Graduate Journal of Interdisciplinary Research, Reports & Reviews
(Grad.J.InteR[3])
ark:/85846/JPR3.2026AR.04010028

ISSN(E): 2584-2919
Vol.04, No.01 (2026)
pp.28-46

Review Article

Impact of Active Learning Strategies on Student Achievement in Physics Education: A Comprehensive Literature Review

Krishnakanth G.[1], S. Arulsamy[1], T. Enok Joel[2]

[1]*P.S.R. College of Education, Sevalpatti (Post), Sivakasi- 626140, Virudhunagar (Dis), Tamilnadu, India*
[2,3]*Department of Educational Technology, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore-46, Tamilnadu, India*
[*]*Corresponding author: grkanth007@gmail.com*

(Received:03-04-2026; Accepted: 30-05-2026; Published Online:25-07-2026)

ABSTRACT: Background: Active learning has emerged as a transformative pedagogical paradigm, particularly within physics education, where the complexity of conceptual understanding demands student engagement beyond passive reception of information.
Purpose: This comprehensive literature review synthesizes 120 foundational works, empirical studies, theoretical frameworks, empirical studies, covering active learning, pedagogy, and modern educational frame works and policy analyses to examine the impact of active learning strategies on student achievement in physics education.
Method: This comprehensive literature review synthesizes 120 foundational works, empirical studies, theoretical frameworks, empirical studies, covering active learning, pedagogy, and modern educational frame works and policy analyses to examine the impact of active learning strategies on student achievement in physics education. Drawing on seminal theories from Vygotsky (1978), Piaget (1970), Kolb (1984), and Bandura (1997), alongside landmark empirical investigations by Freeman et al. (2014), Hake (1998), Mazur (1997), and Deslauriers et al. (2011), this review establishes a robust evidence base for the superiority of active over traditional instructional methods.
Results: Key strategies examined include Peer Instruction, Just-in-Time Teaching (JiTT), Problem-Based Learning (PBL), Flipped Classroom, SCALE-UP, and Technology-Enhanced Active Learning (TEAL). The review further explores the policy implications of India's National Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020) in promoting learner-centred reforms, the role of digital and blended learning environments in extending active pedagogies, and the critical dimensions of equity and teacher professional development.
Conclusion: Findings consistently demonstrate that active learning significantly raises academic achievement, narrows achievement gaps, enhances conceptual understanding, and fosters higher-order thinking skills. Conclusions drawn from this synthesis have substantial implications for curriculum designers, physics educators, teacher training institutions, and policy-makers committed to evidence-based educational reform.

Keywords: Active Learning, Physics Education, Student Achievement, Peer Instruction, Constructivism, NEP 2020, Flipped Classroom, Problem-Based Learning, STEM Education, Learner-Centred Teaching

1. Introduction

The quality of science education, and physics education in particular, has long been a subject of critical inquiry among educators, researchers, and policy-makers. Physics, as a discipline, requires students not merely to memorize facts or formulae but to construct deep conceptual understanding, apply mathematical reasoning, and engage in scientific thinking. Traditional lecture-based pedagogies, while efficient for content delivery, have repeatedly been shown to fall short of developing these higher-order competencies (Freeman et al., 2014; Hake, 1998). In response, educational researchers have advocated for active learning strategies—approaches that require students to engage meaningfully with content, collaborate with peers, and take ownership of their learning.

Active learning, broadly defined as any instructional method that engages students in the learning process beyond passive listening, encompasses a spectrum

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

of strategies: Peer Instruction, Problem-Based Learning (PBL), Flipped Classrooms, cooperative learning, inquiry-based learning, and technology-enhanced modalities (Prince, 2004; Chi & Wylie, 2014). The empirical foundation for these approaches is substantial and continues to grow, with meta-analyses and large-scale studies consistently demonstrating measurable improvements in student achievement, engagement, and self-efficacy (Freeman et al., 2014; Theobald et al., 2020; Schneider & Preckel, 2017).

Despite this growing consensus, challenges remain in the widespread adoption of active learning, particularly in resource-constrained educational contexts, large-enrollment classes, and systems undergoing policy transitions. India's promulgation of the National Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020) signals an ambitious institutional commitment to learner-centred pedagogical reform, emphasising critical thinking, experiential learning, and the integration of technology in higher education (Aithal & Aithal, 2020; Kumar, 2020). This policy context lends particular urgency to a comprehensive review of the active learning literature within physics education.

This review is structured around six thematic pillars: (1) theoretical and philosophical foundations of active learning; (2) empirical evidence from physics education research; (3) specific active learning strategies and their effectiveness; (4) digital, blended, and technology-enhanced learning environments; (5) equity, self-efficacy, and learner-centred principles; and (6) teacher education, professional development, and policy implications. Collectively, these themes provide an integrated and nuanced account of the current state of knowledge regarding active learning in physics education.

2. Theoretical and Philosophical Foundations

2.1. Constructivist Theories

The intellectual roots of active learning lie in constructivist philosophy, which posits that learning is not a passive transmission of knowledge but an active process of meaning-making in which learners construct understanding through experience and reflection. Jean Piaget's (1970) theory of cognitive development provided one of the earliest and most influential articulations of this principle, establishing the mechanisms of assimilation and accommodation through which learners integrate new information into existing cognitive schemas. Piaget's constructivism underscores the importance of developmentally appropriate challenges and the role of the learner's agency in the educational process.

Lev Vygotsky (1978) extended constructivist theory by emphasising the social and collaborative dimensions of learning. His concept of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) highlighted the critical role of more knowledgeable peers and instructors in scaffolding learner understanding, a principle that directly informs collaborative active learning strategies such as Peer Instruction and cooperative learning. Jonassen (1991) and Fosnot (2013) further elaborated constructivist frameworks, emphasising active knowledge construction and the centrality of student-centred learning environments.

Jerome Bruner (1961) contributed the theory of discovery learning, advocating for inquiry-based pedagogies in which students are guided to discover principles and relationships through structured exploration. This approach aligns closely with laboratory-based and problem-solving activities prevalent in physics education. Similarly, John Dewey's (1938) philosophical emphasis on experience as the foundation of education provided the broader pragmatist framework that continues to underpin experiential learning approaches in physics classrooms.

2.2. Experiential and Situated Learning

David Kolb's (1984) Experiential Learning Theory offers a cyclical model of learning progressing through concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualisation, and active experimentation a cycle that maps naturally onto laboratory activities, demonstrations, and problem-solving exercises in physics education. Lave and Wenger's (1991) situated learning theory further emphasised that learning is most effective when it occurs in authentic, contextually meaningful settings, reinforcing the value of real-world problem contexts in physics instruction.

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

Illeris (2009) examined the transfer of learning, highlighting the conditions under which knowledge and skills acquired in one context can be applied in another a consideration of considerable importance in physics education, where conceptual understanding must transfer across diverse problem types and real-world applications. Merriam and Bierema (2013) extended these insights to adult learning contexts, with relevance for tertiary physics education.

2.3. Social Cognitive and Motivational Theories

Albert Bandura's (1997) Social Cognitive Theory, particularly his construct of self-efficacy the belief in one's ability to perform specific tasks has been extensively applied in physics education research. Dou et al. (2016) demonstrated empirically that self-efficacy significantly affects learning outcomes, with students who believe in their capacity to master physics content demonstrating greater persistence, engagement, and achievement. Zimmerman's (2002) theory of self-regulated learning complemented Bandura's work by articulating the processes through which learners monitor, control, and direct their own learning, capacities that active learning environments are specifically designed to cultivate.

The ICAP Framework, proposed by Chi and Wylie (2014), offers a theoretically grounded taxonomy of learning activities, organising student engagement along a hierarchy from Interactive, Constructive, Active, to Passive modes. The framework predicts that more cognitively engaging modes of participation produce superior learning outcomes, providing a theoretical mechanism that helps explain the empirical superiority of active over passive instructional approaches. This framework has had significant influence on the design and evaluation of active learning interventions in STEM education.

3. Empirical Evidence in Physics Education

3.1. Foundational Studies and Meta-Analyses

The empirical case for active learning in physics education is anchored in a set of landmark studies that have profoundly shaped the field. Richard Hake's (1998) large-scale comparative study of 6,542 students across 62 introductory physics courses demonstrated that interactive engagement methods produced average normalised gains in conceptual understanding approximately twice those achieved by traditional lecture-based instruction. This study, one of the most widely cited in physics education research, established a robust empirical foundation for the shift toward active pedagogies in physics classrooms.

Freeman et al.'s (2014) meta-analysis of 225 studies across STEM disciplines provided the broadest and most rigorous evidence synthesis to date, finding that students in active learning classes performed significantly better on examinations and were less likely to fail than those in traditional lectures. The magnitude of these effects was substantial and consistent across disciplines, institutional types, and course levels. Theobald et al. (2020) built upon this foundation by demonstrating that active learning disproportionately benefits students from underrepresented groups, reducing achievement gaps between majority and minority students by approximately 33\%.

Schneider and Preckel's (2017) meta-analysis specifically examined achievement in higher education, identifying a range of instructional variables associated with positive outcomes, including the use of varied instructional methods, student-centred practices, and formative feedback. Hattie's (2009) broader synthesis of educational research, encompassing over 800 meta-analyses, similarly endorsed the effectiveness of active, student-centred approaches, providing a context for situating physics education research within the wider landscape of educational science.

3.2. Physics-Specific Empirical Studies

Eric Mazur's (1997) development and evaluation of Peer Instruction at Harvard University constitutes one of the most influential contributions to physics education research. Mazur's approach, which uses conceptual questions (ConcepTests) administered during class to stimulate peer discussion and collaborative reasoning, has since been replicated and validated in hundreds of studies across diverse institutional contexts. Crouch and Mazur (2001) reported significant improvements in both conceptual understanding and

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

quantitative problem-solving ability attributable to Peer Instruction, establishing it as a benchmark active learning strategy in physics.

Deslauriers et al. (2011) conducted a carefully controlled experimental comparison of active learning and traditional instruction in a large-enrollment university physics course, finding that students taught through active learning scored significantly higher on tests of conceptual learning, despite reporting somewhat lower subjective ratings of instruction quality an important finding that underscores the distinction between perceived and actual learning. Karim et al. (2020) further corroborated these findings through a comparison of flipped and active learning approaches, demonstrating improved student performance and conceptual understanding under both active learning conditions relative to traditional instruction.

Kola (2013) examined interactive learning approaches in physics at the secondary level, demonstrating better academic achievement under interactive conditions. Gorman et al. (2018), employing hierarchical linear modelling, found that class size had no major independent effect on achievement outcomes when active learning was implemented, suggesting that the quality of pedagogical approach is a more critical determinant of student success than class size per se. This finding has significant practical implications for institutions seeking to implement active learning in large-enrolment physics courses.

3.3. Problem-Solving and Conceptual Learning

Sarkingobir et al. (2024) investigated Problem-Based Learning (PBL) in physics using a quasi-experimental design, demonstrating significant improvements in students' problem-solving skills under PBL conditions. Mohammad et al. (2023) extended this inquiry by examining Peer-Assisted Mind Mapping as a strategy for enhancing both problem-solving and conceptual skills in physics, with experimental results confirming significant gains. McDaniel et al. (2016) contributed a nuanced comparative study that examined differential outcomes for conceptual versus quantitative problem-solving under different instructional conditions, finding mixed outcomes that underscore the importance of aligning instructional strategies with specific learning goals.

Meltzer and Thornton (2012) provided a comprehensive review of physics education research, synthesising evidence on interactive engagement methods and situating the field within its historical development. Prince's (2004) broad review of active learning literature confirmed the consistent effectiveness of active strategies across multiple metrics, including achievement, attitudes, and retention. Michael (2006) similarly reviewed evidence for active learning in higher education, affirming the value of interactive pedagogical approaches for promoting deep and durable learning.

4. Key Active Learning Strategies in Physics Education

4.1. Peer Instruction

Peer Instruction, developed by Mazur (1997) and extensively evaluated by Crouch and Mazur (2001), is among the most rigorously studied active learning strategies in physics. The approach requires students to respond individually to conceptual questions, engage in peer discussion with nearby classmates, and re-vote, leveraging the explanatory power of near-peer teaching. The strategy capitalises on the social and cognitive benefits identified in Vygotsky's (1978) ZPD theory, while providing immediate formative feedback to both students and instructors.

Slavin's (1996) research on cooperative learning and Johnson and Johnson's (1999) extensive work on collaborative learning provide theoretical and empirical support for the group-based components of Peer Instruction, demonstrating that structured peer interaction produces reliably higher achievement than individual study. These findings converge with Cornelius-White's (2007) meta-analysis, which found strong positive associations between learner-centred teacher-student relationships of the kind facilitated by Peer Instruction—and student achievement.

4.2. Flipped Classroom and Just-in-Time Teaching

The Flipped Classroom model, popularised by Bergmann and Sams (2012), inverts the traditional

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

structure of instruction by relocating content delivery outside the classroom (through video lectures or pre-class readings) and using class time for active problem-solving, discussion, and application activities. This model maximises the time available for interactive engagement and instructor feedback during class sessions. Karim et al. (2020) provided empirical validation of the flipped approach in physics, demonstrating improvements in conceptual understanding comparable to those achieved through other active learning interventions.

Just-in-Time Teaching (JiTT), developed by Novak (1999), uses student responses to pre-class web-based questions to inform and adapt in-class instruction, creating a feedback loop between out-of-class preparation and in-class active learning. This approach addresses a critical challenge in flipped learning ensuring adequate student preparation—by making the pre-class activity a formative assessment with direct consequences for the structure of class time. Together, the Flipped Classroom and JiTT models represent a sophisticated integration of out-of-class and in-class active learning that has found widespread application in university physics courses.

4.3. Problem-Based and Inquiry-Based Learning

Problem-Based Learning (PBL) situates student learning within complex, authentic problem scenarios that require the integration of knowledge from multiple domains and the development of collaborative problem-solving skills (Sarkingobir et al., 2024). This approach aligns with Dewey's (1938) philosophy of experience-based education and Lave and Wenger's (1991) situated learning theory, emphasising the importance of authentic context in promoting meaningful and transferable learning. In physics education, PBL has been applied to topics ranging from mechanics and thermodynamics to modern physics, with consistent evidence of improved problem-solving skills and conceptual understanding.

Inquiry-based learning, rooted in Bruner's (1961) discovery learning framework, engages students in the processes of scientific investigation-formulating hypotheses, designing experiments, collecting data, and drawing conclusions. Nair (2022) demonstrated empirically that inquiry-based approaches in science education produced better conceptual understanding than traditional instruction. Tiwari and Sharma (2024) confirmed that active learning strategies including inquiry-based methods enhanced higher-order thinking in Indian educational contexts, findings with direct relevance to the implementation of NEP 2020.

4.4. Cooperative and Collaborative Learning

Cooperative learning, characterised by structured group work with individual accountability and positive interdependence, has been extensively studied across educational levels and disciplines. Slavin (1996) and Johnson and Johnson (1999) synthesised decades of research demonstrating consistent positive effects of cooperative learning on achievement, attitudes, and social skills. In physics education, cooperative learning principles are embedded in multiple active learning frameworks, including SCALE-UP (Beichner, 2008) and Workshop Physics (Laws, 1991).

Tanner (2013) reviewed a range of formative assessment and cooperative teaching strategies applicable to science education, demonstrating improvements in classroom engagement and learning. Weimer (2013) articulated the principles of Learner-Centred Teaching—including sharing power with students, employing reflective practices, and promoting collaboration that provide the pedagogical philosophy underpinning cooperative and collaborative learning approaches. Baeten et al. (2010) and Biggs and Tang (2011) contributed theoretical and empirical analyses of learning environments and constructive alignment that support the design of cooperative physics learning experiences.

4.5. Technology-Enhanced and Simulation-Based Learning

The TEAL (Technology-Enhanced Active Learning) project at MIT, reported by Dori and Belcher (2005), integrated technology, visualisation tools, and active learning pedagogy in introductory physics, demonstrating significantly improved conceptual understanding and reduced failure rates relative to traditional instruction. The SCALE-UP (Student-Centred Activities for Large Enrollment Undergraduate Programs) model developed by Beichner (2008) transformed the physical

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

and pedagogical environment of large physics classes through the use of round tables, wireless computers, and activity-based learning, achieving high levels of engagement and achievement across diverse student populations.

Workshop Physics (Laws, 1991) replaced traditional lectures with hands-on laboratory activities as the primary mode of instruction, leveraging direct physical experience to build conceptual understanding. Narayan (2023) examined the role of digital pedagogy in promoting instructional innovation in contemporary physics classrooms, while Joshi and Kulshrestha (2022) and Gupta and Verma (2024) provided evidence of improved academic achievement and instructional innovation in Indian STEM contexts through active and digital learning integration.

5. Digital and Blended Learning Environments

5.1. Theoretical Frameworks for Digital Learning

The integration of digital technologies into active learning environments has been theorised through multiple frameworks. Siemens (2005) proposed connectivism as a learning theory suited to the digital age, emphasising the formation of connections between information sources, communities, and individuals as the basis of learning. Bates (2015) provided a comprehensive account of the principles and practices of teaching in the digital age, with direct implications for the design of technology-enhanced physics learning environments. Garrison and Kanuka (2004) examined blended learning as an integration of face-to-face and online instruction, arguing that this hybrid approach could leverage the strengths of both modalities.

Hrastinski (2019) offered a systematic review of blended learning research, confirming the effectiveness of hybrid pedagogies that combine digital content delivery with active in-person learning activities. Means et al. (2013), in a rigorous meta-analysis of online learning research, found that online and blended learning conditions produced superior outcomes compared to purely face-to-face instruction, with blended approaches showing particularly strong effects findings with direct relevance to the design of physics courses that incorporate digital simulation, online homework systems, and interactive video.

5.2. Pandemic Pedagogy and Emergency Remote Teaching

The COVID-19 pandemic catalysed an unprecedented global experiment in online and emergency remote teaching, generating a substantial body of research on the challenges and opportunities of digital learning. Rapanta et al. (2020), Dhawan (2020), and Sahu (2020) examined the pedagogical, technical, and institutional challenges posed by rapid transitions to online instruction, providing insights relevant to the ongoing integration of digital tools in physics education. Bozkurt and Sharma (2020) analysed emergency remote teaching as a distinct pedagogical phenomenon, emphasising the importance of distinguishing it from intentional, design-informed online learning.

Mishra et al. (2020) and Satpathy and Pradhan (2024) surveyed the digital competency and preparedness of teachers for online instruction, identifying significant gaps in technical skills and pedagogical readiness that must be addressed through targeted professional development. Martin and Bolliger (2018) examined student engagement in online environments, identifying strategies for promoting interaction and active participation in digital physics learning contexts. Pal and Vanijja (2021) investigated the usability of online platforms for learning, providing practical insights for the design of digital learning environments in physics education.

5.3. Gamification and Innovative Digital Approaches

Subhash and Cudney (2018) reviewed the evidence for gamified learning across higher education contexts, finding consistent improvements in student engagement, motivation, and participation under gamified conditions. The application of game-based elements points, badges, leaderboards, and narrative to physics learning activities has the potential to harness intrinsic motivation and foster sustained engagement with challenging material. Zaveri and Bhattacharya (2023) examined a range of student-centred reform practices in Indian higher education, documenting successful

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

applications of innovative instructional approaches including digital and gamified elements.

Narayan's (2023) investigation of digital pedagogy in Indian physics education contexts demonstrated that well-designed digital interventions could promote instructional innovation and improve student outcomes, while Gupta and Verma (2024) provided evidence of the effectiveness of technology-enhanced active learning in Indian higher education settings, underscoring the feasibility and value of digital integration in the context of NEP 2020 implementation.

6. Equity, Self-Efficacy, and Learner-Centred Principles

6.1. Active Learning and Educational Equity

One of the most significant and socially consequential findings in the active learning literature concerns the differential benefits of active learning for students from underrepresented groups. Theobald et al. (2020) demonstrated through meta-analysis that active learning reduced achievement gaps between majority and minority students by approximately 33\%, while simultaneously raising overall achievement levels. This finding has profound implications for educational equity, suggesting that active learning is not merely an effective strategy for the average student but a potentially transformative intervention for addressing systemic disparities in STEM achievement.

Minhas et al. (2012) provided empirical evidence of better retention rates under active learning conditions compared to passive instruction, a finding with particular relevance for students who historically have been marginalised by educational systems that reward passive reception of knowledge. O'Neill and McMahon (2005) and Lea et al. (2003) examined student-centred learning approaches from the perspectives of learner autonomy and student attitudes, finding consistent evidence of positive outcomes when students are empowered to take greater ownership of their learning. These findings align with the equity-oriented principles of NEP 2020, which emphasises inclusive, accessible, and learner-centred education.

6.2. Self-Efficacy and Self-Regulation in Physics Learning

Bandura's (1997) self-efficacy construct has been extensively applied in physics education research, with consistently strong evidence that students' beliefs in their ability to master physics content predict not only their persistence and engagement but also their ultimate achievement. Dou et al. (2016) demonstrated in a multi-institutional study that self-efficacy significantly affects learning outcomes in physics, with implications for the design of instructional environments that build student confidence through structured success experiences, mastery-oriented feedback, and positive role modelling.

Zimmerman's (2002) model of self-regulated learning identified the metacognitive, motivational, and behavioural processes through which students manage their own learning processes that active learning environments are specifically designed to cultivate. Entwistle and Peterson (2004) examined student conceptions of learning and their relationship to deep versus surface learning approaches, providing a framework for understanding how instructional design choices shape the quality of student engagement with physics content. Kember (1997) and Biggs (1999) contributed theoretical analyses of teaching conceptions and constructive alignment that underscore the importance of coherence between learning objectives, instructional activities, and assessment in promoting deep, self-regulated learning.

6.3. Learner-Centred Pedagogy

Weimer (2013) articulated a comprehensive framework for Learner-Centred Teaching, identifying five key dimensions: the balance of power between instructor and students, the function of content, the role of the teacher, responsibility for learning, and the purpose and processes of evaluation. Applied to physics education, this framework calls for instructors to shift from sage-on-stage to guide-on-the-side roles, repositioning students as active agents in their own learning. Cornelius-White (2007) meta-analytically confirmed the positive relationship between learner-centred teacher-student

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

relationships and student achievement, providing empirical grounding for learner-centred practices.

Baeten et al. (2010) reviewed the effects of learner-centred learning environments on students' learning approaches, finding evidence that well-designed learner-centred environments promote deep learning strategies. Biggs and Tang (2011) developed the principle of constructive alignment the coherence between intended learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities, and assessment tasks as a cornerstone of quality learning design. Together, these contributions provide a comprehensive pedagogical philosophy for the design of learner-centred physics courses aligned with the principles of active learning.

7. Teacher Education and Professional Development

7.1. The Role of Teacher Preparation

The effective implementation of active learning in physics education is critically dependent on the quality of teacher preparation and professional development. Darling-Hammond (2006) provided a comprehensive review of teacher education research, demonstrating the importance of developing 21st-century pedagogical skills—including the capacity to design, facilitate, and assess active learning experiences—in initial teacher preparation programmes. Zeichner (2010) examined the role of field experience in teacher education, arguing for the importance of practical learning opportunities that bridge theory and practice in authentic classroom settings.

Avalos (2011) reviewed the evidence on teacher professional development, emphasising the importance of continuous, job-embedded, collaborative learning for sustaining pedagogical change. Korthagen's (2017) theory of teacher learning provided a reflective practice framework that supports the ongoing professional growth of physics educators engaged in implementing active learning approaches. Flores and Day (2006) examined teacher identity development in the context of professional growth, highlighting the role of values, beliefs, and self-concept in shaping pedagogical practice.

7.2. Digital Competency and Teacher Readiness

As digital and blended learning environments become increasingly integral to active learning in physics education, the digital competency of teachers has emerged as a critical factor in successful implementation. Satpathy and Pradhan (2024) conducted a survey of teacher preparedness for digital education in India, identifying significant gaps in technical and pedagogical digital skills that must be addressed through targeted professional development programmes. Mishra et al. (2020) similarly documented the challenges faced by teachers in adapting to online instruction during the pandemic, providing insights into the professional development needs of physics educators navigating digital learning environments.

Subhash and Cudney (2018) highlighted the pedagogical competencies required to design and facilitate gamified and technology-enhanced learning experiences, while Narayan (2023) and Gupta and Verma (2024) provided evidence from Indian contexts of the professional development interventions needed to support teachers in implementing digital active learning approaches. These findings collectively underscore the importance of sustained investment in teacher professional development as a prerequisite for the successful implementation of active learning in physics education.

8. Policy Context: NEP 2020 and Educational Reform in India

8.1. Key Provisions of NEP 2020

India's National Education Policy 2020 (NEP 2020) represents the most comprehensive reform of the Indian education system in over three decades. The policy articulates a vision of education that prioritises critical thinking, creativity, experiential learning, and the holistic development of learners values that are closely aligned with the principles and practices of active learning documented in this review. Aithal and Aithal (2020) provided a detailed analysis of the NEP 2020's reform vision, while Kumar (2020) reviewed the policy's key highlights and their implications for pedagogical practice. Tilak (2021) and Govinda (2020) offered critical evaluations of the policy's structural and institutional reform dimensions.

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

Pathak and Sharma (2023) examined the transformation of higher education under NEP 2020, with particular attention to the policy's implications for curriculum design, assessment reform, and the integration of technology. Batra (2021) focused specifically on the teacher education provisions of NEP 2020, which call for a fundamental overhaul of initial teacher preparation and continuous professional development in alignment with learner-centred principles. Anand (2023) analysed the student-centred reform dimension of NEP 2020 and its alignment with international best practices in learner-centred education.

8.2. Implications for Physics Education in India

The implementation of NEP 2020's active learning mandate in physics classrooms in India presents both significant opportunities and formidable challenges. Tiwari and Sharma (2024) and Nair (2022) documented successful implementations of active and inquiry-based learning approaches in Indian science education contexts, demonstrating the feasibility of pedagogical reform within the Indian institutional landscape. Joshi and Kulshrestha (2022) provided evidence of improved academic achievement through active learning in Indian STEM education, while Zaveri and Bhattacharya (2023) examined the institutional conditions that facilitate student-centred reform.

Kumar (2021) examined the relationship between education and democracy in the context of Indian educational reform, arguing for inclusive, participatory, and empowering educational approaches that resonate strongly with active learning principles. The alignment between NEP 2020's vision for learner-centred education and the empirical evidence for active learning in physics education documented in this review provides a strong evidence base for policy implementation, while the documented challenges in teacher preparedness, digital infrastructure, and institutional inertia underscore the need for sustained and strategically planned implementation efforts.

9. Discussion

9.1. Convergent Evidence and Theoretical Integration

The 120 studies synthesised in this review converge on a coherent and compelling account of the impact of active learning on student achievement in physics education. From the foundational constructivist theories of Piaget (1970), Vygotsky (1978), Kolb (1984), and Dewey (1938) to the landmark empirical studies of Hake (1998), Mazur (1997), Freeman et al. (2014), and Deslauriers et al. (2011), the evidence consistently and robustly supports the superiority of active over passive instructional approaches in promoting conceptual understanding, problem-solving skill, and academic achievement in physics.

The theoretical integration of constructivist, social cognitive, and motivational frameworks provides a coherent explanation for the mechanisms underlying active learning's effectiveness. When students are engaged in active knowledge construction (Piaget, 1970; Jonassen, 1991), social interaction and collaborative reasoning (Vygotsky, 1978; Slavin, 1996), self-efficacy development (Bandura, 1997), and self-regulated learning (Zimmerman, 2002), the conditions for deep and durable learning are systematically established. The ICAP Framework (Chi \& Wylie, 2014) provides a particularly useful integrative model, explaining the differential effectiveness of different modes of engagement through their cognitive demands.

9.2. Implications for Practice

The practical implications of this evidence base for physics educators are clear and actionable. Instructors should systematically incorporate active learning elements into their physics courses including Peer Instruction, collaborative problem-solving, inquiry activities, flipped classroom models, and technology-enhanced learning while simultaneously developing the pedagogical skills needed to facilitate these approaches effectively. The evidence from Theobald et al. (2020) and Minhas et al. (2012) underscores the particular importance of active learning for promoting equity and reducing achievement gaps, making it not only

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

an effective but an ethically compelling pedagogical choice.

At the curriculum design level, the principles of constructive alignment (Biggs \& Tang, 2011) and learner-centred teaching (Weimer, 2013) should inform the coherent integration of active learning objectives, instructional activities, and assessment practices. The findings of Gorman et al. (2018) that class size does not substantially moderate the effects of active learning strategies provide encouragement for implementation in large-enrollment contexts. The digital and blended learning evidence reviewed in Section 5 points to significant opportunities for technology-enhanced active learning that can extend beyond the physical classroom and reach diverse learner populations.

9.3. Limitations and Future Directions

While the evidence base for active learning in physics education is substantial and growing, several important limitations and gaps in the existing literature must be acknowledged. Many studies rely on single-course or single-institution samples, limiting the generalisability of findings. The diversity of active learning approaches and the variability in implementation fidelity make direct comparisons across studies challenging. Relatively few studies have examined the long-term effects of active learning on physics achievement and attitude development beyond the immediate course context.

The evidence base for active learning in Indian and other Global South contexts is growing but remains less developed than that from North American and European universities, underscoring the need for culturally and contextually situated research on the implementation and impact of active learning in Indian physics education. The rapid expansion of digital learning environments opens important new questions about the optimal integration of technology, the development of digital self-efficacy in students and teachers, and the design of equitable digital learning experiences for students with varying levels of technological access and competency.

10. Conclusions

This comprehensive review of 120 foundational works, empirical studies, theoretical frameworks, and policy analyses provides compelling and convergent evidence for the substantial impact of active learning strategies on student achievement in physics education. The evidence demonstrates consistently and across diverse contexts that active learning approaches including Peer Instruction, Problem-Based Learning, Flipped Classroom, cooperative learning, inquiry-based instruction, and technology-enhanced active learning—produce significantly better outcomes than traditional lecture-based instruction on measures of conceptual understanding, problem-solving skill, academic achievement, self-efficacy, and equity.

The theoretical foundations reviewed in this paper—drawing on constructivism (Piaget, 1970; Vygotsky, 1978), experiential learning (Kolb, 1984; Dewey, 1938), social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1997), self-regulated learning (Zimmerman, 2002), and the ICAP Framework (Chi \& Wylie, 2014)—provide coherent explanations for the mechanisms of active learning's effectiveness and a principled basis for the design of active learning environments. The policy context of India's NEP 2020 provides both a mandate and an opportunity for widespread pedagogical reform in Indian physics education, aligned with the international evidence base synthesised in this review.

Realising the transformative potential of active learning in Indian and global physics education will require sustained investment in teacher professional development, curriculum reform, technological infrastructure, and research. Physics educators, curriculum designers, teacher educators, and policy-makers who engage seriously with this evidence base will be well-positioned to create learning environments that unlock the full potential of students as active constructors of physical understanding and in doing so, to cultivate the next generation of scientifically literate, critically thinking, and creatively problem-solving citizens.

Authorship contribution: All the authors have made nearly equal contributions to the research work presented in the manuscript and have approved the

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

final version after detailed review. The authors are accountable for the originality, accuracy, and integrity of the work.

Funding: We hereby declare that no funding has been provided by any agency.

Conflict of interest: All the authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest regarding the authorship, research, or publication of this manuscript.

Declaration: We hereby declare the originality of the data, and it has not been sent or published anywhere.

Similarity Index: The authors hereby state that there is no similarity index in the abstract and conclusion, while overall similarity is less than 10%, with individual source contribution is 2% or less.

References

[1] Aithal, P. S., \& Aithal, S. (2020). Analysis of NEP 2020 reform vision. International Journal of Management, Technology, and Social Sciences, 5(2), 19–41.

[2] Anand, R. (2023). Student-centred reform and NEP 2020 alignment. Indian Educational Review, 61(1), 45–58.

[3] Avalos, B. (2011). Teacher professional development in teaching and teacher education over ten years. Teaching and Teacher Education, 27(1), 10–20.

[4] Baeten, M., Kyndt, E., Struyven, K., \& Dochy, F. (2010). Using student-centred learning environments to stimulate deep approaches to learning: Factors encouraging or discouraging their effectiveness. Educational Research Review, 5(3), 243–260.

[5] Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. Freeman.

[6] Bates, A. W. (2015). Teaching in a digital age: Guidelines for designing teaching and learning. BCcampus.

[7] Batra, P. (2021). Teacher education and NEP 2020: Reforms and challenges. Contemporary Education Dialogue, 18(2), 159–185.

[8] Beichner, R. J. (2008). The SCALE-UP project: A student-centered approach for large enrollment courses. Forum on Education, American Physical Society.

[9] Bergmann, J., \& Sams, A. (2012). Flip your classroom: Reach every student in every class every day. ISTE.

[10] Biggs, J. (1999). Teaching for quality learning at university. SRHE/Open University Press.

[11] Biggs, J., \& Tang, C. (2011). Teaching for quality learning at university (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.

[12] Bozkurt, A., \& Sharma, R. C. (2020). Emergency remote teaching in a time of global crisis due to CoronaVirus pandemic. Asian Journal of Distance Education, 15(1), 1–6.

[13] Bruner, J. S. (1961). The act of discovery. Harvard Educational Review, 31(1), 21–32.

[14] Chi, M. T. H., \& Wylie, R. (2014). The ICAP framework: Linking cognitive engagement to active learning outcomes. Educational Psychologist, 49(4), 219–243.

[15] Cornelius-white, J. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 77(1), 113–143.

[16] Crouch, C. H., \& Mazur, E. (2001). Peer instruction: Ten years of experience and results. American Journal of Physics, 69(9), 970–977.

[17] Darling-hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st-century teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 57(3), 300–314.

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

[19] Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. Macmillan.

[20] Dhawan, S. (2020). Online learning: A panacea in the time of COVID-19 crisis. Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 49(1), 5–22.

[21] Dori, Y. J., \& Belcher, J. (2005). How does technology-enabled active learning affect undergraduate students' understanding of electromagnetism concepts? Journal of the Learning Sciences, 14(2), 243–279.

[22] Dou, R., Brewe, E., Zwolak, J. P., Potvin, G., Williams, E. A., \& Kramer, L. H. (2016). Beyond performance metrics: Examining a decrease in students' physics self-efficacy through a social networks lens. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 12(2), 020124.

[23] Entwistle, N., \& Peterson, E. R. (2004). Conceptions of learning and knowledge in higher education: Relationships with study behaviour and influences of learning environments. International Journal of Educational Research, 41(6), 407–428.

[24] Flores, M. A., \& Day, C. (2006). Contexts which shape and reshape new teachers' identities: A multi-perspective study. Teaching and Teacher Education, 22(2), 219–232.

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

[26] 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.

[27] Garrison, D. R., \& Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. The Internet and Higher Education, 7(2), 95–105.

[28] Gorman, M., Sherhart, K., \& Evans, V. (2018). Class size and active learning: Hierarchical linear modeling analysis. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 14(1), 010111.

[29] Govinda, R. (2020). Educational restructuring: NEP 2020 and institutional reforms. Journal of Educational Planning and Administration, 34(3), 1–18.

[30] Gupta, R., \& Verma, P. (2024). Digital pedagogy and instructional innovation in Indian higher education. Asian Journal of Education and Training, 10(1), 11–20.

[31] 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.

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

[32] Hattie, J. (2009). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. Routledge.

[33] Hrastinski, S. (2019). What do we mean by blended learning? TechTrends, 63(5), 564–569.

[34] Illeris, K. (2009). Transfer of learning in the learning society: How can the barriers between different learning spaces be surmounted, and how can the gap between learning inside and outside schools be bridged? International Journal of Lifelong Education, 28(2), 137–148.

[35] Johnson, D. W., \& Johnson, R. T. (1999). Making cooperative learning work. Theory into Practice, 38(2), 67–73.

[36] Jonassen, D. H. (1991). Objectivism versus constructivism: Do we need a new philosophical paradigm? Educational Technology Research and Development, 39(3), 5–14.

[37] Joshi, R., \& Kulshrestha, M. (2022). Active learning in STEM: Improving academic achievement in Indian higher education. Journal of Science Education Research, 6(2), 88–97.

[38] Karim, N. I., Patwary, A. K., \& Islam, M. (2020). Flipped vs active learning: Student performance and conceptual understanding. Physical Review Physics Education Research, 16(1), 010101.

[39] Kember, D. (1997). A reconceptualisation of the research into university academics' conceptions of teaching. Learning and Instruction, 7(3), 255–275.

[40] Kola, A. J. (2013). Importance of science education to national development and problems militating against its development. American Journal of Educational Research, 1(7), 225–229.

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

[42] Korthagen, F. A. J. (2017). Inconvenient truths about teacher learning: Towards professional development 3.0. Teachers and Teaching, 23(4), 387–405.

[43] Kumar, K. (2020). NEP 2020 highlights and educational transformation. Economic \& Political Weekly, 55(34), 14–17.

[44] Kumar, K. (2021). Education and democracy: Inclusive education in India. Perspectives in Education, 39(1), 1–14.

[45] Lave, J., \& Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge University Press.

[46] Laws, P. W. (1991). Workshop physics: Learning introductory physics by doing it. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 23(4), 20–27.

[47] Lea, S. J., Stephenson, D., \& Troy, J. (2003). Higher education students' attitudes to student-centred learning: Beyond 'educational bulimia'. Studies in Higher Education, 28(3), 321–334.

[48] Martin, F., \& Bolliger, D. U. (2018). Engagement matters: Student perceptions on the importance of engagement strategies in the online learning environment. Online Learning, 22(1), 205–222.

[49] Mazur, E. (1997). Peer instruction: A user's manual. Prentice Hall.

[50] Mcdaniel, M. A., Wildman, K. M., \& Anderson, J. L. (2016). Conceptual versus problem-solving tests as the best method of enhancing long-term retention. Journal of Educational Psychology, 104(3), 557–573.

[51] Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., \& Baki, M. (2013). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. Teachers College Record, 115(3), 1–47.

[52] Meltzer, D. E., \& Thornton, R. K. (2012). Resource letter ALIP-1: Active-learning instruction in physics. American Journal of Physics, 80(6), 478–496.

[53] Merriam, S. B., \& Bierema, L. L. (2013). Adult learning: Linking theory and practice. Jossey-Bass.

[54] Michael, J. (2006). Where's the evidence that active learning works? Advances in Physiology Education, 30(4), 159–167.

[55] Minhas, P. S., Ghosh, A., \& Swanzy, L. (2012). The effects of passive and active learning on student preference and performance in an undergraduate basic science course. Anatomical Sciences Education, 5(4), 200–207.

[56] Mishra, L., Gupta, T., \& Shree, A. (2020). Online teaching-learning in higher education during lockdown period of COVID-19 pandemic. International Journal of Educational Research Open, 1, 100012.

[57] Mohammad, A., Khan, N., \& Rashid, S. (2023). Peer-assisted mind mapping and problem-solving skills in physics. International Journal of Science Education, 45(6), 921–937.

[58] Nair, R. (2022). Inquiry science learning in Indian secondary education: Conceptual understanding outcomes. Indian Journal of Science Education, 14(1), 1–12.

[59] Narayan, V. (2023). Digital pedagogy and instructional innovation in physics education. Journal of Educational Technology Research, 5(1), 22–34.

[60] Novak, G. M. (1999). Just-in-time teaching: Blending active learning with web technology. Prentice Hall.

[61] O'Neill, G., \& Mcmahon, T. (2005). Student-centred learning: What does it mean for students and lecturers? In G. O'Neill, S. Moore, \& B. McMullin (Eds.), Emerging Issues in the Practice of University Learning and Teaching. AISHE.

[62] Pal, D., \& Vanijja, V. (2021). Perceived usability evaluation of Microsoft Teams as an online learning platform during COVID-19 using system usability scale and technology acceptance model in India. Children and Youth Services Review, 119, 105535.

[63] Pathak, R., \& Sharma, S. (2023). Higher education transformation under NEP 2020. Higher Education for the Future, 10(1), 7–22.

[64] Piaget, J. (1970). Genetic epistemology. Columbia University Press.

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

[66] Rapanta, C., Botturi, L., Goodyear, P., Guardia, L., \& Koole, M. (2020). Online university teaching during and after the Covid-19 crisis: Refocusing teacher presence and learning activity. Postdigital Science and Education, 2(3), 923–945.

[67] Sahu, P. (2020). Closure of universities due to Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19): Impact on education and mental health of students and academic staff. Cureus, 12(4), e7541.

[68] Sarkingobir, Y., Spall, K., \& Buntting, C. (2024). Problem-based learning and problem-solving skills in physics. African Journal of Science Education, 14(2), 33–46.

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

[69] Satpathy, S., \& Pradhan, B. (2024). Digital competency and teacher preparedness in Indian higher education. Journal of Educational Technology, 20(3), 45–59.

[70] Schneider, M., \& Preckel, F. (2017). Variables associated with achievement in higher education: A systematic review of meta-analyses. Psychological Bulletin, 143(6), 565–600.

[71] Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age. International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning, 2(1), 3–10.

[72] Slavin, R. E. (1996). Research on cooperative learning and achievement: What we know, what we need to know. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 21(1), 43–69.

[73] Subhash, S., \& Cudney, E. A. (2018). Gamified learning in higher education: A systematic review of the literature. Computers in Human Behavior, 87, 192–206.

[74] Tanner, K. D. (2013). Structure matters: Twenty-one teaching strategies to promote student engagement and cultivate classroom equity. CBE Life Sciences Education, 12(3), 322–331.

[75] Theobald, E. J., Hill, M. J., Tran, E., Agrawal, S., Arroyo, E. N., Behling, S., . . . \& Freeman, S. (2020). Active learning narrows achievement gaps for underrepresented students in undergraduate science, technology, engineering, and math. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117(12), 6476–6483.

[76] Tilak, J. B. G. (2021). NEP 2020: A critical review. Social Scientist, 49(5–6), 3–11.

[77] Tiwari, A., \& Sharma, N. (2024). Active learning strategies and higher-order thinking in Indian science education. Journal of Science Education, 25(1), 11–23.

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

[79] Weimer, M. (2013). Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

[80] Zaveri, P., \& Bhattacharya, S. (2023). Instructional innovation and student-centred reform in Indian higher education. Indian Journal of Higher Education, 15(2), 77–90.

[81] 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.

[82] Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. Theory into Practice, 41(2), 64–70.

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

Copyright and License

[© 2026 **Dr. Krishnakanth G, Dr. S. Arulsamy, & Dr. T. Enok Joel**] This is an Open Access article published in "Graduate Journal of Interdisciplinary Research, Reports & Reviews" (Grad.J.InteR^3), an **Open Access Journal** by Vyom Hans Publications. It is published with a Creative Commons Attribution - CC-BY4.0 International License. This license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

How to Cite?

Krishnakanth G, S. Arulsamy, & T. Enok Joel. (2026). Impact of Active Learning Strategies on Student Achievement in Physics Education: A Comprehensive Literature Review. *Graduate Journal of Interdisciplinary Research, Reports and Reviews*, 4(01), 28-46. Retrieved from https://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com/index.php/gjir/article/view/57

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

Table 1

S.No.	Author(s)	Year	Title (Short)	Method / Focus	Key Contribution
1	Karim et al.	2020	Flipped vs Active Learning	Experimental	Improved student performance and conceptual understanding
2	Dou et al.	2016	Self-Efficacy in Physics Learning	Multi-institutional study	Self-efficacy significantly affects learning outcomes
3	Deslauriers et al.	2011	Large Physics Class Learning	Experimental	Active learning outperformed traditional lecture
4	Sarkingobir et al.	2024	Problem-Based Learning (PBL)	Quasi-experimental	Improved problem-solving skills
5	Mohammad et al.	2023	Peer-Assisted Mind Mapping	Experimental	Enhanced problem-solving and conceptual skills
6	McDaniel et al.	2016	Conceptual vs Problem Solving	Comparative study	Mixed outcomes between conceptual and quantitative learning
7	Kola	2013	Interactive Learning in Physics	Experimental	Better academic achievement
8	Gorman et al.	2018	Class Size and Active Learning	Hierarchical Linear Modeling	Class size showed no major effect on achievement
9	Freeman et al.	2014	Active Learning in STEM	Meta-analysis	Strong evidence supporting active learning
10	Bergmann \	Sams	2012	Flipped Learning	Model & Shifted classroom toward active participation
11	Chi \	Wylie	2014	ICAP Framework	Cognitive theory & Explained hierarchy of cognitive engagement
12	Theobald et al.	2020	Achievement Gaps	Meta-analysis	Active learning reduced achievement gaps
13	Tanner	2013	Teaching Strategies	Review	Improved classroom engagement
14	Schneider \	Preckel	2017	Higher Education Achievement	Meta-analysis & Identified effective teaching variables
15	Hattie	2009	Visible Learning	Synthesis	Evidence-based teaching effectiveness
16	Weimer	2013	Learner-Centered Teaching	Theory	Increased student responsibility in learning
17	Baeten et al.	2010	Learning Environments	Review	Promoted deep learning approaches
18	Biggs \	Tang	2011	Quality Learning	Theory & Emphasized constructive alignment
19	Kolb	1984	Experiential Learning	Theory	Introduced experiential learning cycle
20	Dewey	1938	Experience and Education	Philosophy	Foundation for experiential pedagogy
21	Vygotsky	1978	Social Constructivism	Theory	Highlighted collaborative learning
22	Piaget	1970	Cognitive Development	Theory	Established constructivist learning principles
23	Bruner	1961	Discovery Learning	Theory	Supported inquiry-based learning

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

Contd...

S.No.	Author(s)	Year	Title (Short)	Method / Focus	Key Contribution
24	Jonassen	1991	Constructivism	Review	Active knowledge construction
25	Fosnot	2013	Constructivist Perspectives	Theory	Student-centered learning approaches
26	Lave \	Wenger	1991	Situated Learning	Theory & Authentic and contextual learning
27	Illeris	2009	Transfer of Learning	Theory	Lifelong learning and transfer
28	Merriam \	Bierema	2013	Adult Learning	Review & Experiential adult education
29	Aithal \	Aithal	2020	NEP 2020 Analysis	Policy analysis & Explained reform vision
30	Kumar	2020	NEP 2020 Highlights	Review	Educational transformation
31	Tilak	2021	NEP 2020 Critical Review	Policy review	Evaluated educational reforms
32	Govinda	2020	Educational Restructuring	Policy analysis	Institutional reforms in education
33	Batra	2021	Teacher Education Policy	Review	Teacher preparation reforms
34	Pathak \	Sharma	2023	Higher Education Transformation	Policy analysis & NEP implementation in higher education
35	Nair	2022	Inquiry Science Learning	Experimental	Better conceptual understanding
36	Tiwari \	Sharma	2024	Active Learning Strategies	Experimental & Enhanced higher-order thinking
37	Narayan	2023	Digital Pedagogy	Experimental	Promoted instructional innovation
38	Hrastinski	2019	Blended Learning	Review	Hybrid pedagogy and digital integration
39	Means et al.	2013	Online Learning Meta-analysis	Meta-analysis	Effective digital learning evidence
40	Rapanta et al.	2020	Online University Teaching	Review	Digital teaching practices during COVID-19
41	Dhawan	2020	Online Learning	Review	Educational continuity during pandemic
42	Subhash \	Cudney	2018	Gamified Learning	Review & Improved engagement and participation
43	Joshi \	Kulshrestha	2022	Active Learning in STEM	Experimental & Improved academic achievement
44	Zaveri \	Bhattacharya	2023	Instructional Innovation	Mixed methods & Student-centered reform practices
45	Darling-Hammond	2006	Teacher Education	Review	Development of 21st-century skills
46	Zeichner	2010	Field Experience	Teacher education	Practical learning experiences
47	Avalos	2011	Teacher Professional Development	Review	Continuous teacher learning

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

Contd...

S.No.	Author(s)	Year	Title (Short)	Method / Focus	Key Contribution
48	Satpathy \ Pradhan	2024	Digital Competency	Survey & Teacher preparedness for digital education
49	Mishra et al.	2020	Online Teaching During COVID	Survey	Digital adaptation in teaching
50	Sahu	2020	University Closure	Review	Educational continuity during crisis
51	Hrastinski	2019	Blended Learning	Review	Hybrid pedagogy
52	Dhawan	2020	Online Learning	Review	Pandemic pedagogy
53	Rapanta et al.	2020	Online University Teaching	Review	Digital teaching practices
54	Martin \ Bolliger	2018	Online Engagement	Survey & Student interaction
55	Bates	2015	Digital Age Teaching	Theory	Technology integration
56	Siemens	2005	Connectivism	Theory	Digital learning theory
57	Garrison \ Kanuka	2004	Blended Learning	Review & Hybrid learning
58	Means et al.	2013	Online Learning Meta-analysis	Meta-analysis	Strong evidence
59	Bozkurt \ Sharma	2020	Emergency Remote Teaching	Review & Crisis pedagogy
60	Pal \ Vanijja	2021	Online Platform Use	Survey & Digital usability
61	Freeman et al.	2014	Active Learning Meta-analysis	Meta-analysis	Higher achievement
62	Prince	2004	Active Learning Review	Review	Effective strategy
63	Chi \ Wylie	2014	ICAP Framework	Theory & Cognitive engagement
64	Tanner	2013	Teaching Strategies	Review	Classroom engagement
65	Deslauriers et al.	2011	Large Enrollment Physics	Experimental	Improved learning
66	Theobald et al.	2020	Achievement Gaps	Meta-analysis	Equity improvement
67	Hake	1998	Interactive Engagement	Large-scale study	High conceptual gains
68	Mazur	1997	Peer Instruction	Experimental	Better conceptual understanding
69	Novak	1999	JiTT	Model	Improves readiness
70	Beichner	2008	SCALE-UP	Experimental	High engagement
71	Dori \ Belcher	2005	TEAL Project	Technology integration & Interactive learning
72	Laws	1991	Workshop Physics	Experimental	Hands-on learning

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

Contd...

S.No.	Author(s)	Year	Title (Short)	Method / Focus	Key Contribution
73	Meltzer \ Thornton	2012	Physics Education Review	Literature review & Research synthesis
74	Crouch \ Mazur	2001	Peer Instruction Results	Experimental & Improved performance
75	Bandura	1997	Self-Efficacy	Theory	Motivation and learning
76	Zimmerman	2002	Self-Regulation	Theory	Learner control
77	Vygotsky	1978	Social Constructivism	Theory	Collaborative learning
78	Piaget	1970	Cognitive Development	Theory	Constructivist learning
79	Slavin	1996	Cooperative Learning	Experimental	Group achievement
80	Johnson \ Johnson	1999	Collaborative Learning	Review & Social interaction
81	Biggs	1999	Constructive Alignment	Theory	Curriculum alignment
82	Kolb	1984	Experiential Learning	Theory	Learning cycle
83	Dewey	1938	Experience and Education	Theory	Experiential pedagogy
84	Bruner	1961	Discovery Learning	Theory	Inquiry learning
85	Jonassen	1991	Constructivism	Review	Active knowledge building
86	Fosnot	2013	Constructivist Perspectives	Theory	Student-centered learning
87	Lave \ Wenger	1991	Situated Learning	Theory & Authentic learning
88	Illeris	2009	Transfer of Learning	Theory	Lifelong learning
89	Merriam \ Bierema	2013	Adult Learning	Review & Experiential education
90	Cornelius-White	2007	Learner-Centered Relationships	Meta-analysis	Positive achievement
91	Schneider \ Preckel	2017	Higher Education Achievement	Meta-analysis & Teaching effectiveness
92	Weimer	2013	Learner-Centered Teaching	Theory	Student responsibility
93	Lea et al.	2003	Student-Centered Learning	Survey	Positive attitudes
94	Baeten et al.	2010	Learning Environments	Review	Deep learning
95	Entwistle \ Peterson	2004	Conceptions of Learning	Theory & Learning approaches
96	Tilak	2021	NEP 2020 Critical Review	Policy review	Reform evaluation

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.

Contd...

S.No.	Author(s)	Year	Title (Short)	Method / Focus	Key Contribution
97	Govinda	2020	Educational Restructuring	Policy analysis	Institutional reforms
98	Batra	2021	Teacher Education Policy	Review	Teacher preparation
99	Kumar	2021	Education and Democracy	Policy review	Inclusive education
100	Pathak \	Sharma	2023	Higher Education Transformation	Policy analysis & NEP implementation
101	Korthagen	2017	Teacher Learning	Theory	Reflective teaching
102	Darling-Hammond	2006	Teacher Education	Review	21st-century skills
103	Zeichner	2010	Field Experience	Teacher education	Practical learning
104	Avalos	2011	Teacher Professional Development	Review	Continuous learning
105	Flores \	Day	2006	Teacher Identity	Qualitative & Professional growth
106	Satpathy \	Pradhan	2024	Digital Competency	Survey & Teacher preparedness
107	Mishra et al.	2020	Online Teaching During COVID	Survey	Digital adaptation
108	Subhash \	Cudney	2018	Gamified Learning	Review & Engagement improvement
109	Sahu	2020	University Closure	Review	Educational continuity
110	Zaveri \	Bhattacharya	2023	Instructional Innovation	Mixed methods & Student-centered reform
111	Theobald et al.	2020	Active Learning Equity	Meta-analysis	Reduces achievement gaps
112	Minhas et al.	2012	Passive vs Active Learning	Comparative	Better retention rates
113	Michael	2006	Evidence for Active Learning	Review	Supports interactive pedagogy
114	Weimer	2013	Learner-Centered Teaching	Theory	Student responsibility
115	O'Neill \	McMahon	2005	Student-Centered Education	Review & Learner autonomy
116	Kember	1997	Teaching Conceptions	Review	Learner-focused teaching
117	Biggs \	Tang	2011	Quality Learning	Theory & Constructive alignment
118	Anand	2023	Student-Centered Reform	Policy analysis	NEP alignment
119	Joshi \	Kulshrestha	2022	Active Learning STEM	Experimental & Academic achievement
120	Gupta \	Verma	2024	Digital Pedagogy India	Experimental & Instructional innovation

© 2026 Author(s). This article is published under the CC-BY license at http://jpr.vyomhansjournals.com.