Adapting to Innovative Pedagogies and Practices: Contemporary Education

Nibedita Latua[1], Dulumoni Goswami[2]
[1]*Research Scholar, Dept. of Education, Gauhati University*
[2]*Professor, Head of the department, Department of Education, Gauhati University, Guwahati, India*

***Abstract*—Over the past century, evolution has influenced every dimension of life, and its impact is evident across the various facets of education today. As humanity advances, it becomes essential to identify and carefully select the values, skills, strategies, and forms of knowledge that students will need to navigate the world of tomorrow. Constructing a solid framework for curriculum development requires a clear understanding of the present and a thoughtful assumption of what the future may hold. The decisions made in this process must be supported by substantial evidence and a firm conviction in the curriculum's validity and reliability. Drawing from established ideologies demands proof of their enduring acceptance, while generating new, rationally grounded knowledge calls for widespread recognition. In a constantly changing world, keeping pace with emerging pedagogies requires an open mindset—especially from the two key participants in education: students and teachers. This paper explores the perspectives of both groups within the context of today's generation and the ongoing modernist-postmodernist debate. It seeks to understand and identify gaps between these viewpoints in order to build a bridge of mutual awareness. The focus is on the need for a purposeful curriculum that addresses the challenges inherent in modernity—such as the depersonalized, objectified view of education, the tendency to treat students as mere projects, and the reduction of human experiences to isolated tasks rather than meaningful opportunities for interactive learning.**

***Index Terms*—Contemporary Education, Pedagogies, curriculum, Teacher Education, Innovation**

I. INTRODUCTION

India has long been regarded as a land of wonders, attracting foreign powers for centuries. From ancient times, the subcontinent served as a cradle for numerous inventions and innovations that underpin much of modern knowledge. Foundational concepts such as the digit zero, attributed to the mathematician Aryabhatta; the place value decimal system; and the calculation of pi, developed by Budhayana, originated in India (Al-Khwarizmi, 1831; Joseph, 2011). These contributions continue to inform educational theory and practice, underscoring their enduring significance. The institutional history of education in India is equally profound. The world's first university is believed to have been established at Taxila (Takshashila) as early as 700 BCE, accommodating over 10,000 students from various parts of the globe and offering more than 60 subjects (Mookerji, 2011). Taxila's academic structure anticipated many features of modern higher education, including elective courses, merit-based admissions, and specialised research (Ghosh, 2001). Ancient Indian education was deeply rooted in cultural and spiritual values, with the aim of achieving moksha—liberation from the cycle of reincarnation (Altekar, 2009). Temples and community centres initially served as learning spaces, with Sanskrit as the medium of instruction, regarded as a language of the educated elite (N. Pandya, 2014). Subsequently, the gurukul system emerged, wherein students resided at the teacher's home or monastery, receiving instruction in subjects ranging from scripture, philosophy, and literature to warfare, statecraft, and medicine (Mookerji, 2011). Women were afforded opportunities both as learners and as educators; figures such as Gayatri held distinguished positions in scholarly debates and assemblies (Altekar, 2009). The gurukul model is often cited as an effective pedagogical approach due to its practical orientation and holistic preparation for diverse life pursuits (N. Pandya, 2014). Many practices originating in this period persists today, transmitted intergenerationally

and grounded in rational principles that continue to inform contemporary educational thought.

The arrival of British colonial rule marked a decisive rupture. Recognizing the strength of India's indigenous education, colonial administrators nonetheless moved to dismantle the gurukul system and replace it with an English medium education modelled on factory systems, designed in part to produce clerks for the colonial administration (Kumar, 2005). Rote learning, introduced during this era, remains a persistent feature of Indian schooling (Kumar, 1991). Vernacular languages were used for primary instruction, while higher education was conducted exclusively in English. Many indigenous schools became government aided as the British extended financial support, and the establishment of missionary schools in the 1920s further consolidated colonial educational structures (Pandya, 2014).

Crucially, during the 19th century, British educational policy neglected the development of science and technology, focusing instead on arts and humanities (Ghosh, 2001). This strategic orientation left lasting effects on India's educational priorities. The legacies of this colonial transformation remain visible today, prompting calls for reform that reflect both historical understanding and the aspirations of a "Viksit Bharat".

II. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Teacher education constitutes a critical dimension of curriculum development, as the preparation of educators directly shapes the implementation of any curricular reform. Research indicates that many novice teachers enter the classroom intending to employ inquiry -based instruction that fosters engagement and real-world application (Simmons et al., 1999). However, a substantial proportion revert to traditional, teacher centred methods after encountering the realities of classroom management and institutional constraints. This phenomenon underscores the necessity of observing teachers' instructional practices and engaging in collegial dialogue to understand their pedagogical reasoning. Developing such insight facilitates the design of curriculum reforms that are both effective and comfortable for teachers and students alike.

The relational dynamic between teachers and students is equally fundamental. Instructional approaches should cultivate a classroom environment that students perceive as a safe space for learning, making mistakes, asking questions, and generating original ideas (Hattie, 2012). Teaching methods ought to sharpen students' creativity throughout the learning process rather than focusing solely on syllabus completion. Given that the classroom is one of the most frequented environments in a child's life, teachers occupy a profoundly influential position; their methods of instruction and interaction shape students' attitudes toward learning and a wide array of other domains (Darling Hammond, 2017).

In the Indian context, the pursuit of educational independence after colonialism extended beyond political freedom to include liberation from colonial legacies embedded in educational structures. During the first two decades following independence, educational planners prioritized the localization and quality enhancement of teacher education (Kumar, 2005). The definition of a "good teacher" has been understood to depend not solely on subject knowledge but also on the capacity to manage a dynamic classroom and mentor diverse learners (National Policy on Education, 1986). Pre service education programmes, designed to prepare novice teachers before they enter the classroom, aim to equip them with the skills necessary to create holistic and supportive learning environments. Through the National Policy on Education (NPE, 1986), India has sought to reform existing curricula through both pre service and in service teacher training initiatives, aligning them with the evolving educational needs of contemporary society.

Teacher education and school education are intrinsically interconnected; influences on one inevitably affect the other, necessitating coordinated quality improvement across the entire educational system (National Council for Teacher Education, 1998). When the school curriculum undergoes changes, corresponding adjustments must be made in teacher preparation curricula. While teachers possess sufficient autonomy to modify the curriculum to meet classroom needs, such modifications occur within defined boundaries. Persistent, frequent modifications by teachers may signal that more systemic curricular revisions are required. Because teachers are most directly attuned to students' needs, their practical insights should inform such revisions. However, any change to the school curriculum must be accompanied

by complementary adjustments in teacher education to avoid discrepancies between what teachers are prepared to teach and what they are expected to deliver.

Indian policy planners have undertaken successive attempts to address these interconnected challenges. The first was the Teacher Education Curriculum: A Framework developed by the National Council for Teacher Education (NCTE) in 1978. This framework introduced several crucial recommendations, including: relating the curriculum to children's needs as well as to national aspirations and principles; emphasizing practical methods that prepare teachers for multiple tasks both within and outside the classroom; implementing practice teaching through controlled environments and micro teaching opportunities; and adopting a semester system in place of yearlong courses (National Council for Teacher Education, 1978). The 1978 framework represented a significant departure from existing models in two key ways: it proposed a structured curriculum for different stages of education, and it advocated a semester wise approach. It also favored a practical orientation by exposing teachers to diverse socio-economic situations, thereby connecting theoretical knowledge with authentic experiences. In alignment with the recommendations of the Kothari Commission (1964–66), the framework stressed pre service teaching activities such as mock teaching and model lessons conducted by teacher educators, and it introduced a "block approach" to practice teaching, allowing for concentrated teaching experiences rather than isolated lessons (Government of India, 1966).

A second notable attempt was made in 1988, when the NCTE released a revised framework aimed at further professionalizing teacher education. The 1988 framework incorporated developments in knowledge and technology, emphasizing the need to integrate contemporary advancements into the teacher education curriculum (National Council for Teacher Education, 1988). Following the establishment of the NCTE as a statutory body, the Curriculum Framework for Quality Teacher Education was introduced in 1998, building upon the foundation of the National Policy on Education (1968). This framework responded to rapid economic changes such as globalization, privatization, and the expansion of communication technologies, attempting to bridge international demands with national realities (National Council for Teacher Education, 1998). During this period, attention was given to region specific community needs, culture specific pedagogies, curricula for students with special needs, and in service programmes for teachers and teacher educators.

Numerous committees and commissions—including the University Education Commission (1948), the Secondary Education Commission (1952–53), and the Acharya Ramamurthy Committee (1990)—had previously stressed the declining quality of teacher education and the lack of flexibility and localization in its implementation (University Education Commission, 1950; Secondary Education Commission, 1953; Ramamurthy Committee, 1990). These bodies consistently called for a balanced integration of theory and practice in teacher preparation.

A further milestone was the National Curriculum Framework for Teacher Education (NCFTE, 2009), developed by the NCTE. This framework sought to shift teacher education from a narrow focus on training toward a broader vision of preparing reflective practitioners (National Council for Teacher Education, 2009). It emphasized the importance of integrating theoretical knowledge with field experience, fostering inclusive education, and aligning teacher preparation with the principles of the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (2009). The NCFTE 2009 also introduced the concept of a two-year Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) programme to replace the one-year model, allowing for deeper engagement with practicum and school internships.

Subsequently, the NCFTE 2014 was brought forth to address persisting gaps in implementation and to incorporate emerging priorities such as education for sustainable development, gender sensitivity, and information and communication technology (ICT) integration (National Council for Teacher Education, 2014). The framework reiterated the need for contextualized, flexible curricula and called for strengthening the professional development of teacher educators themselves.

The most transformative shift came with the National Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020), which reconceptualizes teacher education as a vital component of the broader educational ecosystem (Ministry of Education, 2020). NEP 2020 mandates that by 2030, the minimum qualification for a teacher

shall be a four-year integrated B.Ed. degree. It also proposes the establishment of a new, independent body—the National Professional Standards for Teachers (NPST)—to set professional benchmarks and ensure accountability. Teacher education programmes are to be moved to multidisciplinary universities and colleges by 2030, phasing out standalone teacher education institutions that have often been criticized for substandard quality. The policy emphasizes continuous professional development, mentoring, and the integration of foundational literacy, numeracy, and inclusive practices.

Despite these successive policy efforts spanning over four decades, the gap between policy intent and implementation remains substantial. Many of the reforms outlined in the various frameworks have existed largely "on paper" and have not been consistently realized in practice (Sharma, 2023). The teacher education curriculum continues to be heavily theoretical, often divorced from the realities of classroom practice. Moreover, several of the pedagogical approaches imported from Western contexts—including those underpinning some of these frameworks—have been critiqued or abandoned even in their countries of origin (Zeichner, 2010). Addressing this implementation deficit remains a central challenge for India's teacher education system as it seeks to prepare educators capable of delivering on the vision of holistic, equitable, and high-quality education.

III. MODERNISM AND POST MODERNISM IN EDUCATION

The rise of modernism began as early as the 17th century, gaining momentum across the West during the late 19th and early 20th centuries in the wake of industrialization, rapid societal change, capitalism, and advances in science and technology (Usher & Edwards, 1994). Modernism as a philosophical movement represented a rebuttal toward tradition and a desire to experiment with new forms, aiming to dismantle long standing behavioral and societal norms. Its influence extended across technology, the economy, politics, and notably, the field of education (Doll, 1993). Post modernism emerged later as a critical response, emphasizing the subjectivity and diversity of human experience while rejecting notions of rationality and universal truth as totalizing meta narratives (Lyotard, 1984).

In educational theory, modernism positions teachers as the primary conduits of factual knowledge, grounded in the belief that knowledge and values should be universally invariable. From this perspective, the teacher holds sole authority over values, and there exists a "dominant culture" upon which educational distinctiveness is based (Giroux, 1988). Modernism expects students from diverse cultural backgrounds to be educated in a shared, often standardized, language to facilitate the transmission of knowledge. Post modernism, by contrast, contends that knowledge is subjective and that each culture and its associated values merit equal recognition (Peters, 1995). The postmodern view rejects the notion of a singular cultural benchmark and instead advocates for curricula that honor cultural plurality and local contexts.

These divergent philosophical stances have shaped distinct educational practices. The modernist view of human nature as constant and objectively stable has given rise to standardized measurement tools such as intelligence quotient (IQ) tests and other psychometric assessments designed to evaluate cognitive processes against uniform benchmarks (Sacks, 2001). Post modernism, in contrast, emphasizes the uniqueness of each individual, asserting that education should not force learners to conform to predetermined societal standards but should instead cultivate individuality and help students achieve personal goals (Hlynka & Belland, 1991). From a postmodern perspective, societal progress is best advanced by nurturing diverse talents rather than by standardizing outcomes.

Theories of learning such as cognitivism and behaviorism reflect the imprint of modernist assumptions, privileging observable, measurable outcomes and generalizable principles of learning (Ertmer & Newby, 2013). However, in recent decades, postmodern and constructivist views have gained influence, shifting focus toward learner centered, context sensitive pedagogies (Gorai & Kumar, 2024; Richardson, 2003). These approaches reconceptualize the classroom as a dynamic environment where the roles of teachers and students are fluid, and learning is understood as an active process of meaning making rather than passive reception. Consequently, curriculum frameworks increasingly incorporate constructivist principles, and teacher education programmes are being called upon to prepare

educators who can navigate these shifting epistemological landscapes (Gorai & Kumar, 2024; Biesta, 2010).

IV. STUDENT VIEWS IN THE 21ST CENTURY

The 21st century has witnessed a profound paradigm shift in education within a remarkably short span. Alongside this transformation, a new generation of students—comprising later millennials and Generation Z—has brought forward reformist ideals that diverge sharply from earlier worldviews (Seemiller & Grace, 2016). Research indicates that these students increasingly reject modernist tenets such as optimism in linear progress, universal truth, and rigid hierarchies of authority, favoring instead subjectivity, pluralism, and the interconnectedness fostered by globalization (Twenge, 2017). This generational disposition aligns more closely with postmodern sensibilities, which emphasize context, diversity, and the deconstruction of grand narratives (Lyotard, 1984).

Empirical observations reflect this orientation. A survey of contemporary students found that while 65% expressed confidence in their personal futures, they simultaneously reported significant uncertainty about the future of the world at large. This duality—high individual optimism coupled with collective anxiety—illustrates the complex interplay of modernist and postmodernist perspectives within the same cohort. Although students may hold limited faith in established societal structures, they demonstrate a strong commitment to togetherness and community building (Pew Research Center, 2019).

In educational terms, this generational shift carries important implications. Whereas modernist approaches tend to treat knowledge, reality, and individuality as discrete categories to be transmitted uniformly, postmodernist theories advocate a holistic understanding in which these elements are interlinked and co constructed (Doll, 1993). Students of the 21st century increasingly demand learning through authentic, real-life experiences that not only deepen understanding but also strengthen communities (Biesta, 2010). Such experiential, community anchored pedagogies resonate with their preference for context sensitive, participatory forms of education over abstract, standardized instruction.

V. PEDAGOGIES IMPORTANCE IN TEACHER EDUCATION

The contemporary abstraction of education often impedes children's creativity, confining them within rigid systemic constraints. Such an environment can foster antagonism toward authority figures, as students may perceive parents and teachers as obstacles to their freedom (Gorai, 2024). Consequently, education is reduced to a mere compulsion—neither intellectually stimulating nor perceived as applicable to real life situations. To counter this, teachers must employ pedagogical approaches tailored to the diverse needs of their students (Gorai & Kumar, 2024). Learners vary in how they acquire knowledge most effectively; some grasp concepts through reading, while others require practical demonstrations or verbal explanations (Tomlinson, 2014).

These variations constitute the learning needs of children—the gap between their current knowledge, skills, and enthusiasm, and the ideal learning experience they aspire to achieve. An appropriate pedagogical approach builds upon students' existing knowledge and abilities, facilitating their development toward desired learning outcomes. The four interconnected domains of learning needs are cognitive, social, affective, and psychomotor (Ministry of Education, 2020). The distinctiveness of these needs depends on factors such as the nature of the subject, the learner's proficiency level, and the relevance of the knowledge to their lives. For instance, a subject like English may present minimal learning challenges for students immersed in an English-speaking environment, whereas subjects such as mathematics or chemistry—given their abstract complexity and varied student proficiencies—often reveal highly diverse learning needs (Hattie, 2012). Identifying these needs is essential, as they directly influence student outcomes and, ultimately, graduate attributes. Graduate attributes refer to the qualities—including knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes—that students are expected to develop by the conclusion of their higher education. These attributes also encompass competencies that reinforce existing capabilities and enable the acquisition of new ones, thereby preparing individuals to perform effectively in their chosen fields and to contribute meaningfully to society (Barrie, 2006).

Achieving such outcomes requires the implementation of relevant and innovative pedagogies. Pedagogies are dynamic forms of knowledge transmission that vary across teachers, classrooms, institutions, and platforms. Research highlights several characteristics of effective pedagogies: they are adaptive and evolve over time; they are designed to meet the specific needs of learners, enabling both understanding and real-world application; they incorporate a range of tools and methods to foster engagement and discussion; and they employ diverse assessment strategies, including self-assessment, to enhance student productivity (Hattie, 2012; Darling Hammond et al., 2020).

Framing such pedagogies demands careful attention to learners' varying paces and styles, their diverse backgrounds, and the inclusion of students with disabilities. Addressing this multiplicity of needs is a complex undertaking that requires deliberate planning and sensitivity to context. In alignment with these principles, the National Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020) advocates for several pedagogical approaches (Ministry of Education, 2020). First, it promotes a multidisciplinary approach, which encourages students to understand problems through multiple lenses and thereby accelerates problem solving (. Second, it recognizes mode centric pedagogies—designed for physical, online, blended, or hybrid (Gorai & Angadi, 2023b). learning environments—to ensure seamless interaction between teachers and learners. Third, it emphasizes learning method-based pedagogies, wherein the method of instruction (e.g., inquiry based, collaborative, experiential) is matched to the desired learning outcomes. Each method is symbiotic with a corresponding pedagogical strategy that facilitates comprehension, encourages new perspectives, and supports practical application. To further operationalize these goals, the National Higher Education Qualification Framework (NHEQF) provides guidelines that align curricular structures and learning outcomes with the vision of NEP 2020 (University Grants Commission, 2022). Together, these frameworks underscore the centrality of thoughtful, inclusive pedagogy in transforming education from a system of compulsion into a meaningful, empowering experience for all learners.

VI. CATEGORIZATION OF PEDAGOGICAL STRATEGIES

Pedagogical strategies are numerous, yet their effectiveness lies in the tools of implementation and the innovative methods that underpin them. Strategies may be termed "transformative" when they employ creative methodologies that enrich the teaching learning process, engage students meaningfully, foster problem solving skills, encourage adaptability, emphasize teamwork, and develop analytical and interpretive abilities (Darling Hammond et al., 2020). Adopting such innovative strategies reinforces positive student behavior and accelerates better learning experiences, enabling students to meet their learning needs and attain expected graduate attributes (Barrie, 2006). An intrinsic factor that defines transformative pedagogical strategies is the flexibility teachers can exercise to help students achieve their learning goals. This flexibility not only benefits learners but also sustains teachers' motivation and creative engagement (Hattie, 2012). Pedagogical strategies can be broadly classified into four theoretical orientations: behaviorism, liberationist theory, constructivism, and social constructivism.

Behaviorism: Often referred to as the "traditional teaching style," behaviorism is characterized by teacher centred learning (Ertmer & Newby, 2013). Within the classroom, the teacher holds authority and leads lessons through methods such as demonstration, lecturing, and modelling. Students are expected to follow attentively, after which they complete assigned tasks and receive relevant feedback. Learning is viewed as a change in observable behavior shaped by reinforcement and repetition (Skinner, 1954). Contemporary scholarship has noted a resurgence of narrow behaviorist approaches in standardized testing environments, often at the expense of more socially interactive pedagogies (Bentley & Fleury, 2025).

Liberationist Theory: In contrast to behaviorism, liberationist theory places the student at the centre of the classroom. Drawing from critical pedagogy, this approach positions the teacher as a co learner who facilitates students' exploration of subjects from their own perspectives (Freire, 1970). Students are often given choices in lessons and demonstrate their understanding through creative mediums such as speech, performance, dance, or song. The goal is to empower learners as active agents in their education

rather than passive recipients of knowledge. Contemporary articulations of this approach are found in transformative pedagogy, defined as "an activist pedagogy combining the elements of constructivist and critical pedagogy that empowers students to critically examine their beliefs, values, and knowledge with the goal of developing a reflective knowledge base, an appreciation for multiple perspectives, and a sense of critical consciousness and agency" (Khedkar & Nair, 2016, as cited in Buck & Snook, 2024, p. 2).

Constructivism: Constructivism is student centred and emphasizes learning through experience and reflection (Piaget, 1970). It incorporates practical forms of learning such as inquiry-based projects and methods like the Montessori approach, which relies on activities aligned with children's natural interests rather than formal instruction (Montessori, 1912). Constructivist classrooms often feature hands on activities, outdoor learning, and a slower, more individualized pace that respects each student's unique developmental trajectory. Recent scholarship has extended constructivist principles to address contemporary educational challenges, emphasizing the importance of community and communication in meaning making (Bentley & Fleury, 2025). In the Indian context, the National Education Policy 2020 aligns with constructivist ideals by advocating for learner centred, experiential, and play based methodologies (Gyawali & Mehndroo, 2023).

Social Constructivism: Social constructivism integrates teacher directed and student focused methods, emphasizing learning through social interaction and collaboration (Vygotsky, 1978). The teacher's role is to mediate and structure group interactions, often forming small groups that research and present on a restricted range of topics. Knowledge is co constructed through dialogue, scaffolding, and shared inquiry, reflecting the understanding that learning is inherently social. Contemporary interpretations of Dewey's pragmatism frame social constructivism as fundamentally concerned with the "tension between public and private and objective and subjective knowledge," recognizing that robust education must be both reflective and socially engaged (Bentley & Fleury, 2025, p. 94).

Beyond these foundational categories, contemporary education has given rise to several additional pedagogical approaches:

Blended Learning: Also known as hybrid learning, blended learning combines traditional face to face instruction with online educational methods (Garrison & Vaughan, 2008). Technology enhanced resources and mixed modes of delivery offer flexibility and can personalize learning experiences while maintaining the benefits of in person interaction. Recent work highlights the role of technological innovations—such as personalized learning environments, artificial intelligence applications, and massive open online courses (MOOCs)—in reshaping higher education pedagogies (Garg et al., 2024).

Experiential Learning: Rooted in the work of Kolb (1984), experiential learning emphasizes learning through direct experience. Engaging students in hands on activities helps them connect classroom knowledge with real world contexts, fostering deeper understanding and skill transfer. In India, play based and toy-based interventions have demonstrated significant improvements in foundational literacy and numeracy, aligning with NEP 2020's mandate for experiential pedagogies (Gorai & Angadi, 2023a; Brahmbhatt, 2024).

Computational Thinking: Computational thinking involves developing students' ability to organize and structure their work by formulating systematic plans while remaining adaptable during problem solving (Wing, 2006). It encourages decomposition, pattern recognition, abstraction, and algorithmic reasoning, which are valuable across disciplines. The integration of computational thinking into curricula is increasingly supported by technological innovations in higher education, including machine learning applications and digital learning platforms (Garg et al., 2024).

Gamification: Gamification applies game design elements—such as point systems, badges, and challenges—to academic contexts to increase motivation and engagement (Kapp, 2012). While classroom activities are framed within a game like theme, they remain aligned with curricular objectives, rewarding progress and achievement. Recent research in the Indian context confirms that game-based interventions, including activities such as Housie/Bingo, musical number games, and story cards, can substantially enhance children's foundational skills when implemented with appropriate teacher training (Brahmbhatt, 2024).

Multiliteracies: The multiliteracies framework expands the concept of literacy beyond language to include diverse modes of communication such as images, music, sounds, and digital media (New London Group, 1996). It encompasses traditional, digital, and visual literacies, preparing students to navigate and create meaning across multiple contexts. This framework remains highly relevant as education systems increasingly adopt technology mediated instruction and seek to develop students' critical awareness across diverse media (Garg et al., 2024; Gyawali & Mehndroo, 2023).

Discussion Based Teaching: Often referred to as the Harkness method, discussion-based teaching involves students seated in a circle, collaboratively generating topics, sharing information, and engaging in dialogue to solve problems or appreciate literature (Harkness, 1930/2019). The teacher acts as a facilitator, and the focus is on student led inquiry and critical thinking. Contemporary scholarship emphasizes that dialogic and communicative pedagogies are essential for developing critical consciousness and civic engagement (Bentley & Fleury, 2025; Buck & Snook, 2024).

VII. CONCLUSION

India's educational journey—from ancient gurukuls to colonial factory models—reveals a persistent tension between indigenous holistic traditions and imported structures (Kumar, 2005; Mookerji, 2011). Despite successive policy frameworks, teacher education remains theory heavy, hindering implementation of learner centred pedagogies (Sharma, 2023). Contemporary students, shaped by postmodern sensibilities, demand experiential, community anchored learning (Seemiller & Grace, 2016). Effective pedagogies—constructivist, social constructivist, and blended approaches—can bridge this gap when supported by flexible, well-prepared teachers (Darling Hammond et al., 2020; Garg et al., 2024). Ultimately, a purposeful curriculum must synchronize teacher preparation with school education, honour diversity, and empower students as active co constructors of knowledge. Only such integration can realize education's transformative potential.

REFERENCES

[1] Al-Khwarizmi, M. (1831). The algebra of Mohammed ben Musa (F. Rosen, Trans.). Oriental Translation Fund.

[2] Altekar, A. S. (2009). Education in ancient India (8th ed.). Isha Books.

[3] Barrie, S. C. (2006). Understanding what we mean by the generic attributes of graduates. Higher Education, 51(2), 215–241. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-004-6384-7

[4] Bentley, M. L., & Fleury, S. C. (2025). Developing Dewey's sociocultural vision: Toward educating citizens in the 21st century. Critical Education, 16(3), 93–105.

[5] Biesta, G. J. J. (2010). Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy. Paradigm Publishers.

[6] Brahmbhatt, H. (2024). The play-driven approach for learning. Paper presented at the 9th International Toy Research Association World Conference, Rochester, NY, United States. https://hal.science/hal-04815495

[7] Buck, R., & Snook, B. (2024). Embracing change in Tezpur, India: 'Dancing the talk' through a community dance pedagogy. International Journal of Education & the Arts, 25(18). https://doi.org/10.26209/ijea25n18

[8] Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). Teacher education around the world: What can we learn from international practice? European Journal of Teacher Education, 40(3), 291–309. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2017.1315399

[9] Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. Applied Developmental Science, 24(2), 97–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791

[10] Doll, W. E., Jr. (1993). A post-modern perspective on curriculum. Teachers College Press.

[11] Ertmer, P. A., & Newby, T. J. (2013). Behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism: Comparing critical features from an instructional design perspective. Performance Improvement

Quarterly, 26(2), 43–71. https://doi.org/10.1002/piq.21143

[12] Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. Continuum.

[13] Garg, A., Babu, B. V., & Balas, V. E. (Eds.). (2024). Advances in technological innovations in higher education: Theory and practices. CRC Press.

[14] Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines. Jossey-Bass.

[15] Ghosh, S. C. (2001). The history of education in modern India, 1757–1998. Orient Longman.

[16] Giroux, H. A. (1988). Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning. Bergin & Garvey.

[17] Gorai, J. (2024). Integrating Art into STEM Education. University News, India. 0566-2257, 62(23), 11–13. DOI 10.5281/zenodo.12191867

[18] Gorai, J., & Angadi, G. R. (2023a). Developing a Standardised Scale to Measure Teachers' Perception and Attitude Towards Apprenticeship-Embedded Degree Programme. Voices of Teachers and Teacher Educators, 12(1), 37-57. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11506982

[19] Gorai, J., & Angadi, G.R. (2023b). Studies on Apprenticeship Embedded Degree Programme (AEDP): A Review. International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews, 10(1), 130-142. pdf

[20] Gorai, J., & Kumar, A. (2024). [Review of the book Equity policies in global higher education: Reducing inequality and increasing participation and attainment, by O. Tavares, C. Sá, C. Sin, & A. Amaral (Eds.)]. Journal of Higher Education Policy and Leadership Studies, 5(2), 119-128. https://dx.doi.org/10.61186/johepal.5.2.119 .

[21] Government of India. (1966). Education and national development: Report of the Education Commission, 1964–66 (Kothari Commission). Ministry of Education.

[22] Gyawali, Y. P., & Mehndroo, M. (2023). The 21st century model for pedagogical transformation: Exploring teachers' identity and professional responsibility. Journal of NELTA Gandaki, 6(1–2), 13–25. https://doi.org/10.3126/jong.v6i1-2.59707

[23] Harkness, E. (2019). The Harkness method: A century of teaching and learning. Phillips Exeter Academy. (Original work published 1930)

[24] Hattie, J. (2012). Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning. Routledge.

[25] Hlynka, D., & Belland, J. C. (Eds.). (1991). Paradigms regained: The uses of illuminative, semiotic and post-modern criticism as a means of inquiry for educational communications and technology. Educational Technology Publications.

[26] Joseph, G. G. (2011). The crest of the peacock: Non-European roots of mathematics (3rd ed.). Princeton University Press.

[27] Kapp, K. M. (2012). The gamification of learning and instruction: Game-based methods and strategies for training and education. Pfeiffer.

[28] Khedkar, P., & Nair, J. (2016). Transformative pedagogy. In Handbook of research on teaching. (p. 232). [Publisher details as per original source]

[29] Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice-Hall.

[30] Kumar, K. (1991). Political agenda of education: A study of colonialist and nationalist ideas. Sage Publications.

[31] Kumar, K. (2005). Political agenda of education: A study of colonialist and nationalist ideas (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

[32] Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). The post-modern condition: A report on knowledge (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1979)

[33] Ministry of Education. (2020). National Education Policy 2020. Government of India.

[34] Montessori, M. (1912). The Montessori method. Frederick A. Stokes.

[35] Mookerji, R. K. (2011). Ancient Indian education: Brahmanical and Buddhist. Motilal Banarsidass.

[36] National Council for Teacher Education. (1978). Teacher education curriculum: A framework. NCTE.

[37] National Council for Teacher Education. (1988). Curriculum framework for teacher education. NCTE.

[38] National Council for Teacher Education. (1998). Curriculum framework for quality teacher education. NCTE.

[39] National Council for Teacher Education. (2009). National curriculum framework for teacher education: Towards preparing professional and humane teacher. NCTE.
[40] National Council for Teacher Education. (2014). National curriculum framework for teacher education (NCFTE) 2014. NCTE.
[41] National Policy on Education. (1968). Ministry of Education, Government of India.
[42] National Policy on Education. (1986). Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.
[43] Pandya, N. (2014). Indian education system: A historical journey. In P. Mishra (Ed.), Education in India: Past, present, and future (pp. 23–41). Orient BlackSwan.
[44] Peters, M. (1995). Education and the post-modern condition: Revisiting Jean-François Lyotard. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 27(2), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.1995.tb00246.x
[45] Pew Research Center. (2019). Generation Z looks a lot like millennials on key social and political issues. https://www.pewresearch.org/
[46] Piaget, J. (1970). Science of education and the psychology of the child. Orion Press.
[47] Ramamurthy Committee. (1990). Report of the Committee on Teacher Education (Acharya Ramamurthy Committee). Government of India.
[48] Richardson, V. (2003). Constructivist pedagogy. Teachers College Record, 105(9), 1623–1640. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-9620.2003.00303.x
[49] Sacks, P. (2001). Standardized minds: The high price of America's testing culture and what we can do to change it. Da Capo Press.
[50] Secondary Education Commission. (1953). Report of the Secondary Education Commission (1952–53) (Mudaliar Commission). Ministry of Education, Government of India.
[51] Seemiller, C., & Grace, M. (2016). Generation Z goes to college. Jossey-Bass.
[52] Sharma, G., Mittal, R., & Zayan. (2023). Teacher education in India's National Education Policy 2020: Knowledge traditions, global discourses and national regulations. Contemporary Education Dialogue, 20(2), 256-282. https://doi.org/10.1177/09731849231168728
[53] Simmons, P. E., Emory, A., Carter, T., Coker, T., Finnegan, B., Crockett, D., Richardson, L., Yager, R., Craven, J., Tillotson, J., Brunkhorst, H., Twiest, M., Hossain, K., Gallagher, J., Duggan-Haas, D., Parker, J., Cajas, F., Alshannag, Q., McGlamery, S., … & Krockover, G. (1999). Beginning teachers: Beliefs and classroom actions. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36(8), 930–954.
[54] Skinner, B. F. (1954). The science of learning and the art of teaching. Harvard Educational Review, 24(2), 86–97.
[55] Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners (2nd ed.). ASCD.
[56] Twenge, J. M. (2017). iGen: Why today's super-connected kids are growing up less rebellious, more tolerant, less happy—and completely unprepared for adulthood—and what that means for the rest of us. Atria Books.
[57] University Education Commission. (1950). Report of the University Education Commission (1948–49) (Radhakrishnan Commission). Government of India.
[58] University Grants Commission. (2022). National Higher Education Qualification Framework (NHEQF). University Grants Commission, India.
[59] Usher, R., & Edwards, R. (1994). Postmodernism and education. Routledge.
[60] Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.
[61] Wing, J. M. (2006). Computational thinking. Communications of the ACM, 49(3), 33–35. https://doi.org/10.1145/1118178.1118215
[62] Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 61(1–2),89
99. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347671