report how redesigned spaces improved collaboration and problem-solving. In Scandinavian countries, flexible seating, integrated digital tools, and project-based learning environments have become central to education reform, driving higher student autonomy and performance (Sigurðardóttir & Hjartarson, 2016). In contrast, Ghana, remain tied to rigid, exam-driven, and overcrowded environments that undermine the effectiveness of curriculum reforms (Ananga & Tamanja, 2017). This comparison reveals the structural disadvantage Ghana faces in constantly reforming its education system without addressing classroom environmental challenges.

Despite the numerous educational reforms implemented in Ghana over the years, Ghana's educational system have long remained deeply entrenched in traditional approaches to teaching and learning (Cobbold, 2017). The reforms, often designed to refine instructional practices and align them with current pedagogical trends, have not succeeded much in dislodging the dominance of teacher-centered methodologies. Research have established that pre-tertiary schools in Ghana are characterized by large class sizes leading to overcrowding, row-column type of seating arrangement pointing towards a single board, over-emphasis on standardized assessment promoting teaching to the test, high teacher to student ratio, all of which provide breeding grounds for entrenched traditional classroom environments (Ananga & Tamanja, 2017; Bekoe, 2023).

The recent curriculum reform in Ghana seek to transition from the objective-based model to the standards-based approach which prioritizes the development of transferable skills through innovative pedagogical approaches (Addai-Mununkum & Setordzi, 2023; NaCCA, 2018). However, the successful implementation of the

pedagogical innovations inherent in the new standards-based curriculum are at risk due to the stark disconnect between the innovations and the conventional physical infrastructure in public basic schools. While Ghana has made significant strides in transitioning its pre-tertiary curriculum to a learner-centered paradigm, the failure to modernize classroom environments that still rely heavily on traditional, and rigid setups presents a significant obstacle. Without adapting the physical spaces in which teaching and learning occur, the innovative pedagogical approaches outlined in the new curriculum may struggle to gain traction, leaving the educational system caught between the old and the new.

As Kliebard (1988, p. 21–22), cited in Bekoe (2006), reminds us, curriculum change without due regard for a modification of the context in which the change is to take place is doomed to a short life. In Ghana, basic school teachers are integral in this reform, as their awareness of innovative teaching methods is a crucial first step toward successful implementation. Awareness not only shapes how teachers interpret curricular demands but also influences their confidence and willingness to adopt new strategies in resource-constrained context. Thus, the study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the level of awareness among basic school teachers regarding the innovative teaching methods introduced in the new subject curriculum?
2. How do basic school teachers implement innovative teaching methods in traditional classroom settings?

### **Theoretical Framework**

This study is grounded in Rogers' Diffusion of Innovation Theory (Rogers, 2003), which provides a lens for understanding how basic school teachers in Ghana adopt innovative teaching methods within traditional classroom contexts. The theory explains how new practices spread over time, influenced by both individual choices and contextual factors (Ayodele, 2020; Menzli et al., 2022). Rather than treating Rogers' five stages of adoption; knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation, and confirmation as sequential, the study interprets them as interrelated conditions that shape teachers' readiness and capacity to adopt innovation. Rogers also outlines five innovation attributes: relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, and observability (Shanmugam & Shanmugam, 2021) which are used to analyze how features of learner-centered methods affect adoption. For example, perceived difficulty (complexity) and lack of alignment with classroom conditions (compatibility) may hinder adoption, while observable benefits and opportunities to experiment (trialability and observability) can promote it. The framework helps contextualize teacher experiences with Ghana's curriculum reforms.

### **METHOD**

#### **Research Design**

Anchored within the pragmatic research paradigm, a parallel convergent mixed-method design was employed, enabling the simultaneous collection and analysis of both numeric and non-numeric data. This design was selected to capitalize on the strengths

of both research methods, ensuring a well-rounded and comprehensive understanding of the research problem (Dawadi et al., 2021).

### **Participants**

The participants for this study comprised basic school teachers in their first year of study leave at the University of Education, Winneba, during the 2024/2025 academic year. The focus was specifically on those who were in their first year at the time data was collected in March and April 2025. The University of Education, Winneba admits teachers on study leave from all regions of Ghana. Consequently, the participants in this study represent a geographically diverse and nationally reflective group of public basic school teachers. Prior to commencing their study leave, these teachers were actively involved in implementing the new curriculum. Their recent and practical classroom experiences made their perspectives both relevant and valuable to the aim of this study.

### **Sampling Procedure**

Two distinct sampling techniques were used to align with the mixed-methods approach and ensure effective participant recruitment. For the quantitative component, a simple random sampling technique was applied to select 97 teachers from the membership of the Ghana National Association of Teachers on Campus (GNATOC). This sample size was determined using Yamane's formula with a 10% margin of error. This probabilistic sampling approach was chosen to ensure that every member of the sampling frame had an equal chance of being selected, thereby enhancing the representativeness of the sample. The application of simple random sampling aimed to minimize selection bias, thus enabling the findings to be more generalizable (Turner, 2020).

In contrast, convenience sampling was employed for the qualitative component to select 12 participants. This non-probabilistic sampling technique was chosen for its practicality, as it allowed for the efficient identification and recruitment of individuals who were readily willing to participate (Stratton, 2021). By focusing on participants with direct experience in the implementation of the new curriculum, this approach ensured that the qualitative data gathered was both relevant and insightful, providing a deeper understanding of the research problem.

### **Instruments**

Data collection was conducted using two complementary instruments: an electronic questionnaire, developed with the assistance of Kobo Toolbox, and in-depth interviews guided by a semi-structured interview protocol. Participants were first contacted through phone calls and invited to take part in the study. Upon acceptance, a link to the electronic questionnaire was sent for completion. Those who expressed willingness to provide further insights were subsequently contacted for interviews. The interviews were conducted via mobile phone calls and were guided by open-ended questions designed to elicit teachers' awareness, experiences, and challenges in adopting innovative pedagogies within conventional classroom settings. Sample questions included: "What are your general thoughts on how the recent curriculum promotes innovative pedagogies?"; "Which innovative teaching methods do you often use in your classroom (e.g., project-based learning, cooperative learning, flipped learning)?" and

“How does the physical layout of your classroom (seating arrangement, class size, access to electricity and resources) influence your ability to implement innovative teaching methods?”

### **Analysis**

The numeric data were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The process began with extracting the dataset from Kobo Toolbox in Excel format, followed by data cleaning to address errors and inconsistencies. The cleaned data were then imported into SPSS (version 30) for statistical analysis. In parallel, the non-numeric data were subjected to thematic analysis to identify patterns and emerging themes. Finally, findings from both quantitative and qualitative analyses were triangulated to ensure a comprehensive and well-rounded interpretation of the results

### **Study Quality**

To ensure the validity and trustworthiness of findings, the study applied legitimation principles proposed by Onwuegbuzie and Johnson (2006), which are crucial for rigorous mixed-methods research. Three key strategies guided the study’s quality assurance: weakness minimization legitimation, paradigmatic mixing legitimation, and sample integration legitimation. Weakness minimization was addressed through data triangulation, where concurrent collection of quantitative and qualitative data allowed the strengths of one method to offset the limitations of the other, enhancing the credibility of inferences. To achieve paradigmatic mixing legitimation, the study was grounded in the pragmatic paradigm, which supports methodological pluralism and the use of diverse tools to address real-world problems. This alignment ensured philosophical coherence across research design and execution. For sample integration legitimation, the study adopted a parallel convergent mixed-methods design, consistent with the dominant-less dominant approach recommended by Onwuegbuzie and Johnson (2006). This integration enabled the development of robust meta-inferences that accurately captured the complexity of the educational context.

**FINDINGS****Research Question 1: What is the Level of Awareness of Basic School Teachers about the Innovative Teaching Methods Introduced in the New Subject Curriculum?**

Table 1  
Teachers' level of awareness

	M	SD
I am aware of the emphasis placed on cooperative and collaborative learning within the new subject curriculum.	3.6	0.5
I am aware that the standards-based curriculum for my subject area promotes project-based learning as a core instructional method.	3.5	0.6
I am certain that experiential learning is a key component of the new subject curriculum.	3.5	0.5
I am aware that the new curriculum mandates the integration of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in teaching and learning.	3.5	0.6
I am aware that the new subject curriculum advocates for the use of problem-based learning methodologies.	3.4	0.6
I am aware that differentiated instructional methods are recommended within the new subject curriculum.	3.5	0.6
I am aware that scaffolding techniques are recommended for use in the new subject curriculum.	3.4	0.6
I am aware of the integration of community-based learning activities in the new subject curriculum.	3.4	0.7
I am aware that flipped learning is incorporated into the new subject curriculum.	3.1	0.7
I am aware of the integration of inquiry-based learning in the new subject curriculum.	3.5	0.5
Mean of means/ Standard deviation	3.4	0.6

Decision Rule:  $M < 2.5$  = below average  $\geq 2.50$  = above average).

The result presented in Table 1 reveal a generally high awareness of key pedagogical strategies introduced under the standards-based curriculum, with mean scores ranging from 3.1 to 3.6. Cooperative and collaborative learning emerged as the most widely recognized method ( $M = 3.6$ ,  $SD = 0.5$ ), closely followed by experiential, project-based, ICT-integrated, and inquiry-based learning, each scoring  $M \geq 3.4$ . This suggests that teacher training and curricular dissemination efforts have effectively foregrounded participatory and technology-enhanced approaches as pedagogical cornerstones. Comparatively, flipped learning ( $M = 3.1$ ) among the others shows weaker familiarity and greater variability ( $SD = 0.7$ ), indicating potential gaps in either teacher exposure or comprehension. However, the spread in standard deviations ranging from 0.5 to 0.7 further suggests that awareness is not uniformly distributed, pointing to disparities that may stem from unequal professional development and implementation support. This uneven awareness is critical. Innovations with higher perceived complexity or less contextual compatibility such as flipped classrooms may struggle to gain traction, even as simpler, more intuitive strategies like group work proliferate. These findings are consistent with Rogers' (2003) theory, which posits that complexity and compatibility are key determinants of an innovation's diffusion.

To triangulate the quantitative data on teacher awareness, qualitative interviews were analyzed to explore whether self-reported familiarity with innovative pedagogies aligned with the depth and clarity of teachers' verbal accounts. While quantitative data indicated generally high awareness, the qualitative analysis revealed three key themes highlighting nuances in understanding and application.

### **General Recognition of Core Methods**

Teachers demonstrated broad awareness of the core instructional strategies in the new curriculum, such as collaborative learning, experiential learning, and inquiry-based methods. This suggests a general internalization of the curriculum's pedagogical objectives.

Some of the teachers interviewed reiterated:

“With the new curriculum, the emphasis is on the learner. So, it deals with teachers using several creative techniques to help student acquire some core competencies” [sic].

“Yes, the new curriculum, all it talks about is acquiring skills like critical thinking and problems-solving. That is why it looks at methods like experiential learning, collaboration, and inquiry-based learning” [sic].

### **Limited Depth and Application Knowledge**

Despite general recognition, most teachers could not provide concrete examples of how these methods are applied in curriculum exemplars, indicating superficial understanding and limited practical knowledge. One of the teachers confirmed this by stating:

“Okay, talking about that, I have no idea of how those methods have been applied but I know of the various instructions you mentioned” [sic].

### **Emphasis on Learner-Centered Principles**

Teachers consistently highlighted the child-centered nature of the curriculum, focusing on facilitating student exploration and skill acquisition. While this reflects awareness of the curriculum philosophy, it also underscores a conceptual rather than practical grasp of innovative pedagogical strategies. In this regard, a teacher mentioned that:

“Okay, the new curriculum is really good because it is child-centered and this is whereby the children are allowed to explore different dimensions. With this new curriculum, the teacher facilitates” [sic].

Comparatively, the qualitative findings confirm the general awareness reported quantitatively but reveal divergences regarding depth, clarity, and application. Teachers understand the philosophy and key methods but struggle to articulate concrete classroom implementation, particularly for strategies that may be complex or less familiar. These insights complement the quantitative data, highlighting areas where professional development and practical support are needed to bridge the gap between awareness and effective application.

### **Research Questions 2: How do Basic School Teachers Implement Innovative Teaching Methods in Traditional Classroom Settings?**

Drawing from the quantitative and qualitative data, the findings demonstrate that while teachers are motivated and conceptually prepared to innovate, their experiences with implementation is shaped by three interrelated factors:

1. The rigidity and limitations of physical classroom conditions.
2. Strategic adaptation and selective method use.
3. Motivational resilience despite systemic constraints.

#### **Rigidity and Limitations of Physical Classroom Conditions**

Table 2

Classrooms condition and perceived nature

	N	%
<b>Observed Classroom Conditions</b>		
Desks and chairs are arranged in fixed rows facing the teacher.	70	72.2
The teacher's desk is positioned at the front, with a writing board placed behind or adjacent to it.	43	44.3
Classroom is overcrowded, with desks placed close together, leaving little room for movement.	38	39.2
There is enough space for the teacher to move between desks but limited open space for student engagement.	57	58.8
The classroom relies mainly on chalkboards, whiteboards, and textbooks rather than digital tools like projectors or smart boards.	57	58.8
The walls have minimal decoration, with only a few charts, maps, or a timetable displayed.	63	64.9
<b>Perceived Nature of Classroom Setting</b>		
Purely Traditional	53	54.6
Purely innovative	2	2.1
A mix of more traditional and less innovative elements	28	28.9
A mix of less traditional and more innovative elements	14	14.4

The quantitative results in Tables 2 confirm that a majority of classrooms maintain traditional layouts with 72.2% of teachers reporting fixed desk rows, and 64.9% noting minimal visual aids. Furthermore, over half of the respondents describe their classrooms as lacking digital tools and being overcrowded or inflexible in space usage. When asked to classify their classrooms, 54.6% described them “purely traditional,” and only 2.1% identified them as “purely innovative.”

The quantitative results pointing to inadequate infrastructure were strongly corroborated by qualitative interviews. Teachers’ narratives consistently highlighted classroom conditions that were structurally misaligned with the demands of the standards-based curriculum.

#### **Infrastructural Constraints**

From the interviews, the teachers’ narratives vividly illustrated the infrastructural challenges highlighted in the quantitative data, revealing a single, overarching theme:

classroom environments that impede effective implementation of the standards-based curriculum. Participants consistently described shortages of electricity, digital tools, and basic instructional materials, alongside rigid seating arrangements and poorly maintained physical spaces.

As describe by a teacher:

*“In my school, the children are not many but we don’t have resources too. The school has chairs, but no electricity and sometimes we struggle to get chalks. There are 20 students in my class yet we still lack resources” [sic].*

Another teacher affirmed poor physical conditions:

*“So if I should take my classroom, we don't have electricity. In fact, the classroom floor is not cemented and really dusty. The kids sit in rows and columns” [sic].*

A third participant added:

*“Okay, the classroom setting has four windows. The learners are seated in rows and columns. There is the presence of wall charts, some learning materials, but no electricity” [sic].*

These narratives collectively show that both resource shortages and structural limitations hinder teachers’ ability to implement collaborative, movement-based, and technology-enhanced pedagogies. Even in classrooms with fewer students, the combination of insufficient materials and inflexible physical conditions creates a significant barrier, confirming the patterns revealed in the quantitative survey and emphasizing the urgent need for infrastructural support to fully realize the curriculum’s objectives.

### **Strategic Adaptation and Selective Method Use**

The presentation under this themes is organized under three interrelated constructs:

1. Frequently adopted methods
2. Perceived difficulty of implementation
3. Adaptive classroom strategies.

Table 3  
Frequency of Implementation

	M	SD
I actively use cooperative and collaborative learning methods to enhance student engagement.	3.5	0.6
I bring project-based learning to life in my subject area, making it a central part of my teaching.	3.3	0.7
I make experiential learning a hands-on experience that connects students with real-world challenges.	3.3	0.6
I integrate Information and Communication Technology (ICT) to create interactive and modern lessons.	2.9	0.6
I challenge students with problem-based learning, helping them solve real problems creatively.	3.3	0.6
I tailor my lessons using differentiated methods to ensure every student's learning style is met.	3.3	0.6
I use scaffolding techniques to guide students through complex concepts, ensuring their success step by step.	3.2	0.6
I bring the community into the classroom through meaningful, community-based learning activities.	3.0	0.6
I spark curiosity and critical thinking by embracing inquiry-based learning in my lessons.	3.3	0.5
Mean of means/ Standard deviation	3.2	0.6

Scale:  $1.00 \leq M \leq 1.49$  = Never;  $1.50 \leq M \leq 2.49$  = Occasionally;  $2.50 \leq M \leq 3.49$  = Often;  $3.50 \leq M \leq 4.00$  = Very Often.

The numeric data revealed that teachers reported frequent use of a range of innovative teaching methods. As shown in Table 3, the most frequently used method was cooperative and collaborative learning ( $M = 3.5$ ,  $SD = 0.6$ ), falling into the “very often” category. Several other methods including project-based learning ( $M = 3.3$ ), inquiry-based learning ( $M = 3.3$ ), problem-based learning ( $M = 3.3$ ), experiential learning ( $M = 3.3$ ), and differentiated instruction ( $M = 3.3$ ) were all reported as “often used.” ICT integration scored slightly lower ( $M = 2.9$ ), though still within the “often” range.

Moreover, the interview participants echoed these preferences in the interviews. Many gravitated toward collaborative learning and group activities, citing it as the most realistic, effective, and manageable option in their constrained settings. They described grouping students to work on projects or assignments as a practical solution that requires minimal physical reorganization and external technology. Some of the teachers claimed that:

*“I use the collaborative learning. They make the class lively and every child wants to participate” [sic].*

*“With the collaborative, it has help the students to express themselves. They are able to express whatever is in their mind “[sic].*

*“Group learning has helped them to be tolerant of each other. And I can say for a fact that it puts some sort of confidence in them “[sic].*

Table 4  
Perceived difficulty level

Method	M	SD
Cooperative and Collaborative Learning	3.1	0.8
Project-Based Learning	2.7	0.7
Experiential Learning	3.0	0.6
ICT Integration in Teaching	2.3	0.8
Problem-Based Learning	2.8	0.5
Differentiated Instruction	2.9	0.7
Scaffolding Techniques	2.9	0.6
Community-Based Learning	2.8	0.8
Flipped Learning	2.9	0.6
Inquiry-Based Learning	2.9	0.8
Mean of means/ Standard deviation	2.8	0.7

Decision Rule:  $1.00 \leq M \leq 1.49$  = Very Easy;  $1.50 \leq M \leq 2.49$  = Easy;  $2.50 \leq M \leq 3.49$  = Difficult;  $3.50 \leq M \leq 4.00$  = Very Difficult.

Despite frequent adoption, most pedagogical methods were perceived as difficult to implement. As presented in Table 4, cooperative and collaborative learning though commonly used was rated as “difficult” ( $M = 3.1$ ), alongside inquiry-based learning ( $M = 2.9$ ), experiential learning ( $M = 3.0$ ), and other approaches.

#### Divergence from the Qualitative Results

However, during the interviews, several teachers described collaborative learning as the most workable approach, citing its low material demands and its adaptability even within constrained classroom environments. This reveals a divergence between the quantitative and qualitative data.

*“The easiest one would be to put them in groups and give them the work. It is because it does not need any special materials and also get students involved”.* [sic].

*“The collaboration, I guess. The class size is not big and the classroom is spacious to put them into groups”* [sic].

*“The collaborative is the easiest because the class is spacious and that is what adopt almost all the time. The use of technology is difficult because the resources are not there”* [sic].

#### ICT Integration Perceived as Easy

Notably, ICT integration was the only method perceived as “easy” to implement in the survey, with a mean score of 2.3. This perception may reflect the fact that teachers often improvise using personal digital tools such as mobile phones, which may reduce the apparent complexity of integration. However, this quantitative finding contrasts sharply with the interview data. Despite reporting some use of ICT, their accounts reveal that implementation is often limited, inefficient, and burdensome. As some participants explained:

*“The use of ICT is difficult. This is because the curriculum requires us to use it but we don’t have the materials to use” [sic].*

*“The use of technology is difficult because the resources are not there” [sic]*

*“Due to the lack of technological gadgets, instead of making it an interactive class, you become limited to just delivering what you know” [sic].*

*“It really affects me because sometimes the curriculum require teachers to show a video about disaster or conflict but this is the case I don’t even have access to a laptop” [sic].*

Table 5  
Teachers’ adaptation efforts

	N	%
Reorganizing seating into clusters or flexible arrangements to encourage group work and interaction.	82	84.5
Utilizing multi-purpose spaces for activities such as discussions, presentations, and hands-on tasks.	70	72.2
Rearranging teacher-student interactions by circulating around the classroom to provide guidance and engage in discussions.	77	79.4
Incorporating visual aids like posters and digital visuals to simplify complex concepts.	68	70.1
Using personal smart technology such as laptops, smartphones, and projectors to enhance learning.	75	77.3
Adjusting lesson pacing to allocate sufficient time for interactive activities.	70	72.2

Table 5 highlights a variety of classroom adaptation strategies that teachers employ to support innovative teaching within traditional settings. These strategies go beyond instructional content to include changes in classroom layout, interaction, and pacing aimed at fostering active, student-centered learning. The most common adaptation is reorganizing seating to support group work (84.5%). A significant number of teachers (79.4%) also move around the classroom to engage students directly. Additionally, 77.3% use personal digital devices, while 72.2% repurpose classroom space for hands-on activities and adjust lesson pacing to allow deeper engagement. Finally, 70.1% incorporate visual aids like posters and charts to enhance comprehension.

However, the findings from the interview strongly support these quantitative trend, particularly in the area of ICT. In the absence of the ICT tools prescribed by the curriculum, teachers often resorted to improvisation, relying on personal mobile phones to simulate the use of multimedia in instruction. While this demonstrates commitment and creativity, it also highlights the inefficiency and limitations of such workarounds. The use of personal phones to display videos or images was a recurring strategy, though one fraught with practical challenges. As they explained:

*“My phone is a small phone with a very small screen so if it is a video that I want to show to the students then, I will have to move from desk to desk” [sic]*

*“So, sometimes when I use my phone, I have to pass the phone around” [sic]*

**Motivational Resilience despite Systemic Constraints**

Despite unfavourable classroom conditions, many teachers demonstrate **deep intrinsic commitment** to reform-oriented teaching, drawing on personal convictions about student growth, engagement, and empowerment.

Table 6  
Motivating factors

	N	%
The potential to increase student engagement in class activities and discussions	85	87.6
The opportunity to improve students' academic performance	78	80.4
The desire to foster better collaboration among students in group tasks or projects	79	81.4
The aim to encourage greater creativity in students' work	77	79.4
The goal of increasing student responsibility for their own learning	72	74.2
The intention to boost student confidence in asking questions and sharing ideas	76	78.4
The belief that it will improve students' problem-solving and critical thinking skills	78	80.4
The drive to increase student motivation to attend and participate in class	77	79.4

As summarized in Table 6, teachers identified a broad range of motivating factors that influence their willingness to adopt innovative teaching methods even when implementation is difficult. The most cited motivation, endorsed by 87.6% of teachers was the potential to increase students' engagement. The teachers believe that when students are actively involved, they become more curious, expressive, and attentive. This desire to make learning more participatory and meaningful appears to be a powerful internal driver of implementing the pedagogical change. Similarly, 80.4% of respondents viewed innovative methods as a means of improving academic performance and critical thinking, while 81.4% were motivated by the opportunity to promote collaboration among students. These figures reflect teachers' belief that learner-centered methods are not only aligned with curriculum demands but are also instrumental to holistic student development. Other notable motivations included encouraging creativity (79.4%), supporting autonomy and student responsibility (74.2%), and building confidence and classroom participation (78.4%).

**DISCUSSION**

This study engaged Rogers' (2003) Diffusion of Innovation Theory as a lens to interpret how basic school teachers in Ghana implement innovative pedagogical practices within traditional classroom settings. Rather than merely mapping stages of adoption, the discussion interrogates the contradictions between teacher intent and institutional structures, illuminating the systemic inequities and policy gaps that mediate the diffusion of educational innovation in resource-limited contexts. Rogers posits that knowledge is the initial and foundational stage of the innovation-decision process. In this study, most teachers demonstrated broad awareness of the instructional methods promoted by Ghana's standards-based curriculum, with a composite mean score of 3.4 indicating above-average familiarity. These results support earlier findings by Yalley (2022), Mochiah and Adibi (2023), and Laryea (2023), which also report widespread teacher awareness. Yet this promising surface belies a deeper inconsistency. As Kwarteng (2024) and the qualitative results in this study both reveal, many teachers,

while aware of the innovations, struggle with practical know-how. Some could list methods but could not describe how they are operationalized in curriculum exemplars. This suggests a fragmentation between principle knowledge and procedural competence, limiting the transition from cognitive awareness to confident implementation.

These findings resonate with Rogers' distinction between awareness and "how-to" knowledge, with the latter being essential for adoption. They also expose a wider policy failure: while curriculum reform has promoted innovative methods, teacher preparation and continuous professional development have not sufficiently equipped teachers to translate theory into practice. This reflects broader structural disconnects between curricular aspirations and institutional readiness. A concern echoed in studies from similar low-resource contexts, such as Ngware et al. (2020) in Kenya and Yusuf and Dada (2021) in Nigeria, where inadequate teacher training undermines implementation fidelity. The tension becomes more pronounced when teachers attempt to implement innovation within structurally ill-equipped environments. As the study showed, the majority of classrooms remain overcrowded, under-resourced, and configured for passive learning. These conditions directly contradict the pedagogical demands of activity-based, student-centered instruction. In Rogers' terms, the perceived complexity of innovations especially those requiring digital tools or flexible space undermines adoption. Teachers may be persuaded of the value of these methods, but they are simultaneously constrained by physical layouts, lack of electricity, and shortages of basic instructional materials. These findings reinforce the work of Addai-Mununkum and Setordzi (2023) and Nyamekye et al. (2023), who also found that Ghanaian basic school teachers often revert to lecture-based approaches due to such constraints.

Yet, despite these challenges, the study found strong evidence of positive attitudes toward innovation. Many teachers expressed clear motivation to adopt learner-centered strategies not merely out of policy compliance but based on their direct experience of improved student engagement, confidence, and collaboration. This aligns with Rogers' persuasion stage, particularly the concept of perceived relative advantage. Teachers' beliefs in the benefits of innovation often led them to take adaptive measures to approximate the kind of interactive teaching.

This study is not without limitations. First, although the sample was drawn from a nationally diverse group of teachers on study leave at the University of Education, Winneba, the findings may not fully capture the perspectives of teachers who remained in active classroom service. Their ongoing experiences could reveal additional insights into the day-to-day challenges of implementing the standards-based curriculum. Second, while the mixed-methods design provided breadth and depth, the reliance on self-reported survey data and phone-based interviews may have introduced social desirability bias, with some participants possibly overstating their awareness or use of innovative methods. Third, the study's cross-sectional nature offers a snapshot of teachers' experiences at a particular moment, limiting the ability to track how awareness and implementation evolve over time. Additionally, the focus on descriptive statistics restricted the analysis to surface-level patterns without exploring more

complex relationships between variables such as teacher demographics, years of experience, or school location.

Future research should therefore consider longitudinal designs to trace changes in teacher adoption of innovative pedagogies as curriculum reforms mature. Comparative studies across regions or school types (urban vs. rural; public vs. private) could also illuminate contextual variations in implementation. Furthermore, more in-depth classroom observations and case studies would complement self-reported data and provide a richer account of how innovative teaching unfolds in practice. Investigating the alignment between teacher preparation programs and classroom realities in Ghana remains an urgent area for exploration, as systematic mismatches between training and practice hinder sustainable reform. Finally, international comparative studies, especially with other Sub-Saharan African countries undergoing similar reforms, could broaden the understanding of how resource-constrained systems navigate the integration of 21st-century pedagogies.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study highlights a core paradox in Ghana's basic education reform: while teachers increasingly align with the goals of innovative, 21st-century pedagogy, the traditional classroom environments they work in significantly hinder effective implementation. The findings show that teacher motivation and awareness alone cannot drive transformation without corresponding systemic support. True curricular innovation depends on enabling infrastructure, access to teaching materials, and context-responsive policies. To bridge this gap, the study recommends a shift in reform focus from prescribing what teachers should do to transforming the conditions that shape what they can do. This includes urgent investments by the Ghana Education Service and Ministry of Education in school infrastructure, electricity, ICT, and learning materials. Additionally, teachers should be supported to continue adapting creatively within their constraints, as such efforts play a crucial role in sustaining innovation amid systemic challenges.

## REFERENCES

- Addai-Mununkum, R., & Setordzi, S. (2023). Implementing Curriculum Change in Ghana: Exploring Teachers' Experiences with Enacting 21st-Century Pedagogies. *American Journal of Qualitative Research*, 7(4), 119-139. doi.org/10.29333/ajqr/13660
- Aldhilan, D., Rafiq, S., & Afzal, A. (2024). The Innovative Pedagogical Approaches & Challenges in the Early Childhood Education: Insights from Saudi Arabia. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, 40(2), 159-176. DOI: 10.51380/gujr-40-02-03
- Ananga, E. D., & Tamanja, E. M. (2017). Managing the effects of large class sizes on quality education in Ghana. *Accra, Ghana*.
- Ayodele, A. A., Nwatu, C. B., & Olise, M. C. (2020). Extending the diffusion of innovation theory to predict smartphone adoption behaviour among higher education

institutions' lecturers in Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 12(5), 14-21. DOI: 10.7176/EJBM/12-5-02

Bekoe, S. O. (2023). Towards a Theory: The Constraining Hold of High-Stakes External Assessment on Curriculum Implementation. *Creative Education*, 14(5), 993-1013. DOI: 10.4236/ce.2023.145063

Bekoe, S. O. O. (2006). Assessment and curriculum goals and objectives: evaluation of the systemic impact of the SSSCE on the senior school Social Studies curriculum in Ghana. DOI: 0.48730/32p8-2265

Blömeke, S., Nilsen, T., & Scherer, R. (2021). School innovativeness is associated with enhanced teacher collaboration, innovative classroom practices, and job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 113(8), 1645. <https://psycnet.apa.org/buy/2021-88163-001>

Byers, T., Imms, W., & Hartnell-Young, E. (2018). Comparative analysis of the impact of traditional versus innovative learning environment on student attitudes and learning outcomes. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 58, 167-177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2018.07.003>

Closs, L., Mahat, M., & Imms, W. (2022). Learning environments' influence on students' learning experience in an Australian Faculty of Business and Economics. *Learning environments research*, 25(1), 271-285. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10984-021-09361-2>.

Cobbold, C. (2017). Moving from page to playground: The challenges and constraints of implementing curriculum in Ghana. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(4), 1-11.

Dawadi, S., Shrestha, S., & Giri, R. A. (2021). Mixed-Methods Research: A Discussion on its Types, Challenges, and Criticisms. *Journal of Practical Studies in Education*, 2(2), 25-36 DOI: 10.46809/jpse.v2i2.20

Frei-Landau, R., Muchnik-Rozanov, Y., & Avidov-Ungar, O. (2022). Using Rogers' diffusion of innovation theory to conceptualize the mobile-learning adoption process in teacher education in the COVID-19 era. *Education and information technologies*, 27(9), 12811-12838.

French, R., Imms, W., & Mahat, M. (2020). Case studies on the transition from traditional classrooms to innovative learning environments: Emerging strategies for success. *Improving Schools*, 23(2), 175-189. DOI: 10.1177/1365480219894408

Gyawali, Y. P., & Mehndroo, M. (2023). The 21st Century Model for Pedagogical Transformation: Exploring Teachers' Identity and Professional Responsibility. *Journal of NELTA Gandaki*, 6(1-2), 13-25. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jong.v6i1-2.59707>

Hassler, B., Hennessy, S., & Hofmann, R. (2018). Sustaining and scaling pedagogic innovation in Sub-Saharan Africa: Grounded insights for teacher professional development. *Journal of learning for development*, 5(1). DOI:10.56059/jl4d.v5i1.264

Kliebard, H. M. (1988). Fads, fashions, and rituals: The instability of curriculum change. In L. N. Tanner (Ed.), *Critical issues in curriculum* (pp. 16-34). 87th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I. The University of Chicago Press. Reprinted with editorial modifications in H. M. Kliebard, *Changing course: American curriculum reform in the 20th century* (pp. 76-90). Teachers College Press, 2002.

Kwarteng, E. V. E. L. Y. N. (2024). *Early-grade teachers' pedagogical knowledge in the implementation of the standard-based curriculum in Atwima-Kwawoma district* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Education Winneba). <http://41.74.91.244:8080/handle/123456789/4137>

Laryea, P. A. (2023). *Assessing teachers' perceptions, knowledge and readiness for the implementation of the new standard based curriculum in Ablekuma south municipality in the Greater Accra region of Ghana* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Education Winneba). <http://41.74.91.244:8080/handle/123456789/3225>

Menzli, L. J., Smirani, L. K., Boulahia, J. A., & Hadjouni, M. (2022). Investigation of open educational resources adoption in higher education using Rogers' diffusion of innovation theory. *Heliyon*, 8(7). DOI:10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e09885

Mochiah, J. N. A., & Adibi, M. G. D. (2023). The New Standard Based Curriculum in Ghana; Prospects, Challenges and the Way Forward. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(4), 67-79.

National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (2018). *National pre-tertiary education curriculum framework for developing subject curricula*. Ministry of Education.

Nyamekye, E., Zengulaaru, J., & Nana Frimpong, A. C. (2023). Junior high schools teachers' perceptions and practice of constructivism in Ghana: The paradox. *Cogent Education*, 10(2). DOI:10.1080/2331186X.2023.2281195

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Johnson, R. B. (2006). The validity issue in mixed research. *Research in the Schools*, 13(1), 48-63.

Paniagua, A., & Istance, D. (2018). Teachers as designers of learning environments. *Educational Research and Innovation*, OECD Publication. 17-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264085374.en>

Prokhorova, M., Lebedeva, T., Sedykh, E., Egorov, E., & Mineeva, O. (2021). Flipped learning: Analysis of difficulty and intensity. *Laplace em Revista*, 7(Extra-E), 51-59. DOI:10.24115/S2446-622020217Extra-E1160p.51-59

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.

Shanmugam, K., & Shanmugam, J. K. (2021). The impact of perceived characteristics on technology adoption among manufacturing small and medium enterprises in Malaysia. *Journal of Academia*, 9(2), 40-55.

- Siregar, R. A. (2020). The Effective 21st-century Pedagogical Competence as Perceived by Pre-service English Teachers. *Pedagogy: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 8(1), 1-12. DOI: 10.32332/pedagogy.v8i1.1953
- Stratton, S. J. (2021). Population research: convenience sampling strategies. *Prehospital and disaster Medicine*, 36(4), 373-374. DOI: 10.1017/S1049023X21000649
- Swanzy-Impraim, E., Morris, J. E., Lummis, G. W., & Jones, A. (2023). An investigation into the role of innovative learning environments in fostering creativity for secondary visual arts programmes in Ghana. *Journal of Creativity*, 33(2). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yjoc.2023.100054>
- Turner, D. P. (2020). Sampling Methods in Research Design. *Headache: The Journal of Head & Face Pain*, 60(1). DOI: 10.1111/head.13707
- Yalley, C. E. (2022). Examining basic school teachers' knowledge and practice towards the implementation of the National Pre-tertiary Education Curriculum in Ghana. [Paper Presentation]. In *6th Biennial Faculty of Social Science Conference. University of Education, Winneba. Ghana* (p. 2).