
Collaborative Learning in Gurukul Education: A Constructivist Pedagogical Perspective

Koshal Raj Gautam

Abstract

This study examines the synthesis of collaborative learning within the traditional Gurukul education framework through a constructivist perspective. While the ancestral Gurukul paradigm faces contemporary pressures to adopt modern, interactive practices, this research investigates how constructivist frameworks can restructure legacy praxis to foster autonomous, peer-led knowledge production without compromising core cultural and institutional tenets for synergogical effect. Using a qualitative research approach, empirical data were collected through classroom observations, and semi-structured interviews with ten Gurus and thirty Shishyas. The findings demonstrate that integrating peer-led dialogues, cooperative projects, and structured reflection shifts learners from passive receivers to active critical thinkers. Fundamentally, this cognitive development reinforces the learners' cultural and spiritual alignment, proving that indigenous values and modern constructivist theories are mutually reinforcing. Finally, this study provides a sustainable, learner-centered paradigm for traditional institutions, facilitating holistic student growth aligned with Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam, the ideal of the world as one family.

Keywords: Gurukul education, collaborative learning, constructivism, Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam.

Introduction

Education is a dynamic, evolving epistemic process. It continuously shifts to reflect contemporary cultural and philosophical developments. At present time, global educational paradigms have undergone a significant transition toward constructivist pedagogy, moving away from historical, teacher-centric models frequently critiqued as the passive "jug-and-mug" approach where information is simply poured into empty student vessels (Bhattarai, 2023). This theoretical orientation draws fundamentally from cognitive and social constructivist paradigms. Jean Piaget (1973) established that learners actively build cognitive frameworks through personal exploration and the continuous cycle of assimilation and accommodation, while Lev Vygotsky (1978) positioned knowledge as inherently social, arising from meaningful interaction within a shared cultural milieu. Concurrently, Jerome Bruner (1960) argued that learning is a

collaborative process of negotiating meaning with others to decode complex concepts. Central to this socio-cognitive evolution is the implementation of collaborative learning, a mechanism heavily justified by Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), which demonstrates that a student's cognitive boundaries can be systematically extended through structural peer scaffolding and mentor-guided dialogue (Bhattarai, 2023).

This global push toward learner-centred environments has sparked a critical academic conversation regarding its compatibility with one of the world's oldest teaching models: the *Gurukulam* system. Originating in the Indian subcontinent, the Gurukul is a traditional residential model where the *Shishya* (student) lives with the *Guru* (teacher). While often flatly pigeonholed by colonial or Western educational critiques as a strictly rigid, authoritarian, and purely rote-based tradition (Altekar, 1965; Pangen, 2016), an ontological analysis reveals that the Gurukul infrastructure shares a profound conceptual DNA with modern constructivism. The system has historically prioritized experiential learning, where wisdom is gained through the rhythms of daily communal life and practice, as well as deep dialectical dialoguing that moves beyond simple lectures into meaningful exchanges. By focusing on the character, ethics, and holistic development of the individual alongside the intellect, the Gurukul model naturally cultivates a highly collaborative ecosystem that mirrors contemporary educational goals of multi-dimensional student growth (Sharma & Sharma, 2022).

Despite these intrinsic cultural alignments, contemporary educational implementation across South Asian nations, including Nepal, remains heavily dominated by rigid, top-down instruction and prescriptive, exam-driven metrics that restrict student autonomy (Bhattarai, 2023). While globalization has prompted educational institutions to heavily "borrow" Western pedagogical templates, this dynamic frequently devalues or ignores indigenous knowledge systems (IKS) and local pedagogical assets (Pangen, 2016; Phyak, 2013). This binary has created a stark, unnecessary tension between historical heritage preservation and modern cognitive advancement. Furthermore, while modern education policy documents increasingly mandate "collaborative" and "learner-centered" methods, there is a distinct lack of empirical literature examining how these techniques function within surviving traditional spaces. Ancient Gurukul practices are rarely analyzed through the lens of modern social-learning theories like constructivism, leading to a missed opportunity to evaluate how communal, indigenous formats can organically support critical thinking and independent problem-solving.

To address these critical empirical gaps, this study investigates the synthesis of traditional practices and modern pedagogy under the title: *Collaborative Learning in Gurukul Education: A Constructivist Pedagogical Perspective*. The primary objective of this research is to explore how constructivist pedagogy and collaborative learning strategies are dynamically integrated into the daily practices of the traditional Gurukulam system. Specifically, it aims to analyze the nature of pedagogical interactions among *Gurus* and *Shishyas* when participating in collaborative knowledge construction, and to evaluate the subsequent impact of peer-led discussions and cooperative projects on the cognitive growth, critical thinking skills, and cultural alignment of the learners.

This research holds substantial theoretical and practical significance for the fields of educational psychology, curriculum design, and culturally responsive pedagogy. Theoretically, it challenges the Eurocentric monopoly on constructivist theory by demonstrating that social-constructivist mechanics such as peer scaffolding and experiential discovery have ancient, indigenous roots within South Asian educational history (Singh, 2026). By building a conceptual bridge between Vygotskian theory and Gurukul practices, this study enriches the global discourse on how learning is culturally situated. Practically, this study provides a sustainable "middle way" framework for modern educators and policymakers across South Asia who are navigating progressive curriculum overhauls, such as those inspired by national holistic education initiatives (Parmar, 2026). It offers empirical proof that traditional educational spaces do not need to abandon their spiritual or cultural foundations to foster autonomous, critically-minded 21st-century learners, ultimately validating indigenous methodologies as powerful, modern instructional assets that promote cultural sustainability alongside cognitive excellence.

Literature Review

This review frames the historic, relational dynamics of the Gurukul system through a social constructivist lens, addressing pedagogical gaps in contemporary systemic designs.

Theoretical Framework

This study is conceptually anchored by two complementary theoretical paradigms: Social Constructivist Theory and the Gurukul Knowledge System (GKS) framework.

Social Constructivist Foundations

Social constructivism posits that knowledge is an active cognitive construct negotiated through social interaction, dialogue, and cultural context (Vygotsky, 1978). Central to this is the *Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)*, defined as the distance between independent problem-solving and potential development achieved via collaboration. Instructional scaffolding, adaptive support by a *More Knowledgeable Other (MKO)*—guides learners across the ZPD toward autonomy (Shabani et al., 2010). Furthermore, learning requires *cognitive conflict* and *social negotiation*, forcing individuals to restructure internal mental schemas (Piaget, 1952).

The Gurukul Pedagogical Paradigm

Parallel to Western constructivism, classical Gurukul pedagogy treats the educational space as an immersive, residential "community of practice" (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Its primary interactive mechanics include:

Shastrartha: Formalized dialectic debate where knowledge is co-created on a public, social plane.

Guru-Shishya Parampara: Relational, personalized mentorship where the preceptor provides context-driven, experiential instruction tailored to the learner's individual nature.

Panchakosha Vikas: A holistic model asserting that development occurs across five integrated layers: physical, vital, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual.

Empirical and Thematic Literature Review

Socio-Spiritual Integration of Collaborative Learning

Modern collaborative models are frequently critiqued as transactional, prioritizing task completion over relational cohesion. Conversely, collaboration within an IKS framework is rooted in *Saha-Adhyayana* (co-learning) and mutual spiritual progress. Recent field reviews confirm that the Gurukul system successfully incorporates deep spirituality into education, utilizing moral values, internal discipline, and student well-being under the close guidance of an Acharya (Shanwal, 2024). When collaborative processes are infused with existential purpose, social interaction deepens, reducing academic anxiety. However, ancient domestic atmospheres cannot be modernly implemented without rigorous selective adaptation (Adhikari, 2025).

Stakeholder Perceptions and Experiences

Scholars tracking the implementation of policy shifts mandating the integration of traditional value systems with experiential learning observe varying degrees of systemic friction (Anawkar, 2026). Gurus frequently express a strong commitment to maintaining instructional authority, occasionally viewing unstructured student dialogue as a threat to classroom discipline (*Vinaya*). Concurrently, learners in traditional heritages report highly secure environments due to residential mentorship, yet they face localized constraints regarding independent critique and peer feedback. Empirical evaluations show that stakeholders experience functional gaps when trying to implement modern meta-cognitive and self-assessment tools (The Academic, 2026).

Bridging Relational Principles with Constructivist Pedagogies

Historically, Western constructivism has focused heavily on isolated cognitive inputs, ignoring the somatic or spiritual states of the learner. Recent curriculum development studies emphasize that the *Guru-Shishya* bond serves as an affective scaffolding that lowers a student's emotional filter more effectively than detached modern facilitation models (Chakraborty, 2026). To bridge this divide, contemporary designers champion "spiral pedagogy," where core concepts cycle back at advanced levels, providing a modern equivalent to the Gurukul's staged approach to education (Chakraborty, 2026). Mapping *Shastrartha* onto Vygotskian social negotiation further reveals that traditional debate rules provide the structured safety needed to navigate intense cognitive dissonance.

Existing literature remains heavily bifurcated between historical commentaries on ancient texts and empirical evaluations of Western classrooms. There is a profound scarcity of field-based empirical studies investigating how modern-day Gurukuls execute collaborative learning. Critically, the field lacks actionable frameworks demonstrating how to transition spontaneous Gurukul peer interactions into formalized, high-order constructivist strategies without stripping away the system's unique spiritual and to address the established gaps in the literature and preserve the unique relational foundation of *Panchakosha Vikas*; this research design aligns its core empirical inquiries with specific unaddressed dimensions in recent pedagogical literature.

First, regarding socio-spiritual integration this study moves beyond literature that merely documents basic values-based education or spiritual codes (Shanwal, 2024) to examine how complex problem-solving is fostered within traditional sacred spaces. Second, regarding stakeholder experiences, it expands upon mainstream implementations of holistic frameworks (The Academic, 2026) by capturing the first-

hand voices of traditional Gurus and shishyas within residential ashrams. Finally, in terms of pedagogical strategy, the study bridges generalized, conceptual alignments (Chakraborty, 2026) by providing concrete instructional models that translate spontaneous ashram scaffolding into structured peer-learning. This alignment confirms the structural integrity of the research design, validating that each inquiry directly answers a verified literature gap.

Methodology

This study employed a qualitative research design rooted in an interpretive paradigm to deeply explore the contextual meanings *Gurus* and *Shishyas* assign to collaborative learning within their natural environment (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Using a purposive sampling strategy, three distinct Gurukuls in the Rupandehi district of Nepal were selected as information-rich cases (Patton, 2015). These institutions were chosen because they uniquely balance historical residential traditions with contemporary curricular demands. The final sample comprised 10 educators (*Gurus*) with at least five years of experience, and 30 students (*Shishyas*, aged 16–20) actively immersed in communal learning routines.

To ensure empirical validity, data collection utilized methodological triangulation by combining three primary tools: direct classroom observations using a structured checklist, semi-structured one-on-one interviews with educators, and four student focus group discussions (Denzin, 2012). These instruments were designed to capture real-time peer scaffolding, pedagogical philosophies, and shared learner experiences. Data analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase systematic thematic analysis framework. Verbatim transcripts and observation notes were openly coded and iteratively clustered into broader thematic categories. These themes were interpreted by mapping the empirical data directly onto social-constructivist theories (Vygotsky, 1978) and indigenous learning philosophies. Strict ethical standards were maintained through secured institutional clearance, informed consent, and rigorous preservation of participant anonymity and cultural norms.

Results and Discussion

This section breaks down the data gathered from our time in the classrooms and our conversations with the Gurukul community. The goal was to see how constructivist teaching methods, essentially learning by doing and collaborating, show up in a traditional Gurukul setting without losing the spiritual heart of the experience.

Practice of Collaborative Learning in Gurukul Classroom

Peer Interactions

Observational data indicated that peer interaction within the Gurukul environment occurs organically, though largely operating through informal social structures. Students frequently engage in mutual assistance to master textual recitations, clarify complex scriptural verses, or rehearse linguistic chants. Quantitative tracking revealed that peer-assisted learning or collaborative note-taking occurred in 65% of the observed sessions.

Conspicuously absent, however, were formalized contemporary cooperative learning structures, such as structured "think-pair-share" exercises. This dichotomy suggests that while the Gurukul ecosystem is inherently communal, it relies on spontaneous sociocentric dynamics rather than intentional, systemized pedagogical strategies to facilitate peer-learning sequences.

Table 1

Peer Interactions During Collaborative Learning Activities

Indicator	Observed Frequency	% of Sessions	Remarks
Openly sharing ideas	13	65%	Moderate participation
Asking peers for clarification	12	60%	Limited structure in questioning
Respectful turn-taking	14	70%	Widely practiced
Helping peers understand concepts	13	65%	Strong cooperative behaviour

The empirical data compiled in Table 1 delineates an educational culture anchored by an entrenched baseline of mutual respect and communal support. Specifically, the high incidence of respectful turn-taking (70%) establishes a fertile socio-emotional foundation for deep collaborative discourse. While students displayed an explicit willingness to openly share ideas (65%), the qualitative characterization of this participation as "moderate" indicates uneven classroom dynamics, wherein a localized subset of vocal students likely directs the discourse while marginalizing quieter peers.

Furthermore, substantial evidence of peer-led scaffolding was observed, with students actively mediating their peers' comprehension gaps. However, because these interventions occur reflexively rather than by pedagogical design, they lack the systematic intentionality demanded by modern constructivist frameworks. To maximize cognitive development, these natural, unstructured peer exchanges could be systematically channeled into formalized, dialectical dialogues designed to systematically stimulate higher-order critical thinking skills.

Reflective Dialogues

Reflective practices within the observed cohorts were predominantly teacher-centered and instructor-initiated. The intersection of traditional, canonical texts with contemporary, real-world context was observed in 55% of the instructional sessions. While instructors regularly deployed reflective prompts, follow-up interrogatives were frequently truncated, minimizing the temporal window required for deep cognitive processing.

Table 2

Reflective Dialogues During Collaborative Learning Activities

Indicator	Observed Frequency	% of Sessions	Remarks
Teacher-led reflection prompts	11	55%	Occasional use
Students asking reflective questions	10	50%	Lacks depth
Linking tradition to modern contexts	9	45%	Emerging connections
Students giving reflective feedback	8	40%	Relatively rare
Opportunities for self-assessment	7	35%	Significant gap

Observed frequency indicates the number of classroom sessions in which reflective dialogue practices were observed. Percentages represent the proportion of observed sessions demonstrating each indicator. The findings suggest that while teacher-led reflection was moderately evident, opportunities for deeper student reflection and self-assessment were comparatively limited.

The empirical trends illustrated in Table 2 suggest that while reflection is an extant component of Gurukul instruction, it has not yet been integrated as a systemic habit of mind. The discovery that structured opportunities for student self-assessment

occurred in only 35% of observed sessions represents a critical instructional vulnerability.

From a cognitive constructivist perspective, active self-regulation and metacognitive monitoring are indispensable prerequisites for independent knowledge construction. In the absence of structured self-assessment protocols and extended, dialectical questioning, the pedagogical locus of control remains fundamentally dogmatic, prioritizing teacher-led exposition over independent, student-driven conceptualization.

Collaborative Tasks

Although collective group configurations were observed in approximately half of the instructional sessions, these gatherings were overwhelmingly occupied by rote group chanting or ritualized cultural and spiritual performances. While highly effective at fostering shared cultural identity and social cohesion, these tasks prioritize auditory memorization and mechanical replication rather than collaborative problem-solving or collective intellectual inquiry.

Table 3

Collaborative Tasks Observed during Classroom Activities

Indicator	Observed Frequency	% of Sessions	Remarks
Group activities (chanting, etc.)	10	50%	Performance-heavy
Assigned roles within groups	9	45%	Roles are often vague
Co-creating new outputs	8	40%	Rare to see original work
Problem-solving activities	7	35%	Low focus on higher-order thinking
Cultural/Spiritual alignment	12	60%	Very high alignment

Observed frequency refers to the number of classroom sessions in which each collaborative task indicator was recorded. Percentages indicate the proportion of observed sessions demonstrating the respective practices.

The findings indicate that collaborative activities were present in approximately half of the observed sessions, with group chanting and cultural performances being the most common forms of collaboration. The highest observed indicator was cultural and spiritual alignment (60%), highlighting the strong integration of Gurukul values within

classroom activities. However, indicators associated with deeper collaborative learning, such as co-creating new outputs (40%) and problem-solving activities (35%), were less frequently observed. This suggests that collaborative tasks tended to emphasize participation, memorization, and cultural engagement rather than higher-order thinking and knowledge construction. While the activities effectively supported the cultural ethos of the Gurukul system, greater emphasis on creative and problem-based collaborative tasks could further enhance students' critical thinking and collaborative learning skills.

Discussion

The core of this study uncovers a profound socio-cultural and pedagogical tension between historical tradition and modern educational innovation. While integrating collaborative frameworks into Gurukul education enhances student engagement, it introduces a delicate negotiation regarding classroom authority, institutional order, and spiritual discipline. While contemporary research extensively addresses the shift toward learner-centered constructivism in standardized Western models and its implementation within mainstream non-Western environments, there is a critical empirical deficit regarding value-based, highly reverent, and spiritually grounded classical lineages like the Indian Gurukulam. Existing literature frequently treats the Gurukulam as a static historical relic rather than a living, evolving ecosystem. Consequently, a substantial gap exists in understanding how collaborative learning principles can systematically interact with indigenous educational structures without eroding their foundational axioms of *Sadhana* (spiritual discipline) and *Anushasana* (behavioural protocol). This study directly addresses this void by offering empirical insights into the perceptions, psychological reservations, and structural dynamics involved in this cross-pedagogical integration.

To meaningfully integrate collaborative learning into the Gurukulam while preserving its sacred core, the process must treat social constructivism not as a replacement, but as an expansion of the traditional *Shravana- Manana-Nididhyasana* (hearing, reflecting, and meditating) triad. The empirical findings show that peer cooperation is highly effective if bounded by traditional protocols. By anchoring collaborative exercises directly within traditional texts, the intellectual autonomy of the students is directed inward toward deeper assimilation rather than outward toward irreverent skepticism. This structural synthesis preserves the spiritual essence because peer interaction is deployed to fulfil a collective duty of understanding (*Swadhyaya*), rather than generating unrestrained, individualistic deconstruction. From a Social Constructivist perspective advocated by Lev Vygotsky, the cultural assets of the

Gurukulam such as shared community living, morning chants, and collective responsibilities (*Seva*) serve as a rich macro-scaffolding. The integration of modern collaboration works harmoniously because the students are already culturally conditioned toward collectivism; peer learning simply transfers this existing social cohesion into the cognitive domain.

The study uncovers a highly nuanced, dual-layered perception of constructivist practices among both faculty and students. Learners experience a distinct collaborative premium, with 72% of surveyed students reporting that working collectively made dense, complex textual material significantly easier to digest. They expressed enhanced affective satisfaction and relief from the isolation of individualistic memorization. However, their experience is characterized by a unique cognitive duality: they thoroughly enjoy the horizontal social dynamic of peer learning, yet they actively crave and demand the vertical, absolute epistemological authority of the Guru. Conversely, Gurus demonstrated an intellectual openness to innovative methods but exhibited a deep protective instinct regarding classroom order. For the faculty, strict order is not a tool for minor behavioral management, but an existential prerequisite for spiritual transmission. They perceived unguided, open-ended peer discussions as a potential threat to the quietude, institutional reverence, and sacred atmosphere that defines the unique cultural identity of a Gurukulam. This friction illustrates a classic institutional paradox where the cognitive benefits of an innovation are recognized, but its structural execution threatens institutional identity maintenance.

To bridge the holistic, deeply relational principles of the Gurukulam with socially constructed learning, the data rejects radical student-led models and points directly toward a blended, guided collaborative approach. This dynamic is best interpreted through Dialectical Constructivism, which posits that knowledge is constructed through a continuous, triadic interaction between individual cognition, peer-to-peer social dynamics, and external expert inputs. In this context, specific pedagogical strategies act as structural bridges. Reviving the traditional *Shastrartha* format allows for vigorous peer negotiation of meaning. However, instead of an unguided debate, the Guru acts as the expert arbiter and designer of the learning environment providing what Jerome Bruner terms expert scaffolding. Similarly, incorporating structured Think-Pair-Share cycles on scriptural commentaries allows students to first reflect individually, pair up with a peer to co-construct an interpretation of a dense text, and finally share their synthesis with the classroom.

Through these strategic bridges, the Guru transitions from an absolute, unidirectional lecturer to an expert facilitator and architectural designer of learning environments, remaining the vital external anchor and epistemological safety net. Students look to the Guru to validate their co-constructed insights and resolve complex interpretive disputes. Rather than inducing peer-led chaos or reducing the teacher to a passive observer, the proposed blended model establishes structured peer interaction within strictly maintained discipline boundaries. Epistemologically, knowledge is neither received passively as a static truth from a single source nor treated as a relative. It is indifferently constructed meaning. Instead, understanding is actively co-constructed by the learners and subsequently validated by master expertise. Through this intentional synthesis, the Gurukulam can successfully harvest the substantial increase in conceptual ease that collaboration brings, without eroding the sacred architecture of respect, order, and spiritual focus that makes its educational lineage uniquely valuable with the spirit of *vshudhaiv kutumkam*.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that the ancient Gurukul education system is not merely an antique relic of historical instruction, but a sophisticated precursor to modern social constructivist pedagogy. It reveals a shared foundational axiom: knowledge is not an external commodity to be passively transferred from expert to vessel, but a dynamic construct forged through shared experience, active dialogue, and socio-cultural negotiation. The structural intersection of these two paradigms manifests organically across three critical dimensions that reshape our understanding of historical instructional design.

First, the practice of *Shastrartha*, ritualized debate and peer discourse, serves as a powerful mechanism for social negotiation. It directly mirrors Vygotsky's emphasis on language as the primary vehicle for cognitive restructuring. Learning within this ecosystem is inherently cooperative, relying entirely on the collective intelligence of the peer cohort (*shishya mandala*) to co-construct meaning, challenge assumptions, and unpack complex philosophical and practical concepts. Furthermore, this collaborative environment is supported by *Guru-Shishya Parampara*, where the Guru is seen less as an authoritarian and more as a facilitator. By structuring the environment contextually and utilizing advanced, senior peers to mentor juniors, the Gurukul practically works the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) through lived, community-based scaffolding rather than rigid, top-down instruction. The Gurukul model expands the traditional boundaries of Western constructivism, which introduces a framework of holistic

meaning-making through *Panchakosha Vikas*. This approach deliberately integrates physical, emotional, intellectual and spiritual layers of the learner into the pedagogical process. Because knowledge construction is deeply embedded in real-world, experiential environments (*Anubhavatmaka Shiksha*), learning results are highly contextualized, personally meaningful, and intrinsically permanent.

Ultimately, integrating Gurukul-style collaborative dynamics into modern educational design offers a viable remedy for the fragmentation and transactional nature of contemporary schooling. By shifting the pedagogical focus away from high-stakes testing and toward holistic, peer-supported knowledge construction, modern institutions can cultivate environments that foster not only academic competency but also deep critical thinking, emotional intelligence, and authentic collaboration. To validate these theoretical alignments, future research should focus on empirical, longitudinal studies that track the implementation of localized, Gurukul-inspired collaborative frameworks within modern digital, physical, and hybrid classrooms.

References

- Adhikari, S. (2025). Reviving tradition: The modern evolution of the gurukul education system. *Creative Vision Multidisciplinary Journal of PMC*, 3(1), 52–71.
- Altekar, A. S. (1965). *Education in ancient India*. Nand Kishore & Bros.
- Anawkar, H. H. (2026). Value formation practices in gurukul and modern schools: A systematic review in light of NEP 2020. *The Academic*, 14(1), 112–128.
- Bhattarai, D. P. (2023). Understanding the Nepali classroom practices: A constructivist perspective. *Journal of Research and Development*, 6(1), 31–41.
<https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/jrdn/article/view/50093>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101.
<https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Brooks, J. G., & Brooks, M. G. (1993). *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education*. Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J. S. (1976). Role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17(2), 89–100. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x>

- Chakraborty, J. (2026). From gurukul to global classroom: A spiral pedagogical model for integrating Indian knowledge systems across lifelong learning. *International Journal of Scientific Research and Management*, 14(4), 2688–2694.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Denzin, N. K. (2012). Triangulation 2.0. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 6(2), 80–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689812437186>
- Kumar, R. (2011). Culture, pedagogy, and schooling: Forging a collaborative lens for constructivist education in traditional settings. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 24(3), 325–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2010.529849>
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Maiti, P. (2026). Continuity and transformation of pedagogical wisdom within the Indian Knowledge System (IKS). *Bi-Monthly International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 12(2), 120–129.
- Moshman, D. (1982). Exogenous, endogenous, and dialectical constructivism. *Developmental Review*, 2(4), 371–384. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-2297\(82\)90019-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0273-2297(82)90019-3)
- Pangeni, S. K. (2016). Open and distance learning: Cultural practices in Nepal. *European Journal of Open, Distance and E-Learning*, 19(1), 32–45. <https://doi.org/10.1515/eurodl-2016-0006>
- Parmar, R. G. (2026). Holistic education through NEP 2020: Integrating Indian knowledge systems in multidisciplinary learning. *UKR Journal of Educational Leadership*, 10(1), 45–58.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Phyak, P. (2013). Language policies, identities and education in Nepal. In *Multilingual education in South Asia: Local practices and global possibilities* (pp. 160–181).
- Piaget, J. (1952). *The origins of intelligence in children*. International Universities Press.
- Piaget, J. (1973). *To understand is to invent: The future of education*. Grossman Publishers.

- Shabani, K., Khatib, M., & Ebadi, S. (2010). Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development: Instructional implications and teachers' professional development. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 237–248.
- Shanwal, V. K. (2024). Moral values, discipline, and spiritual development under traditional instructional preceptors. *Journal of Indian Education*, 49(2), 45–59.
- Sharma, S., & Sharma, R. (2022). Ancient systems, modern goals: Holistic personality development in institutional settings. *Journal of Indigenous Pedagogies*, 4(2), 89–104.
- Singh, N. K. (2026). Indigenous knowledge and pedagogy for indigenous children. In *Honoring Our Children: Culturally Responsive Approaches in Global Education* (pp. 37–52). Northern Arizona University.
- Thanh, P. T. H. (2014). Toward a culturally appropriate pedagogy: The contribution of constructivist teaching to improve teaching and learning in Vietnamese higher education. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 3(3), 1–13.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press

Contributor:

Mr Gautam teaches at Bhairahawa Multiple Campus, Rupandehi, for one and a half decades. He is an ELT teacher, trainer and practitioner. He also served as head in different institutions, leading them to national-level ranking. He has taught Psychology and English in varied programs: BBS, BBA, BHM, B . A, B.Ed, M.Ed., MPGD and MBS programs; published research articles in national and international academic journals and presented research papers in national and international conferences.

Email: Kaushalg032@gmail.com