P-ISSN 2708-6453	Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review	Oct-Dec 2022, Vol. 6, No. 4
O-ISSN 2708-6461	http://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2022(6-IV)54	[593-604]

Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review
www.plhr.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

Teacher and Student Centered Learning: A Philosophical Investigation

Dayyab Gillani

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

***Corresponding Author** dayyabgillani.polsc@pu.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

This article seeks to principally investigate the philosophical roots of teacher and student centered modes of learning. This mode of investigation allows us to better understand and acknowledge the intellectual movements and paradigm shifts through the ages that necessitated one or the other learning methodology at any given time. By demonstrating that the teacher centered style of learning fundamentally serves the premodern and modern intellectual movements, the article effectively makes a case for student centered style of learning as it better corresponds to and caters to the demands and dictates of post-modernism- the dominant intellectual movement of the modern times. The article is especially critical of the relentless pursuit objectivity, as typically advanced by the modern and premodern traditions. Instead, it argues that the scientific discoveries in recent times have brazenly exposed our otherwise complex and multifaceted reality and in order to account for these new realizations, it is increasingly becoming necessary to reevaluate our objectivity-obsessed learning practices.

Key Words: Teacher centered Learning, Student Centered Learning, Premodern, Modern, Post-Modern, Philosophy

Introduction

The time-honoured human endeavor to seek knowledge about the world we inhibit has over the years generated numerous paradigms and intellectual movements. These movements have subsequently produced various methodologies and frameworks that allow us to pursue learning in a systemized and structured manner. While there are understandably a number of offshoots and tangents, the two most standout modes of pursuing knowledge are teacher and student centered modes of learning.

The theoretical underpinnings of both the teacher and student centered modes of learning are crucial to understanding the respective advantage the two methodologies offer. Moreover, such an analysis is also necessary to determine the relevance of a certain mode of learning at any given point of time. An in-depth philosophical inquiry into the matter will allow us to appreciate not only the logical basis for teacher and student centered styles of learning but also the intellectual movements they dutifully serve.

As this article demonstrates, teacher and student centered style of learning respectively cater to different intellectual and academic movements. The choice for either should therefore not be a matter of preference or convenience but instead must be an upshot of the dictates of the dominant intellectual movement of the time. Failure

to cater to the demands of the prevailing intellectual movements will lead to flawed methodologies and yield inexact outcomes.

It is the central contention of this paper that the longstanding teacher centered approach largely fails to account for the recent post-modern turn and is essentially only applicable to the pre-modern and modern intellectual movements. In contrast, the student-centered approach not only meets all the demands of the post-modern paradigm shift but also adequately satisfies the appetite of any other intellectual movements.

This article now examines in detail the philosophical and theoretical roots of teacher and student-centered approaches that will not only allow us to appreciate and acknowledge the rationale behind these two learning methodologies but also the intellectual movements (pre-modern, modern and post-modern) they respectively serve.

Theoretical Underpinnings of Teacher and Student Centered Modes of Learning

The teacher-centric approach, which since antiquity has enjoyed widespread primacy, suffers some serious shortcomings that are now becoming increasingly evident. To begin with, it is effectively rooted in the pre-modern and modern mode of instruction that largely fails to cater to the demands of the post-modern movement. The pre-modern and modern movements, in their own ways, were both incredibly rigid and uncompromising. Where the pre-modern tradition relied solely on customs, religion, and traditions as the primary source of all knowledge, the modernist intellectual movement did not permit any deviation from empiricism and sensory experience (Korab-Karpowicz, 2019). Such an uncompromising standpoint nurtured and even necessitated an intransigent mode of teacher-centered learning.

In the pre-modern and modern setup, it was essentially the responsibility of the teacher to mold the minds of the students according to the dictates and demands of the established practice and premise of the discipline. Deviation from the norm, especially if it challenged or undermined the ontological basis and intellectual premise of the discipline, were not only strongly disregarded but also effectively discouraged. The predetermined laws and stipulations of various academic disciplines often required complete surrender of independent will and thought. The teacher-centric approach that placed the instructor at the helm of learning and called for near unconditional obedience from the students, readily facilitated these rigid pre-modern and modern conventions.

With the advent of the post-modern movement in the later half of the 20th century, questions were raised over established teaching practices and norms that catered primarily to the relics of a bygone age. The teacher-centric approach in particular was scrutinized and its inherent bias was brazenly exposed (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1998).

The post-modern paradigm shift was in effect a reaction to the rigidity and obduracy of the preceding modern and pre-modern movements (Barker, 1996). It sought to expose the myopic standpoint of the established traditions through advancing the logic of relativity and reflexivity. On the one hand, the notion of relativity challenged the rigid and uncompromising premise of the pre-modern and modern traditions by suggesting that reality is neither absolute nor necessarily objective. Academic pursuit of knowledge therefore needs to account for subjective interpretations and multiple

realities. On the other hand, the logic of reflexivity questioned the unqualified and unequivocal obedience to established norms and modes of seeking knowledge. It was highly skeptical of treating individuals, both researchers and their subjects, as objects bound by some universal laws and dogmas. Instead, reflexivity argued that knowledge and learning demand that we give due accordance to individual biases and inherent inferences (Subramani, 2019).

This novel and groundbreaking premise of the post-modern school of thought allowed it to challenge the long-established teaching and learning practices, especially in the social sciences. Foremost among the scrutinized was the longstanding teacher-centric approach. Deeming the practice retrograde, post-modernism instead advanced the idea of student-centered learning. Such an approach arguably granted substantial advantages that were categorically absent in the traditional teacher-centric mode of learning (Misdi et al., 2013). Moreover, the student centric approach highly complemented the increasing demands of the post-modern paradigm shift, especially the aforementioned provisions of relativity and reflexivity.

Although post-modernism is a fairly open-ended intellectual movement that has no clear or well-defined parameters, it is however not completely devoid of theory. Enshrined in the tradition of constructivism, post-modernism now has sound and well-established theoretical foundations. Drawing its intellectual inspiration from interpretivism, constructivism challenged the positivist and empiricist postulation of the modernist tradition. Deeming reality relative and questioning the relentless pursuit of objectivity, constructivism advanced the logic of deconstructing and reconstructing social realities. Such construction, deconstruction and subsequent reconstruction is believed to provide a better understanding of the intrinsic subjective realities of our social world (Korab-Karpowicz, 2019).

Now the traditional teacher-centric approach, as discussed already, caters primarily to the dictates and demands of the pre-modern and modern world. The approach typically involves a teacher or an instructor who delivers a fairly lengthy lecture to silent but supposedly attentive students. The students may raise questions if there is any confusion, but as a rule they neither challenge the content of the lecture nor the credibility of its knowledge claims. This is because in the teacher-centered approach, the instructor can somewhat be regarded as a source or a medium by means of which absolute truth about reality is communicated to the next generation. With the imparted knowledge believed to be largely absolute, any counter claims are understandably frowned upon.

With knowledge about the world believed to be completely independent of our subjective inferences, neither the teacher nor the students are seen as thinking individuals that can question the supposedly objective foundation of knowledge claims. This is not to say that students and teachers in the teacher-centered mode of learning cannot raise questions or challenge the existing knowledge in anyway. While questions can indeed be raised and existing knowledge can also sometimes be challenged, there are however set parameters and predetermined yardsticks that strictly limit and monitor the range and scope of these questions and challenges. These rules and restrictions are clearly outlined in the pre-modern and modernist intellectual traditions. Where the pre-modern belief system does not permit any intrusion that undermines the commands of some religion, convention, or norm, the modernist tradition categorically disregards any intellectual pursuit that is not rooted in objectivity and empiricism.

In retrospect, it is certainly not surprising that students taught in such a manner go on to develop myopic and parochial viewpoints about the world and are overly resistant to contrary beliefs and opinions. They become strict adherents of objectivity and advance the logic of either modern or pre-modern belief systems throughout their lives. In other words, the traditional mode of teacher-centered education renders them largely incapable of critical and reflexive thinking as they vehemently discount and disregard any subjective interpretations and inferences.

This inevitably takes us to the question of objectivity and its relentless and somewhat unqualified pursuit. In our perennial quest to gain knowledge about the world, obtaining objective truths by means of objective methods, has long been the predominant assertion. It is imperative therefore to examine in detail the cost and veracity of this longstanding obsession before we draw any conclusions in favor of the subjectivity-favoring student centered mode of learning.

Pursuit of Knowledge: Obsession with Objectivity VS the Need for Subjectivity

The intrinsic inability to cater to subjective realities and inherent biases of both researchers and their subjects is essentially the most standout failure of the pre-modern and modern intellectual movements. While that maybe so, both pre-modern and modern traditions would alternately argue that any knowledge claims about the world that does not take its cue from religion and conventions or is not rooted in objectivity and empiricism respectively, is not real knowledge to begin with. After all, both traditions are fairly rigid in their respective understanding of the world we live in and how we acquire knowledge about it. Since they neither permit any deviation nor allow any transgression, the pre-modern and modern schools will not view their inherent inability to account for subjective realities and biases as a handicap. Instead, they would view it as strength in their respective pursuit of objective truth about the world.

This line of reasoning, given the premise of both intellectual traditions, is fairly logical. Indeed if contrary claims about knowledge are entirely baseless or fictitious then there is no point pursuing a futile enterprise. Accounting for subjective truths and realities in a world that is allegedly objective and largely independent of our individual biases and inferences would certainly be inefficacious and counterproductive.

While that maybe so, it is increasingly becoming evident that we do not necessarily live in a simple world that strictly obeys some universal laws or principles. The pursuit of a single objective truth in an incredibly uncertain and unpredictable world is fairly myopic and parochial (See e.g. Panhwar et al., 2017). This is not to say that there is no objective truth or reality to this world. There may well be some universal objective truth, however owing to where we intellectually stand at the moment, that is just as uncertain as are the subjective claims about the world.

Obsession with objectivity is neither neoteric nor a novelty. In fact, fixation with objectivity or some universal truth or reality is perhaps just as old as the pursuit of knowledge itself. This perennial objectivity complex is in part due to the human nature that inherently prefers simplicity and straightforwardness (Feldman, 2003). Clearly, the universe becomes far less enigmatic and mysterious when it is believed to constitute a single objective reality. In comparison, if the universe has no single reality and is open to multiple interpretations, it inadvertently transforms into an undecipherable paradox that could forever evade our attempts to understand it. Even if we were to somehow make sense of such a relativist universe, the subjective realities thereof would appear

somewhat illogical and inconsequential. The human mind by default therefore discredits subjective truths and multiple realities, since the implications could potentially lead to panic and even existential anxiety. We are thus intrinsically hardwired to pursue objectivity somewhat unconditionally.

With the subjective knowledge about the world generally disregarded on account of our inherent inability to easily rationalize and cognize such a reality (Feldman, 2016), the longstanding obsession with the pursuit of objectivity is certainly not surprising. This in part explains why we hopelessly and somewhat irrationally cling on to beliefs and methodologies that promise a single objective truth or reality. It is also primarily the reason why the modern movement was never able to completely displace the pre-modern thinking, since it too came with its own set of objective claims about the world.

Thus even though the modern movement successfully challenged many of the central assertions of the pre-modern thinking and took over as the dominant intellectual movement, it could neither replace it nor prove it wrong al together. The two traditions exist simultaneously with each generally disregarding and denouncing the other. This essentially is the problem with all objectivity seeking one-dimensional approaches; they are far too rigid and uncompromising. There is absolutely no room for concessions or trespassing as all claims and speculations about the world must first fulfill the strict criterion laid out in the respective traditions. Generation and pursuit of knowledge therefore is largely subordinate to the unyielding methodologies of objectivity seeking modern and pre-modern movements.

In addition to our inherent propensity to generally disregard subjective realities, it is important to also acknowledge the state of orthodoxy acquired by the pre-modern and modern movements, which helps explain their persistence and resilience. The pre-modern tradition, in particular, has a long and well-established pedigree that transcends both time and space. It was arguably the first intellectual movement that allowed us to make sense of the world and is perhaps as old as consciousness itself. To displace such a tradition, which is probably as old as the human civilization, is clearly no plain sailing. Similarly (though to a much lesser extent) the modern movement has its roots in the 15th century renaissance and the subsequent age of enlightenment and scientific revolution (Southgate, 2002). With over half a millennia dedicated to the scientific cause coupled with the large number of sacrifices rendered (owing to the strong backlash of the pre-modern tradition), the modern intellectual movement has in many ways become the bedrock of modern human civilization. It has, over the last few centuries, acquired a substantial degree of orthodoxy that cannot be easily dispelled. Owing to this orthodoxy attained by the modern and pre-modern movements, any new intellectual movement that purportedly challenges them will be viewed with disdain and skepticism.

Our inherent propensity to disregard subjective realities and the longstanding orthodoxy associated with the pre-modern and modern movements only partly explain their appeal and allure. Moreover, these two tendencies fail to explain why and how the modern movement was able replace the pre-modern movement as the most dominant intellectual movement of the time. In order to fully understand the overwhelming dominance of the objectivity seeking intellectual traditions, we have to duly acknowledge the success and accomplishments of the modern movement in particular.

As opposed to the preceding pre-modern tradition, the modern movement at the behest of the positivist school of thought and the scientific method had indeed yielded

remarkable outcomes. The great industrial revolution and the technological leaps in the fields of medicine, communication and agriculture can all in one way or another be attributed to the scientific revolution. This remarkable success was not just limited to the natural world since tremendous strides had also been made in matters of governance, emancipation, and general societal reforms. Substituting the divine right to rule logic (a fundamental pre-modern assertion) with popular representation and democracy is a case in point.

The tremendous success of the scientific method in the last few centuries, in both the natural and the social world, prompted many to suggest that it was the only methodology worthy of pursuing. After all, both the scale of human progress and the speed at which it had been accomplished was simply unprecedented and the credit for it all, in one way or another, was duly attributed to the scientific method. Thus, "From the standpoint of the Enlightenment Philosophers it seemed clear that it was necessary simply to adopt the procedures of that successful science, and apply them universally to achieve more general progress" (Southgate, 2002, p. 3).

Notwithstanding the astonishing turn of events, it is worth noting that despite its popularity and overwhelming success, the scientific method was also seriously tested and questioned over the numerous groundbreaking discoveries and developments that transpired during the 20th century. Surprisingly, foremost among them were the inconsistencies and disparities observed in the natural world. Einstein's theory of relativity, in particular, had turned the conventional scientific wisdom on its head. The logic of space-time continuum and a relativistic understanding of fundamental universal forces like gravity, shattered our one-dimensional simplistic understanding of the world. Even though Einstein himself was a fellow determinist and famously argued that God does not play dice with the universe (Graham, 1992), his theory of relativity however opened the door to a fairly relativistic understanding of the universe and its so-called fundamental laws and forces.

Determinism itself was somewhat a natural consequence of both the pre-modern and modern intellectual movements. Where the pre-modern thinking advanced the idea of some divine or supernatural entity that had clearly laid out the laws for the universe, the modern thinking supported the idea of an absolute reality where each and every event could be determined by some pre-existing cause. Hence, they both essentially propagated that everything in the universe is somewhat predetermined and that there are no probabilistic events, since each of the universe's components was supposedly performing its assigned or pre-determined task (Rietdijk, 1966).

Over the course of the 20th century however, the traditional or Newtonian determinism that viewed the universe like a clock with calculable rules and laws, became highly questionable. Numerous observations and findings during this period cast serious doubts over the longstanding objectivity seeking determinist approaches. Alongside Einstein's theory of relativity, the Heisenberg's uncertainty principle, Popper's theory of falsification and Kuhn's Paradigm shift are notable examples.

In 1927, the famous German physicist Werner Heisenberg proposed the groundbreaking uncertainty principle. Heisenberg argued that it was not possible to accurately measure the position and momentum of electrons in an atom due to their wave-like characteristics. A particle that can at random behave like a wave could therefore not be subjected to the strict laws of matter (Heisenberg, 1949). In other words, the electrons were somewhat free to behave erratically by virtue of their nature. The

uncertainty principle thus challenged the conventional wisdom regarding quantum mechanics and behavior of sub-atomic particles. Nature, at its most basic and fundamental level, was apparently erratic and unpredictable.

Though clearly controversial at the time, the uncertainty principle was overwhelmingly backed by the very scientific evidence that was otherwise resisting its broader implications. Despite the pushback therefore, the uncertainty principle simply could not be brushed aside. The longstanding conviction that nature and reality were rigid and absolute was slowly beginning to crumble. The objectivity seeking scientific method, that had stood tall and resolute for centuries and had consistently resisted any counter claims to knowledge, was now beginning to reveal cracks.

If nature and reality were not as absolute and certain as we had previously thought then clearly the investigative methods that we had long relied on to seek answers were also fundamentally flawed. The pursuit of objectivity, in particular, was a fairly pointless enterprise if the fundamental building blocks of nature were themselves erratic and unpredictable. This growing realization coupled with the numerous discoveries of the time generated an intense philosophical debate over our existing ontological and epistemological premises and posed a profound challenge to the previously undisputed superiority of the scientific method. Perhaps the most notable and impactful of these philosophical challenges came from Popper's seminal work on the theory of falsification.

Karl Popper, one of the most influential philosophers of the 20th century, famously denounced the classical inductivist approach to scientific inquiry. Inductivism is an epistemological standpoint that advances the practice of deriving absolute laws and theories from objectively observed facts and reality. Inductivism, with its unwavering support for objectivity, has long been a cornerstone of the scientific method and an essential prerequisite for all scientific theories. Popper in his groundbreaking book *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* rejected this longstanding premise and instead advanced the idea of empirical falsification. He argued that it was not possible to conclusively prove any scientific theory, since all theories could ultimately be disproven or substantially modified with new findings and discoveries over time (Popper, 2005).

The near flawless logic of falsifiability turned the conventional scientific wisdom on its head. By blatantly exposing the inherent logical contradiction of the classical inductivist approach, the theory of falsification cast serious doubts over the blind pursuit of objectivity. All scientific laws and theories were thus far from absolute and could simply be refuted and falsified with new observations and findings. Even the best of our theories "in the past have turned out to be falsified. Popper expects no less of our current theories" (O'Hear, 1995, p. 18).

Popper's theory of falsification better accounted for the scientific inconsistencies and anomalies (such as the uncertainty principle) that were increasingly being observed during the 20th century. It subsequently paved the way for more inclusive and flexible approaches that were not only far less rigid in their outlook than the traditional scientific approaches but also better accounted for seemingly novel and unusual discoveries.

Popper's seminal work had a profound impact on the philosophy of science and the pursuit of knowledge generally. In particular, it paved the way for constructive critique and scrutiny of the previously immune scientific method. It also substantially influenced the works of philosophers like Kuhn, who would go on to revolutionize our

understanding of the world and the methodologies we impulsively lean upon to make sense of it.

Thomas Kuhn is perhaps one of the most notable and influential philosophers of science. His book *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* was a landmark achievement both in the field of science and philosophy. Kuhn believed that scientific progression is neither linear nor one-dimensional. He argued that an analysis of the history of science reveals that major changes in the fields of study do not come about gradually or organically. Instead he believes that "revolutions in science come about as a result of breakdowns in intellectual systems, breakdowns that occur when old methods won't solve new problems. He calls the change in theory that underlines this kind of revolution a paradigm shift" (Orman, 2016, p. 47).

Kuhn's paradigm shift was a groundbreaking revelation. It squashed the myth of linear progression of scientific knowledge that was believed to be completely independent of subjective inferences and intellectual biases. The notion of paradigm on its own simply refers to an existing scientific activity with "strong networks of commitments- conceptual, theoretical, and methodological" (Kuhn, 1970, p. 42). Kuhn had argued that a typical paradigm is contingent on the consensus of the scientific community at any given time and not on some isolated and independent line of inquiry. A paradigm shift would then transpire when the same or the following community of scientists begin to question the credibility of an existing paradigm.

The fact that the consensus and preferences of the scientific community determines the prevalence of a paradigm at any given point of time suggests that the subjectivities of the individual scientists and their respective biases are perhaps just as crucial as any other claims to knowledge acquisition and progression. This somewhat straightforward yet remarkable way of gauging scientific progress subsequently paved the way for the inclusive and flexible postmodernist tradition to take center stage. Though there have since been a number of influential post-modern scholars, the work of Lyotard and Derrida particularly stands out.

The French philosopher and literary theorist, Jean-Francois Lyotard, is perhaps best known for his contribution to the post-modern school of thought. His famous book *The Postmodern Condition* is essentially an examination of the existing state of knowledge and the process of legitimization of the dominant discourse (Lyotard, 1994). According to Lyotard, the condition of knowledge today can perhaps best be described as postmodern, "according to which the modern epoch is considered to be over and is superseded by a postmodern epoch" (Lyotard & Brugger, 2001, p. 78). He attributed this transition to a number of factors and realizations, foremost among them were the glaring limitations and handicaps of the scientific method.

Lyotard was particularly critical of the notions of 'universals' and 'grand narratives', which he believed were a byproduct of the premodern and modern world (Lyotard, 1994). Universals, simply put, are metaphysical assertions about the nature of our world. A universal is a constant not bound by time and space that can be utilized to discern characteristics of both social and natural occurrences. While a universal cannot be quantified, it supposedly allows us make generalized assumptions about the world (Kraut, 2010). A grand or meta narrative on the other hand, is a process of ascribing a distinct meaning to history and experiences in both the material and physical world that subsequently serves to legitimize some existing process and pursuit of knowledge (Hannabuss, 1997).

Although universals and meta-narratives are abstract concepts, as repeatable and recurrent entities, they have however frequently been utilized by the modern and premodern traditions to draw generalizations about the world. Lyotard was highly critical of this longstanding practice. He was particularly skeptical of the blind reliance on universalizing theories that conveniently lumped together social practices and academic disciplines. According to him, "the narratives we tell to justify a single set of laws and stakes are inherently unjust" (Elliott & Ray, 2003, p. 212).

Lyotard's critique of the universalizing methods of modernism not only had a profound impact on the intellectual developments of the time but also effectively laid the foundation for the emerging critical theory and constructivist school of thought.

As discussed already, postmodernism neither has any set parameters nor does it follow any linear progression of thought. As a deliberately open-ended intellectual tradition, postmodernism can be of any shape, size or design. Unlike the modernist and premodernist tradition, there is no theoretical or conceptual core to postmodernism. Its interpretation, just as its underlying central assumptions, is often dependent on subjective inferences and preferences.

While that maybe so, it will be wrong to assume that postmodernism is completely devoid of theory and methodology. The work of Jacques Derrida in the development of an academic practice to aid the postmodern transition is especially noteworthy.

The Algerian born French philosopher, Jacques Derrida, is a household name amongst the critical and postmodern modern scholars. He is especially well known for developing the academic tradition of deconstruction. As a very vocal critic of modernism and universalizing theories, Derrida wanted to reassess and reevaluate the many concepts and narratives that had been constructed over the years (Sallis, 1987). He proposed instead the theory of deconstruction that among other things aims to examine and expose the construction of language, discourse, and narratives (Silverman, 2004).

Derrida was profoundly skeptical of the proverbial status that has long been accorded to some of the central assertions of famous scholars like Plato and Aristotle. His critical reading of the classical Greek philosophers revealed inconsistencies and some blatant contradictions that were otherwise overshadowed by their larger than life personas (Baird, 2016). Such contrarieties were a clear evidence of our scholarly fallacies and intellectual oversight. For Derrida, it was necessary therefore to deconstruct the dominant discourse to redress these longstanding academic gaffes.

Throughout his life, Derrida was obsessed with finding a deeper meaning other than the obvious or the intended one in all existing texts, languages, and discourses (Norris, 1988). The intellectual premise of the postmodern school of thought allowed him to seek this deeper meaning and expose the construction of our supposedly self-evident realities.

Derrida's theory of deconstruction provided the necessary analytical and methodological toolkit that the postmodern school of thought desperately needed. It would go on to become a benchmark for aspiring postmodern scholars that were particularly keen on deconstructing the social realities that had long been taken for granted. The logic of construction, deconstruction, and reconstruction of both our social realities and so-called established facts would go on to not only define and characterize

the emerging postmodern paradigm shift but also challenge the longstanding teaching and academic practices that catered primarily to the one-dimensional objectivity seeking premodern and modern intellectual movements.

Conclusion

Owing to the contributions by the postmodern and constructivist school of thought, we have begun to realize that acquisition of knowledge is neither linear nor one-dimensional. Moreover, it is also becoming increasingly evident that the relentless pursuit of objectivity, as advocated by the premodern and modern traditions, is somewhat of a futile enterprise as it brazenly bypasses the otherwise complex and multifaceted reality. In order to account for these new realizations and intellectual paradigm shifts, it is clearly becoming necessary to reevaluate our existing learning and academic practices.

The longstanding teacher centric approach is foremost a product of the premodern and modern intellectual movements. Consequently therefore it trains individuals to pursue and abide by objective realities and universalizing theories. The approach not only discredits alternative opinions and viewpoints but effectively also discourages any departure from established laws and set parameters. This rigid premise of the teacher centric approach prevents scholars from thinking independently and critically.

By virtue of its strict structural nature, teacher-centered mode of learning inadvertently advances the logic of objectivity and fails to account for both social construction of reality and subjective inferences. The approach therefore is clearly not compatible with the post-modern paradigm shift.

In comparison, the student centric style of learning can perhaps best be described as a natural byproduct of the postmodern paradigm shift. It categorically encourages students to ask questions and freely challenge any existing norms or practices. There are no established facts nor some universal objective truth or law that cannot be challenged or questioned. With its in-built provision to account for subjective realities, the student centric style of learning strongly compliments the fundamental assertions of the postmodern intellectual movement. It is this inherent compatibility that necessitates its across the board adoption.

Ever since the postmodern turn, it has thus become abundantly clear that the teacher-centric mode of learning ought to be substituted with the student-centered style of learning. Failure to do so could not only jeopardize the necessary intellectual transition but could potentially also undermine the organic progression of knowledge itself.

References

Baird, F. E. (2016). *From Plato to Derrida*. Routledge.

Barker, S. (Ed.). (1996). *Signs of change: premodern-modern-postmodern* (Vol. 4). SUNY Press.

Elliott, A., & Ray, L. J. (2003). *Key contemporary social theorists*. Blackwell Publishers.

Feldman, J. (2003). The simplicity principle in human concept learning. *Current directions in psychological science*, *12*(6), 227-232.

Feldman, J. (2016). The simplicity principle in perception and cognition. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*, *7*(5), 330-340.

Graham, E. (1992). The Dice-Playing God: Reflections on Life in a Post-Modern Age. *Sociology*, *26*(3), 529-531.

Hannabuss, S. (1997, August). Lyotard and postmodern knowledge. In *Aslib proceedings*. MCB UP Ltd.

Heisenberg, W. (1949). *The physical principles of the quantum theory*. Courier Corporation.

Korab-Karpowicz, W. J. (2019). The Clash of Epochs: Traditional, Modern, Postmodern, and Evolutionity. *Perspectives on Political Science*, *48*(3), 170- 182.

Kraut, R. (2010). Universals, metaphysical explanations, and pragmatism. *The Journal of philosophy*, *107*(11), 590-609.

Lyotard, J. F. (1994). The postmodern condition. *Manchester: Manchester*.

Lyotard, J. F., & Brügger, N. (2001). What about the Postmodern? The Concept of the Postmodern in the Work of Lyotard. *Yale French Studies*, (99), 77-92.

Misdi, M., Hartini, N., Farijanti, D., & Wirabhakti, A. (2013). Teacher-centred and Teacher Controlled Learning: a Postmodernism Perspective. *ELT Perspective Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*, *1*(1).

Norris, C. (1988). Deconstruction, Postmodernism and Philosophy: Habermas and Derrida. *Praxis international*, *8*(4), 426-446.

O'Hear, A., & Clark, P. (Eds.). (1995). *Karl Popper: philosophy and problems* (Vol. 39). Cambridge University Press.

Orman, T. F. (2016). Paradigm as a central concept in Thomas Kuhn's thought. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *6*(10), 47- 52.

Panhwar, A. H., Ansari, S., & Shah, A. A. (2017). Post-positivism: An effective paradigm for social and educational research. *International Research Journal of Arts & Humanities (IRJAH)*, *45*(45).

Popper, K. (2005). *The logic of scientific discovery*. Routledge.

Rietdijk, C. W. (1966). A rigorous proof of determinism derived from the special theory of relativity. *Philosophy of Science*, *33*(4), 341-344.

Sallis, J. (Ed.). (1987). *Deconstruction and philosophy: The texts of Jacques Derrida*. University of Chicago Press.

Silverman, H. J. (Ed.). (2004). *Derrida and deconstruction*. Routledge.

Southgate, B. (2002). *History: what and why? Ancient, modern and postmodern perspectives*. Routledge.

Subramani, S. (2019). Practising reflexivity: Ethics, methodology and theory construction. *Methodological Innovations*, *12*(2), 2059799119863276.