



Constructivism in theory and practice: implications for classroom pedagogy

Satish Prakash Chand

Assistant Professor, Department of Education, College of Humanities, Education & Law, Fiji National University, Fiji

Corresponding author: Satish Prakash Chand

Received 7 Nov 2025; Accepted 23 Dec 2025; Published 8 Jan 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.64171/JAES.6.1.23-29>

Abstract

Constructivism is a learning theory that posits that learners actively construct knowledge through environmental and social interactions, rather than passively receiving information. This paper explores the theory of constructivism, tracing its psychological and pedagogical roots through the work of Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky, and Jerome Bruner, and examines its implications for classroom practice. Emphasising a student-centred learning environment, the paper reviews the major principles of constructivism, describes the features of constructivist classrooms, and considers the practical challenges and opportunities of implementing constructivist pedagogy in contemporary school contexts, particularly within the framework of the Fiji National Curriculum Framework (FNCF). While constructivism is widely advocated in policy and theory, a limited synthesis of its theoretical foundations and practical classroom implications remains within Pacific education systems; this paper addresses this gap by contextualising constructivist principles within the Fijian schooling context. The discussion also highlights the alignment between constructivist theory and the demands of twenty-first-century education, offering contextually grounded recommendations for practitioners and researchers.

Keywords: Constructivism, Student-centred learning, Classroom pedagogy, Fiji, Curriculum design

Introduction

Over the past decades, educational researchers and practitioners have increasingly emphasised student-centred approaches, active learning, inquiry, collaboration, and reflection. At the core of many of these innovations lies constructivist theory, which posits that learners actively construct their own knowledge rather than passively receiving it. As Zajda (2021) ^[48] notes, constructivism emphasises learners as active knowledge builders who develop understanding through experience and interaction. In a classroom context, this perspective repositions teachers as facilitators of learning and students as active meaning-makers. The relevance of constructivism to classroom practice is profound because it directly influences how learning tasks are designed, how students engage with content, and how understanding is assessed. When learners draw upon prior knowledge, engage in reflection, collaborate with peers, and revisit ideas over time, the teacher's role shifts from transmitter of information to facilitator of learning who guides inquiry, scaffolds understanding, and supports deeper conceptual development, leading to improved learner engagement, autonomy, and higher-order thinking. In the context of Fiji, the Fiji National Curriculum Framework (FNCF) explicitly draws upon constructivist perspectives (Ministry of Education [MOE], 2013) ^[27], thereby inviting educators to rethink the design of learning and assessment in ways that are culturally responsive and learner-centred.

This theoretical paper examines the origins of constructivism, outlines its key psychological and pedagogical principles,

analyses its implications for classroom practice, and discusses the challenges associated with implementing constructivist pedagogy in contemporary schooling contexts. The paper concludes by identifying implications for teachers, school leaders, and researchers, particularly within the Fijian education system.

Theoretical foundations of constructivism

The origins of constructivist theory in educational psychology are often attributed to Jean Piaget (1896-1980). Piaget's work investigated how children develop cognitive structures and engage with the world through the processes of assimilation, accommodation, and equilibration (Allen, 2022; Flavell, 2020; Kaur *et al.*, 2024) ^[2, 18, 23]. In Piaget's view, learning is not a passive absorption of given knowledge but a dynamic process in which learners actively adapt to their environment over time (Piaget, 1968) ^[34]. Within cognitive constructivism, learners actively organise, interpret, and integrate experiences into existing mental structures, reshaping understanding through interaction with their environment. Piaget proposed four major stages of cognitive development:

- Sensorimotor stage (birth to 2 years),
- Pre-operational stage (2-7 years),
- Concrete-operational stage (7-12 years), and
- Formal operational stage (adolescence and adulthood).

During each stage, a child's interaction with objects, tasks, and the surrounding environment plays a critical role in intellectual growth (Rabindran & Madanagopal, 2020) ^[36]. Piaget emphasised the importance of learners' prior knowledge,

cognitive conflict, and restructuring (equilibration) as central mechanisms through which conceptual change occurs, principles that remain foundational to constructivist thought. While Piaget emphasised individual cognitive development, Lev Vygotsky (1896-1934) redirected attention to the social, cultural, and historical dimensions of learning. According to Vygotsky, higher mental functions originate in social interaction before being internalised by the learner. His assertion that “every function in the child’s cultural development appears twice” highlights the process by which learning first occurs through interaction with others (interpersonal) and is later internalised as individual understanding (intrapersonal) (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 57) ^[45]. Central to this view is the concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which refers to the range of learning that learners can achieve with guidance, scaffolding, or collaboration beyond what they can accomplish independently (McLeod, 2024) ^[26]. In a social constructivist classroom, learning is therefore mediated through dialogue, collaborative problem-solving, and scaffolded support.

Jerome Bruner (1915-2016) further enriched the constructivist tradition by emphasising discovery learning, scaffolding, structured instruction, and the spiral curriculum. He defined learning as “an active process in which learners construct new ideas or concepts based upon their current and previous knowledge” (Bruner, 1996, p. 11) ^[7]. Bruner proposed three key principles of constructivist instruction:

- Learning must relate to the learner’s experiences and readiness.
- Instruction must be structured so learners can grasp concepts.
- Learners should be able to extrapolate knowledge and fill gaps (Bruner, 1996) ^[7].

Moreover, his concept of the spiral curriculum posits that core ideas should be revisited repeatedly over time, with increasing levels of complexity and depth.

Together, these theorists underpin the broad epistemological foundation of constructivism: learners are active meaning-makers, knowledge is socially mediated, and teachers facilitate learning rather than transmit fixed content. Constructivism, therefore, shifts the focus from content coverage to learning processes, from the “what” of knowledge to the “how” and “why” of understanding. As ELM Learning (2024) suggests, constructivist approaches enable learners to construct knowledge and skills through meaningful engagement, reflection, and self-directed inquiry.

This perspective aligns closely with experiential learning theories advanced by Dewey (1938) ^[16] and Kolb (2015) ^[24], who argue that learning is most effective when learners actively engage in experience, reflection, experimentation, and social dialogue rather than functioning as passive recipients of information. Collectively, these theoretical foundations provide a coherent framework for understanding constructivism as an integrated approach to learning that encompasses cognitive, social, and experiential aspects.

Core principles of constructivist learning

Several interlocking principles are derived from constructivist theory. These principles collectively emphasise learning as an active, social, contextualised, and reflective process.

- Knowledge is constructed rather than transmitted; learners actively build new understanding by connecting new information to prior knowledge and experiences (Phillips, 1995) ^[33].
- Learning is enhanced through active engagement and social interaction, as learners participate in hands-on experiences, inquiry, experimentation, reflective thinking, dialogue, and collaboration rather than functioning as passive recipients of information (Dewey, 1938; Kolb, 2015; Moura *et al.*, 2024) ^[16, 24, 30].
- Learning is situated in meaningful and authentic contexts, enabling learners to apply concepts to real-life situations rather than memorising decontextualised facts (Allen, 2022) ^[2].
- Reflection and cognitive conflict are central to learning, as learners examine their thinking, confront misconceptions, learn from mistakes, and revise mental models through productive struggle (Allen, 2022) ^[2].

In practice, a classroom designed along constructivist lines begins by eliciting students’ prior conceptions and using these as a foundation for further learning, rather than assuming learners are blank slates. Students engage in inquiry-based tasks such as investigating real-world problems, conducting experiments, analysing case studies, and collaborating on group projects, which research has shown to promote deeper understanding and conceptual change (Brooks & Brooks, 1999) ^[6]. The teacher poses thoughtful, open-ended questions, allows wait time to support reflection, and encourages peer discussion and explanation. Learners are encouraged to articulate their reasoning, challenge ideas respectfully, and refine their understanding through dialogue and feedback. Classroom structures typically include flexible groupings, student choice, opportunities for metacognitive reflection, and self-assessment. Moreover, assessment moves beyond rote recall to include performance-based tasks, problem-solving activities, reflective journals, portfolios, and open-ended projects, which allow students to demonstrate understanding in authentic ways (Alam, 2017) ^[1]. Unlike traditional assessments that primarily rank learners, constructivist assessment emphasises feedback, growth, and learning processes, supporting students in monitoring and improving their own understanding.

A constructivist orientation also implies significant shifts in curriculum design and assessment practices. Curriculum content should encourage connections across subject areas, promote real-life relevance, and support multiple ways of knowing rather than focusing on isolated facts. Tasks should offer varied experiences and allow learners to make meaningful decisions about how they learn (Dangel *et al.*, 2004) ^[13]. Teachers are expected to design assessments that inform learners about their learning processes and guide future instruction rather than merely judging performance (MOE, 2013) ^[27]. In the Fiji context, the Fiji National Curriculum

Framework (FNCF) explicitly promotes “learning in real-world contexts,” “social negotiation and mediation,” “independent and collaborative learning,” and “assessment that informs learning,” positioning teachers as guides and facilitators rather than transmitters of knowledge (MOE, 2013) [27]. These curriculum principles strongly reflect constructivist ideals and underscore the alignment between national education policy and constructivist pedagogy.

Application to classrooms: Opportunities and challenges

A growing body of evidence suggests that constructivist practices can significantly enhance student learning outcomes, particularly in terms of engagement, critical thinking, problem-solving, autonomy, and knowledge retention. For instance, Daodu *et al.* (2024) [14] posited that the effective use of constructivist strategies reduces passive learning, increases learner participation, and enhances students’ ownership of knowledge. Similarly, a mixed-methods study in Taiwan found that teachers’ constructivist beliefs positively predicted their perceived value of classroom observation and were negatively correlated with psychosocial stress, suggesting that adopting constructivist approaches may also support teacher well-being and confidence (Chen *et al.*, 2022) [12]. A systematic review of constructivist implementation across diverse educational settings further confirms that teacher beliefs, professional knowledge, and contextual factors significantly shape the enactment and effectiveness of these approaches (Arega & Hunde, 2025) [3].

In the Fijian context, the Fiji National Curriculum Framework (FNCF) explicitly integrates constructivist principles (MOE, 2013) [27]. For teachers, this entails shifting from teacher-centred to student-centred practices, encouraging students to hypothesise, predict, manipulate materials, ask questions, conduct research, imagine, and innovate (Gray, 2019) [20]. The teacher’s role shifts to that of a facilitator and guide, rather than a transmitter of knowledge. However, while policy promotes these principles, classroom realities often reflect persistent traditional practices. Research shows that many Fijian teachers, despite endorsing student-centred learning, continue to rely on directive approaches (Chand, 2021) [9]. Contextual factors, including school type, grade level, student abilities, and curriculum demands, strongly influence actual classroom practice.

Key challenges in implementing constructivist pedagogy include:

- **Teacher beliefs and professional identity:** Teachers accustomed to lecture-based instruction may struggle to adopt facilitative roles and design inquiry-oriented tasks (Kumar *et al.*, 2024; O’Shea & Leavy, 2013) [25, 32].
- **Curriculum and systemic constraints:** High-stakes testing, rigid syllabi, large class sizes, and limited instructional time restrict opportunities for open-ended exploration (Bada, 2015) [4].
- **Heterogeneous learners:** Differentiating instruction for students with varying readiness levels requires additional time, expertise, and scaffolding (Reiser, 2023) [37].

- **Scaffolding and classroom management:** Constructivist classrooms demand high levels of scaffolding, teacher sensitivity, and reflection time; without this, learners may struggle or reinforce misconceptions (Shah, 2019) [39].
- **Assessment misalignment:** Traditional assessments often focus on recall rather than application, collaboration, or metacognitive skills.
- **Structural and resource limitations:** Class size, time allocation, teaching materials, classroom layout, teacher workload, and limited professional development opportunities constrain effective implementation (Moluayonge & Park, 2017) [29].

In the Fijian context, these challenges are observable in both primary and secondary classrooms, where large class sizes and exam-driven systems frequently limit student-centred innovation.

Enabling factors and opportunities for constructivist practice include:

- **Professional development:** Sustained, targeted training that deepens teachers’ understanding of constructivist principles and supports task design is critical (Shah, 2019) [39].
- **Curriculum alignment:** Policies such as the FNCF that emphasise student agency, collaboration, and real-world relevance create a supportive environment for constructivist pedagogy.
- **Digital technologies:** Tools such as simulations, virtual labs, collaborative platforms, and interactive learning apps provide new avenues for inquiry, experimentation, and peer discourse, reinforcing constructivist approaches (Allen, 2022) [2].
- **Inclusive pedagogy:** Constructivist practices naturally support diversity by valuing multiple perspectives, encouraging negotiation of meaning, and scaffolding learning for all students (Grier-Reed & Williams-Wengerd, 2018) [21].
- **Teacher-researcher collaboration and evidence-based practice:** Engaging teachers in reflective research, classroom-based experimentation, and continuous professional learning fosters innovation and contextual adaptation of constructivist strategies.

Overall, while challenges persist in implementing constructivist pedagogy, especially in resource-constrained and exam-driven contexts such as Fiji, the combination of supportive policies, professional development, and technology-mediated learning provides significant opportunities for enhancing student learning outcomes and improving teacher practice.

Constructivism in the Fiji National Curriculum Framework

The Fiji National Curriculum Framework (FNCF) explicitly draws on key constructivist principles to guide teaching and learning (MOE, 2013) [27]. These principles can be summarised as follows:

- **Learning is an active process:** Students construct knowledge through engagement rather than passively receiving information.
- **Learning is social:** Knowledge is co-constructed through dialogue, collaboration, and interaction with others.
- **Knowledge is dynamic:** Learners create, recreate, and internalise knowledge, reshaping their understanding of the world.

To operationalise these principles, the FNCF specifies that learning should:

- Take place in real-world contexts that are meaningful to students.
- Encourage social negotiation and mediation.
- Foster independent and collaborative learning.
- Ensure content and skills are relevant to learners' prior experiences.
- Account for learners' prior knowledge and readiness levels.
- Use assessments that inform learning, such as formative and performance-based tools.
- Position teachers as guides and facilitators rather than transmitters of content.
- Provide multiple perspectives and representations.
- Recognise that all children can learn, supporting differentiated instruction.
- Maintain a safe and supportive learning environment.

Classroom application of these principles encourages teachers to design tasks that connect with students' prior knowledge, integrate real-life and cultural contexts, and scaffold learning appropriately. For example, teachers may present open-ended investigations into local issues such as:

- Community water quality monitoring.
- Indigenous flora and environmental sustainability projects.
- Oral histories or cultural heritage projects, where students collect and analyse stories from elders.

In these tasks, teachers scaffold learning by:

- Structuring activities into manageable steps while leaving space for inquiry.
- Guiding collaborative group work and facilitating peer dialogue.
- Encouraging students to hypothesise, test ideas, reflect, and revise initial assumptions.
- Using formative assessments (such as reflective journals, observation checklists, or peer feedback) to monitor learning progress.

Successfully transitioning to constructivist pedagogy in Fijian classrooms requires sustained support and ongoing development. This includes professional development that models inquiry-based instruction, collaborative planning time, access to relevant resources, and ongoing reflective practice. Examples of strategies include peer coaching, lesson study, mentoring programs, and professional learning communities,

where teachers design, implement, and collectively evaluate constructivist tasks.

By grounding classroom practice in the FNCF's constructivist orientation, teachers create environments that prioritise active, collaborative, and meaningful learning, while addressing the diverse needs of students in real-world contexts.

Discussion and implications for teaching and learning

Constructivism provides a robust framework for understanding how learners actively construct, interpret, and refine knowledge (Bada, 2015) ^[4]. While the contributions of Piaget, Vygotsky, and Bruner have been discussed in detail earlier, their implications for classroom practice are particularly salient: Piaget highlights the importance of cognitive conflict and adaptation; Vygotsky underscores scaffolding and socially mediated learning; and Bruner emphasises structured instruction, spiral revisiting of concepts, and guided discovery (Brooks & Brooks, 1999; Wood *et al.*, 1976) ^[6, 47]. Collectively, these perspectives underpin student-centred, inquiry-driven, collaborative, and reflective learning environments.

Teacher roles and classroom practices

Teachers must shift from transmitters of knowledge to facilitators of learning, designing tasks that:

- Stimulate cognitive conflict to promote conceptual growth (Piaget, 1985) ^[35].
- Provide scaffolding and guided support appropriate to students' Zone of Proximal Development (Wood *et al.*, 1976; Vygotsky, 1978) ^[47, 57].
- Encourage student agency and independent inquiry.
- Promote reflective thinking as part of ongoing learning (Schön, 2016) ^[38].
- Foster collaboration and peer discourse, employing open-ended questioning and revisiting ideas over time through spiral curriculum approaches (Bruner, 1960; Black & Wiliam, 1998) ^[8, 5].

Assessment implications

Assessment must move beyond rote recall to include tasks requiring application, creation, reflection, and collaboration, enabling learners to engage deeply with concepts (Shepard, 2000) ^[40]. Formative assessment practices, peer feedback, and performance-based evaluations are central to constructivist pedagogy.

Policy and systemic support

Schools and educational systems play a crucial role in enabling constructivist learning by providing:

- Supportive policies and guidelines aligned with constructivist principles (MOE, 2013) ^[27].
- Resources and classroom environments conducive to active, collaborative, and inquiry-based learning.
- Ongoing professional development, mentoring, and collaborative learning communities to build teacher capacity and foster reflective practice (Fullan, 2016; Thaman, 2009) ^[19, 42].

Contextual challenges in Fiji and the Pacific

Despite policy support, several systemic constraints persist:

- Large class sizes and limited resources constrain the implementation of student-centred strategies.
- Entrenched teacher-centred practices and high-stakes examinations limit innovation.
- Professional development gaps restrict teachers' ability to enact constructivist approaches (Chand, 2024; Singh & Chand, 2021) ^[10, 9].

Addressing these challenges requires sustained investment in capacity building, mentoring, collaborative teacher learning communities, and structured opportunities for reflective practice and peer observation.

Research implications

Key areas for future research include:

- Conducting contextually grounded empirical studies in under-researched regions such as Pacific Island nations to understand how constructivist pedagogy is interpreted, adapted, and enacted (Nabobo-Baba, 2006; Chand, 2025) ^[31, 11].
- Undertaking longitudinal studies to examine effects on student outcomes, including critical thinking, learner autonomy, collaboration, and lifelong learning (Darling-Hammond *et al.*, 2020) ^[15].
- Investigating professional development models that effectively shift teacher beliefs and practices, including mentoring, coaching, and reflective enquiry cycles (Guskey, 2002; Timperley *et al.*, 2007) ^[22, 43].
- Developing valid, reliable, and authentic assessment tasks aligned with constructivist pedagogy to support enquiry, problem-solving, and application in real-world contexts (Wiggins, 1998; Shepard, 2000) ^[46, 40].
- Exploring technology integration in constructivist classrooms to scaffold learning, enhance collaboration, support inclusivity, and reduce teacher workload (Mishra & Koehler, 2006; Voogt *et al.*, 2013) ^[28, 44].

Conclusion

Constructivism offers a coherent framework for understanding how learners actively construct and refine knowledge. From Piaget's cognitive stages, through Vygotsky's socially mediated scaffolding and internalisation, to Bruner's scaffolded instruction and spiral curriculum, the theory emphasises active, social, reflective, inquiry-based, and evolving learning processes. Implementing constructivist pedagogy in classrooms requires shifting from transmission-oriented models to student-centred, facilitative, collaborative, and contextually relevant practices.

Research evidence highlights the benefits of constructivist teaching, including deeper engagement, enhanced learner autonomy, and inclusive learning, yet practical implementation remains complex. Key challenges include teacher beliefs, curriculum constraints, heterogeneous learners, assessment misalignment, and resource limitations. Opportunities arise through alignment with national curricula (such as Fiji's FNCF), sustained professional development, and integration of technology.

For educators and policymakers committed to twenty-first-century learning, characterised by critical thinking, creativity, collaboration, and lifelong learning, a constructivist orientation remains essential. Practitioners should design tasks that build on prior knowledge, scaffold learning, promote reflection and peer discourse, and allow students to revisit ideas through a spiral curriculum. Researchers should continue to explore how constructivist practices unfold in diverse contexts, how professional learning can support teacher change, and how assessment and technology can enhance these approaches.

Ultimately, a truly constructivist classroom does not simply deliver knowledge; it organises meaningful experiences, supports learners' active sense-making, fosters agency and metacognitive reflection, and engages students in an evolving journey of thinking, questioning, and constructing understanding. By embracing these principles, constructivist pedagogy has the potential to transform educational practice, nurture lifelong learners, and create more equitable and responsive learning environments.

References

1. Alam MM. Constructivism and the classroom curriculum. *Int J Indian Psychol.* 2017;5(1):20-29. doi:10.25215/0501.103.
2. Allen A. An introduction to constructivism: Its theoretical roots and impact on contemporary education. *J Learn Des Leadersh.* 2022;1(1):1-11. Available from: https://ldjournal.web.illinois.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Andrew-Allen-Constructivism_JLDL_Vol1Issue1September2022.pdf
3. Arega NT, Hunde TS. Constructivist instructional approaches: A systematic review of evaluation-based evidence for effectiveness. *Rev Educ.* 2025;13(1):e70040. doi:10.1002/rev3.70040.
4. Bada SO. Constructivism learning theory: A paradigm for teaching and learning. *IOSR J Res Method Educ.* 2015;5(6):66-70. doi:10.9790/7388-05616670.
5. Black P, Wiliam D. Assessment and classroom learning. *Assess Educ Princ Policy Pract.* 1998;5(1):7-74. doi:10.1080/0969595980050102.
6. Brooks JG, Brooks MG. In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms. Rev ed. Alexandria (VA): ASCD, 1999.
7. Bruner J. The culture of education. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1996.
8. Bruner JS. The process of education. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1960.
9. Chand SP. Exploring the efficacy of constructive alignment in primary classrooms across Fiji [doctoral dissertation]. Suva: University of the South Pacific, 2021.
10. Chand SP. Teacher's views on professional learning and development in primary schools in Fiji. *Asia Pac Educ Rev.* 2024;25:10004. doi:10.1007/s12564-024-10004-3.
11. Chand SP. Challenges in implementing constructivist approaches: Exploring teachers' experiences in Fijian primary school classrooms. *Aust Educ Res.* 2025;52:3631–3655. doi:10.1007/s13384-025-00870-0.

12. Chen PH, Hong JC, Ye JH, Ho YJ. The role of teachers' constructivist beliefs in classroom observations: A social cognitive theory perspective. *Front Psychol.* 2022;13:904181. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2022.904181.
13. Dangel JR, Guyton E, McIntyre CB. Constructivist pedagogy in primary classrooms: Learning from teachers and their classrooms. *J Early Child Teach Educ.* 2004;24(4):237–245. doi:10.1080/1090102040240404.
14. Daodu M, Elegbede C, Adedotun O. Effectiveness of constructivism theory of learning as 21st century method of teaching. *J Adv Psychol.* 2024;6(2):1-11. doi:10.47941/japsy.2267.
15. Darling-Hammond L, Flook L, Cook-Harvey C, Barron B, Osher D. Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Appl Dev Sci.* 2020;24(2):97-140. doi:10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791.
16. Dewey J. *Experience and education.* New York: Macmillan, 1938.
17. ELM Learning. Constructivist learning theory [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2026 Jan 7]. Available from: <https://elmllearning.com/hub/learning-theories/constructivism/>
18. Flavell JH. *The developmental psychology of Jean Piaget.* New York: Literary Licensing LLC, 2020.
19. Fullan M. *The new meaning of educational change.* 5th ed. New York: Teachers College Press, 2016.
20. Gray A. Constructivist teaching and learning. *SSTA Res Centre Rep,* 2019, 97-07. Available from: <https://saskschoolboards.ca/wp-content/uploads/97-07.htm>
21. Grier-Reed T, Williams-Wengerd A. Integrating universal design, culturally sustaining practices, and constructivism to advance inclusive pedagogy in the undergraduate classroom. *Educ Sci.* 2018;8(4):167. doi:10.3390/educsci8040167.
22. Guskey TR. Professional development and teacher change. *Teach Teach.* 2002;8(3):381–391. doi:10.1080/135406002100000512.
23. Kaur G, Kaur R, Rashid A, Ngadni I, Ramasamy R, Balakrishnan K. Generating Piaget- and Vygotsky-grounded parenting strategies: Home-based approaches to enhance cognitive development among young children. *Int J Acad Res Prog Educ Dev.* 2024;13(3):2030-2043. doi:10.6007/IJARPED/v13-i3/22020.
24. Kolb D. *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River (NJ): Pearson Education, 2015.
25. Kumar DV, Kumar S, Karamthoti MB, Rao M. *Innovative pedagogy and quality concerns in teacher education.* New Delhi: Academic Guru Publishing House, 2024.
26. McLeod S. Vygotsky's zone of proximal development [Internet], 2024 [cited 2026 Jan 7]. Available from: <https://www.simplypsychology.org/zone-of-proximal-development.html>
27. Ministry of Education. *Fiji National Curriculum Framework.* Suva: Ministry of Education, Fiji, 2013.
28. Mishra P, Koehler MJ. Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teach Coll Rec.* 2006;108(6):1017-1054. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x.
29. Moluayonge GE, Park I. Effect of challenges with class size, classroom management and availability of instructional resources on science teachers' teaching practices in secondary schools. *J Sci Educ.* 2017;41(1):135-151.
30. Moura A, MacPhail A, Graça A, Batista P. Encouraging students to co-construct and co- and self-regulate their learning within a cooperative learning environment in physical education. *J Teach Phys Educ.* 2024;43(1):11-20. doi:10.1123/jtpe.2022-0104.
31. Nabobo-Baba U. *Knowing and learning: An indigenous Fijian approach.* Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific, 2006. Available from: <https://repository.usp.ac.fj/id/eprint/3456>
32. O'Shea J, Leavy AM. Teaching mathematical problem-solving from an emergent constructivist perspective: The experiences of Irish primary teachers. *J Math Teach Educ.* 2013;16(4):293-318. doi:10.1007/s10857-013-9235-6.
33. Phillips DC. The good, the bad, and the ugly: The many faces of constructivism. *Educ Res.* 1995;24(7):5-12. doi:10.3102/0013189X024007005.
34. Piaget J. *Six psychological studies.* New York: Vintage Books, 1968.
35. Piaget J. *The equilibration of cognitive structures: The central problem of intellectual development.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
36. Rabindran R, Madanagopal D. Piaget's theory and stages of cognitive development: An overview. *Scholars J Appl Med Sci.* 2020;8(9):2152–2157. doi:10.36347/sjams.2020.v08i09.034.
37. Reiser BJ. Why scaffolding should sometimes make tasks more difficult for learners. In: *Routledge eBooks.* London: Informa, 2023, 255-264. doi:10.4324/9781315045467-37.
38. Schön DA. *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* London: Routledge, 2016.
39. Shah RK. *Effective constructivist teaching learning in the classroom.* ERIC, 2019. Available from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED598340>
40. Shepard LA. The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educ Res.* 2000;29(7):4-14. doi:10.3102/0013189X029007004.
41. Singh SV, Chand SP. Effects of the examination-driven education system on teachers and students in primary schools in Fiji. *Int J Assess Eval.* 2022;29(1):57-65. doi:10.18848/2327-7920/CGP/v29i01/57-65.
42. Thaman KH. *Towards cultural democracy in teaching and learning with specific references to Pacific Island nations.* *Int J Scholarsh Teach Learn,* 2009, 3(2). doi:10.20429/ijstl.2009.030206.
43. Timperley H, Wilson A, Barrar H, Fung I. *Teacher professional learning and development: Best evidence synthesis iteration.* Wellington: Ministry of Education, 2007. Available from: <https://www.oecd.org/education/school/48727127.pdf>

44. Voogt J, Fisser P, Pareja Roblin N, Tondeur J, van Braak J. Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A review of the literature. *J Comput Assist Learn.* 2013;29(2):109-121. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2729.2012.00487.x.
45. Vygotsky L. *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 1978.
46. Wiggins G. *Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1998. Available from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED418997>
47. Wood D, Bruner JS, Ross G. The role of tutoring in problem solving. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry.* 1976;17(2):89-100. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x.
48. Zajda J. *Constructivist learning theory and creating effective learning environments.* Cham: Springer, 2021.