



# **Intersecta Minds Journal**

## **Social Science and Management Science**

ISSN: 3056-929X (Online)

**Pacific Institute of Management Science**

222/2 M.1 Phaholyothin Rd., Bantam, Mueang Phayao 56000

Phone +66(0)54 887-188, [www.ipacific.ac.th](http://www.ipacific.ac.th)

## **The Impact of Education on Pedagogical Theory and Practice**

### **Author & Corresponding Author\***

1. Jantima Shangphare

### **Affiliation:**

1. Mahamakut Buddhist University, Thailand.

1. \*Email: [jantima.seang@mbu.ac.th](mailto:jantima.seang@mbu.ac.th)

### **Article history:**

Received: 25/05/2025, Revised: 16/06/2025,  
Accepted: 13/8/2025, Available online: 01/09/2025

### **How to Cite:**

Shangphare. J. (2025). The Impact of Education on Pedagogical Theory and Practice.  
*Intersecta Minds Journal*, 4(2), 67-79.



INTERSECTA MINDS JOURNAL  
SOCIAL SCIENCE AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE

<https://so13.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/IMJ/index> | ISSN: 3050-929X (Online)

PACIFIC INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCE

222/2 M.1 Phaholyothin Rd., Bantam, Muang Phayao 56000 Phone +66(0)54 887-188, [www.ipacific.ac.th](http://www.ipacific.ac.th)



---

Academic Review Articles

---

## The Impact of Education on Pedagogical Theory and Practice

Jantima Shangphare\*

---

### Abstract

Education plays a central role in shaping pedagogical theory and practice by mediating philosophical values, structural arrangements, and conceptual understandings of learning. This theoretical narrative review examines how education influences pedagogy at both structural and conceptual levels, emphasizing the interdependence between educational purposes and pedagogical transformation. Drawing on key perspectives from educational philosophy, curriculum theory, learning sciences, and sociocultural theory, the article synthesizes foundational ideas from idealism, pragmatism, constructivism, and critical theory, alongside structural factors such as curriculum frameworks, assessment regimes, institutional organization, and professional standards. The analysis further explores conceptual shifts in learning theories, highlighting the movement from transmission-oriented models toward constructivist, socio-cultural, and lifelong learning perspectives. Rather than focusing on empirical outcomes, the article adopts a conceptual and integrative approach to illuminate how pedagogy is shaped by evolving educational goals in response to globalization, technological change, and calls for equity and sustainability. The review contributes to contemporary educational discourse by clarifying the theoretical foundations of pedagogy and offering a coherent framework for understanding pedagogical change in complex educational contexts.

**Keywords:** Education, Pedagogy, Learning Theory, Educational Philosophy, Instructional practice

### Introduction

Education is widely recognized as a fundamental mechanism for individual development and societal transformation, serving not only to transmit knowledge but also to shape values, identities, and social structures (Dewey, 1938; UNESCO, 2015). Within this broad educational landscape, pedagogy—understood as both the theory and practice of teaching and learning—functions as a critical mediating force between educational ideals and classroom realities.

Pedagogical approaches are therefore not neutral or static; rather, they are deeply embedded within educational systems and reflect prevailing philosophical assumptions, sociocultural conditions, and ideological orientations (Alexander, 2008; Biesta, 2015).

The impact of education on pedagogy operates at both structural and conceptual levels. Structurally, education influences curriculum design, assessment systems, institutional organization, and professional roles within learning environments. Conceptually, it shapes how knowledge is defined, how learning is understood, and how teachers and learners relate to one another in the educational process (Bernstein, 2000; Illeris, 2018). As educational goals shift in response to globalization, technological advancement, and calls for equity and sustainability, pedagogical paradigms are continually reconfigured to address new demands and expectations (Fullan, 2016; OECD, 2019).

Against this backdrop, a purely outcome-oriented or empirical focus is insufficient to capture the depth and complexity of pedagogical transformation. A theoretical and narrative approach is therefore necessary to explore how educational purposes, philosophical foundations, and social contexts interact to shape pedagogical thought and practice. This article seeks to contribute to such understanding by synthesizing key perspectives from educational philosophy, psychology, and sociology, offering a conceptual analysis of the evolving relationship between education and pedagogy in contemporary contexts.

### **Objectives of the Article**

In order to achieve the aims outlined above, this theoretical narrative article is guided by the following objectives. To study the conceptual relationship between education and pedagogy by analyzing how educational purposes, values, and ideologies influence pedagogical theories and practices

### **Philosophical Foundations of Education and Their Pedagogical Implications**

Educational philosophy provides the foundational lens through which pedagogy is conceptualized, justified, and enacted. It shapes fundamental assumptions about the purposes of education, the nature of knowledge, the process of learning, and the roles of teachers and learners within educational systems. Pedagogy, therefore, cannot be understood as a neutral or purely technical practice; rather, it is deeply rooted in philosophical traditions that reflect broader social, cultural, and ideological orientations (Alexander, 2008; Biesta, 2015). An examination of key educational philosophies—such as idealism, pragmatism, constructivism, and critical theory—reveals how philosophical commitments continue to influence pedagogical theory and practice.

Idealist philosophy views education as a means of cultivating the intellect and moral character through engagement with enduring truths and canonical knowledge. From this

perspective, knowledge is seen as objective and hierarchical, and learning involves the transmission of established ideas from teacher to learner. Pedagogically, idealism has historically supported teacher-centered approaches, structured curricula, and emphasis on intellectual discipline (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2018). While often criticized for its rigidity, idealist pedagogy continues to influence contemporary education through standardized curricula and content-driven instructional models, particularly in systems that prioritize academic achievement and examination performance.

In contrast, pragmatism, most notably articulated by John Dewey, reconceptualizes education as an experiential and dynamic process grounded in learners' interactions with their environments. Dewey (1938) rejected the separation of theory and practice, arguing that knowledge emerges through reflective experience and problem-solving. From a pragmatic standpoint, education aims to prepare individuals for democratic participation and adaptive living, rather than mere content mastery. Pedagogically, this philosophy supports inquiry-based learning, project-based instruction, and reflective practice, positioning learners as active participants in the construction of meaning. The enduring influence of pragmatism is evident in contemporary pedagogical approaches that emphasize learner engagement, collaboration, and real-world application.

Constructivist philosophy further extends the pragmatic emphasis on active learning by asserting that knowledge is constructed through cognitive and social processes rather than transmitted intact from teacher to student. Influenced by theorists such as Piaget and Vygotsky, constructivism emphasizes learners' prior knowledge, social interaction, and contextual meaning-making (Illeris, 2018). Pedagogically, constructivist education promotes student-centered learning environments, formative assessment, and dialogical teaching methods. Teachers are reconceptualized as facilitators or guides who design learning experiences that support exploration and reflection. This philosophical shift has significantly impacted modern pedagogy, particularly in higher education and professional learning contexts, where critical thinking and lifelong learning are prioritized.

Critical theory introduces a more explicitly political and ethical dimension to educational philosophy. Rooted in the work of Freire (1970) and later critical pedagogues, this tradition views education as a site of power relations and ideological reproduction. Knowledge is not considered neutral but socially constructed and shaped by historical, economic, and political forces. The purpose of education, from a critical perspective, is emancipation—enabling learners to question dominant narratives and transform unjust social conditions. Pedagogically, critical theory supports dialogical learning, critical reflection, and participatory practices that challenge hierarchical teacher–student relationships. Such pedagogy seeks not only cognitive development but also the cultivation of critical consciousness and social responsibility.

These philosophical traditions illustrate that pedagogy is inherently value-laden and responsive to broader educational beliefs. As Alexander (2008) argues, pedagogical choices reflect underlying assumptions about authority, knowledge, and learning, as well as cultural

norms and societal priorities. For example, educational systems that emphasize economic competitiveness and accountability may favor pedagogies aligned with efficiency, measurement, and standardization. Conversely, systems committed to democratic citizenship, equity, and sustainability are more likely to adopt pedagogies that emphasize dialogue, inclusion, and holistic development.

In contemporary educational contexts, philosophical pluralism increasingly characterizes pedagogical theory and practice. Rather than adhering to a single philosophical tradition, modern pedagogy often integrates elements from multiple perspectives to address complex educational challenges. Biesta (2015) notes that education today must balance competing purposes, including qualification, socialization, and subjectification. This complexity requires pedagogical frameworks that are flexible, reflective, and ethically grounded. As educational goals evolve in response to globalization, technological change, and social transformation, pedagogical theory likewise adapts, incorporating insights from diverse philosophical traditions.

Moreover, international policy discourse has reinforced the philosophical reorientation of education toward humanistic and holistic values. UNESCO (2015) emphasizes education as a global common good, advocating pedagogical approaches that foster ethical responsibility, intercultural understanding, and sustainable development. Such perspectives challenge narrow instrumental views of education and reaffirm the importance of philosophical foundations in shaping pedagogical innovation.

In sum, philosophical foundations play a decisive role in shaping pedagogical theory and practice by defining the aims of education, the nature of knowledge, and the dynamics of teaching and learning. Idealism, pragmatism, constructivism, and critical theory each offer distinct yet overlapping insights into how education should be organized and enacted. Understanding these philosophical underpinnings enables educators and scholars to critically examine pedagogical choices and align instructional practices with broader educational values. As educational systems continue to confront rapid social and technological change, sustained engagement with educational philosophy remains essential for developing pedagogies that are meaningful, equitable, and responsive to contemporary needs.

### **Structural Influences of Education on Pedagogical Practice**

At the structural level, education exerts a powerful influence on pedagogical practice through formal systems and institutional arrangements that regulate teaching and learning. Curriculum frameworks, assessment regimes, governance structures, and professional standards collectively shape how pedagogy is conceptualized and enacted in educational settings. These structures do not merely support pedagogical practice; they actively define the boundaries within which teaching and learning occur. As Bernstein (2000) argues, educational systems regulate pedagogical discourse by determining what knowledge is considered legitimate, how it is



organized and sequenced, and how learning is evaluated. Consequently, pedagogy is deeply embedded within structural conditions that both constrain and enable instructional practice.

Curriculum frameworks represent one of the most significant structural influences on pedagogy. National and institutional curricula specify learning objectives, content standards, and progression pathways, thereby shaping instructional priorities and classroom interactions. When curricula are highly centralized and prescriptive, pedagogy often becomes content-driven and teacher-centered, emphasizing coverage and compliance over inquiry and creativity (Ornstein & Hunkins, 2018). Teachers working within such frameworks may have limited flexibility to adapt instruction to learners' needs, resulting in pedagogical practices focused on transmission rather than engagement. In contrast, curriculum models that emphasize competencies, interdisciplinary learning, and local adaptation tend to support pedagogical approaches that are more learner-centered and context-responsive.

Assessment systems further reinforce structural influences on pedagogy by shaping what is valued and rewarded in education. High-stakes assessments, particularly those linked to accountability and performance metrics, exert strong pressure on teachers to align pedagogy with test requirements. This phenomenon, often referred to as "teaching to the test," encourages instructional practices that prioritize efficiency, measurability, and standardized outcomes (Au, 2011). Under such conditions, pedagogical innovation may be constrained, as teachers focus on ensuring that students meet externally defined benchmarks rather than fostering deeper understanding or critical thinking.

Conversely, assessment reforms that emphasize formative assessment, feedback, and authentic evaluation can enable more dialogical and reflective pedagogical practices. Black and Wiliam (2009) argue that formative assessment supports learning by providing ongoing feedback that informs both teaching and learning processes. Educational systems that institutionalize formative assessment practices tend to promote pedagogies characterized by interaction, self-regulation, and learner agency. Thus, assessment structures play a pivotal role in shaping pedagogical orientation and classroom dynamics.

Institutional organization and governance also significantly influence pedagogical practice. School structures, scheduling systems, class sizes, and resource allocation affect how teachers plan and implement instruction. For example, rigid timetables and large class sizes may limit opportunities for collaborative learning and individualized instruction, reinforcing more traditional pedagogical approaches. In contrast, flexible scheduling, team teaching, and supportive leadership can create conditions conducive to pedagogical innovation and professional collaboration (Fullan, 2016). Institutional cultures that value experimentation and reflective practice are more likely to foster pedagogies aligned with contemporary educational goals.

Professional expectations and standards for teachers constitute another critical structural dimension shaping pedagogy. Teacher education programs, certification requirements, and professional development policies influence teachers' pedagogical knowledge, beliefs, and

practices. When professional standards emphasize accountability, compliance, and technical competence, pedagogy may be framed primarily as the efficient delivery of curriculum. However, when standards highlight reflective practice, ethical responsibility, and learner-centeredness, teachers are encouraged to adopt more adaptive and responsive pedagogical approaches (Darling-Hammond, 2017). The professional positioning of teachers within educational systems thus has direct implications for pedagogical autonomy and innovation.

Educational policy reforms further illustrate the dynamic relationship between structure and pedagogy. Policies promoting competency-based education, inclusive education, and digital learning environments have reshaped pedagogical expectations in many contexts. The OECD (2019) emphasizes the need for pedagogies that develop creativity, critical thinking, and lifelong learning skills in response to the demands of knowledge-based economies. Such policy directions require structural adjustments in curriculum design, assessment practices, and teacher professional development to support new pedagogical paradigms. Without corresponding structural support, however, pedagogical reform often remains superficial or fragmented.

Importantly, structural influences on pedagogy are not deterministic. Teachers exercise agency within structural constraints, interpreting and enacting policies in ways that reflect their professional judgment and contextual realities. Bernstein's (2000) concept of recontextualization highlights how pedagogical practice emerges through the interaction between official educational discourse and classroom-level interpretation. This perspective underscores the complexity of pedagogical change, which depends not only on structural design but also on the capacity of educators to navigate and transform existing conditions.

In contemporary educational discourse, there is growing recognition of the need to align structural conditions with pedagogical goals that emphasize equity, inclusion, and sustainability. UNESCO (2015) advocates for educational structures that support holistic learning and democratic participation, challenging narrow accountability-driven models. Such alignment requires systemic coherence, ensuring that curriculum, assessment, institutional organization, and professional standards collectively support meaningful pedagogical practice.

In conclusion, structural influences of education play a central role in shaping pedagogical practice by defining the institutional, policy, and organizational contexts of teaching and learning. Curriculum frameworks, assessment regimes, institutional arrangements, and professional expectations interact to regulate pedagogical possibilities and constraints. Understanding these structural dimensions is essential for developing pedagogical theories and practices that are responsive to contemporary educational challenges. As educational systems continue to evolve, sustained attention to structural alignment remains critical for enabling pedagogies that foster deep learning, learner agency, and social transformation.

## **Conceptual Shifts in Learning Theories and Pedagogical Thought**

Education influences pedagogy not only through structural arrangements but also at a conceptual level by shaping dominant theories of learning and knowledge. Over time, educational discourse has undergone significant conceptual shifts, moving from transmission-oriented models toward perspectives that emphasize learning as an active, contextualized, and socially mediated process. These shifts reflect broader changes in how education conceptualizes the learner, the nature of knowledge, and the purpose of teaching. As a result, pedagogical thought has evolved in ways that fundamentally reshape instructional practices and teacher–learner relationships.

Traditional learning theories, particularly those grounded in behaviorism and early cognitive psychology, conceptualized learning as the acquisition of discrete units of knowledge or skills. From this perspective, learning was viewed as a relatively passive process, with the teacher responsible for transmitting information and reinforcing correct responses. Pedagogically, this conceptualization supported teacher-centered instruction, linear curricula, and standardized assessment practices (Illeris, 2018). While such models contributed to systematic instructional design, they were increasingly criticized for neglecting learners’ agency, context, and meaning-making processes.

The emergence of constructivist learning theory marked a major conceptual shift in educational thought. Constructivism posits that learners actively construct knowledge by integrating new experiences with prior understanding. Influenced by the work of Piaget and later expanded through social constructivist perspectives, this theory emphasizes cognitive development, inquiry, and reflective thinking (Fosnot, 2013). Within this framework, knowledge is not transmitted intact but co-constructed through engagement with ideas, materials, and problems. Pedagogically, constructivism supports learner-centered approaches such as problem-based learning, project-based instruction, and experiential learning, all of which prioritize understanding over memorization.

Socio-cultural theories of learning further extend constructivist ideas by emphasizing the social and cultural dimensions of learning. Drawing on Vygotsky’s concept of mediated learning and the zone of proximal development, socio-cultural theory views learning as inherently relational and situated within cultural practices and social interaction (Lave & Wenger, 1991). From this perspective, knowledge emerges through participation in communities of practice rather than solely through individual cognition. Pedagogical implications include collaborative learning, dialogical teaching, and the use of scaffolding to support learners’ development. Teachers are reconceptualized as facilitators who guide participation and support learners’ movement toward greater competence.

These conceptual developments have significantly influenced pedagogical thought by challenging traditional hierarchies between teachers and learners. As educational theory increasingly recognizes learners as active agents, pedagogical models shift toward shared



authority, dialogue, and co-construction of meaning. Biesta (2015) argues that education must move beyond a narrow focus on knowledge acquisition to include subjectification, enabling learners to become responsible and autonomous subjects. This shift underscores the ethical and relational dimensions of pedagogy, emphasizing the formation of learners' identities alongside cognitive development

Contemporary learning theories also highlight the affective and social dimensions of learning, contributing to more holistic pedagogical approaches. Illeris (2018) emphasizes that learning involves cognitive, emotional, and social processes, all of which must be considered in pedagogical design. As a result, pedagogy increasingly incorporates reflective practice, emotional engagement, and supportive learning environments that attend to learners' well-being. This conceptual broadening challenges reductionist views of learning and supports pedagogical approaches that foster deeper and more sustainable learning outcomes.

Another significant conceptual shift in learning theory involves the recognition of learning as a lifelong and adaptive process. In knowledge-based and rapidly changing societies, education is no longer confined to formal schooling but extends across the lifespan and multiple contexts. The OECD (2019) emphasizes the importance of developing competencies such as critical thinking, creativity, and self-regulation. These priorities require pedagogical models that promote metacognition, autonomy, and adaptability. Consequently, teachers are increasingly viewed as designers of learning environments that support continuous learning rather than transmitters of fixed knowledge. Digital technologies have further accelerated conceptual shifts in learning theories and pedagogical thought. Networked learning theories emphasize connectivity, access to information, and participatory knowledge construction in digital environments (Siemens, 2005). These perspectives challenge traditional notions of authority and expertise, as learners engage with diverse sources of knowledge beyond the classroom. Pedagogically, this shift supports blended learning, collaborative online environments, and learner-driven inquiry, reinforcing the view of learning as distributed and socially situated. Importantly, these conceptual shifts do not imply the complete abandonment of earlier learning theories. Rather, contemporary pedagogical thought is characterized by theoretical integration and pluralism. Educators draw on multiple learning theories to address diverse learners, contexts, and purposes. As Bernstein (2000) suggests, pedagogical practice emerges through the selective recontextualization of theoretical knowledge within specific educational settings. Understanding conceptual shifts in learning theories therefore enables educators to critically examine pedagogical assumptions and align practice with evolving educational goals. In conclusion, conceptual shifts in learning theories have profoundly reshaped pedagogical thought by redefining learning as an active, social, and holistic process. The movement from transmission models toward constructivist, socio-cultural, and lifelong learning perspectives has repositioned learners as active meaning-makers and teachers as facilitators of learning environments. These developments underscore the reciprocal relationship between educational

theory and pedagogical practice, highlighting the importance of ongoing theoretical reflection in addressing contemporary educational challenges.

## **Conclusion**

This theoretical narrative review has explored the impact of education on pedagogical theory and practice through an integrated analysis of philosophical foundations, structural influences, and conceptual shifts in learning theories. The discussion has demonstrated that pedagogy is not an isolated instructional technique but a socially, philosophically, and institutionally situated practice that reflects broader educational purposes and values. Educational philosophy provides the normative and ethical grounding for pedagogy, structural arrangements regulate pedagogical possibilities, and evolving learning theories reshape how teaching and learning are understood and enacted.

The analysis highlights that pedagogical change is a complex and multidimensional process that cannot be adequately explained through outcome-based or purely empirical approaches alone. Instead, pedagogical transformation emerges from the dynamic interaction between educational goals, institutional structures, and conceptual understandings of learning. As education systems respond to globalization, technological innovation, and increasing demands for equity, inclusion, and sustainability, pedagogy must continuously adapt while remaining grounded in coherent theoretical and philosophical foundations. Ultimately, understanding the reciprocal relationship between education and pedagogy is essential for developing meaningful, reflective, and context-responsive teaching practices. By clarifying the theoretical underpinnings of pedagogy, this review contributes to contemporary educational discourse and provides a conceptual framework for examining pedagogical change in complex and evolving educational contexts.

## **Body of Knowledge**

The body of knowledge emerging from this review underscores that pedagogy is best understood as a dynamic and relational construct shaped by educational philosophy, institutional structures, and evolving learning theories. Education functions as the overarching system within which pedagogical practices are conceptualized, legitimized, and enacted. At the philosophical level, educational traditions such as idealism, pragmatism, constructivism, and critical theory provide normative orientations that define the aims of education and guide pedagogical decision-making (Alexander, 2008; Biesta, 2015). These philosophical commitments shape assumptions about knowledge, authority, and the learner's role, thereby influencing instructional design and classroom interaction.

Structurally, educational systems translate philosophical values into formal mechanisms, including curriculum frameworks, assessment policies, and professional standards. Bernstein's (2000) theory of pedagogic discourse highlights how educational structures regulate what

knowledge is taught, how it is organized, and how learning is evaluated. These regulatory mechanisms exert a powerful influence on pedagogical practice, often privileging certain forms of knowledge and modes of teaching over others. For instance, standardized curricula and high-stakes assessments tend to reinforce transmissive pedagogies, whereas competency-based and formative approaches support learner-centered and dialogical practices (Black & Wiliam, 2009; Fullan, 2016).

Conceptually, shifts in learning theories have further reshaped pedagogical thought by redefining learning as an active, social, and lifelong process. Constructivist and socio-cultural perspectives emphasize meaning-making, interaction, and contextualized learning, challenging traditional teacher-centered models (Illeris, 2018; Lave & Wenger, 1991). These theoretical developments reposition teachers as facilitators and designers of learning environments and learners as active participants in knowledge construction. The integration of digital technologies and networked learning theories has further expanded pedagogical possibilities, reinforcing the view of learning as distributed across social and technological systems (Siemens, 2005).

Taken together, these philosophical, structural, and conceptual dimensions form an integrated body of knowledge that explains how pedagogy evolves in response to changing educational purposes. Pedagogical transformation is therefore not the result of isolated instructional innovations but emerges from the interaction between educational values, institutional conditions, and theoretical understandings of learning.

## **Suggestions**

Drawing on the conceptual insights of this review, several suggestions are proposed to support pedagogical development at policy, institutional, and scholarly levels.

### **Suggestions for Implementation**

First, educational policymakers and curriculum designers should ensure greater alignment between educational values and pedagogical practices. Curriculum frameworks should explicitly reflect philosophical commitments such as democratic participation, learner agency, equity, and holistic development, thereby supporting pedagogical approaches that move beyond narrow content transmission.

Second, assessment systems should be reoriented to support meaningful learning rather than solely accountability-driven outcomes. Expanding the use of formative, authentic, and reflective assessment practices can create structural conditions that enable learner-centered, dialogical, and inquiry-based pedagogies.

Third, teacher education and professional development programs should place stronger emphasis on educational philosophy, learning theory, and reflective practice. Strengthening

teachers' theoretical understanding can enhance their capacity to interpret curriculum flexibly, exercise professional judgment, and adapt pedagogy to diverse learners and contexts.

### **Suggestions for Future Research**

Future research could extend this theoretical analysis by examining how philosophical, structural, and conceptual dimensions of education interact within specific educational contexts, such as higher education, vocational education, or teacher education programs. Comparative studies across national or cultural contexts may also provide valuable insights into how different educational systems shape pedagogical practice.

Additionally, empirical research informed by this conceptual framework could investigate how educators negotiate structural constraints while enacting learner-centered or critical pedagogies in practice. Longitudinal studies exploring the relationship between educational reform, pedagogical change, and professional identity development would further enrich understanding of pedagogical transformation over time.

Finally, future studies could explore the implications of digitalization, artificial intelligence, and sustainability education for pedagogical theory, particularly in relation to ethical responsibility, learner autonomy, and lifelong learning.

### **Declaration of Interests**

The author declares that there are no financial, personal, or professional interests that could have influenced the content, interpretation, or presentation of this article.

### **Ethical Considerations**

This article is based on a theoretical narrative review of existing literature and does not involve human participants, animals, or primary data collection. As such, formal ethical approval was not required. Nevertheless, ethical academic practices were observed throughout the study, including accurate citation of sources, critical engagement with existing scholarship, and respect for intellectual integrity.

### **Acknowledgments**

The author would like to acknowledge Mahamakut Buddhist University, Thailand, for providing academic support and an intellectual environment conducive to scholarly reflection. Appreciation is also extended to colleagues and peer reviewers whose insights and feedback contributed to the refinement of this article.

### Definition of Conflicts of Interest

A conflict of interest refers to any situation in which an author's personal, professional, or financial relationships could inappropriately influence, or be perceived to influence, the objectivity, integrity, or interpretation of scholarly work. In this study, no such conflicts of interest were identified.

### References

- Alexander, R. (2008). *Education for all, the quality imperative and the problem of pedagogy*. Institute of Education, University of London.
- Au, W. (2011). Teaching under the new Taylorism: High-stakes testing and the standardization of the 21st century curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 43(1), 25–45. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2010.521261>
- Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique* (Rev. ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Biesta, G. (2015). Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy. *Routledge*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315635815>
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 5–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11092-008-9068-5>
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2017). *Teaching for equity and deeper learning*. Teachers College Press.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. Macmillan.
- Fosnot, C. T. (2013). *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice* (2nd ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
- Fullan, M. (2016). *The new meaning of educational change* (5th ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Illeris, K. (2018). *Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists... in their own words* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.
- OECD. (2019). *Future of education and skills 2030: OECD learning compass 2030*. OECD Publishing.
- Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2018). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles, and issues* (7th ed.). Pearson.
- Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A learning theory for the digital age. *International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning*, 2(1), 3–10.
- UNESCO. (2015). *Rethinking education: Towards a global common good?* UNESCO.