**International Journal of Innovative Teaching and Learning in Higher Education**
Volume 1 • Issue 3 • July-September 2020

# Pedagogical Innovation in Higher Education:
## Defining What We Mean

Jae Major, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1302-4768

Sandi Lynne Tait-McCutcheon, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

Robin Averill, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8941-5565

Amanda Gilbert, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2669-7742

Bernadette Knewstubb, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

Anita Mortlock, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3223-4915

Liz Jones, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

## ABSTRACT

Quality teaching in higher education (HE) is gaining increasing international attention and pedagogical innovation is seen as an important construct of quality teaching. The drivers for pedagogical innovation include the need for 21st century skills and understandings, student demographics and empowerment, technological advances, and a turn to teaching in HE. Defining innovative pedagogies is a recurring challenge in the literature and a key focus of this article. Using an investigation into innovative approaches to teaching and learning at one New Zealand university, prevailing themes of newness, benefit, and student outcomes are discussed to develop a working definition. What is missing from the discourses and definitions is specific consideration of the influence of context on what counts as pedagogical innovation. In light of this, the authors offer an emergent definition of pedagogical innovation in higher education.

### KEYWORDS

Definition, Innovative Teaching, Lecturers, Pedagogy, Students, University

DOI: 10.4018/IJITLHE.2020070101

## INTRODUCTION

In recent years quality teaching has become an increasing focus in universities around the world (OECD, 2012). This focus is the result of increased student numbers, higher levels of accountability, the affordances and impact of new technologies, changes in student expectations, and the raised profile of the importance of teaching alongside research (Biggs, 2011). Quality teaching initiatives are also seen to increase student enrolment and engagement, and to improve retention and completion rates in universities (Wyatt, 2011). Innovation in teaching is identified as an important element of quality teaching. For example, an OECD Report (2012) suggested that innovative teaching is often a response to specific situations or problems and can involve all aspects of a programme of study – content, pedagogy, student support, assessment and the learning environment (p. 33). However, it is difficult to establish from the literature what counts as innovative within a teaching and learning context. Pedagogical innovation is frequently either undefined or not clearly defined in the research literature (e.g., Jaskyte, Taylor, & Smariga, 2009; Kivunja, 2014), making it challenging to discuss the nature and range of pedagogies adopted in higher education (HE) that could be identified as innovative. It seems that innovation is an inherently unstable construct when applied in higher education; however, a lack of definitional clarity potentially impedes the development of useful theory and measures of innovative teaching (Johannessen, Olsen, & Lumpkin, 2001), so further development in this area is warranted.

Developing a clear and shared understanding or definition of pedagogical innovation is the focus of this article, which reports a strategic research initiative at the authors' institution investigating innovative approaches to teaching and learning across the university. A key goal of the initiative was to determine how best to support and facilitate pedagogical innovations that enhance student engagement and learning. In this article we discuss data which contributed to the development of a definition of innovative pedagogies in higher education that informs our further work in this area.

Three key questions guide the investigation reported here:

1. What are the prevailing themes relating to pedagogical innovation in higher education (HE)?
2. What are the contradictions and tensions in defining pedagogical innovation in HE?
3. How can innovative approaches to teaching and learning in HE be defined?

The article begins with an overview of the factors that have led to a focus on innovative teaching in HE and a discussion of prevailing themes about pedagogical innovation in HE. This is followed by a description of the research initiative designed to investigate innovative approaches to teaching in the authors' institution, and the case studies that formed the foundation for the research. Drawing on data generated from these case studies and wider staff and student online surveys, the contradictions and

tensions in defining innovative practices in HE are considered. The article concludes with a discussion of the working definition developed by the authors.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Why Innovative Pedagogies in HE Matter

There are many reasons why institutions of higher education (HE) may seek and promote pedagogical innovation. Five key factors have been identified in the literature as leading to pedagogical responses; some of these are interrelated and all are complex. First, the changing skills, knowledges and understandings needed by graduates in the 21st century are prompting institutions of higher education to reconsider what and how they teach. There is greater demand for professionally-oriented degree programmes that are relevant and enhance employability (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009). Graduate attributes have developed as a common expression of skills and competencies beyond disciplinary knowledge, such as critical and creative thinking, communication, ethical scholarship, intellectual autonomy and integrity, and skills to work independently and collaboratively (see for example: www.wgtn.ac.nz/learning-teaching/partnership/graduate-profile). In order to develop these skills and competencies, many institutions and educators are questioning and moving away from traditional lecture-based transmission approaches of formal disciplinary-based knowledge as inappropriate for the demands of an unknown future (Barnett, 2012; Király & Géring, 2019).

Second, moves to widen participation in HE internationally have changed student demographics and led not only to increasing numbers of students enrolling in institutions, but also increasing diversity amongst them (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009; Henard & Roseveare, 2012; Layne & Lake, 2014). Such diversity includes students who are first in family to go to university, previously underrepresented groups (especially socio-economic and ethnic), and mature students studying for career changes (Luo, Guo, & Shi, 2018; Nachatar Singh, 2018; O'Shea, Stone, Delahunty, & May 2018). In addition, globalisation and the increasing middle classes in countries such as India, China and Brazil are leading to increased enrolments of international students (Layne & Lake 2014), creating linguistically and culturally diverse student populations that require diverse teaching responses (Yamauchi, Taira, & Trevorrow, 2016).

Third, the marketization of tertiary education positions students as consumers (Woodall, Hiller, & Resnick, 2014), as is evidenced by demands for equality of treatment and for students to be positioned as partners in the institution and in their learning (Healey, Flint, & Harrington, 2016; McLoughlin & Lee, 2010). Engaging students as partners in institutional and pedagogical decision-making is an innovation that is proposed as beneficial for students' personal development, employability, and meeting graduate attributes (Kahu, 2013; Pauli, Raymond-Barker, & Worrell, 2016).

Fourth, the rapid development of technological advances and the ways the millennial generation experiences the world via this technology create new expectations of and

opportunities for higher education (McCurry & Martins, 2010). Not only do digital technology and tools demand digital fluency for both students and lecturers (Becker et al., 2017), the world wide web (WWW) and developments such as Massive Online Open Courses (MOOCS) provide opportunities to learn anywhere at any time. Much pedagogical innovation in recent years aims to take advantage of the affordances of digital technologies to enhance teaching and learning, for example: online and blended learning, collaboration, gamification, flipped classroom and so on (Alexander et al., 2019; Scoppio & Covell, 2016).

Finally, the development of the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) as a new area of research in higher education (Fanghanel, Pritchard, Potter, & Wisker, 2016) reflects a growing expectation that university educators have effective pedagogical skills, and that they "cooperate with students, colleagues from other departments, and with external stakeholders as members of a dynamic learning community" (Henard & Roseveare, 2012, p. 9). Henard and Roseveare (2012) note the trend toward strategic development of teaching and learning taken by many HE institutions, including those that have traditionally been heavily research focussed. The growth of teaching awards at institutional and national levels is a trend that supports the notion of a 'turn to teaching' in tertiary education (Jones, 2010; West & Stephenson, 2016; Willingham-McLain, 2015).

## Themes and Trends in Innovative Teaching in Higher Education

As interest in teaching and learning in higher education (HE) has grown, there has been a proliferation of research from which a number of themes and trends relevant to pedagogical innovation are evident. Much of the research has focused on technology and its potential to enhance both traditional face-to-face teaching and online distance education. Recent large scale reviews of trends in HE (for example the New Media Centre (NMC) and Educause *Horizons* reports of 2017 and 2019, the OECD's *Understanding Innovative Pedagogies Working Paper* of 2018, and the Open University's *Innovating Pedagogy 2016*) highlight the significance of technology as a key driver of innovation in teaching and learning. For example, blended learning, open learning (e.g. MOOCS), online learning, gamification, blockchain, and learning analytics have been identified as technologically influenced trends (Alexander et al., 2019; Lloyd & Bahr, 2016; Peterson, Dumont, Lafuente, & Law, 2018; Sharples et al., 2016).

Other key themes to emerge from the literature relate to the influence of constructivist notions of education particularly in relation to student engagement, achievement, and learning autonomy. Common themes include pedagogical approaches that promote cooperation and collaboration amongst students (e.g. problem-based and inquiry learning), authenticity and relevance (e.g. role plays, 'real-world' contexts, service learning, practicum and clinical placements, scenario-based assessments), constructive alignment in course design (e.g. Wang, Su, Cheung, Wang, & Kwang, 2013), and the design of learning spaces (e.g. Siegel & Claydon, 2016). These trends

are frequently discussed with reference to developing attributes such as creativity, flexibility, critical thinking, critical reflection, and self-directed learning.

Despite the plethora of research, much of the literature is equivocal about defining pedagogical innovation in higher education. Studies frequently provide no definition or rely on generalised understandings related to the purpose of the innovation, for example; enhancing student engagement and achievement through games and simulations (Vlachopolous & Makri, 2017), fostering creativity (Jaskyte et al., 2009), and developing collaboration (Siegel & Clayton, 2016). There is also a tendency to conflate innovation with the use of new technologies (Walder, 2014a), which is potentially unhelpful as technology can be used in pedagogically traditional ways, so is no guarantee of innovation (McLoughlin & Lee, 2010).

Some studies, however, offer more focused and precise definitions of pedagogical innovation. For example, from a survey of student teachers' ideas about innovations in higher education, Jurgena and Cedēre (2016) defined innovative pedagogy as "a process of renewal,… the selection of the most appropriate material (idea, activity, form, method, means, concept or programme) and their [sic] practical implementation," (p. 32). The main ideas in this definition are the notions that innovative teaching is related to *renewal* by *implementing something* that has been *consciously selected*. These ideas are also found in Law's (2010) definition of innovation as having a "tangible product or procedure that is new and intentional, and that aims to be beneficial" (p. 335). Denning (2004, as cited by Casanovas, 2010), also incorporates the idea of benefit, defining innovation as changes in practices that are beneficial because they generate value for the members of the community within which the innovation is implemented. Sharples et al. (2016), include technology in their definition of innovation as "novel or changing theories and practices of teaching, learning and assessment for the modern, technology-enabled world" (p. 7). After exploring the way innovation has been defined in HE in recent decades, Walder (2014a) arrived at this definition: "Pedagogical innovation in a university context is characterised by an intentional action that aims to improve university students' learning in a sustainable manner" (p. 197). She further states that pedagogical innovation "is a new way of teaching unlike those commonly used; it is bespoke and surprises students" (Walder, 2014b, p. 24).

From these definitions, three salient elements of pedagogical innovations emerge – newness, benefits, and outcomes. These formed the basis for the work in the study described below to further define and understand the nature of pedagogical innovation in higher education.

## METHODS

The study was situated in the authors' institution, the largest and longest established university located in the capital city of New Zealand. The research team included academics from the Faculty of Education and from the Centre for Academic Development, which is responsible for professional development and support for teaching and learning in the university. Responding to the challenges in defining

innovative pedagogies, the researchers began the investigation by developing case studies with teaching staff from across the university who were considered innovative. Participants were recruited from a list of academic staff with numerous mentions through a range of avenues, such as winners of university and national teaching awards, those identified as innovative by academic managers, and those nominated by students in annual surveys conducted by the Student Association. After obtaining ethical approval, twenty-five lecturers were approached and thirteen from nine different discipline areas agreed to participate in a semi-structured interview. They were invited to talk about their teaching and innovation, their understandings about innovative pedagogies more generally, and what supported or hindered their attempts to innovate their teaching. Where possible, focus groups were held with students from a nominated course that each case study participant taught, and the researchers collected artefacts (de-identified examples of student work and teaching resources) related to the teaching innovation that each participant described.

Each interview was transcribed and analysed using repeated readings of interview transcripts and viewings of other associated data by all researchers. Initial themes were identified, discussed and coded, with further axial coding drawing related themes and data together. Smaller groups of researchers then took up a particular theme and collated relevant data that developed significant meanings and understandings in relation to that theme.

As well as this analytic work, the researchers also developed a case study for each participant. The aim of the case study approach was to create 'narratives' that targeted a particular innovative element of the participants' practices that could be shared and might inspire others to try new ideas in their teaching. All participants were willing to be identified in the descriptive case studies which followed a consistent pattern where the person (or people) was introduced, the driver for the innovation was described, followed by the pedagogical innovation itself, then the outcomes of the innovation, the underpinning pedagogical theory, and a summary conclusion. Once completed, the case studies were returned to each participant for their checking and feedback, before being refined and published on an internal university website (https://learning.vicinnovate.ac.nz/innovative-pedagogies-project.html). The case studies and all associated data were also entered into NVivo for further analysis to identify cross-case themes and characteristics of innovative practices.

The major themes from the interview data were used to create a working definition of innovative pedagogies and inform the design of two online survey questionnaires in Qualtrics – one for teaching staff and one for students (see Appendix for sample). These surveys investigated participants' experiences, and sought examples of innovative approaches to teaching and learning at the university from the perspective of either lecturer or learner. All lecturing staff were invited to complete the survey and sixty-four responses were received. A random selection of 2,000 students from across all parts of the university were invited to participate and 448 responses were received.

The authors created a working definition from the case study data, which was used in the staff and student questionnaires: "Innovative approaches to teaching

can be defined as those that are *new*, *different* or *creative* and that aim to promote *achievement*, *engagement*, *autonomy* or *enjoyment* in learning and teaching". The definition was deliberately kept quite open, and this elicited a wide range of responses about what was considered innovative amongst lecturers and students. To move towards a tighter framing of the concept, the authors analysed the interview and qualitative questionnaire data in the light of three prevalent themes about innovation in HE found in the literature – newness, benefit, and student outcomes. The findings below discuss data in relation to these themes.

## FINDINGS

### Newness

Perhaps the most common concept used in relation to innovative teaching (and perhaps innovation more generally) is the notion that it is about change or renewal, something new or novel, different to expectations. While questions arise about whether newness means completely new, new in a specific context, or new to specific individuals or groups (Johannessen, Olsen, & Lumpkin, 2001), it is the newness that is critical for innovation because while "innovation presupposes changes, … not all change presupposes innovation" (Johannessen et al., 2001, p. 22).

This theme of newness was prevalent in the data, particularly in the student online survey data where it was the most-often mentioned characteristic of innovative teaching. Students identified as innovative, lecturers' use of new activities or approaches to teaching, that were different to what happened in other classes and different to their expectations. For example:

*Songs and music…breaks it up, which in itself stimulates a further interest as it is out of the ordinary. (Student Online Survey)*
*Something exciting and different that isn't usually done in classes. (Student Online Survey)*

Newness and novelty also featured in staff data but was more likely to be problematized. As one case study participant said:

*I just have a problem with the term innovative, because it kind of implies something new and special and different. It's like advancement for the sake of advancement - new for the sake of new. (Case study)*

One student comment agreed saying:

*To be honest I don't care about innovation I just want the lecture material to be clear, sometimes trying to be new and fun detracts from the actual material. (Student Online Survey)*

While some teaching staff rejected the notion of novelty as a sound basis for innovation, others embraced it as a driver for their pedagogical innovations. For example:

*I don't think standing in front of a bunch of students is effective practice, so I constantly explore new things…new ways of engaging students. (Case study).*

They spoke of introducing new ideas to engage students and keep them interested. They also identified trying new activities, strategies, assessments, and tools as important for maintaining their own interest in teaching.

## Benefit

The second dominant theme about innovation in tertiary teaching relates to the notion of benefit and generating value for the learning community. This commonly occurs as a "search for creative solutions for problems and challenges" (Henard & Roseveare, 2012, p. 33) in teaching and learning. All the case study participants identified some aspect of their teaching or students' learning that they were not happy with that led to a pedagogical innovation. In one example, the problem of poor attendance at lectures and disappointing assessment performance led to a complete redesign of a course. In another, the problem of ensuring students understood complex concepts led to the use of puppets to demonstrate. The issues identified varied, as did the responses. As one case study participant put it,

*Innovation I think identifies something that's not going quite well, either for the students as learners, and you as the teacher, or even if it's an admin thing that's repeatedly not going well - and do something about it; just caring enough - giving a damn enough to actually do something about it. (Case Study)*

In other research, "creative solutions for problems and challenges" include engaging in pedagogical research and critical enquiry with peers to find solutions to issues (Robson, Wall, and Lofthouse 2013), interactive, group focussed, objective and experiential learning (McCurry and Martins 2010), changing intellectual approaches (Béchard, 2000 quoted in Walder, 2014a), using technology in fieldwork (Thomas & Munge, 2017), and service learning as a pedagogical innovation (Bosaller, 2016).

Students also identified benefits, with 76% agreeing that teaching innovations they experienced benefited their learning either moderately or very much. When describing teaching innovations, students frequently identified benefits, such as:

*[It] helped a lot with my understanding of my course and [I] got better marks… (Student Online Survey)*
*The creative freedom led to deeper learning, it has changed my perspective. (Student Online Survey)*

*These short experiments …were very helpful to illustrate learning theories and principles… (Student Online Survey)*

However, not all innovations were seen as beneficial, even though that was the intention. One student responded:

*The class activity with group design thinking exercises was innovative because it was different to traditional class exercise – [but] it wasn't helpful and was a waste of time. (Student Online Survey)*

## Outcomes

The third theme is that innovations should achieve or intend to achieve specific outcomes for the teaching-learning environment, including student outcomes, student-lecturer relationships, and classroom culture. Examples of these outcomes include: working collaboratively, communicating effectively and solving novel problems (Siegel & Claydon, 2016), interactivity and collaboration in the classroom (Honkima "ki et al., 2004), enhancing student engagement, (Montgomery, Hayward, Dunn, Carbonaro, & Amrhein, 2015), promoting self-regulated learning (McLoughlin & Lee, 2010), and fostering creativity (Fleith, 2019; Jaskyte et al., 2009). The research data revealed that many pedagogical innovations focused on building relationships between students and lecturers, and amongst students, as a foundation for learning. For example, one participant offered "coffee and craic" (social talk) sessions which were informal opportunities for students to discuss any aspects of content with the lecturer over a coffee in a communal space. Another described taking his teaching outside the lecture theatre and scheduled teaching week, offering a day in the weekend to explore case law with pizza provided. This case study participant described it thus:

*when students feel that they've been treated decently by people who care, they are open to a whole lot of new stuff. (Case Study)*

Student data suggested that teaching approaches that developed relationships was not an expected element of higher education, and so when it happened, it was seen as innovative. While only 13% of student respondents said they had experienced 'lecturers who actively build positive relationships with students', 60% said that this was something that enhanced their learning. The things that students identified as innovative included: lecturers learning their names, demonstrating care and concern for them, making time for them outside class, providing additional support, including group discussion and collaborative activities during class. While these may not seem like particularly innovative practices, the fact that they were not widespread in students' experiences at university made them so to the students. Comments from across a number of different discipline areas in the university supported this:

*[This course had] really supportive lecturers who built strong relationships with students and created a good learning environment. (Student Online Survey)*
*[The lecturer] Builds strong, caring relationships. (Student Online Survey)*
*The lecturers develop good relationships with students and teach in interesting and engaging ways. (Student Online Survey)*

Engagement and motivation were other significant outcomes related to innovation for both staff and student participants. One respondent to the staff online survey described the need for pedagogical innovation thus:

*Students can become crippled by poor academic approaches, making them hate coming to class. There needs to be consistent innovative approaches to student engagement across the years, so that students learn to love learning. (Staff online Survey)*

A student from a focus group interview that contributed to a case study described the feelings that were an outcome of the storytelling approach taken by the lecturer:

*The only way I can describe it, I was thinking about it, was you were sitting around a campfire telling stories. And that was her, because you felt that relaxed. (Student Focus group)*

These three themes about pedagogical innovations offer some promise for developing a definition of pedagogical innovation. However, contradictions and tensions in the data suggest that there are other factors to consider. These are discussed in the next section.

## Contradictions and Tensions in Defining Innovative Teaching

The most significant tension the authors found in trying to define pedagogical innovation is that almost every lecturer participant rejected the idea that their practices were innovative. This rejection seemed to relate to the newness theme with participants insisting that their teaching strategies or practices were learned from others, that they were just good practice, or that they were nothing new. Data from the case studies and staff online survey demonstrate these ideas.

*To be honest, I don't know that any of them are. I mean, none of these are my own ideas; they are things that [someone else] has suggested, or I've done a little bit of reading. (Case Study)*
*I don't see my pedagogy as innovative … It is sound, based on research… I am offering what we consider a sound, social constructivist way of learning. (Case Study)*
*I don't think this is being innovative, because we're actually trying to achieve what happened in studios in days gone by… So, from my point of view, it's try and reclaim some of those original values of architectural studio. This isn't new, we are trying to claim back something we once had that we knew worked well. (Case Study)*

*It is new for me, but I'm not sure it is innovative - other people have done it before, I'm sure. (Case Study)*
*Calling "innovative" things that are basic and necessary (preparing an appropriate syllabus and tasks that are relevant to the real world, learning students' names, guiding students to collaborate and develop as effective learners, interact and engage with students whose cultural backgrounds differ from my own, and encourage students to have fun learning and succeed) is silly. These are the things that good teachers have always done, and what students want. What works still works well. (Staff Online Survey)*

This last quote from the staff survey highlights the issue clearly. For those who incorporate elements of effective teaching as part of their usual practice, calling these things innovative seems 'silly'. What is innovative in one context is business-as-usual in another.

While newness is readily accepted as a characteristic of innovation, it creates problems when applied to specific practices. The following quotes from survey and case study data exemplify the shifting nature of, and therefore uncertainty about, what counts as innovative.

*I often give a little multiple choice "quiz" [in lectures] … I used to do this using "clickers" but now just do it more casually with show of hands. It is innovative compared to students just listening to me lecture, however given how much this sort of thing is incorporated into teaching now I am not sure it is innovative anymore. (Staff Online Survey)*
*It is not clear anymore what counts as "innovative" because that is a time based reference, but the window of what is "new" keeps moving forward...so maybe a more accurate word/term is needed to encompass these approaches. (Staff Online Survey)*
*An innovation can work one year and not the next. Also things can get stale. So, innovations have got a shelf life… The novelty value is gone, and because the novelty value is gone their effectiveness as a tool I think has diminished. (Case Study)*

Walder (2014a) defines pedagogical innovations as those that improve student learning in a sustainable manner. While this might be the aim and ideal for pedagogical innovations at the structural or course level, the everyday small-scale innovations that individual lecturers enact in their own practice, are frequently not sustained or sustainable because there is a time-bound element or 'shelf-life' for particular strategies. This suggests that perhaps flexibility and responsiveness are underpinning characteristics of innovative practices in HE, and should be included in a definition.

The data above illustrate the difficulty of developing a shared understanding of pedagogical innovation. It is clear that there are diverse ideas amongst staff and students about what is considered new, different or creative. The inherently unstable nature of innovation, when applied in higher education, suggests that definitions and terminology need to be used cautiously and mindfully, taking account of context.

These ideas are taken up in the next section in an attempt to define some of the key characteristics of pedagogical innovation in HE.

## DISCUSSION

As previously noted, there was a wide variation in the innovative practices described across the different data sources; from whole course or programme level developments to individual lecturers using specific technologies or teaching practices. It seemed that context was a significant variable in decisions about what and whether a particular practice was innovative. While place and timing are clearly elements of context that could determine the extent to which a practice might be considered innovative, the scope of pedagogical innovations also seemed significant. The wider innovation literature distinguishes between radical and incremental innovation suggesting that these occur on a continuum (Johannessen et al., 2001). Along similar lines, the authors thought of pedagogical innovation in terms of being capital 'I' and small 'i' innovations, where capital 'I' innovation denotes radical change, such as completely reshaping how a programme, qualification or course is implemented, and incremental small 'i' innovation is where a lecturer introduces a different assignment, technology, or learning activity into their teaching. As one case study participant put it:

*innovative can be radically different, or it can be innovative within the structure and the constraints that you're working with. So, I see it as being an across the spectrum thing. (Case Study)*

Any definition should take account of this continuum, and the fact that where pedagogical innovations fall on the continuum may be context-dependent.

The notion of incremental change and context may also help explain some of the tensions around the discourse of newness in relation to innovation in higher education. Current emphases on evidence-based practice in education suggest that decisions about innovating teaching often are and should be informed by evidence. Rather than seeing this as detracting from innovative practice, the authors suggest that pedagogical innovation should be grounded in evidence. This takes account of the fact that many pedagogical innovations have provenance elsewhere which supports their implementation in new contexts. Indeed, it can be argued that it is essential for capital 'I' or radical innovations to be informed by evidence, and that this does not make them any less innovative in their context.

Incorporating context into a definition of pedagogical innovation may address the notion that innovation can occur along a continuum and incorporate a range of practices. With this in mind the authors offer the following as an emergent and evolving definition: innovative pedagogies are teaching approaches and practices that are new or different in a particular context, and which are designed to purposefully and responsively benefit student experiences and outcomes in that context.

## CONCLUSION

In this article the authors have considered innovative pedagogies in higher education and ways in which innovative pedagogies are defined. Newness, benefit, and student outcomes have been identified as three themes apparent in literature that seeks to define innovative pedagogies. Supported from the research reported here, the authors added the important element of context to enhance understandings of what is, and can be, defined as pedagogical innovation in higher education. It is further suggested that pedagogical innovations can be thought of along a continuum from radical, or capital 'I', to incremental, or small 'i'.

While it is useful to be able to define innovation in relation to teaching and learning practices, there are several related questions that require further investigation. For example, what motivates lecturers to invest time and energy into pedagogical innovations? What institutional conditions support and foster pedagogical innovation, or conversely, inhibit it? How do lecturers' and students' perceptions of pedagogical innovation align or differ? How can definitions of pedagogical innovation be further refined and modelled to provide ongoing guidance to institutions and individuals in higher education? These are areas which the authors, and hopefully others, will continue to explore in an effort to promote and enhance innovative teaching and learning experiences in higher education.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This project was supported by strategic funding (grant number 217721) from the Faculty of Education at Victoria University of Wellington.

## REFERENCES

Alexander, B., Ashford-Rowe, K., Barajas-Murphy, N., Dobbin, G., Knott, J., McCormack, M., Pomerantz, J., Seilhamer, R., & Weber, N. (2019). *EDUCAUSE Horizon Report: 2019 Higher Education Edition*. EDUCAUSE.

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2009). Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution. Paris: UNESCO & Rotterdam: Sense Publ.

Barnett, R. (2012). Learning for an unknown future. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *31*(1), 65–77. doi:10.1080/07294360.2012.642841

Becker, S. A., Cummins, M., Davis, A., Freeman, A., Glesinger Hall, C., & Ananthanarayanan, V. (2017). *NMC Horizon Report: 2017 Higher Education Edition*. The New Media Consortium. https://www.learntechlib.org/p/174879/

Biggs, J. B. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does*. McGraw-Hill Education.

Byrnes, G. (2017, 4 October). Are Degrees still worth it? *New Zealand Herald.* https://www.nzherald.co.nz/opinion/news/article.cfm?c_id=466&objectid=11928962

Casanovas, I. (2010). Exploring the current theoretical background about adoption until institutionalization of online education in universities: Needs for further research. *Electronic Journal of E-learning*, *8*(2), 73–84.

Fanghanel, J., Pritchard, J., Potter, J., & Wisker, G. (2016). *Defining and supporting the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL): A sector-wide study*. Higher Education Academy.

Fleith, D. D. S. (2019). The role of creativity in graduate education according to students and professors. *Estudos de Psicologia (Campinas)*, *36*, e180045. Advance online publication. doi:10.1590/1982-0275201936e180045

Healey, M., Flint, A., & Harrington, K. (2016). Students as partners: Reflections on a conceptual model. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry*, *4*(2), 1–13. doi:10.20343/teachlearninqu.4.2.3

Henard, F., & Roseveare, D. (2012). *Fostering quality teaching in higher education: Policies and practices. An IMHE Guide for higher education*. Retrieved from: http://www.oecd.org/education/imhe/QT%20policies%20and%20practices.pdf

Honkima ¨ki, S., Tynja ¨la¨, P. I., & Valkonen, S. (2004). University students' study orientations, learning experiences and study success in innovative courses. *Studies in Higher Education*, *29*(4), 431–449. doi:10.1080/0307507042000236353

Jaskyte, K., Taylor, H., & Smariga, R. (2009). Student and faculty perceptions of innovative teaching. *Creativity Research Journal*, *21*(1), 111–116. doi:10.1080/10400410802633673

Johannessen, J.-A., Olsen, B., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2001). Innovation as newness: What is new, how new and new to whom? *European Journal of Innovation Management*, *4*(1), 20–31. doi:10.1108/14601060110365547

Jones, J. (2010). Building pedagogic excellence: Learning and teaching fellowships within communities of practice at the University of Brighton. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *47*(3), 271–282. doi:10.1080/14703297.2010.498178

Jurgena, I., & Cēdere, D. (2016). Students' ideas on innovations in higher education. *Signum Temporis*, *8*(1), 30–36. doi:10.1515/sigtem-2016-0014

Kahu, E. (2013). Framing student engagement in higher education. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *38*(5), 758–773. doi:10.1080/03075079.2011.598505

Király, G., & Géring, Z. (2019). Introduction to 'Futures of Higher Education' special issue. *Futures*, *111*. 123-129. doi:10.1016/j.futures.2019.03.004

Kivunja, C. (2014). Innovative pedagogies in higher education to become effective teachers of 21st century skills: Unpacking the learning and innovations skills domain of the new learning paradigm. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *3*(4), 37–48. doi:10.5430/ijhe.v3n4p37

Law, N. (2014). Comparing pedagogical innovations. In M. Bray, B. Adamson, & M. Mason (Eds.), *Comparative Education Research: Approaches and Methods* (2nd ed., pp. 333–364). Springer International. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-05594-7_12

Layne, P. C., & Lake, P. (Eds.). (2014). *Global innovation of teaching and learning in higher education: Transgressing boundaries*. Springer.

Lloyd, M., & Bahr, N. (2016). What matters in higher education: A meta-analysis of a decade of learning design. *Journal of Learning Design*, *9*(2), 1–13. doi:10.5204/jld.v9i2.280

Luo, Y., Guo, F., & Shi, J. (2018). Expansion and inequality of higher education in China: How likely would Chinese poor students get to success? *Higher Education Research & Development*, *37*(5), 1015–1034. doi:10.1080/07294360.2018.1474856

McCurry, M. K., & Martins, D. C. (2010). Teaching undergraduate nursing research: A comparison of traditional and innovative appraches for success with millennial learners. *The Journal of Nursing Education*, *49*(5), 276–279. doi:10.3928/01484834-20091217-02 PMID:20055330

McLoughlin, C., & Lee, M. J. W. (2010). Personalised and self regulated learning in the Web 2.0 era: International exemplars of innovative pedagogy using social software. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *26*(1), 28–43. doi:10.14742/ajet.1100

Montgomery, A. P., Hayward, D. V., Dunn, W., Carbonaro, M., & Amrhein, C. G. (2015). Blending for student engagement: Lessons learned for MOOCs and beyond. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *31*(6), 657–670. doi:10.14742/ajet.1869

Nachatar Singh, J. K. (2018). What are the factors that contribute to postgraduate international students' academic success? A Malaysian qualitative study. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *37*(5), 1035–1049. doi:10.1080/07294360.2018.1467383

O'Shea, S., Stone, C., Delahunty, J., & May, J. (2018). Discourses of betterment and opportunity: Exploring the privileging of university attendance for first-in-family learners. *Studies in Higher Education*, *43*(6), 1020–1033. doi:10.1080/03075079.2016.1212325

OECD. (2012). *Better skills, better jobs, better lives: A strategic approach to skills policies*. OECD Publishing. doi:10.1787/9789264177338-

Pauli, R., Raymond-Barker, B., & Worrell, M. (2016). *The impact of pedagogies of partnership on the student learning exerience in UK higher education: A psychological perspective*. Higher Education Academy.

Peterson, A., Dumont, H., Lafuente, M., & Law, N. (2018). *Understanding innovative pedagogies: Key themes to analyse new approaches to teaching and learning*. OECD Education Working Papers No. 172. OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/9f843a6e-en

Robson, S., Wall, K., & Lofthouse, R. (2013). Raising the profile of innovative teaching in higher education? Reflections on the EquATE project. *International Journal on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *25*(1), 92–102.

Scoppio, G., & Covell, L. (2016). Mapping trends in pedagogical approaches and learning technologies: Perspectives from the Canadian, international and military education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *46*(2), 127–147.

Sharples, M., de Roock, R., Fergusson, R., Herodotou, C., Koh, E., Kukulska-Hulme, A., . . . Hsiang, L. (2016). *Innovating pedagogy 2016: Open University Innovation Report 5*. Retrieved from https://repository.nie.edu.sg/handle/10497/18319

Siegel, C., & Claydon, J. (2016). Innovation in higher education: The influence of classroom design and instructional technology. *i-Manager's Journal of School Educational Technology, 12*(2), 24-33.

Victoria University of Wellington. (n.d.). *Graduate profile*. Retrieved from https://www.wgtn.ac.nz/learning-teaching/partnership/graduate-profile

Walder, A. M. (2014a). The concept of pedagogical innovation in higher education. *Education Journal*, *3*(3), 195–202. doi:10.11648/j.edu.20140303.22

Walder, A. M. (2014b). The preliminary and subsequent stages to integrating pedagogical innovation: The crux of the matter for the innovator. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, *60*(1), 22–42.

Wang, X., Su, Y., Cheung, S., Wang, E., & Kwang, T. (2013). An exploration of Biggs' constructive alignment in course design and its impact on students' learning approaches. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *38*(4), 477–491. doi:10.1080/02602938.2012.658018

West, D., & Stephenson, H. (2016). SANTPEN's SoTL journey: Building and using a SoTL approach across institutions. *The Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, *16*(5), 107–122. doi:10.14434//josotl.v16i5.19983

Willingham-McLain, L. (2015). Using a scholarship of teaching and learning approach to award faculty who innovate. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, *20*(1), 58–75. doi:10.1080/1360144X.2014.995661

Woodall, T., Hiller, A., & Resnick, S. (2014). Making sense of higher education: Students as consumers and the value of the university experience. *Studies in Higher Education*, *39*(1), 48–67. doi:10.1080/03075079.2011.648373

Wyatt, L. G. (2011). Nontraditional student engagement: Increasing adult student success and retention. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *59*(1), 10–20. doi:10.1080/07377363.2011.544977

Yamauchi, L. A., Taira, K., & Trevorrow, T. (2016). Effective instruction for engaging culturally diverse students in higher education. *International Journal on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *28*(3), 460–470.

*Jae Major is senior lecturer in primary teacher education at Victoria University of Wellington. Her research interests include effective pedagogies in Higher Education, teaching for and with diversity and difference, language and literacies, and identities in teaching and learning.*

*Sandi Tait-McCutcheon is senior lecturer in pre- and in-service teacher education.*

*Robin Averill's research focusses on enhancing equity of access to learning and achievement, in particular through the areas of culturally responsive mathematics and initial teacher education. With an extensive background in mathematics teacher education, Robin teaches in primary and secondary initial teacher education and Masters programmes and supervises Masters and doctoral thesis students. Robin appreciates researching in partnership with Indigenous and Pasifika researchers and research participants towards improving pedagogy and assessment practice and enhancing equity in education, particularly for learners of marginalised cultural groups.*

*Amanda Gilbert is a lecturer in higher education at The Centre for Academic Development, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. As an academic developer she works with academics to improve their teaching and teaches on the Post Graduate programme for teachers in HE. Her research interests include the in-class experience and improving outcomes for students. Her recent work focuses on large group teaching and lecturing and on supporting tutors and demonstrators.*

*Bernadette Knewstubb is an adjunct research fellow for Victoria University of Wellington.*

*Anita Mortlock has an interest in teacher-education and creativity spanning several decades, which has culminated in two teaching awards. Some of the underpinning influences on her work are peer culture theories and symbolic interactionism. Her current research projects include (a) enhancing teachers' creativity, and (b) using learning through play to engender children's expression in early primary classes. Her PhD investigated pedagogies and peer culture norms that affected children's inclusion and participation at mat time.*

*Liz Jones is an educational psychologist who has worked in a variety of roles in education for 50 years. These include school psychologist, primary teacher and principal, teacher educator and lecturer in Education. Most recently Director of the Center for Academic Development at Victoria University of Wellington. Now retired.*