

[Open Peer Review on Qeios](#)

Innovating While Maintaining Standards: Exploring the Tension Between Vertical Qualification Alignment and Innovation in Zimbabwean Higher Education

Evelyn Chiyevo Garwe

Funding: No specific funding was received for this work.

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Abstract

Higher education institutions (HEIs) face increasing pressure to balance rigorous standards and innovation. However, little is known about how vertical qualification alignment requirements, which ensure coherence and quality across degree levels, affect this balance. This study explores this issue using the case of Zimbabwe, where vertical alignment of faculty qualifications is a key policy instrument for quality assurance. Through interviews and focus group discussions with lecturers, administrators and quality assurance officials, the study reveals how vertical alignment standards enable and constrain innovation in different ways. The findings suggest that while vertical alignment fosters depth of knowledge in a discipline, it can also limit the breadth of transdisciplinary knowledge acquisition required by changing workplaces. To achieve excellence and equity, higher education needs to uphold rigorous standards while promoting innovation through adaptable structures, a culture conducive to strategic risk-taking, and policies that balance oversight and autonomy. The study proposes a balanced approach that preserves qualification integrity while allowing regulated experimentation to ensure curriculum relevance amid changing needs. The study contributes to the understanding of the complex interplay between standards, flexibility and collaboration in higher education, and its implications for cultivating pioneering graduates and cutting-edge solutions that advance socio-economic progress. The findings of this study indicate that quality assurance agencies and HEIs must work together to implement innovative, evidence-based strategies that balance academic rigor with supportive flexibility in order to develop adaptable graduates equipped to solve complex problems and drive socio-economic progress. With a nuanced, evidence-based approach, vertical alignment need not impede HEIs' potential to cultivate agile thinkers and pioneers.

Keywords: Vertical qualification alignment; innovation; higher education, balance, Zimbabwe.

Introduction

Higher education institutions (HEIs) play a vital role in cultivating human capital and fostering innovation and creativity in society (Guerrero & Urbano 2012; Mugimu, 2022; Neck & Greene, 2011). However, they face increasing pressure to

balance rigorous standards and innovation. This tension is particularly problematic in the context of Zimbabwe. As the nation strives to strengthen postsecondary opportunities while keeping pace with the Fourth Industrial Revolution using the heritage-based Education 5.0 doctrine (Ministry of Higher and Tertiary Education, Science and Technology Development, 2022), innovation has been identified as crucial for powering industrialization.

Vertical qualification alignment requirements that prescribe lecturers' subject expertise through obtaining undergraduate through doctoral degrees in the same field constrain creativity and innovation. If taken to an extreme, overemphasis on rigid alignment risks hindering the agility required.

The paper analyzes interviews and discussions with lecturers, administrators and quality officers to answer three research questions: (1) What are the specific ways in which vertical qualification alignment acts as an enabler or barrier to innovation, as revealed by the views of stakeholders? (2) How do organizational culture characteristics contribute to either aiding or obstructing the balance between standards and innovation? and (3) What strategies can quality assurance agencies and institutions adopt to uphold qualification rigor while promoting innovation and creativity, considering the insights gained from the interplay between vertical alignment standards and innovation?

Insights gained provide guidance for policymakers and institutions seeking to optimize qualification frameworks in a way that safeguards educational excellence while catalysing responsive curricula and innovation. With universities poised to bolster Zimbabwe's knowledge economy, balancing disciplinary depth with interdisciplinary breadth deserves careful consideration.

Literature Review

Innovation is a complex, multidisciplinary concept that encompasses the successful introduction of new ideas, products, services, or processes that add value (Kochetkov, 2023). Innovation can take many forms within higher education depending on intended outcomes and conceptual definitions (Tierney & Lanford, 2016). From an entrepreneurial perspective, innovation focuses on commercialization of research and cultivating an entrepreneurial mindset in students (Guerrero & Urbano, 2012). Other conceptualizations emphasize innovations in pedagogy, curriculum design, partnerships, and community engagement to better address societal needs (Mpuangnan & Ntombela, 2023). Overall, innovation involves the application of knowledge in novel ways to create economic, social, or academic value (Kochetkov, 2023; Price, et al. 2013). This provides the grounding for understanding different approaches to innovation in the higher education sector.

Universities play a vital role in enabling innovation through knowledge generation, skills development, and connections with industries and communities (Perkmann et al., 2013, Zhou, 2020). However, the tension between academic standards and innovation outcomes involves ongoing debate. Quality assurance frameworks traditionally emphasize vertical alignment, where lecturers hold graduate degrees in closely related disciplines to their teaching areas (Abatayo et al., 2017). Supporters argue this enhances subject matter expertise, research quality, and teaching effectiveness (Abatayo et al., 2017). However, critics note rigid structures can constrain innovation and cross-disciplinary collaborations needed to

address complex problems (Manathunga et al., 2012).

This debate around the effects of vertical alignment standards sets the stage for empirical examination. Whilst previous empirical studies provide mixed evidence on the relationship between vertical alignment and innovation, they do not account for factors like disciplinary breadth, research quality, or innovation definitions justifying the need for more contextual analysis. Notably, few studies examine innovation outcomes at multiple levels - including student mindsets, commercialization, pedagogical practices, and societal impacts. Definitions of innovation also vary considerably. More nuanced approaches are needed to understand contextual factors influencing different types of innovation from stakeholder perspectives. The relationship between vertical qualification alignment and holistic innovation remains an underexplored issue requiring multifaceted investigation.

To help address this issue, this qualitative study examines specifically how vertical qualification standards impact innovation according to stakeholders within Zimbabwean higher education. Requirements aim to ensure teaching quality, but critics argue this narrow focus limits exposure beneficial for innovation as well as developing students' versatile thinking (Manathunga et al., 2012).

The Zimbabwe case context

This paper examines the interplay between vertical qualification alignment and innovation in the context of Zimbabwe, where innovation is a key pillar of the national vision for the future of learning, known as Education 5.0 (Ministry of Higher and Tertiary Education, Science and Technology Development, 2022). Education 5.0 aims to equip students with human-centered skills for life and work in a rapidly changing world, driven by the fourth industrial revolution (Alharbi, 2023). An exploration of Education 5.0's goals sets the stage for examining its implications for qualifications and innovation.

Education 5.0 promotes collaborative, experiential learning approaches that develop technological proficiency alongside abilities like creativity, critical thinking and problem-solving (Wuta, 2022). It also encourages open, blended and distributed models of education delivery that leverage digital tools and platforms to reach wider audiences, especially in underserved rural communities. Furthermore, it supports interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary programs that cut across traditional fields, fostering holistic competencies needed in interlinked domains like healthcare, agriculture and sustainability (Keche, 2021). The overarching goal is to cultivate lifelong learners equipped for Zimbabwe's knowledge economy of the future (Dingindawo & Trenance, 2023; Muzira & Bondai, 2020). Therefore, Education 5.0 envisions that universities use innovation as a catalyst for industrialization and societal progress, requiring creativity and multidisciplinary perspectives (Maringehosi, 2020; Mabika & Maireva, 2022). This ambition for transformation requires examination of any potential barriers.

However, achieving innovation through Education 5.0 also depends on the quality assurance frameworks and standards that govern higher education in Zimbabwe. The Zimbabwe Council for Higher Education (ZIMCHE) oversees academic standards and program accreditation (ZIMCHE, 2021). One of the standards is vertical qualification alignment, which requires that lecturers hold bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees in closely related fields. This is intended to ensure

depth of knowledge and expertise in a discipline, which can enhance teaching quality and innovation (Abatayo et al., 2017). However, some critics argue that vertical alignment can also inhibit interdisciplinary exposure and flexibility needed to cultivate agile thinking and solutions tailored to multifaceted societal issues (Manathunga et al., 2012). Moreover, a lack of coordination in policy implementation has resulted in inconsistencies in vertical alignment and overregulating amid capacity constraints risks stifling the agility tertiary programs must develop. Therefore, there is a need for more research on how vertical alignment standards impact innovation in different ways, and how to achieve a balance between rigorous standards and innovation in Zimbabwe. This issue forms the basis of the current study.

Conceptual framework

This study is grounded in several key theoretical concepts including praxis orientation, standards, flexibility, organizational culture, and interdisciplinarity. Together these provide a robust conceptual framework for understanding contextual factors influencing how vertical alignment standards interact with innovation in curriculum development within higher education.

Praxis orientation posits that higher education institutions must balance external standards with internal realities through reflection and adaptation. The standards concept considers how quality assurance frameworks maintain consistency while also potentially constraining flexibility and responsiveness over time (Sadler, 2014). Standards have multiple functions. They can be used to evaluate the quality of a student's work in relation to a specific assignment, and to show the level of a certain course or programme (Coates, 2015; Kuh et al., 2015). Standards are not always consistent across different situations, as they may seem to have a similar format to show a level of achievement, but they can often meet different needs for different audiences. Related flexibility theory examines how adaptability allows organizational change but risks ineffectiveness without clarity.

Organizational culture characteristics also impact innovation outcomes (Birasnav, 2014; Obeidat, 2016). Cultures valuing attributes like flexibility, learning, collaboration and open communication foster innovation, while those emphasizing narrowly performance hinder innovative behaviors (Gram-Hanssen, 2019; Jo & Hong, 2022).

Interdisciplinarity concept holds that exposure to diverse ideas through cross-disciplinary training equips individuals and organizations with wider perspectives and problem-solving capacities (Prialx & Weinel, 2018). Such qualifications foster versatile thinking skills needed for tackling complex real-world issues (Cai & Sankaran, 2015). However, emphasis on vertical alignment risks limiting interdisciplinary collaboration and approaches.

By integrating these theoretical lenses, this study examines stakeholder perspectives on how vertical alignment standards influence the balance between academic consistency, innovative responsiveness and development of versatile thinking capacities within curriculum development in Zimbabwean higher education. This study examines how vertical alignment standards influence the balance between consistency and flexibility in curriculum development.

Methodology

This section describes the research design, data collection methods, and data analysis methods used in this study. The study aims to explore how vertical alignment standards affect innovation in curriculum development in Zimbabwean higher education. The study utilizes a qualitative case study methodology to gather rich insights from lecturers, administrators, and quality assurance officials in Zimbabwean higher education institutions. The case study approach allows for an in-depth exploration of the research questions and provides a contextualized understanding of the relationship between vertical alignment and innovation.

Two data collection methods were employed: online focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews. Online focus group discussions were conducted with a sample of 60 participants, 20 per each group of lecturers, administrators, and quality assurance practitioners from 10 higher education institutions in Zimbabwe. The discussions were facilitated through an online platform, lasted approximately 60 minutes each, and were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with a purposive sample of 30 stakeholders, representing 10 lecturers, 10 administrators, and 10 quality assurance officials from the sample of 10 Zimbabwean higher education institutions. The interviews were conducted via video conferencing or in-person, based on participant preferences, and lasted approximately 60 minutes each.

Thematic analysis was employed to analyze the data collected from the focus group discussions and interviews. This involved the identification and coding of themes and sub-themes that emerged from the participants' perspectives and experiences. Content analysis was used to analyze relevant policies and documents related to curriculum development and quality assurance in Zimbabwean higher education institutions. This analysis provided additional context and supported the interpretation of the qualitative data.

Ethical clearance was obtained from the institutional research committee before the commencement of data collection, ensuring adherence to ethical guidelines and protection of participants' rights. Informed consent was obtained from all participants, clearly explaining the purpose of the study, voluntary participation, and confidentiality of their responses. Participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity throughout the study, and identifying information was securely stored and accessible only to the research team. The study was conducted over a period of six months, allowing sufficient time for data collection, analysis, and interpretation.

Online tools such as Zoom were used to facilitate the online focus group discussions and interviews, ensuring efficient data collection while accommodating participant preferences and geographical constraints. Overall, these qualitative methods offer foundational understandings to address gaps in holistic, context-specific inquiry into innovation and standards.

The use of self-report methods is a limitation as responses may be impacted by social desirability bias. Additionally, the study relies on participant perceptions rather than objective measures, which provide an important but incomplete picture. Further research using complementary methods could help triangulate findings.

Findings

This section presents the findings of the study, which explored how vertical alignment standards affect innovation in curriculum development in Zimbabwean higher education. The study addressed three research questions: (1) What are the specific ways in which vertical qualification alignment acts as an enabler or barrier to innovation, as revealed by the views of stakeholders? (2) How do organizational culture characteristics contribute to either aiding or obstructing the balance between standards and innovation? and (3) What strategies can quality assurance agencies and institutions adopt to uphold qualification rigor while promoting innovation and creativity, considering the insights gained from the interplay between vertical alignment standards and innovation?

Perceptions on Vertical Qualification Alignment as an enabler or barrier to innovation

The findings revealed nuanced perspectives on how vertical qualification alignment impacts innovation. Most stakeholders agreed that balancing rigorous quality standards with curricular flexibility is important for both promoting innovation and maintaining educational quality. As one lecturer described, "Rigid adherence to vertical standards now seems at odds with the agility learners need. We must empower creativity alongside core expertise." An administrator agreed cautiously: "While mastery through depth aids teaching and research if taken to extremes, could it also limit perspectives? A balanced understanding recognizes both merits." Most saw benefits and challenges, favoring balance. As a quality official concluded, "Standards ensure coherence but stifling flexibility harms relevance - both factors critically impact innovation outcomes."

However, not all agreed on vertical alignment's role in enabling innovation. Clear qualification standards were widely valued by lecturers and administrators for providing curricular coherence and quality across degree levels. Vertical alignment was seen as helpful for guiding curriculum design and facilitating student mobility. At the same time, participants felt rigid compliance with input-based alignment criteria could obstruct innovative program development.

Table 1 summarizes the study's key findings regarding the positive and negative impacts of vertical alignment on curricular innovation. In particular, ensuring educational quality and standards while allowing flexibility emerged as an ongoing tension, with calls for balance between regulation and innovation.

Table 1. Impact of vertical alignment on innovation

Positive effects	Negative effects
Enhances expertise and authority in subject area which stimulates innovation	Narrows perspective on teaching and learning
Encourages specialization and in-depth knowledge which are necessary for innovation	Reduces interdisciplinary collaboration and communication
Increases focus and efficiency in teaching and research	Limits creativity and broad thinking due to over-specialization
Supports academic rigor and ensures that lecturers can prepare students for the labor market	Inhibits creativity due to alignment rigidity
Alignment is essential for maintaining quality standards in higher education	Prevents ability to respond to changing industry needs due to alignment rigidity

The findings revealed varying perspectives on how vertical qualification alignment impacts curricular innovation. While some stakeholders believed balancing rigorous standards with flexibility best promotes innovation, others saw rigid compliance with alignment criteria as hindering innovative program development.

The positive impacts of vertical alignment included enhancing subject matter expertise, encouraging specialization, increasing focus and efficiency, supporting academic rigor, and maintaining quality standards. Consistent with prior research, vertically aligned qualifications allowed lecturers to demonstrate confident mastery of content and connect concepts to real-world applications, enhancing student engagement (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). Such focused specialization also tended to produce innovative disciplinary research and enable collaboration benefiting teaching and the institution.

However, the findings also indicated potential negative impacts. Strict vertical alignment was seen as narrowing perspectives, reducing interdisciplinary collaboration, limiting creativity and broad thinking, and inhibiting responsiveness to changing industry needs. Conversely, exposure to diverse ideas through interdisciplinary training can better equip students and lecturers for today's interconnected world. Prior studies confirm interdisciplinary qualifications foster wider thinking beyond single disciplines (Cai & Sankaran, 2015). By linking domains, such qualifications may generate innovative solutions to complex real-world problems (Bennett & Lemoine, 2014).

These positive and negative impacts imply vertical alignment has advantages in developing expertise but risks hindering the flexibility needed for innovation, especially in rapidly changing environments. An ability to draw from multiple perspectives, as interdisciplinary training provides, may better position lecturers and students to respond innovatively to uncertainty (O'Reilly et al., 1997). Striking a balance between depth and breadth therefore emerges as an ongoing challenge for supporting both educational quality and curricular innovation over time.

Characteristics of Organizational Culture that Aid or Obstruct the Balance between Standards and Flexibility

The balance between standards and flexibility innovation is influenced by organizational culture. Quality assurance officials emphasized the importance of a culture that values both innovation/creativity as well as academic rigor. An innovative culture should foster experimentation, risk-taking, and collaboration among lecturers. "An environment encouraging experimentation lets us test new ideas without fear of failure," explained one lecturer. However, others noted how inflexible cultures breed resistance to change. As a lecturer observed, "When leadership signals innovation isn't truly valued beyond rhetoric, gaining support proves nearly impossible." Colleagues agreed open communication and collaborative problem-solving better enable strategizing solutions balancing needs. Administrators and lecturers also observed that a culture prioritizing tradition/stability over innovation can impede balancing standards and flexibility.

Table 2 summarizes how certain cultural characteristics like collaboration, risk-taking and open communication aid balancing standards and flexibility, whereas reluctance to change hinders it. An innovative organizational culture emerged as supporting curricular agility while maintaining academic rigor. Fostering the right culture may thus help educational institutions navigate tensions between regulation and responsiveness over time.

Table 2. Characteristics of Organizational Culture that Aid or Obstruct the Balance between Standards and Flexibility

Characteristics of Organizational Culture	Facilitates innovation	Obstruct Innovation
Flexibility	Enables adaptability and responsiveness to changing industry needs,	May result in a lack of clarity and consistency in standards
Learning Orientation	Learning Orientation supports experimentation, risk-taking, and continuous learning	May result in a lack of focus on standardization
Performance Orientation	Supports high levels of performance and achievement, which can aid innovation by creating a culture of continuous improvement	May result in a lack of focus on standardization
Collaboration	Encourages collaboration and knowledge-sharing among employees, other institutions, industry, and government	May result in inefficiencies and conflicts
Risk Tolerance	Promotes experimentation and calculated risk-taking	May result in an inability to evaluate and manage risk effectively
Communication	Fosters open and effective communication, enabling employees to share ideas and collaborate on innovation	May result in communication breakdowns and misunderstandings,
Leadership	Supports and encourages innovation through leadership behaviors and practices	May result in a lack of leadership support and encouragement for innovation

Table 2 indicates organizational culture influences the balance between standards and flexibility in curriculum development. Certain cultural characteristics were identified as aiding or obstructing this balance. Characteristics facilitating innovation included flexibility, a learning orientation, performance orientation, collaboration, risk tolerance, effective communication, and supportive leadership (Jo & Hong, 2022). Conversely, characteristics obstructing innovation included a lack of clarity/consistency in standards, lack of focus on standardization, potential inefficiencies/conflicts, inability to evaluate/manage risk effectively, communication breakdowns, and lack of leadership support for innovation.

Recent studies support these findings. Cultures valuing flexibility, learning, collaboration and open communication foster innovation (Lam, 2021). Flexible, collaborative cultures allow adaptation to new ideas/needs (Gram-Hanssen, 2019). However, too much flexibility without clear goals/accountability can reduce focus/effectiveness (Taha et al., 2016). Similarly, while risk-taking enables experimentation, inadequate risk management hinders quality/sustainability (Sitkin et al., 2011; Zieba, et al., 2022). A narrowly performance-oriented culture could discourage innovative behaviors seen as diverting from core operations (Birasnav, 2014; Obeidat, 2016). Conversely, strong performance management coupled with learning drives continuous improvement linked to innovation outcomes. Effective leadership communicating a shared vision of balancing standards with flexibility is likewise crucial to navigating this tension.

In summary, the study's findings on how cultural characteristics interact with standards and flexibility aligns well with existing understanding around organizational culture, leadership, collaboration, risk orientation and their impacts on sustaining innovation over time. A balanced approach recognizes both the facilitating and obstructing impacts of different cultural dimensions.

Strategies that quality assurance agencies and institutions can adopt to uphold qualification rigor while promoting innovation and creativity

Participants proposed strategies for upholding rigor while enabling creativity. As one lecturer noted, "Blended professional development and peer collaboration cultivates continuous improvement across our institution." An administrator concurred such synergistic approaches best serve all stakeholders. Most favored flexible yet clear guidelines. A quality assurance officer explained that "overly rigid rules hamper localized responsiveness to rapid changes, while principles-based guidance supports customizing innovative solutions." Overall, participants saw balancing standards and agility as key to strengthening universities' roles in societal advancement. Participants suggested that quality assurance agencies and institutions in Zimbabwe can adopt the balanced strategies to uphold qualification rigor while promoting innovation and creativity shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Balanced Strategies for Upholding Qualification Rigor and Promoting Innovation and Creativity

Strategies for Quality Assurance Agencies and HEIs	Promotes Qualification Rigor	Promotes Innovation and Creativity
Fostering a Culture of Continuous Improvement	Promotes ongoing quality improvement and innovation.	Encourages experimentation and risk-taking.
Providing Guidelines and Standards	Ensures consistency and quality in qualifications.	Can stifle innovation if overly prescriptive.
Encouraging Collaboration	Promotes sharing of best practices and innovation.	Fosters creativity and innovation.
Supporting Innovation through Funding and Resources	Enables institutions to invest in innovation and new ideas.	Encourages innovation and creativity.
Regularly Reviewing and Updating Qualifications	Ensures qualifications remain relevant and up-to-date.	Promotes innovation and adaptability.
Encouraging Risk-Taking and Failure	Promotes experimentation and learning from failure.	Encourages innovation and creativity.
Providing Training and Professional Development	Enhances capacity for innovation and creativity.	Promotes innovation and adaptability.
Encouraging Stakeholder Engagement	Promotes collaboration and buy-in for innovation	Encourages innovation and creativity
Interdisciplinary course design and research	Maintains academic rigor and research impact	Fosters broader thinking and problem-solving skills among students
Flexible curriculum design	Enhances academic standards	Enable HEIs to respond quickly to changing workforce needs and technological advancements

Table 3 shows that fostering a culture of continuous improvement, providing guidelines and standards, encouraging collaboration, supporting innovation through funding and resources, regularly reviewing and updating qualifications, encouraging risk-taking and failure, providing training and professional development, and encouraging stakeholder engagement are all effective strategies for quality assurance agencies and institutions to adopt in order to uphold qualification rigor while promoting innovation and creativity. Therefore, balanced policies recognizing the value of cross-disciplinary exposure are needed to develop dynamic, versatile academics and graduates.

Existing literature support these views. Fostering learning cultures encourages risk-taking vital for innovation (Henriksen, et al., 2021). Knowledge-sharing also boosts creativity through collaboration (Mazorodze et al., 2022). Principles versus

prescriptive regulations facilitate adaptation to industry shifts. Dedicated funding likewise catalyzes new ideas, as entrepreneurial mindsets require nurturing (Parker, 2018). Training enhances pedagogical and subject matter innovation skills (Kwangmuang et al., 2021).

Other scholars have also underscored interdisciplinarity's role in developing adaptable graduates equipped to solve complex problems (Horn, et al., 2022). A multifaceted, ecosystem approach optimized different leverage points recognizes inherent tradeoffs. Therefore, participants' proposals aligned well with current understanding of best practices for balancing academic rigor, creative capacities and responsiveness within higher education. With consideration, quality agencies and institutions can strengthen innovation outcomes through principles of continuous improvement, knowledge-sharing, and carefully managed flexibility.

Implications of the study

The findings offer timely insights that can help Zimbabwean higher education balance rigorous standards with supportive flexibility in order to cultivate the next generation of innovative problem solvers. By framing implications based on participant feedback within the national Education 5.0 vision, stakeholders can work in partnership to advance socioeconomic goals.

Regarding vertical alignment, the study suggests institutions consider program-specific criteria that stimulate interdisciplinarity without compromising expertise. Alignment guidelines could incorporate flexibility to accommodate emerging fields driving innovation. This balances disciplinary depth with exposure to versatile thinking.

Organizational cultural shifts necessitate thoughtful, sustained efforts. Leaders may link performance to demonstrated innovation promotion. Staff training could embed creativity exercises and risk discussions. Cross-institutional collaboration platforms may encourage knowledge-sharing beyond departments. Such initiatives nurture an environment conducive to strategic risk-taking.

Quality agencies profoundly impact culture through engagement. Consultative processes assessing stakeholder innovation concerns regionally provide actionable reform ideas aligned with changing needs. Outcome-focused reporting emphasizing entrepreneurial success beyond compliance may inspire cultural evolution supporting Education 5.0 aspirations.

Comparative case studies across diverse systems would generate robust policy insights, as would incorporating student and industry feedback for triangulated perspectives on curriculum relevance. Quantitative tracking of outputs like startups arising from new interdisciplinary programs could evidence cultural and policy impacts tangibly to stakeholders.

By collaborative evidence-based continuous improvement, quality circles and professional bodies can help Zimbabwe build upon this preliminary work to exemplify balancing standards with the flexibility needed to cultivate pioneering graduates equipped to solve societal challenges.

Limitations and future research

This study only assessed one national context using qualitative methods. Further comparative case studies across diverse systems would generate more robust policy insights. Incorporating student and industry feedback would offer triangulated perspectives on curriculum relevance.

Quantitative data complementing interviews and observations could also strengthen implications. Pre- and post- reform metrics tracking programs, publications or startups stemming from new interdisciplinary fields would evidence cultural and policy impacts tangibly. International rankings surveying innovation capacities may motivate continuous improvement.

This study lays foundations but implementations will determine longer-term success. I hope quality circles and professional bodies build upon these beginnings by collaborating on evidence-based solutions at multiple levels. With willingness to thoughtfully update frameworks over time, Zimbabwean higher education seems well positioned to exemplify balancing standards with creativity leading societal progress.

Conclusion

While ensuring academic quality remains paramount, this study reveals vertical alignment standards can paradoxically constrain the innovation essential for Zimbabwe's vision of Education 5.0. By eliciting stakeholder perspectives, two fundamental tensions emerge between disciplinary rigor and versatile thinking that demands balance.

Primary findings summarize that whereas subject matter expertise enhances teaching, rigid adherence to credentials inhibits the interdisciplinarity driving curricular reform. A balanced approach upholding qualification integrity through praxis orientation alongside regulated experimentation optimizes standards flexibility.

Moving forward, mixed methods research assessing the impacts of specific alignment policies on innovation outputs would generate actionable insights. Comparing diverse international systems may uncover adaptive practices befitting Zimbabwe's development objectives. Exploring constraints and untapped potential could also nurture stakeholder buy-in for evidence-based solutions nurturing pioneering graduates.

Finally, reconceptualizing innovation more broadly and contextualizing factors influencing its cultivation will empower policymakers and institutions working in tandem. With willingness to thoughtfully calibrate frameworks dynamically, Zimbabwean higher education is poised to set an exemplary standard of safeguarding academic prowess while incubating agile problem solvers through responsive, cutting-edge curricula. This study provides foundational understandings to progress that mission.

References

- Abatayo, M. M., Arabejo, C., & Kunwar, S. S. (2017). Vertical alignment of faculty of science and mathematics. *Journal*

of Higher Education Research Disciplines, 1(2): 27-33.

- Alharbi, A. (2023). Implementation of Education 5.0 in Developed and Developing Countries: A Comparative Study. *Creative Education*, 14: 914-942. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2023.145059>
- Bennett, N., & Lemoine, G. J. (2014). What VUCA really means for you. *Harvard Business Review*, 92(1), 27.
- Birasnav, M. (2014) Knowledge Management and Organizational Performance in the Service Industry: The Role of Transformational Leadership Beyond the Effects of Transactional Leadership. *Journal of Business Research*, 67, 1622-1629. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.09.006>
- Cai, W., & Sankaran, G. (2015). Promoting Critical Thinking through an Interdisciplinary Study Abroad Program. *Journal of International Students*, 5(1): 38–49. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v5i1.441>
- Coates, H. (2015). Assessment of learning outcomes. In: *The European Higher Education Area*, Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2015, pp. 399–413.
- Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). Preparing teachers for a rapidly changing world. *Educational Researcher*, 48(2): 133-144.
- Dingindawo, N., Trenance, K. (2023). Re-thinking the Zimbabwean Higher and Tertiary Education Curriculum Terrain: Challenges and Opportunities. *Indiana Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 4(11): 21-30.
- Gram-Hanssen, I. (2019). The role of flexibility in enabling transformational social change: Perspectives from an Indigenous community using Q-methodology. *Geoforum*, 100, 10-20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2019.02.001>
- Guerrero, M., & Urbano, D. (2012). The development of an entrepreneurial university. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 37(1), 43-74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10961-010-9171-x>
- Henriksen, D., Henderson, M., Creely, E., Carvalho, A. A., Cernochova, M., Dash, D., Davis, T., & Mishra, P. (2021). Creativity and risk-taking in teaching and learning settings: Insights from six international narratives. *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 2, 100024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.100024>
- Horn, A., van der Meij, M. G., Willems, W. L., Kupper, F. & Zweekhorst, M.B.M. (2022) Developing interdisciplinary consciousness for sustainability: using playful frame reflection to challenge disciplinary bias, *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 18:1: 515-530, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2022.2095780>
- Jo Y. & Hong AJ. (2022). Impact of Agile Learning on Innovative Behavior: A Moderated Mediation Model of Employee Engagement and Perceived Organizational Support. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.900830>
- Keche, K. (2021). Relevancy of New Higher Education Approaches in 'Second Republic Zimbabwe'
- Kochetkov, D. (2023). Innovation: A State-of-the-Art Review and Typology *International Journal of Innovation Studies*. 13:900830. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijis.2023.05.004>
- Kuh, G. D., Ikenberry, S. O., Jankowski, N. A., Cain, T. R., Ewell, P. T., Hutchings, P., & Kinzie, J. (2015). Using evidence of student learning to improve higher education. John Wiley & Sons
- Kwangmuang, P., Jarutkamolpong, S., Sangboonraung, W., & Daungtod, S. (2021). The development of learning innovation to enhance higher order thinking skills for students in Thailand junior high schools. *Heliyon*, 7(6), e07309. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07309>
- Lam, L., Nguyen, P., Le, N., & Tran, K. (2021). The relation among organizational culture, knowledge management,

and innovation capability: Its implication for open innovation. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 7(1), 66. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc7010066>

- Mabika, P. & Maireva, S. (2022). Education 5.0 in the face of Covid-19: Zimbabwe higher education institutions' response – 2 years on. *Dzimbabwe Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 3(1): 165. <http://ir.gzu.ac.zw:8080/xmlui/handle/123456789/632>
- Manathunga, C., Kiley, M. Boud, D. & Cantwell, R. (2012). From knowledge acquisition to knowledge production: issues with Australian honours curricula. *Teaching in Higher Education* 17,2:139-151.
- Maringehosi, S. J. (2020). HBE 5.0 in Zimbabwe. mail.google.com
- Mazorodze, Alfred H., & Mkhize, Peter. (2022). An investigation into the knowledge-sharing practices for innovation in higher education institutions of developing countries. *Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa*, 18(1), 1-7. <https://dx.doi.org/10.4102/td.v18i1.1230>
- Ministry of Higher and Tertiary Education (2022). Higher and Tertiary Education Strategic Plan (2022-2026). Government of Zimbabwe.
- Mpuangnan, K.N., Ntombela, S. (2023). Community voices in curriculum development. *Curriculum Perspectives*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41297-023-00223-w>
- Mugimu, C. B. (2022). Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Africa Embracing the “New Normal” for Knowledge Production and Innovation: Barriers, Realities, and Possibilities. *IntechOpen*. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.101063>
- Muzira, D. R., & Bondai, B. M. (2020). Perception of educators towards the adoption of education 5.0: A case of a state university in Zimbabwe. *East African Journal of education and social sciences*, 1(2), 43-53.
- Neck, H. M., & Greene, P. G. (2011). Entrepreneurship education: Known worlds and new frontiers. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 49(1), 55-70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-627X.2010.00314.x>
- Obeidat, B. Y. (2016). The effect of strategic orientation on organizational performance: The mediating role of innovation. *International Journal of Communications, Network and System Sciences*, 09(11), 478-505. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ijcns.2016.911039>
- O'Reilly, C. A., Williams, K. Y., & Barsade, S. (1997). Group demography and innovation: Does diversity help? In *Resource in organizational behavior*. Emerald Group Publishing, 183-207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-7623-1372-0.00008-7>
- Perkmann, M., Tartari, V., McKelvey, M., Autio, E., Brostrom, A., D'Este, P., & Fini, R. (2013). Academic engagement and commercialisation: A review of the literature on university–industry relations. *Research policy*, 42(2), 423-442. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2012.09.007>
- Prialux, N., Weinel, M. (2018). Connective knowledge: what we need to know about other fields to ‘envision’ cross-disciplinary collaboration. *European Journal of Futures Research* 6, 21 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-018-0150-z>
- Price, D. P., Stoica, M., & Boncella, R. J. (2013). The relationship between innovation, knowledge, and performance in family and non-family firms: An analysis of SMEs. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 2(14), 1-20 <https://doi.org/10.1186/2192-5372-2-14>
- Sadler, D. R. (2014). The futility of attempting to codify academic achievement standards. *Higher Education*, 67(3), 273-288

- Sitkin, S.B., K.E. See, C.C. Miller, M. Lawless, A. Carton. 2011. The Paradox of Stretch Goals: Organizations in Pursuit of the Seemingly Impossible. *Academy of Management Review* 36(3) 544- 566.
- Taha, V.A., Sirkova, M., & Ferencova, M. (2016). The impact of organizational culture on creativity and innovation. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 14 (1), 7-17.
- Tierney, W. G., & Lanford, M. (2016). Conceptualizing innovation in higher education. In M. B. Paulson (ed). *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 1-40). Gewerbestrasse, Switzerland: Springer International.
- Wuta, R. K. (2022). Extendibility of the Education 5.0 Concept to Zimbabwe"s Secondary School System as Encapsulated in Curriculum Framework 2015-2022. *Indiana Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(5), 26-33.
- Zhou, R. & Tang, P. (2020). The role of university Knowledge Transfer Offices: not just commercialize research outputs. *Technovation*, 90–91.
- Zieba, M., Durst, S. and Hinteregger, C. (2022). The impact of knowledge risk management on sustainability", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 26(11): 234-258. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-09-2021-069>
- ZIMCHE (2021). The National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education in Zimbabwe.