

# Cultural Integration and Curriculum Governance in Religious Institutes: An Educational Governance Perspective

Ven. Qingyuan\*, Ven. Huiru, Ven. Nengcheng

Lingyanshan Branch, Buddhist Academy of China, Jiangsu, 215100, China

\*Corresponding author: Ven. Qingyuan

**Copyright:** 2026 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY-NC 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited, and explicitly prohibiting its use for commercial purposes.

**Abstract:** Cultural integration has become an increasingly important dimension of educational reform in contemporary religious institutes. As the core carrier of educational objectives, curriculum structure and teaching operation mechanisms play a decisive role in translating cultural values into everyday educational practice. However, in many institutes, cultural integration remains insufficiently embedded in curriculum governance, resulting in fragmented implementation and limited institutional coherence. From the perspective of educational governance, this study examines how cultural integration can be systematically incorporated into curriculum design and teaching operation mechanisms. Drawing on policy analysis, educational governance theory, and observation of curriculum practice, the paper analyzes the internal logic, practical challenges, and institutional conditions shaping curriculum governance. The paper argues that effective cultural integration requires coordinated curriculum structure, stable governance mechanisms, and process-oriented teaching management rather than isolated curricular adjustments. By focusing on curriculum governance as an institutional process, this study contributes to discussions on cultural integration, educational governance, and the humanistic dimensions of institutional practice, offering a governance-oriented analytical framework relevant to education reform and institutional development in diverse cultural contexts.

**Keywords:** Cultural Integration; Religious Institutes; Curriculum Governance; Educational Governance; Institutional Practice

**Published:** Feb 24, 2026

**DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.62177/chst.v3i1.1054>

## 1. Introduction

Religious institutes are institutional spaces responsible for cultivating religious professionals and transmitting religious traditions. Within contemporary governance frameworks, institutes are expected to maintain educational quality, institutional order, and social responsibility. In this context, cultural integration has become a key approach to strengthening educational coherence and public legitimacy. For China's religious education sector, policy documents emphasize law-based governance and institutional standardization, which requires that educational objectives be translated into stable teaching practices and governance arrangements<sup>[1-4]</sup>. Related policy-oriented scholarship further highlights that modernization of religious affairs governance and 'new era' religious work require institutions to strengthen standardized internal management and capacity-building, including curriculum and teaching systems<sup>[5,6]</sup>.

Curriculum governance is a central mechanism for this translation. It determines what is taught, how it is taught, how learning outcomes are assessed, and how teaching is organized across programs. When cultural integration is treated as an add-on course or occasional activity, it tends to remain symbolic. When embedded into curriculum governance, it becomes

institutionalized and sustainable. This study asks: How can cultural integration be embedded into curriculum governance in a manner that is coherent, operational, and institutionally stable?

## 2. Policy and Governance Context

The policy context relevant to curriculum governance in religious institutes includes regulations on religious affairs and administrative measures for religious institutes, which emphasize standardized management, quality assurance, and compliance with law-based governance requirements<sup>[1,2]</sup>. These documents imply that curriculum decisions should not be arbitrary or personalized; they should be institutionally reviewed, documented, and evaluated. At the level of guiding principles, the emphasis on the sinicization of religion underscores the importance of cultural integration as a long-term direction of institutional development<sup>[3,4]</sup>. In policy interpretation and governance research, modernization of religious affairs governance is also linked to internal institutional procedures, legality, and accountability, including the legalization of religious affairs and the governance of religious institutes<sup>[5,11]</sup>.

Beyond policy texts, Chinese-language scholarship on the sinicization of religion has discussed its conceptual foundations, practical pathways, and its relationship with broader cultural identity. These discussions commonly stress that cultural integration should be understood as a structured, long-term governance project rather than a short-term symbolic campaign<sup>[7,9,12]</sup>. Research on the relationship between Chinese religion and Chinese culture further suggests that the educational work of institutes must cultivate historical awareness and cultural literacy to sustain the legitimacy and continuity of religious traditions in contemporary society<sup>[10]</sup>.

For educational governance, this means that curriculum governance must link normative requirements (direction, standards, accountability) with operational mechanisms (course structures, teaching routines, evaluation tools). The goal is not to replace professional religious education, but to improve coherence between educational objectives, cultural orientation, and institutional practice<sup>[8,11]</sup>.

## 3. Conceptual Framework: Curriculum Governance as an Institutional Process

Curriculum governance refers to the institutional arrangements through which curriculum objectives, structures, and operational processes are coordinated. In educational governance theory, curriculum is not merely a content list; it is an institutional system that embodies an organization's educational philosophy and governance capacity<sup>[13-16]</sup>. The core components of curriculum governance typically include: (a) curriculum objective-setting and program design; (b) curriculum structure and course mapping; (c) teaching operation mechanisms such as scheduling, teaching supervision, and quality assurance; (d) evaluation and feedback loops; and (e) faculty coordination and professional development as a mechanism of collaborative construction and continuous improvement<sup>[15,18]</sup>.

Cultural integration, in this study, refers to the systematic embedding of culturally grounded values, historical awareness, ethical cultivation, and social responsibility into educational objectives and teaching processes. Cultural integration becomes effective when it is reflected in curriculum objectives, reinforced by course structures, and supported by governance mechanisms that make implementation stable and reviewable. This definition is consistent with policy and research arguments that emphasize cultural identity cultivation and governance-based implementation rather than slogan-like expansion<sup>[7,12]</sup>.

## 4. Practical Challenges in Current Curriculum Practices

Based on common patterns observed in institutional practice and reported in curriculum governance research, several challenges frequently arise when cultural integration is promoted in religious institutes. First, implementation tends to be fragmented: cultural elements appear in isolated general-education courses without being connected to the learning trajectories of professional courses<sup>[17,18]</sup>. Second, curriculum coordination is often weak: different courses are designed and taught independently, resulting in repeated themes in some areas and gaps in others. Third, teaching operation mechanisms may lack explicit governance requirements for cultural integration, leaving implementation to individual teachers' preferences, which undermines stability and comparability across cohorts. Empirical and policy discussion on religious education and the modernization of religious governance similarly note that institutional routines and accountability mechanisms are key to preventing fragmentation and formalism<sup>[8,9]</sup>.

These challenges suggest that cultural integration is not primarily a ‘course addition’ problem; it is a curriculum governance problem. The solution therefore requires institutional design that aligns curriculum structure, teaching operation, and evaluation mechanisms. In addition, where cultural integration touches identity formation, institutes must avoid both over-politicized simplification and purely symbolic cultural displays; instead, they should operationalize cultural objectives in ways that can be taught, assessed, and reviewed<sup>[12]</sup>.

## **5. Institutional Paths for Curriculum Optimization**

### **5.1 Optimize Curriculum Structure through Program-Level Course Mapping**

A practical starting point is program-level course mapping. Institutes can define a limited set of curriculum objectives that articulate cultural integration outcomes (e.g., ethical cultivation, historical awareness, civic responsibility, cultural literacy) and map these outcomes across required and elective courses. This helps ensure that cultural integration is distributed across the curriculum rather than concentrated in a single course. In practice, institutes can maintain the systematic structure of professional religious education while ensuring that cultural integration outcomes are reinforced at multiple points in the learning pathway<sup>[15,17]</sup>.

Course mapping also helps clarify the relationship between general-education courses and professional courses, reducing duplication and strengthening progression. This approach aligns with curriculum system construction practices that connect curriculum design with governance capacity and the shift from administrative ‘management’ to collaborative curriculum construction<sup>[17,18]</sup>.

### **5.2 Strengthen Teaching Operation Mechanisms and Quality Assurance**

Cultural integration becomes stable only when it is supported by teaching operation mechanisms and quality assurance systems. Institutes can incorporate cultural integration requirements into course syllabi templates, teaching plans, and teaching evaluation indicators. For example, syllabi can specify cultural integration learning outcomes and assessment tasks; teaching evaluations can include criteria related to curriculum objectives and coherence. This approach reflects the broader logic of teaching operation mechanisms and quality assurance systems in higher education governance<sup>[19]</sup>.

To avoid formalism, process-oriented management should be emphasized. Rather than counting ‘how many cultural activities’ were held, institutes can review whether cultural integration is reflected in course objectives, learning materials, classroom processes, and student assessment. Such process-oriented governance supports continuous improvement and reduces the risk of superficial compliance, a risk repeatedly noted in policy and practice discussions on the sinicization of religion<sup>[7,9]</sup>.

### **5.3 Faculty Coordination and Professional Development**

Faculty capacity is a decisive condition for curriculum governance. Institutes can establish mechanisms such as collective lesson planning, cross-course teaching seminars, and peer review to support cultural integration in professional teaching. Faculty development can include training on curriculum design, assessment literacy, and culturally informed pedagogy. These arrangements reduce the dependence on individual ‘enthusiastic teachers’ and make curriculum governance more institutional and less personalized<sup>[18,20]</sup>.

### **5.4 Evaluation, Feedback, and Institutional Learning**

Curriculum governance requires feedback loops. Institutes can conduct periodic curriculum reviews (e.g., annually or per cohort) using evidence such as student learning outcomes, assessment samples, and course evaluation reports. The goal is to identify where cultural integration is functioning as intended and where adjustments are needed. This evaluation process should be documented and connected to institutional decision-making, reinforcing internal governance optimization and organizational learning<sup>[20]</sup>.

## **6. Risk Management and Boundary Considerations**

Embedding cultural integration into curriculum governance requires careful boundary management. First, institutes should avoid conceptual inflation: cultural integration should be operationalized as clear curriculum objectives and assessable learning outcomes rather than broad slogans<sup>[7,12]</sup>. Second, institutes should avoid substitution: cultural integration should ‘integrate without replacing’ professional religious education, maintaining the integrity of professional training while

improving cultural coherence<sup>[10]</sup>. Third, institutes should avoid excessive administrative simplification: governance tools should guide teaching practice without reducing education to rigid indicators. Process evaluation and professional dialogue are more effective than one-size-fits-all checklists, consistent with governance modernization arguments in higher education research<sup>[14,16,20]</sup>.

## 7. Conclusion

This study analyzes cultural integration in religious institutes through the lens of curriculum governance and educational governance. The central argument is that cultural integration becomes effective and sustainable when embedded into curriculum structure, teaching operation mechanisms, faculty coordination, and feedback systems, rather than implemented through isolated course additions. By treating curriculum governance as an institutional process, institutes can strengthen coherence between educational objectives and daily teaching practice, thereby improving educational quality and institutional adaptability under law-based governance requirements<sup>[1,2,5,11]</sup>.

Future research may deepen this analysis through comparative studies across different types of institutes and through empirical evaluation of curriculum governance reforms, especially regarding how cultural identity cultivation and institutional legitimacy are shaped through curricular and governance mechanisms over time<sup>[10,12,20]</sup>.

## Funding

No

## Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

## Reference

- [1] State Council of the People's Republic of China. (2018). Regulations on Religious Affairs (Revised Edition). Beijing: State Council of the PRC.
- [2] National Religious Affairs Administration of China. (2021). Measures for the Administration of Religious Institutes. Beijing: National Religious Affairs Administration.
- [3] United Front Work Department of the CPC Central Committee & National Religious Affairs Administration. (2016). Guidelines on Upholding the Sinicization of Religion in China. Beijing.
- [4] Xi, J. (2021). On Upholding the Sinicization of Religion in China. Beijing: Central Party Literature Press.
- [5] Policy and Regulation Department of the National Religious Affairs Administration (Ed.). (2020). Studies on the Modernization of Religious Affairs Governance. Beijing: Religious Culture Press.
- [6] Wang, Z. A. (2019). Religious Work Theory and Practice in the New Era. Beijing: Religious Culture Press.
- [7] Zhuo, X. P. (2018). The theoretical foundation and practical paths of the sinicization of religion. *Studies in World Religions*, (6), 1-9.
- [8] Li, X. P. (2020). Religious education and modernization of religious governance. *China Religion*, (9), 12-15.
- [9] Liu, P. (2019). Practical approaches to upholding the sinicization of religion in China. *China Religion*, (3), 18-21.
- [10] Mou, Z. J. (2017). *Studies on the Relationship between Chinese Religion and Chinese Culture*. Beijing: People's Publishing House.
- [11] Chen, J. G. (2022). Legalization of religious affairs and governance of religious institutes. *Journal of Rule of Law Studies*, (3), 45-53.
- [12] He, H. S. (2019). Cultural identity and the sinicization of religion. *Journal of Ideological & Theoretical Education*, (10), 67-73.
- [13] Liu, H. F. (2018). *Institutional Logic of Higher Education Governance Modernization*. Beijing: Educational Science Publishing House.
- [14] Zhong, B. L. (2019). Building a governance system for higher education with Chinese characteristics. *China Higher Education Research*, (7), 1-7.

- [15] Gu, M. Y. (2016). *Curriculum Reform and Transformation of Educational Approaches*. Beijing: People's Education Press.
- [16] Ye, L. (2020). Theoretical foundations and practical paths of educational governance modernization. *Educational Research*, (5), 4-11.
- [17] Zhang, Z. Y. (2018). Curriculum system construction and enhancement of school governance capacity. *Educational Development Research*, (12), 22-28.
- [18] Chen, S. J. (2019). Curriculum governance: From curriculum management to collaborative construction. *Curriculum, Teaching Material and Method*, (9), 3-9.
- [19] Wang, C. S. (2017). *Teaching Operation Mechanisms and Quality Assurance Systems*. Beijing: Higher Education Press.
- [20] Li, L. G. (2020). Optimization of internal governance structures and operational mechanisms in higher education institutions. *Higher Education Research*, (4), 45-52.