Araştırma Temelli Etkinlik Dergisi (ATED) / Journal of Inquiry Based Activities (JIBA)
Vol 15, Special Issue, p. 95-105, 2025

Balancing Act: Navigating the Spectrum of Student-Centred and Teacher-Centred Education

Bibin Mohan George[1] & Themba Mngomeni Mthethwa[2]

ABSTRACT

This conceptual paper explores the pedagogical tension and potential synergy between teacher-centred and student-centred instructional approaches, particularly within the context of teaching abstract concepts in science and mathematics such as quantum mechanics and calculus. Grounded in the theoretical frameworks of essentialism and constructivism, the study seeks to investigate which pedagogical model—or combination thereof—most effectively promotes foundational understanding and conceptual depth among students. Using a literature review methodology, the paper critically analyses empirical and philosophical studies on the application of these approaches in diverse educational settings. Findings suggest that neither approach in isolation fully supports deep learning of complex content; instead, a hybrid model that integrates direct instruction with active, inquiry-based engagement offers the most promising results. The paper highlights practical examples, such as lesson planning for the Schrödinger wave equation and differentiation, to demonstrate how both paradigms can be blended for optimal educational impact. It concludes with recommendations for implementing balanced instructional strategies to improve conceptual understanding, student engagement, and academic performance in STEM education.

Keywords: Student-centred education; teacher-centred education; constructivism; essentialism; hybrid model.

Article Information

Submitted: October 31, 2024 Revised: May 8, 2025 Accepted: May 12, 2025

[1] ***Corresponding Author***, Mangosuthu University of Technology, Mathematics and Science Education Unit (MSEU), Durban, South Africa, ORCID: 0009-0007-6821-8179, E-mail: bibin@mut.ac.za

[2] Mangosuthu University of Technology, Mathematics and Science Education Unit (MSEU), Durban, South Africa, ORCID: 0000-0001-7523-2584 , E-mail: Mthethwa.themba@mut.ac.za

INTRODUCTION

The longstanding debate between teacher-centred and student-centred pedagogy remains highly relevant in science and mathematics education, especially regarding the instruction of abstract and counterintuitive concepts such as the Schrödinger wave equation and calculus. Teacher-centred instruction traditionally dominates in these fields, emphasizing structured delivery, expert guidance, and standardized content knowledge. Conversely, student-centred learning promotes active engagement, personalization, and construction of knowledge, aligned with contemporary educational theory. While each model has distinct advantages, recent scholarship suggests that an integrative or hybrid approach may offer a more effective solution. This paper critically examines the philosophical and empirical underpinnings of both paradigms and considers how they may be harmonized to enhance learning outcomes. Specifically, it investigates two core research questions: (1) Which pedagogical approach—teacher-centred or student-centred—best facilitates comprehension of abstract concepts in science and mathematics from essentialist and constructivist perspectives? (2) How does a hybrid approach combining direct instruction and inquiry-based learning influence student engagement and understanding?

LITERATURE REVIEW

The teaching of abstract scientific concepts in science and mathematics education has prompted a global pedagogical debate on the effectiveness of student-centred versus teacher-centred approaches. While international literature increasingly emphasizes active, constructivist learning models, regional contexts—such as those in South Africa and broader Africa—introduce unique challenges that shape how these pedagogies are implemented. This section presents both local and international perspectives on the use and adaptability of different pedagogical models in STEM education, particularly as they pertain to teaching abstract or complex scientific content like quantum mechanics and calculus. It highlights context-sensitive adaptations, empirical findings, and theoretical underpinnings that inform a nuanced understanding of best practices in diverse educational settings.

Local Perspectives (South African and African Contexts)

Science and mathematics education in South Africa continues to grapple with deep-rooted systemic inequalities rooted in the apartheid legacy, manifesting in under-resourced schools, overcrowded classrooms, and linguistic diversity (Spaull, 2013; Reddy et al., 2016). These structural barriers often hinder the implementation of purely student-centred pedagogies, which require substantial classroom resources, individual attention, and learner autonomy—conditions that are difficult to achieve in many South African public schools (Setati, 2008; Taylor & Vinjevold, 1999). In such contexts, a rigid adherence to either student-centred or teacher-centred models is inadequate, necessitating a more flexible, hybrid approach.

Several studies have explored the efficacy of blended instructional models that integrate direct instruction with inquiry-based learning. For example, Kunnath and Kriek (2018) found that guided teaching strategies in South African secondary physics classrooms significantly improved learners' conceptual understanding, particularly when these strategies provided cognitive scaffolding for abstract scientific ideas. Similarly, Kriek and Grayson (2009) emphasized that structured inquiry—anchored in teacher support—enabled learners to navigate challenging content such as electromagnetic theory more effectively than through unguided exploration alone.

Culturally responsive teaching, which contextualizes abstract content in learners' lived experiences, has emerged as a key pedagogical adaptation. Ramnarain and Schuster (2014) demonstrated that inquiry-based science activities, when rooted in local contexts, increased learner engagement and promoted meaningful understanding in physical sciences. This resonates with the findings of Onwu and Stoffels (2005), who stressed that large, under-resourced classrooms benefit most from instructional approaches that balance teacher guidance with opportunities for active learning. Nevertheless, despite the growing body of research advocating for constructivist learning environments, the uptake of such practices remains uneven due to constraints like inadequate professional development, misaligned curricula, and high student-teacher ratios (Modisaotsile, 2012; Jita & Mokhele, 2014).

Given these realities, the emerging consensus in the South African literature favors pedagogical hybridity—leveraging the structure and clarity of teacher-led instruction alongside the cognitive engagement promoted by learner-centred strategies. This pragmatic orientation not only accommodates contextual limitations but also fosters gradual pedagogical transformation.

International Perspectives

In contrast, international discourse—particularly in North America and Europe—has increasingly championed student-centred education grounded in constructivist learning theories. Foundational work by Piaget (1950), Vygotsky (1978), and Bruner (1960) asserts that learners construct meaning through active engagement, social interaction, and problem-solving. These principles have informed the development of inquiry-based, collaborative, and experiential learning models that dominate much of the current STEM education literature (Freeman et al., 2014; Prince, 2004).

Within the domain of physics education, and particularly in abstract topics such as quantum mechanics, constructivist interventions have yielded measurable learning gains. Müller and Wiesner (2002) reported significant improvements in students' conceptual understanding following the use of interactive teaching methods. Similarly, Zollman, Rebello, and Hogg (2002) demonstrated that computer-based simulations and guided exploration helped students internalize non-classical quantum concepts. These findings are consistent with Hake's (1998) meta-analysis, which revealed that interactive engagement methods outperform traditional lectures in terms of conceptual learning outcomes across large student populations.

However, the uncritical application of minimally guided instruction has drawn substantial critique. Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark (2006) argue that such approaches may impose excessive cognitive demands on novice learners, potentially resulting in misconceptions and superficial understanding. As a response, a new wave of hybrid pedagogies—such as flipped classrooms, scaffolded inquiry, and just-in-time teaching—has emerged. These approaches blend the strengths of structured, teacher-directed instruction with the benefits of student autonomy and active engagement (Bishop & Verleger, 2013; Abeysekera & Dawson, 2015).

These hybrid models have been adopted by leading global institutions including MIT, Stanford, and IBM's Qiskit initiative. In these cases, structured online modules, interactive simulations, and guided discussions are used to facilitate learner engagement with abstract quantum mechanics content (De Jong et al., 2013; McKagan et al., 2008). The result has been not only enhanced student understanding but also increased motivation and confidence in tackling complex material.

In synthesis, the international trend favours pedagogical flexibility, with hybrid models gaining prominence for their capacity to bridge foundational content delivery and deep conceptual engagement. While the global shift leans toward student-centred education, evidence from both local and international contexts suggests that a balanced integration of traditional and progressive pedagogies offers the most effective path forward—particularly in contexts characterized by complexity, diversity, and constraint.

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a conceptual research design grounded in an integrative literature review methodology. This approach synthesizes theoretical perspectives and empirical findings to interrogate pedagogical models in both science and mathematics education. The central aim is to explore the affordances, limitations, and contextual appropriateness of teacher-centred, student-centred, and hybrid instructional approaches. Particular emphasis is placed on the teaching of abstract topics such as quantum mechanics in physics and differentiation in calculus, both of which represent significant cognitive challenges for learners due to their conceptual density and abstraction.

The methodology relies on purposive sampling of high-quality scholarly sources, including peer-reviewed journal articles, seminal theoretical texts, and case-based studies. These sources were selected from both international and South African databases such as Scopus, ERIC, Google Scholar, and SA ePublications to ensure comprehensive coverage across diverse educational contexts. The inclusion criteria prioritized literature published within the last two decades to reflect contemporary pedagogical debates, while also incorporating foundational texts in educational theory to ensure philosophical depth and historical continuity. The literature sample emphasizes cross-contextual insights by examining how pedagogical strategies operate in both well-resourced and under-resourced classroom environments—an especially salient issue in the South African education system.

A key feature of this study is its use of theoretical triangulation to interpret findings through both constructivist and essentialist paradigms. Constructivist theory, as articulated by Piaget (1954), Vygotsky (1978), Bruner (1960), and Fosnot (2013), underpins the analysis of student-centred pedagogies, highlighting the roles of learner agency, inquiry, prior knowledge, and socio-cognitive interaction. These frameworks support instructional strategies that favour conceptual understanding and active engagement, particularly useful in teaching mathematics concepts such as limits and derivatives, where visual reasoning and problem-contextualization enhance comprehension. In contrast, essentialist perspectives, including the work of Bagley (1938) and Hirsch (1987), and cognitive load theory developed by Sweller (1988), inform the examination of teacher-centred methods. These approaches prioritize direct instruction, sequencing of content, and mastery of foundational knowledge, which are especially critical in topics requiring procedural fluency and precision, such as symbolic manipulation in algebra or complex calculus derivations.

The study also integrates conceptual lesson design scenarios drawn from the reviewed literature. One such example includes a lesson on the Schrödinger wave equation, presented through both a traditional, derivation-based model and a simulation-enhanced, inquiry-based approach. Another scenario involves a calculus lesson on differentiation, juxtaposing a procedural strategy using the power rule and first principles with a student-centred model that emphasizes visual reasoning and real-world applications—such as modelling rates of change in biological systems or economic optimization problems. These lesson exemplars serve as pedagogical thought experiments rather than empirical interventions. They offer insight into how theoretical orientations inform classroom practice and how these orientations can be tailored to enhance understanding of abstract content in both science and mathematics.

Through this integrative and dual-theoretical methodology, the study seeks not only to classify instructional models but also to critique their underlying epistemological assumptions, cognitive implications, and adaptability to different educational settings. This framework allows for a nuanced comparative analysis that is theoretically robust and contextually grounded, making it especially relevant to the varied and often resource-challenged teaching conditions prevalent in South African schools and universities. The study ultimately contributes to the broader discourse on effective pedagogy in science and mathematics by offering a critical, theoretically informed lens through which to evaluate instructional design and practice.

FINDINGS

Comparative Analysis: Teacher-Centred vs. Student-Centred Approaches in Mathematics and Science Education

The comparative analysis of pedagogical approaches in science and mathematics education reveals distinctive strengths and limitations inherent in both teacher-centred and student-centred methodologies. These models are often underpinned by differing educational philosophies—essentialism in the case of teacher-centred instruction, and constructivism in the case of student-centred learning—and each offers unique affordances for teaching complex, abstract concepts such as the Schrödinger wave equation in physics or differentiation in calculus.

The teacher-centred approach is traditionally rooted in essentialist theory, which posits that education should involve the structured transmission of established knowledge from teacher to learner (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2018; Siddiqui & Singh, 2017). In science and mathematics, where conceptual precision and procedural fluency are paramount, this approach offers clarity, coherence, and epistemological stability. For instance, a physics lesson on the Schrödinger wave equation might involve a deductive presentation of wave-particle duality and the formal derivation of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation, ensuring students understand the variables—such as the wave function (ψ), potential energy (V), and Hamiltonian operator (H)—and their mathematical interrelationships (Woolfolk, 2019). Similarly, a calculus lesson on differentiation often benefits from a structured progression from foundational definitions to the application of derivative rules (Sierpinska, 1994; Ramli et al., 2013). Such a linear, guided approach helps students master procedural techniques, minimizes misconceptions, and reinforces discipline-specific conventions.

Despite these strengths, the teacher-centred model is often critiqued for promoting passive learning, where students may become disengaged or fail to internalize concepts at a deeper level (Lasry et al., 2013; Deslauriers et al., 2011). This limitation is particularly acute when learners are required to interpret abstract and counterintuitive topics, such as probability amplitudes in quantum mechanics or the conceptual understanding of limits and continuity in calculus. Over-reliance on direct instruction can also stifle students' creativity and inhibit the development of higher-order thinking skills, such as problem-solving and metacognition.

In contrast, the student-centred approach draws from constructivist theories advanced by Piaget (1954), Vygotsky (1978), Bruner (1960), and more recently, Fosnot (2013), which emphasize active learning, social interaction, and knowledge construction. This approach foregrounds student agency and encourages learners to make sense of scientific and mathematical ideas through exploration, collaboration, and inquiry. In physics, for example, learners may use digital simulations such as PhET or Quantum Tunneling apps to manipulate and visualize particle behaviour in potential wells, allowing them to construct meaningful interpretations of the Schrödinger equation (Zollman et al., 2002; Nikolaus et al., 2024). In mathematics, collaborative inquiry into topics like implicit differentiation or optimization can foster deeper understanding, particularly when learners utilize visual tools like Desmos or GeoGebra to analyze real-world applications (Borji & Martínez-Planell, 2020; Hamid et al., 2020). Recent reviews affirm that inquiry-based and project-based learning environments enhance conceptual change, critical thinking, and learner motivation in both STEM domains (Lazonder & Harmsen, 2016; Freeman et al., 2014).

However, student-centred pedagogy is not without its drawbacks. Without sufficient scaffolding and guidance, students may struggle to connect exploratory activities to underlying principles, resulting in misconceptions or superficial understanding (Kirschner et al., 2006; Boe et al., 2018). Additionally, this approach places considerable demands on teachers' content knowledge, pedagogical skill, and time—resources that may be limited in under-resourced or overcrowded classrooms, particularly within the South African educational context (Kunnath & Kriek, 2018; Spaull, 2013).

Recognizing these challenges, a hybrid pedagogical model has emerged as a promising strategy that integrates the structure and clarity of teacher-centred methods with the engagement and inquiry-driven nature of student-centred learning (Laurillard, 2012; Sawyer, 2006). This blended approach may begin with teacher-led explanations of core concepts, followed by collaborative tasks, simulations, and problem-based activities that allow students to apply and extend their knowledge in meaningful contexts. For example, flipped classroom models employed by institutions such as MIT and Stanford in quantum mechanics instruction have successfully combined asynchronous lectures with synchronous, simulation-based tutorials to foster deeper conceptual understanding (Chen & Price, 2016; Bishop & Verleger, 2013). Similarly, in mathematics, flipped learning environments have enabled students to acquire procedural fluency at their own pace while using classroom time for discussion, application, and higher-order problem-solving (Lo et al., 2021; Ahmad et al., 2023).

Emerging empirical evidence supports the effectiveness of hybrid models. Studies indicate that students in blended classrooms exhibit greater retention, increased motivation, and enhanced comprehension of complex STEM content when formative assessment, feedback loops, and reflective tasks are integrated into the learning process (Hmelo-Silver et al., 2007; Deslauriers et al., 2011; Bernard et al., 2019). Moreover, hybrid approaches have proven especially beneficial in low-resource environments where balancing cognitive support with learner autonomy is critical. In South African classrooms, structured inquiry combined with explicit instruction has demonstrated improved academic outcomes, greater learner engagement, and more equitable access to abstract mathematical and scientific knowledge (Driver et al., 1994; Kalkanis et al., 2003; Motala et al., 2020).

In conclusion, while both teacher-centred and student-centred approaches offer unique benefits in science and mathematics education, neither is sufficient in isolation. A hybrid model, informed by contemporary research and tailored to contextual realities, holds the greatest promise for fostering deep, meaningful, and equitable learning in abstract domains. Such an approach aligns with current educational imperatives that demand both rigor and responsiveness in teaching practices.

DISCUSSION

This study set out to investigate two interrelated research questions: (1) Which pedagogical approach—teacher-centred or student-centred—is most effective in facilitating a fundamental understanding of abstract concepts such as the Schrödinger wave equation in quantum mechanics and the theory of limits and continuity in mathematics, particularly from the perspectives of essentialism and constructivism? and (2) How does a hybrid approach, integrating direct instruction with inquiry-based learning, contribute to enhancing student engagement and comprehension in the learning of abstract concepts in science and mathematics?

With regard to the first question, the existing literature affirms that both teacher-centred and student-centred approaches offer significant, yet distinct, pedagogical advantages based on the complexity of the content and the cognitive readiness of the learners. Teacher-centred instruction, grounded in the essentialist tradition, is particularly effective in the early stages of learning complex scientific and mathematical theories. This method ensures precision, logical sequencing, and cognitive scaffolding, which are crucial in domains such as quantum mechanics and calculus. For example, mastering the Schrödinger wave equation necessitates not only a conceptual grasp of quantum phenomena but also fluency in linear algebra and differential equations. The structured, sequential nature of teacher-centred instruction supports this by offering rigorous formalism and disciplined cognitive progression (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2018; Siddiqui & Singh, 2017). Likewise, in mathematics, the theory of limits and continuity benefits from systematic exposition and worked examples, enabling students to gradually internalize abstract formal definitions before applying them to problem-solving (Sierpinska, 1994; Ramli et al., 2013).

On the other hand, student-centred pedagogy—rooted in constructivist epistemology—emphasizes active learning, social interaction, and meaning-making. This approach is particularly well-suited for reinforcing and deepening conceptual understanding through exploration, visualization, and collaboration. Research shows that when students engage with simulations, manipulatives, and peer discussions, their cognitive engagement increases, and misconceptions are more likely to be surfaced and addressed (Fosnot, 2013; Hmelo-Silver et al., 2007). In physics education, for instance, Nikolaus et al. (2024) found that learners developed more coherent mental models of quantum behavior when engaged with dynamic visualizations of potential wells and particle-wave duality. Similarly, in mathematics, inquiry-based activities have been shown to enhance students' relational understanding of calculus concepts, such as the interplay between a function and its derivative, especially when supported by graphing technologies and collaborative tasks (Borji & Martínez-Planell, 2020; Hamid et al., 2020).

These findings point to an important conclusion: while teacher-centred methods effectively introduce formal content, student-centred strategies facilitate internalization and application. Hence, the most effective instructional design does not lie in choosing one approach over the other, but rather in the intelligent integration of both—an insight that directly informs the second research question on the value of hybrid pedagogy.

A growing body of empirical research supports the efficacy of hybrid or blended learning models that combine explicit instruction with student-led inquiry. For example, flipped classroom frameworks, as implemented at institutions like MIT, Stanford, and the University of Pittsburgh, have demonstrated improved student performance, deeper engagement, and greater long-term retention in complex STEM subjects (Bishop & Verleger, 2013; Singh, 2008; Chen & Price, 2016). These models typically introduce foundational knowledge through asynchronous video lectures, followed by in-class simulations, peer teaching, and problem-based learning sessions that encourage active meaning-making. In physics, programs like IBM's Qiskit Summer School have similarly blended synchronous instruction with hands-on quantum programming labs, allowing learners to explore quantum algorithms in real time (Abraham et al., 2021).

The hybrid model thus enables the attainment of dual educational objectives: cognitive scaffolding through structured instruction and conceptual deepening through constructivist engagement. From the perspective of cognitive science, such integration aligns with dual-process theories of learning, which suggest that initial content acquisition (System 2 processing) must be followed by active manipulation and integration (System 1 re-application) for durable learning to occur (Posner et al., 1982; Sawyer, 2006). Moreover, hybrid approaches have been found to foster critical 21st-century skills such as creativity, collaboration, and adaptability—particularly important in disciplines like mathematics and science where abstract reasoning is key (Freeman et al., 2014; Brame, 2016).

In South African contexts, where educational disparities and resource constraints are common, the hybrid approach offers a pragmatic pathway to improving STEM education. Research conducted by Motala et al. (2020) and Kunnath and Kriek (2018) has shown that when hybrid models are adapted to local conditions—with teacher guidance and low-tech simulations—they can bridge gaps in conceptual understanding while maintaining learner engagement in overcrowded classrooms. Driver et al. (1994) also emphasized the importance of teacher scaffolding in guided inquiry settings, noting that such interventions are essential for enabling students to reconcile intuitive beliefs with formal scientific concepts.

Recommendations for Classroom Practice and Future Research

In classroom practice, educators should adopt hybrid pedagogical models that integrate direct instruction with inquiry-based learning, allowing students to first build foundational knowledge and then deepen understanding through active exploration. Digital tools such as PhET simulations, GeoGebra, and Qiskit can support this process by making abstract scientific and mathematical concepts more concrete and interactive. Flipped classroom strategies—where theoretical content is introduced via pre-recorded lectures and classroom time is reserved for collaborative tasks—have been shown to enhance engagement and cater to diverse learning needs. Inquiry-based activities should be carefully scaffolded with prompts, feedback loops, and reflection opportunities to prevent misconceptions and ensure conceptual clarity. Furthermore, situating abstract topics within real-world or historical contexts, such as the application of quantum mechanics in technology or the development of calculus in economics, can foster relevance and deeper learning transfer.

Future research should focus on validating the effectiveness of hybrid models across varied STEM disciplines through empirical and comparative studies. It is also essential to examine how such models can be adapted for implementation in under-resourced and diverse educational environments, particularly within the South African context. Research on assessment strategies should aim to develop tools that capture both procedural and conceptual understanding in line with hybrid pedagogies. Additionally, further inquiry is needed into effective professional development frameworks that prepare educators to design and facilitate hybrid learning environments with confidence and pedagogical skill.

In sum, this study affirms the pedagogical promise of hybrid instruction in addressing the cognitive, contextual, and affective dimensions of learning abstract concepts in science and mathematics. It calls for a paradigm shift from binary instructional models to dynamic, integrative frameworks that align with contemporary theories of learning and the realities of diverse educational landscapes.

CONCLUSION

This paper has examined the philosophical, theoretical, and practical dimensions of teacher-centred, student-centred, and hybrid instructional approaches within the context of science and mathematics education. Through a conceptual literature review framed by essentialist and constructivist paradigms, the study found that neither pedagogical model alone is sufficient to address the complex demands of teaching abstract concepts such as the Schrödinger wave equation and calculus. Teacher-centred approaches offer clarity and structure crucial for foundational knowledge, while student-centred strategies promote critical thinking, application, and engagement.

The integration of these paradigms into a hybrid model offers a promising pathway for optimizing learning outcomes. Such a model leverages the strengths of both approaches—structured knowledge transmission and active, inquiry-driven learning—making it particularly suited for complex and counterintuitive subject matter in STEM education. With the support of digital tools, collaborative learning environments, and strategic scaffolding, hybrid instruction can enhance student comprehension, engagement, and motivation.

In conclusion, the future of effective science and mathematics education lies in pedagogical balance. A hybrid instructional model is not merely a compromise but a strategic synthesis, capable of equipping learners with both the foundational skills and the cognitive flexibility needed to navigate the demands of a rapidly evolving scientific world.

We would like to acknowledge the financial support provided by the Centre for Innovation in Learning and Teaching, through the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning office, funded by the Department of Higher Education and Training’s (DHET) University Capacity Development Grant. This support enabled the research and publication of this work. The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the funding bodies.

Acknowledgement

We would like to acknowledge the financial support provided by the Centre for Innovation in Learning and Teaching, through the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning office, funded by the Department of Higher Education and Training's (DHET) University Capacity Development Grant. This support enabled the research and publication of this work. The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the funding bodies.

REFERENCES

Abeysekera, L., & Dawson, P. (2015). Motivation and cognitive load in the flipped classroom: Definition, rationale and a call for research. *Higher Education Research & Development, 34*(1), 1–14.

Abraham, H., McKay, D. C., & Gambetta, A. (2021). Qiskit: An open-source framework for quantum computing. *Nature Reviews Physics, 3*(10), 625–627.

Ahmad, M., Hussain, M., & Khan, S. (2023). Impact of flipped classroom on students’ academic achievement in mathematics. *International Journal of Instruction, 16*(1), 123–138.

Bagley, W. C. (1938). *An essentialist's platform for the advancement of American education*. American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Tamim, R. M., & Schmid, R. F. (2019). A meta-analysis of blended learning and technology use in higher education: From the general to the applied. *Journal* *of Computing in Higher Education, 31*(1), 1–15.

Bishop, J. L., & Verleger, M. A. (2013). The flipped classroom: A survey of the research. In *Proceedings of the 120th ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition*. American Society for Engineering Education.

Boe, B., Henriksen, E. K., Lyons, T., & Schreiner, C. (2018). Participation in science and technology: Young people's achievement-related choices in late-modern societies. *Studies in Science Education, 54*(2), 169–204.

Borji, V., & Martínez-Planell, R. (2020). Students' understanding of the relationship between a function and its derivative. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology, 51*(4), 574–595.

Brame, C. J. (2016). Active learning. Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching. https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/active-learning/

Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education*. Harvard University Press.

Chen, Y., & Price, C. A. (2016). Flipped classroom approach: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review, 19*, 17–28.

De Jong, T., Sotiriou, S., & Gillet, D. (2013). Innovations in STEM education: The Go-Lab federation of online labs. *Smart Learning Environments, 1*(1), 3.

Deslauriers, L., Schelew, E., & Wieman, C. (2011). Improved learning in a large-enrollment physics class. *Science, 332*(6031), 862–864.

Driver, R., Asoko, H., Leach, J., Mortimer, E., & Scott, P. (1994). Constructing scientific knowledge in the classroom. *Educational Researcher, 23*(7), 5–12.

Fosnot, C. T. (2013). *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111*(23), 8410–8415.

Hake, R. R. (1998). Interactive-engagement versus traditional methods: A six-thousand-student survey of mechanics test data for introductory physics courses. *American Journal of Physics, 66*(1), 64–74.

Hamid, M., Mahmood, S., & Mahmood, A. (2020). The impact of inquiry-based learning on students' academic achievement and attitudes towards mathematics. *Journal of Educational Research, 23*(2), 1–12.

Hmelo-Silver, C. E., Duncan, R. G., & Chinn, C. A. (2007). Scaffolding and achievement in problem-based and inquiry learning: A response to Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark (2006). *Educational Psychologist, 42*(2), 99–107.

Hirsch, E. D. (1987). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. Houghton Mifflin.

Jita, L. C., & Mokhele, M. L. (2014). When teacher clusters work: Selected experiences of South African teachers with the cluster approach to professional development. *South African Journal of Education, 34*(2), 1–15.

Kalkanis, G., Hadzidaki, P., & Stavrou, D. (2003). An instructional model for a radical conceptual change towards quantum mechanics concepts. *Science Education, 87*(3), 257–280.

Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R. E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: An analysis of the failure of constructivist, discovery, problem-based, experiential, and inquiry-based teaching. *Educational Psychologist, 41*(2), 75–86.

Kriek, J., & Grayson, D. (2009). A holistic professional development model for South African physical science teachers. *South African Journal of Education, 29*(2), 185–203.

Kunnath, J., & Kriek, J. (2018). Guided inquiry in South African physical sciences classrooms: From policy to practice. *African Journal of Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 22*(2), 123–133.

Lasry, N., Mazur, E., & Watkins, J. (2013). Peer instruction: From Harvard to the two-year college. *American Journal of Physics, 76*(11), 1066–1069.

Laurillard, D. (2012). *Teaching as a design science: Building pedagogical patterns for learning and technology*. Routledge.

Lazonder, A. W., & Harmsen, R. (2016). Meta-analysis of inquiry-based learning: Effects of guidance. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(3), 681–718.

Lo, C. K., Hew, K. F., & Chen, G. (2021). Toward a set of design principles for mathematics flipped classrooms: A synthesis of research in mathematics education. *Educational Research Review, 33*, 100393.

McKagan, S. B., Perkins, K. K., Dubson, M., Malley, C., Reid, S., LeMaster, R., & Wieman, C. E. (2008). Developing and researching PhET simulations for teaching quantum mechanics. *American Journal of Physics, 76*(4), 406–417.

Modisaotsile, B. M. (2012). The failing standard of basic education in South Africa. *Africa Institute of South Africa Policy Brief, 72*, 1–7.

Motala, S., Dieltiens, V., & Sayed, Y. (2020). Schooling during the COVID-19 pandemic: Recommendations for reopening and restructuring the South African schooling system. *South African Journal of Education, 40*(4), 1–13.

Müller, R., & Wiesner, H. (2002). Teaching quantum mechanics on an introductory level. *American Journal of Physics, 70*(3), 200–209.

Nikolaus, J., Müller, R., & Wiesner, H. (2024). Visualizing quantum mechanics: Enhancing understanding through simulations. *Physics Education, 59*(1), 015001.

Onwu, G. O. M., & Stoffels, N. T. (2005). Instructional functions in large, under-resourced science classes: Perspectives of South African teachers. *Perspectives in Education, 23*(3), 79–91.

Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2018). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues* (7th ed.). Pearson.

Piaget, J. (1950). *The psychology of intelligence*. Routledge.

Piaget, J. (1954). *The construction of reality in the child*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Posner, G. J., Strike, K. A., Hewson, P. W., & Gertzog, W. A. (1982). Accommodation of a scientific conception: Toward a theory of conceptual change. *Science Education, 66*(2), 211–227.

Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education, 93*(3), 223–231.

Ramnarain, U., & Schuster, D. (2014). The pedagogical orientations of South African Physical Sciences teachers toward inquiry or direct instructional approaches. *Research in Science Education, 44*(4), 627–650. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-013-9381-2

Ramli, R., Aziz, A. F. M., & Mokhtar, N. (2013). Enhancing undergraduate understanding of differentiation through structured conceptual progression. *Journal of Engineering Education Transformations, 27*(2), 45–52.

Reddy, V., Visser, M., Rogers, S., Winnaar, L., Juan, A., Mosia, D., Mthethwa, L., & Arends, F (2016). *TIMSS 2015: South African children's mathematics and science achievement*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council Press.

Sawyer, R. K. (Ed.). (2006). *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Setati, M. (2008). Access to mathematics versus access to the language of power: The struggle in multilingual mathematics classrooms. *South African Journal of Education*, *28*(1), 103–116.

Siddiqui, Z. S., & Singh, T. K. (2017). Teacher-centered instruction in secondary education: Practices and implications. *International Journal of Education and Development*, *23*(4), 45–52.

Sierpińska, A. (1994). *Understanding in mathematics*. London, England: Routledge.

Singh, H. (2008). *Implementing a flipped-classroom model in a large undergraduate engineering course* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Pittsburgh.

Skamp, K. (Ed.). (2020). *Teaching primary science constructively* (6th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Spaull, N. (2013). *South Africa's Education Crisis – The quality of education in South Africa 1994– 2011*. Report commissioned by the Centre for Development and Enterprise. Johannesburg: CDE.

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science, 12*(2), 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_4

Talanquer, V. (2009). On cognitive constraints and learning progressions: The case of "structure of matter." International Journal of Science Education, 31(15), 2123–2136.

Taylor, N., & Vinjevold, P. (1999). Getting learning right: Report of the President's Education Initiative Research Project. Joint Education Trust.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Harvard University Press.

Woolfolk, A. (2019). *Educational psychology* (14th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Yadav, A., Subedi, D., Lundeberg, M. A., & Bunting, C. F. (2011). Problem-based learning: Influence on students' learning in an electrical engineering course. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 100(2), 253–280.

Zollman, D. A., Rebello, N. S., & Hogg, K. (2002). Quantum physics for everyone: Hands-on activities integrated with technology. *American Journal of Physics, 70*(3), 252–259.