Published by GRAS: Global Researchers and Academics Synergy

Global Dialogues in Humanities and Pedagogy

The Relationship between Teacher Autonomy and Instructional Innovation in Scandinavian Schools

[1]Ingrid Larsson
[1]*Uppsala University, Sweden*

[2] Mikkel Sørensen
[2]*Aarhus University, Denmark*

Corresponding Author: ingrid.larsson@uu.se

ARTICLE INFO

Received August 10, 2023
Revised August 23, 2024
Accepted September 25, 2023
Available September 27, 2023

Keywords:
teacher autonomy, instructional innovation, Scandinavian education, professional freedom, pedagogical practices, educational reform

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between teacher autonomy and instructional innovation within Scandinavian educational systems, specifically focusing on Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. Using mixed-methods research incorporating surveys, interviews, and classroom observations across forty-eight schools, the investigation explores how professional autonomy influences teachers' capacity and willingness to implement innovative pedagogical practices. Findings reveal a significant positive correlation between perceived autonomy and innovation adoption, with teachers reporting high levels of professional freedom demonstrating greater experimentation with digital technologies, student-centered methodologies, and interdisciplinary approaches. The research identifies trust-based organizational cultures, collaborative professional communities, and supportive administrative frameworks as mediating factors strengthening the autonomy-innovation relationship. However, the study also uncovers tensions between individual autonomy and systemic accountability demands, suggesting that autonomy alone does not guarantee innovation without accompanying professional development and resource allocation. These findings contribute to understanding how educational systems can foster teacher-driven pedagogical renewal.

INTRODUCTION

Teacher autonomy has emerged as a critical factor in contemporary educational discourse, particularly as education systems worldwide seek to balance standardization with professional flexibility (Muhsyanur et al., 2021; Muhsyanur and Ramlee Bin Mustapha, 2023). The concept encompasses teachers' capacity to make independent decisions regarding curriculum implementation, pedagogical methods, assessment practices, and classroom management without excessive external constraints (Pearson & Moomaw, 2005). In an era characterized by rapid technological advancement, evolving student needs, and increasingly complex societal challenges, teacher autonomy represents not merely a professional privilege but a functional necessity for adaptive, responsive education that can innovate beyond prescribed frameworks.

Scandinavian countries—Denmark, Norway, and Sweden—have historically embraced educational philosophies emphasizing teacher professionalism, decentralized decision-making, and egalitarian values that position educators as trusted experts rather than technicians implementing externally mandated curricula (Blossing et al., 2014). These Nordic education systems consistently rank highly in international assessments while maintaining relatively low levels of standardization compared to many Western nations, suggesting that professional autonomy may contribute to educational quality rather than undermining it (Sahlberg, 2011). The Scandinavian model provides valuable insight into how structural trust in teacher professionalism interacts with pedagogical innovation.

Instructional innovation refers to the adoption and implementation of novel teaching approaches, technologies, or organizational strategies that meaningfully differ from conventional practice and aim to enhance learning outcomes (Thurlings et al., 2015). Innovation extends beyond superficial technological integration to encompass fundamental shifts in pedagogical thinking, such as moving from transmission-based instruction toward constructivist, inquiry-driven learning environments. The relationship between teacher autonomy and innovation remains theoretically complex, as autonomy might either facilitate experimentation through professional freedom or potentially inhibit innovation if teachers use autonomy to maintain familiar practices without external pressure for change.

Theoretical frameworks linking autonomy and innovation draw from self-determination theory, which posits that autonomy constitutes a fundamental psychological need whose satisfaction promotes intrinsic motivation, creativity, and optimal functioning (Deci & Ryan, 2000). When teachers experience genuine autonomy—perceiving their pedagogical choices as self-determined rather than externally controlled—they demonstrate enhanced professional engagement, greater willingness to undertake challenging innovations, and increased persistence when facing implementation obstacles (Roth et al., 2007). This motivational pathway

suggests that autonomy may serve as a prerequisite for the risk-taking and sustained effort that successful innovation requires.

However, empirical research presents mixed findings regarding the autonomy-innovation relationship, with some studies identifying positive associations while others find weak or conditional effects (Walder, 2017). Contextual factors including school culture, administrative support, resource availability, and teacher collaboration patterns appear to moderate whether autonomy translates into innovative practice. In highly individualistic professional cultures, autonomy might reinforce isolation and reluctance to experiment, whereas in collaborative environments, autonomy combined with collegial exchange may catalyze collective innovation (Vangrieken et al., 2017).

The Scandinavian context offers particular advantages for investigating this relationship due to distinctive educational characteristics including flat organizational hierarchies, strong teacher education traditions, substantial professional autonomy embedded in policy structures, and cultural values emphasizing equality and innovation (Mølstad & Karseth, 2016). These systemic features create conditions where autonomy-innovation dynamics can be examined with reduced confounding from authoritarian management or severely constrained professional discretion that characterizes some educational systems. Understanding how autonomy functions within these high-trust environments provides insights applicable to educational reform efforts globally.

Despite substantial scholarship on teacher autonomy and separate bodies of literature addressing educational innovation, limited research systematically examines their interconnection within specific cultural-systemic contexts (Thurlings et al., 2015). This gap leaves policymakers and educational leaders without clear evidence regarding whether enhancing teacher autonomy will predictably foster innovation or whether additional organizational conditions must accompany autonomy to realize innovative potential. The current study addresses this knowledge deficit through empirical investigation of Scandinavian teachers' experiences, examining how autonomy shapes innovative instructional practices and identifying factors that strengthen or weaken this relationship across Nordic educational contexts.

METHOD

This mixed-methods study employed a convergent parallel design to examine the relationship between teacher autonomy and instructional innovation across forty-eight secondary schools in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. Quantitative data collection involved a comprehensive survey administered to 846 teachers, measuring perceived autonomy using the Teacher Autonomy Scale developed by Pearson and Hall (1993) and innovative practice adoption through a researcher-developed Instructional Innovation Index assessing implementation frequency of twenty-four evidence-based pedagogical approaches including project-based learning, formative assessment techniques, technology integration, and differentiated instruction

strategies. The survey incorporated demographic variables, school contextual factors, and questions addressing organizational culture and administrative support. Statistical analysis utilized multiple regression modeling to examine autonomy-innovation relationships while controlling for confounding variables, alongside correlation analyses and structural equation modeling to explore potential mediating factors (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Qualitative data collection complemented quantitative findings through semi-structured interviews with sixty-four purposively sampled teachers representing diverse autonomy and innovation levels, and classroom observations documenting pedagogical practices in authentic instructional contexts. Interview protocols explored teachers' decision-making processes, factors influencing innovation adoption, experiences of professional autonomy, and perceptions of organizational support structures. Observational data focused on identifying innovative practices and contextual factors facilitating or constraining their implementation. Qualitative analysis followed Charmaz's (2014) constructivist grounded theory approach, employing open coding to identify emergent themes, axial coding to establish relationships between concepts, and selective coding to develop theoretical explanations connecting autonomy and innovation. Data integration occurred through joint display analysis comparing quantitative patterns with qualitative themes to develop comprehensive understanding of the autonomy-innovation relationship (Fetters et al., 2013). Ethical approval was obtained from relevant institutional review boards in all three countries, with informed consent procedures ensuring participant confidentiality and voluntary participation.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Positive Association Between Autonomy and Innovation Adoption

Statistical analysis revealed a significant positive correlation between teacher autonomy and instructional innovation across all three Scandinavian countries, with correlation coefficients ranging from $r = 0.58$ to $r = 0.67$ depending on specific autonomy and innovation dimensions measured. Regression modeling demonstrated that perceived autonomy explained approximately thirty-eight percent of variance in innovation adoption scores even after controlling for teacher experience, school resources, and student demographics. Teachers reporting high levels of autonomy in curriculum decisions, pedagogical method selection, and assessment design showed substantially greater implementation of innovative practices including inquiry-based learning, digital collaborative tools, interdisciplinary projects, and formative assessment strategies compared to colleagues experiencing lower autonomy.

Qualitative interviews illuminated mechanisms underlying this statistical relationship, with teachers consistently describing autonomy as psychologically liberating and professionally empowering in ways that directly facilitated innovation. One Norwegian teacher explained that knowing she could modify curriculum sequences and assessment approaches without seeking administrative

approval enabled her to experiment with flipped classroom methodologies, iterating and refining the approach based on student responses without fearing institutional sanctions for deviating from conventional practice. This freedom to fail and learn from unsuccessful innovations emerged as crucial, as teachers noted that innovation inevitably involves uncertainty and occasional setbacks that would be professionally risky in more constrained environments.

The relationship between autonomy and innovation appeared strongest for complex, pedagogically demanding innovations requiring sustained implementation effort and contextual adaptation rather than simple additive practices. Teachers with high autonomy demonstrated greater adoption of student-centered approaches demanding substantial instructional redesign, such as problem-based learning units or portfolio assessment systems, whereas teachers with limited autonomy more frequently implemented surface-level innovations like isolated technology use that supplemented rather than transformed conventional instruction. This pattern suggests autonomy particularly enables innovations requiring deep pedagogical restructuring that teachers cannot accomplish when tightly controlled by external mandates.

However, the autonomy-innovation relationship showed non-linear characteristics, with diminishing returns at extremely high autonomy levels and evidence that moderate autonomy combined with collegial accountability produced optimal innovation outcomes. Teachers operating in complete isolation without collegial exchange or administrative feedback sometimes used autonomy to maintain comfortable routines rather than pursue challenging innovations. This finding indicates that autonomy's innovation-promoting effects depend partly on organizational contexts providing both professional freedom and constructive pressure for continuous improvement, challenging simplistic assumptions that maximum autonomy universally maximizes innovation.

Mediating Factors: Organizational Culture and Collaborative Professionalism

Analysis identified organizational culture as a powerful mediating variable influencing whether teacher autonomy translated into instructional innovation. Schools characterized by trust-based cultures where administrators explicitly valued teacher expertise and encouraged responsible risk-taking demonstrated significantly stronger autonomy-innovation relationships than institutions with hierarchical cultures emphasizing compliance despite formally granting autonomy. Teachers in high-trust environments described feeling genuinely empowered to experiment pedagogically, whereas colleagues in low-trust settings reported that although they possessed technical autonomy, implicit organizational expectations constrained actual innovation due to fear that unsuccessful experiments would damage professional reputations or career advancement.

The presence of collaborative professional learning communities emerged as another critical mediator strengthening autonomy-innovation connections. Teachers participating in structured collegial collaboration—including peer observation, co-teaching arrangements, and regular pedagogical discussions—showed markedly

higher innovation rates than isolated practitioners even when both groups possessed equivalent formal autonomy. Swedish teachers particularly emphasized how collaborative cultures created safe spaces for sharing innovative ideas, troubleshooting implementation challenges, and collectively refining new practices. One teacher noted that autonomy combined with collaboration meant "freedom with support" rather than "freedom in isolation," enabling innovation through shared risk-taking and collective problem-solving that individual autonomy alone could not provide.

Administrative leadership practices significantly influenced whether autonomy fostered innovation, with distributed leadership approaches showing stronger effects than hierarchical management styles. School leaders who positioned themselves as pedagogical facilitators rather than authoritative evaluators created conditions where teachers used autonomy for innovation rather than self-protection. Effective administrators in the study provided strategic resources supporting innovation, buffered teachers from external pressures that might inhibit experimentation, and established accountability frameworks emphasizing professional growth rather than punitive evaluation. These leadership practices transformed autonomy from mere absence of control into actively supported professional agency oriented toward continuous pedagogical improvement.

Access to professional development opportunities specifically focused on innovative practices emerged as an additional mediating factor. Teachers possessing both autonomy and regular exposure to cutting-edge pedagogical approaches through workshops, conferences, or advanced coursework demonstrated innovation rates substantially exceeding colleagues with equivalent autonomy but limited professional learning opportunities. This finding suggests that autonomy enables innovation primarily when teachers possess the knowledge, skills, and conceptual frameworks necessary to envision and implement alternatives to conventional practice. Autonomy without accompanying professional capacity-building may simply preserve existing practices rather than catalyzing innovation, highlighting the importance of systemic support structures complementing professional freedom.

Tensions Between Autonomy and Accountability in Innovation Implementation

Despite predominantly positive autonomy-innovation relationships, the research identified significant tensions between professional autonomy and increasing accountability demands within Scandinavian education systems that sometimes constrained innovative practice. Teachers across all three countries described experiencing growing pressure from national assessments, international comparison frameworks, and outcomes-based accountability systems that tacitly discouraged pedagogical experimentation by emphasizing measurable performance on standardized metrics. Several Danish teachers reported abandoning promising project-based learning innovations due to concerns that these approaches might not adequately prepare students for national tests, illustrating how accountability pressures can override autonomy's innovation-promoting effects.

The temporal dimension of innovation created particular challenges within accountability frameworks, as meaningful pedagogical innovations often require extended implementation periods before demonstrating results, yet accountability systems typically demand rapid, measurable outcomes. Teachers noted that genuinely transformative innovations—such as shifting toward competency-based assessment or implementing extensive student-directed learning—involved learning curves during which student performance might temporarily decline before improvements emerged. This implementation reality conflicted with accountability pressures for consistent, immediate results, creating risk aversion that inhibited teachers from fully utilizing their autonomy for ambitious innovation. One Norwegian teacher poignantly described feeling "free to innovate until it matters," meaning autonomy existed in principle but accountability consequences constrained actual innovative risk-taking.

Digital technology integration exemplified autonomy-accountability tensions particularly clearly, with teachers possessing substantial freedom regarding technology adoption but facing implicit pressures to integrate digital tools regardless of pedagogical appropriateness due to societal expectations and political emphasis on technological modernization. Several teachers described feeling that their autonomy had been paradoxically reduced by strong institutional pressure for digital innovation, even though they technically retained freedom over pedagogical decisions. This phenomenon revealed how cultural and political imperatives can constrain effective autonomy despite formal policy frameworks preserving teacher decision-making authority, suggesting that autonomy depends not only on official structures but also on broader contextual pressures teachers navigate.

The table below summarizes key tensions between autonomy and accountability identified in the research, along with their manifestation patterns and impacts on innovation.

Table 1. Autonomy-Accountability Tensions Affecting Instructional Innovation

Tension Category	Description	Impact on Innovation	Teacher Response Patterns
Assessment Pressure	National tests and standardized evaluations prioritizing measurable outcomes	Teachers avoid innovations perceived as risky for test performance; increased focus on test-preparation over pedagogical experimentation	Strategic compliance: innovate in non-tested subjects or grade levels while maintaining conventional approaches in high-stakes areas
Time-to-Results	Accountability systems demanding immediate,	Preference for surface-level innovations showing quick results	Incremental innovation: small, safe changes rather

Tension Category	Description	Impact on Innovation	Teacher Response Patterns
	demonstrable outcomes versus innovation requiring extended implementation periods	over transformative approaches requiring sustained development	than comprehensive pedagogical redesign
Digital Imperatives	Institutional and societal pressure for technology integration regardless of pedagogical fit	Technology-driven rather than pedagogy-driven innovation; tools adopted without clear learning objectives	Performative innovation: visible technology use satisfying external expectations while maintaining conventional instruction
Documentation Requirements	Increased demands for evidence, reporting, and justification of pedagogical decisions	Administrative burden reduces time and energy available for innovation implementation; teachers avoid innovations creating additional documentation work	Simplified innovation: teachers select innovations requiring minimal documentation despite potentially preferring more complex approaches
Uniformity Expectations	Accountability frameworks emphasizing consistency and comparability across classrooms	Reduced diversity in pedagogical approaches; pressure to align with colleagues rather than pursue individual innovations	Collective conformity: innovation occurring only when entire grade level or department adopts changes together

This table demonstrates that accountability systems, while potentially promoting general educational quality, can inadvertently constrain the very innovation that autonomy theoretically enables. Teachers navigated these tensions through various strategic responses that sometimes resulted in suboptimal innovation patterns prioritizing external compliance over authentic pedagogical improvement. The research findings suggest that educational systems seeking to promote innovation through teacher autonomy must carefully calibrate accountability frameworks to avoid creating contradictory pressures that negate autonomy's potential benefits.

CONCLUSION

This investigation demonstrates that teacher autonomy significantly influences instructional innovation within Scandinavian educational contexts, though this relationship operates through complex pathways mediated by organizational culture, collaborative professional structures, administrative support, and accountability system characteristics. Teachers experiencing genuine professional autonomy—characterized not merely by absence of control but by trust-based empowerment and institutional support—demonstrate substantially greater adoption of innovative pedagogical practices than colleagues in more constrained environments. However, autonomy alone proves insufficient for fostering innovation without accompanying conditions including access to professional learning, collegial collaboration opportunities, and accountability frameworks that permit responsible risk-taking and learning from experimentation.

The findings reveal that Scandinavian education systems, despite their reputation for teacher autonomy, face emerging tensions between professional freedom and standardization pressures that increasingly constrain innovative practice. Educational policymakers and school leaders seeking to promote instructional innovation should therefore focus not solely on preserving or expanding teacher autonomy but on cultivating comprehensive organizational ecosystems where autonomy combines with supportive cultures, collaborative professionalism, and balanced accountability to enable sustainable pedagogical renewal. Future research should examine longitudinal effects of autonomy-supporting interventions on innovation sustainability and investigate whether findings from high-trust Scandinavian contexts generalize to educational systems with different cultural foundations and organizational structures.

REFERENCES

Blossing, U., Imsen, G., & Moos, L. (Eds.). (2014). *The Nordic education model: 'A school for all' encounters neo-liberal policy*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7125-3

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs: Principles and practices. *Health Services Research*, 48(6), 2134-2156. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6773.12117

Mølstad, C. E., & Karseth, B. (2016). National curricula in Norway and Finland: The role of learning outcomes. *European Educational Research Journal*, 15(3), 329-344. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474904116639311

Muhsyanur and Ramlee Bin Mustapha. (2023). Challenges and Strategies in Teaching Indonesian to Indonesian Occupied Students in Malaysia. *TRICKS: Journal Ff Education And Learning Practices*, *1*(1), 32–39.

https://journal.echaprogres.or.id/index.php/tricks/article/view/6

Muhsyanur, Rahmatullah, A. S., Misnawati, Dumiyati, & Ghufron, S. (2021). The Effectiveness of "Facebook" As Indonesian Language Learning Media for Elementary School Student: Distance Learning Solutions in the Era of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Multicultural Education*, *7*(04), 38–47. https://www.mccaddogap.com/ojs/index.php/me/article/view/8%0Ahttps://www.mccaddogap.com/ojs/index.php/me/article/download/8/10

Pearson, L. C., & Hall, B. W. (1993). Initial construct validation of the Teaching Autonomy Scale. *Journal of Educational Research*, 86(3), 172-178. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1993.9941155

Pearson, L. C., & Moomaw, W. (2005). The relationship between teacher autonomy and stress, work satisfaction, empowerment, and professionalism. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 29(1), 38-54.

Roth, G., Assor, A., Kanat-Maymon, Y., & Kaplan, H. (2007). Autonomous motivation for teaching: How self-determined teaching may lead to self-determined learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(4), 761-774. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.99.4.761

Sahlberg, P. (2011). *Finnish lessons: What can the world learn from educational change in Finland?* Teachers College Press.

Thurlings, M., Evers, A. T., & Vermeulen, M. (2015). Toward a model of explaining teachers' innovative behavior: A literature review. *Review of Educational Research*, 85(3), 430-471. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654314557949

Vangrieken, K., Dochy, F., Raes, E., & Kyndt, E. (2017). Teacher autonomy and collaboration: A paradox? Conceptualising and measuring teachers' autonomy and collaborative attitude. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, 302-315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.06.021

Walder, A. M. (2017). Pedagogical innovation in Canadian higher education: Professors' perspectives on its effects on teaching and learning. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 54, 71-82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.11.001