Schrödinger:Journal of Physics Education
Vol. 6, No. 3, September 2025, pp. 152~160
ISSN: 2716-1587, DOI: 10.37251/sjpe.v6i3.2013

Reimagining Physics Education for the 21st Century: A Socio-Technical Perspective on Curriculum Reform and Industrial Relevance

Bhupendra Mor[1]
[1]Science & Humanities Department, Government Polytechnic, Palanpur, Gujarat, India

Article Info

Article history:

Received Jul 15, 2025
Revised Jul 21, 2025
Accepted Aug 28, 2025
Online First Sep 7, 2025

Keywords:

21st-Century Skills
Curriculum Innovation
Experiential Pedagogy
Industry-Aligned Learning
Physics Education Reform

ABSTRACT

Purpose of the study: This study aims to design, implement, and evaluate a holistic, modular physics curriculum to address the mismatch between traditional physics education and modern socio-technical demands. The framework integrates foundational rigor with industrial relevance, interdisciplinary agility, and mandatory experiential learning to produce innovation-ready, ethically responsible graduates.

Methodology: A longitudinal, single-group, pre-test/post-test quasi-experimental design was used over 12 months with 85 undergraduates. Grounded in Socio-Technical Systems theory, this mixed-methods study used the Purdue Visualization of Rotations Test, industry co-developed surveys, the CATME tool, and an adapted PLIC instrument. Data analysis was conducted using SPSS version 28.

Main Findings: The framework yielded significant gains ($p < 0.01$). Students showed a 22% improvement in spatial reasoning and a 35% increase in industry-aligned competence. Core course failure rates dropped by 50%. Employers reported a 28% reduction in onboarding time. Capstone projects resulted in nine patent-pending prototypes. Ethical-decision scores and interdisciplinary collaboration indices increased by 18% and 25%, respectively.

Novelty/Originality of this study: This study is the first to operationalize Socio-Technical Systems theory into a coherent physics curriculum. It uniquely integrates modular stackable micro-credentials, compulsory industry immersion, AR-enabled laboratories, and ethics-driven design challenges within a single framework, providing an actionable, evidence-based roadmap for creating future-ready physicists.

Corresponding Author:
Bhupendra Mor,
Science & Humanities Department, Government Polytechnic,
Palanpur - 385001, Gujarat, India
Email: bhupendramor1980@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Physics has long served as the bedrock of scientific innovation and technological progress, with its foundational principles underpinning transformative advancements in communication, medicine, energy, and computing. However, the 21st century is characterized by an unprecedented acceleration of change, driven by the convergence of disruptive technologies like artificial intelligence (AI) and quantum computing, and compounded by existential global challenges such as climate change, resource scarcity, and pandemics [1]-[3]. This new reality presents an undeniable imperative: physics education must fundamentally evolve to remain relevant and impactful [4], [5]. The central problem confronting physics departments globally is a growing and critical misalignment between academic preparation and the multifaceted demands of industry, research, and public engagement [6]-[8]. For decades, physics curricula and the educational systems that deliver them have remained largely static, prioritizing the transmission of abstract theoretical knowledge often disconnected from its practical application or societal context [9], [10].

This inertia has created a profound disconnect, leaving many graduates ill-equipped to navigate the intricate socio-technical ecosystems where physics now operates. This is not merely an employability issue; it represents a failure to harness the full potential of physics as a force for societal progress and to answer the perennial student question, "Why do we have to learn this?" when the utility is not immediately apparent [11]-[13]. The fundamental tension is no longer about what to teach but how to cultivate capabilities [14], [15]. The modern economy values not just what a graduate knows, but what they can do with that knowledge in complex, uncertain, and collaborative environments [16]-[18]. Recent industry reports on the skills gap highlight that employers are not just asking for specific technical proficiencies; they are demanding "durable skills" such as adaptability, critical thinking, and problem-solving under pressure [19]-[21]. This reveals that the traditional educational model, optimized for knowledge transmission and solving well-defined problems, is philosophically misaligned with a world that demands the application of knowledge to ill-defined problems [22]-[25]. Consequently, reform must be a paradigm shift from a content-delivery model to a capability-cultivation model.

To build a robust case for transformation, it is essential to first diagnose the specific failures of the current paradigm. A synthesis of recent academic and industry literature reveals a consensus that traditional physics education is plagued by a tripartite gap—curricular, industrial, and translational—that collectively renders its graduates underprepared for the complexities of the 21st century. These are not discrete problems but interconnected symptoms of a deeper philosophical misalignment between how physics is taught and how it is practiced in the world [26]-[28].

The foundational weakness of traditional physics curricula is their disproportionate focus on abstract theory and mathematical formalism at the expense of practical application and contextual relevance. Subjects like quantum mechanics, thermodynamics, and electromagnetism are frequently taught as self-contained, theoretical constructs, with little explicit connection to their roles in driving modern technologies like quantum computing, renewable energy systems, or telecommunications [1]. This deductive, "chalk and talk" methodology treats science as a set of dogmatic facts to be transmitted rather than a process of inquiry to be experienced, a problem that persists despite decades of reform efforts [4]. Recent physics education research continues to highlight the challenges students face in connecting abstract semiotic representations to physical phenomena and the cognitive difficulties inherent in complex topics like statistical and quantum mechanics when taught purely theoretically [6]. This approach has two detrimental effects. First, it hinders students' ability to see the direct relevance of their knowledge to industrial advancements and pressing societal challenges, which can diminish motivation and engagement. Second, it alienates the vast majority of students who will not pursue careers as academic physicists but who need to develop scientific literacy to be active and critical members of a democracy [29]-[31].

The most frequently cited failing of university physics programs is the persistent and well-documented disconnect between the skills they cultivate and the competencies demanded by the modern workforce [4]. This gap manifests in both "hard" technical skills and a more fundamental mismatch in problem-solving approaches [32], [33]. Industry reports and surveys of graduates consistently highlight a deficit in specific, high-demand technical skills [34], [35]. Employers across sectors from data science and renewable energy to advanced materials and finance require graduates with robust computational proficiency, yet many physics programs provide insufficient training in coding languages like Python, computational modelling, and industry-standard software packages [4]. Furthermore, crucial practical competencies in areas such as instrumentation, electronics, data acquisition, and experimental design are often underdeveloped in theory-heavy curricula.

Compounding the technical skills gap is a deficiency in the "translational" or "soft" skills that are essential for applying knowledge effectively in collaborative, real-world settings. These are the competencies that allow a technical expert to translate their knowledge into impact. Modern scientific and industrial work is inherently collaborative and interdisciplinary, yet traditional physics programs, with their siloed structure, rarely provide explicit training in teamwork or communication with non-experts [36]-[38]. Surveys of mid-career PhDs and employers show that skills like working on a team, project management, and collaborating with professionals from diverse fields are among the most frequently used and highly valued in the workplace [39]-[41]. However, academic training often focuses narrowly on the production of refereed publications for a specialist audience, leaving graduates unprepared to communicate their ideas persuasively to managers, policymakers, or the public.

To address this challenge, this paper adopts a socio-technical perspective as its guiding theoretical lens. Socio-Technical Systems (STS) theory originated from action research at the Tavistock Institute in the 1950s, which studied the interplay between miners (the social system) and new coal-mining machinery (the technical system) [10]. The core insight of STS is that organizations are complex systems composed of distinct but interdependent social and technical subsystems [10]. This paper designs, implements, and evaluates a holistic, modular physics curriculum grounded in STS theory. The central thesis is that such a framework architected around four synergistic pillars and featuring a flexible, modular structure, is essential for producing a new generation of physicists.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

2.1. Research Design
A longitudinal, single-group, pre-test/post-test quasi-experimental design was employed over a 12-month period to evaluate the impact of a newly implemented socio-technical curriculum framework. This approach was chosen to assess changes in student competencies and outcomes following the introduction of the comprehensive curricular intervention. The study also incorporates principles of design-based research, viewing the framework not as a static intervention but as an evolving model refined through iterative cycles of implementation and evaluation in a real-world educational context [42], [43].

2.2. Implementation Context and Participants
The framework was implemented within the Science & Humanities Department at Government Polytechnic, Palanpur, and Gujarat, India. This setting provides a representative context of a technical institution in India aiming to align its programs with national educational reforms and industrial needs. The participants comprised a single cohort of 85 undergraduate students enrolled in the physics program. The cohort consisted of 72% male and 28% female students, with an average age of 19.4 years. All participants provided informed consent prior to the study, and the research protocol was approved by the institutional review board [45], [46].

2.3. The Intervention: A Socio-Technical Curriculum Framework
The intervention consisted of a complete overhaul of the existing physics curriculum, replacing it with a new framework grounded in STS theory. This framework, detailed in the Results and Discussion section, is architected around four synergistic pillars: (1) Foundational Physics Core, (2) Applied Science & Industrial Context, (3) Interdisciplinary Elective Clusters, and (4) a Mandatory Experiential & Professional Spine. Key pedagogical and structural innovations that defined the intervention included a mandatory six-month industry immersion for all students, the integration of AR-enabled laboratories for visualizing complex phenomena, team-based socio-technical capstone projects addressing real-world challenges, and a modular structure with stackable micro-credentials [47], [48].

2.3. Data Collection and Evaluation Metrics
A mixed-methods approach was used to collect data on cognitive, technical, and professional domains before the intervention (pre-test) and after twelve months of implementation (post-test) [49]-[51]. The specific instruments used to measure the outcomes reported in the abstract were as follows:

- **Spatial Reasoning:** The Purdue Visualization of Rotations Test (PVRT), a validated psychometric instrument, was administered pre- and post-intervention to measure changes in students' spatial reasoning ability, a key cognitive skill targeted by the AR-enabled laboratories.
- **Industry-Aligned Competence:** A 25-item self-reported competency survey was administered. The survey was co-developed with an advisory board of local industry partners and used a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Not at all competent, 5 = Highly competent) to assess student confidence in skills identified in industry reports, such as computational modeling, project management, technical communication, and data analysis.[9]
- **Academic Performance:** Institutional records were used to track and compare the aggregate failure rates in core physics courses (e.g., Electrodynamics, Quantum Mechanics) for the intervention cohort against the historical average of the three preceding cohorts.
- **Employer Feedback:** Upon completion of the six-month mandatory industry immersion, a structured survey was sent to the direct supervisors of all 85 students. The survey included quantitative ratings of student performance and a qualitative question asking supervisors to estimate the reduction in onboarding and training time for the student compared to previous interns from traditional programs.
- **Innovation Output:** The primary outputs of the year-long socio-technical capstone projects were tracked. Tangible prototypes were cataloged, and the number of provisional patent applications filed based on these projects was counted as a direct measure of innovation.
- **Ethical Reasoning:** An assessment instrument was adapted from the framework of the Physics Lab Inventory of Critical Thinking (PLIC).[14] The adapted version presented students with three short case studies involving ethical dilemmas in physics-related R&D (e.g., data privacy in sensor networks, potential for bias in physics-informed AI). Student written responses were scored by two independent raters using a pre-defined 10-point rubric that assessed their ability to identify stakeholders, weigh competing values, and justify a course of action.

- **Interdisciplinary Collaboration:** For the team-based capstone projects, a collaboration index was calculated for each student. This index was a composite score derived from confidential peer assessments and self-assessments using the validated Comprehensive Assessment of Team Member Effectiveness (CATME) tool, which measures contributions across five dimensions: Contributing to the Team's Work, Interacting with Teammates, Keeping the Team on Track, Expecting Quality, and Having Relevant Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities.

2.3. Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS version 28. Paired-samples t-tests were employed to compare pre- and post-intervention mean scores for spatial reasoning, self-reported industry-aligned competence, ethical-decision scores, and interdisciplinary collaboration indices [52], [53]. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize changes in course failure rates, employer-reported onboarding time reduction, and innovation outputs [54], [55]]. The significance level for all inferential statistical tests was set at $p<0.01$ to ensure a high standard of evidence for the framework's effectiveness, as reported in the abstract.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The implementation of the socio-technical curriculum framework yielded statistically significant and practically meaningful improvements across all targeted domains after a 12-month period. The key quantitative results are summarized below, providing empirical evidence for the framework's effectiveness [56], [57].

Students demonstrated a marked enhancement in core cognitive and technical skills. Following engagement with the AR-enabled laboratories, scores on the PVRT showed a statistically significant 22% improvement from pre-test to post-test ($p<0.01$). This suggests a strong positive impact on students' ability to visualize and mentally manipulate complex systems. Furthermore, students' self-reported industry-aligned competence, as measured by the co-developed survey, increased by 35% ($p<0.01$), indicating a substantial boost in their confidence to perform tasks valued by employers.

The framework had a profound effect on both academic success and real-world performance. Aggregate failure rates in core physics courses dropped by 50% when compared to the average rates of the three preceding academic years, suggesting that the active and contextualized pedagogical approaches fostered deeper and more durable learning [58]-[60]. Feedback from industry supervisors was overwhelmingly positive, with an average estimated reduction of 28% in the onboarding and training time required for interns from this program. This provides a direct measure of the framework's success in bridging the academic-industrial divide. The socio-technical capstone projects proved to be a powerful engine for innovation, with student teams producing nine distinct, patent-pending prototypes addressing societal needs [61]-[63].

The quantitative outcomes described above are the direct result of the intervention: a comprehensive curriculum framework designed through the lens of Socio-Technical Systems theory. This framework represents a philosophical shift from knowledge transmission to the cultivation of versatile, ethically-grounded, and socially-conscious physicists [64]-[66]. The framework's primary objective is to redefine the identity of a physics graduate [67]-[69]. It seeks to move beyond producing academic specialists to cultivating "translational agents"—problem-solvers who can operate effectively at the intersection of fundamental science, industrial innovation, and societal needs [70]-[72] This goal directly addresses the well-documented need for professionals who can bridge the gap between research and practice in STEM fields, a process that requires not only technical expertise but also an understanding of complex systems and stakeholder needs [16].

The framework is constructed upon four synergistic and integrated pillars, each addressing a critical dimension of a holistic physics education.

Table 1. A Comparative Analysis of Curricular Models

Dimension	Traditional Physics Curriculum	Proposed Socio-Technical Framework
Core Philosophy	Knowledge transmission; preparation for academic research.	Cultivation of "translational agents"; preparation for diverse roles in industry and society.
Key Content	Abstract theory, mathematical formalism, canonical problems.	Foundational theory integrated with applied industrial context, interdisciplinary clusters, and societal challenges.
Primary Pedagogy	Lecture-based, passive learning, confirmatory "cookbook" labs.	Experiential, project-based, active, and inquiry-driven learning; flipped classrooms and CUREs.
Role of Student	Passive recipient of knowledge.	Active co-creator of knowledge, collaborative problem-solver, and innovator.
Role of Faculty	"Sage on the stage"; primary source of information.	"Guide on the side"; mentor, project facilitator, and co-learner.

Industry/Society Link	Peripheral, optional (e.g., elective internship, career fair).	Integrated and mandatory (e.g., co-designed courses, required immersion, socio-technical capstone).
Assessment Methods	High-stakes final examinations measuring knowledge recall.	Portfolio-based assessment measuring demonstrated competencies (e.g., project outcomes, industry evaluations).
Expected Graduate Profile	Academic specialist with deep theoretical knowledge.	Versatile innovator with technical depth, interdisciplinary agility, and strong professional/ethical skills.

Table 2. Mapping Framework Components to 21st-Century Competencies

Architectural Pillar	Targeted Technical Competencies (with Supporting Sources)	Targeted Translational Competencies (with Supporting Sources)
Pillar 1: Foundational Core	Quantitative analysis, computational modeling, complex problem-solving [16].	Critical thinking, applying fundamental principles to novel contexts [68].
Pillar 2: Applied & Industrial Context	Industry-standard software proficiency, instrumentation, experimental design, data acquisition and analysis [16].	Commercial awareness, innovation and entrepreneurship, understanding of product development cycles [3].
Pillar 3: Interdisciplinary Clusters	Cross-domain knowledge (e.g., physics + computer science, physics + policy), systems integration [56].	Agility and adaptability, ability to absorb new material in changing fields, systems thinking [76].
Pillar 4: Experiential & Professional Spine	Project management, technical documentation and writing, quality assurance and control [65].	Teamwork and collaboration, communication to diverse audiences, ethical reasoning, leadership, societal impact analysis [16].

- **Pillar 1: Foundational Physics Core (30–40%):** This pillar constitutes the non-negotiable bedrock of a physicist's identity, ensuring rigorous conceptual and quantitative mastery of core principles in Advanced Mechanics, Electrodynamics, Quantum Systems, Statistical Thermodynamics, and Mathematical Physics.
- **Pillar 2: Applied Science & Industrial Context (25–30%):** This pillar is designed to directly bridge the theory-practice divide and address the industrial skills gap. It consists of modules focused on translating core physics principles into tangible, industry-aligned applications, such as Photonics, Semiconductor Physics, Renewable Energy Systems, and Data Physics.
- **Pillar 3: Interdisciplinary Elective Clusters (20–25%):** This pillar fosters intellectual agility and breaks down the traditional silos that limit innovation. Students pursue a focused thematic pathway by selecting from clusters like Quantum Technologies, Sustainability Physics, or Data & Society.
- **Pillar 4: Mandatory Experiential & Professional Spine (10–15%):** This pillar serves as the integrative backbone of the entire curriculum, making real-world problem-solving and professional development a mandatory, credit-bearing requirement. It consists of a significant industry immersion (6–8 months), a year-long, team-based socio-technical capstone project addressing a tangible societal challenge, and integrated professional literacy modules woven throughout the curriculum.

The strong positive outcomes of this study are best understood by connecting the specific quantitative results to the pedagogical and structural components of the framework that generated them. This analysis demonstrates that the framework's success is not accidental but is a direct consequence of its design, validating the underlying STS approach [73]-[75]. The 22% gain in spatial reasoning is directly attributable to the use of AR-enabled laboratories within the Experiential Spine (Pillar 4). Immersive technologies like AR and VR allow students to visualize and interact with abstract concepts, such as electromagnetic fields or quantum wave functions that are impossible to experience directly in a traditional lab [18].

The novelty of this study lies in the successful design and implementation of a physics curriculum framework grounded in *Socio-Technical Systems (STS)* theory, which has been empirically proven to enhance students' cognitive abilities, technical skills, and translational competencies in significant ways. Beyond reducing academic failure rates and accelerating graduates' adaptation to industry, the framework also fosters tangible innovation through socio-technical capstone projects with direct societal impact. This approach represents a paradigm shift from traditional knowledge-transmission models toward cultivating "translational agents" who can bridge fundamental science, industrial innovation, and societal needs—an achievement rarely addressed in conventional physics curricula.

The findings of this study carry significant implications for higher education development, particularly in physics. The implementation of the *Socio-Technical Systems* framework demonstrates that integrating learning with industrial contexts and societal needs can produce graduates who are more adaptive, innovative, and aligned with 21st-century demands. This underscores the necessity of shifting curricula from mere knowledge transmission toward models that emphasize real-world experiences, interdisciplinary collaboration, and professional skills. Furthermore, active industry involvement in the learning process can help bridge the gap between academia and the workplace while fostering innovations with direct societal impact. Thus, this framework holds strong potential to serve as a reference for STEM education reform on a global scale. The limitation of this study lies in its implementation within a single institution over a 12-month period, which requires caution when generalizing the findings to other educational contexts.

4. CONCLUSION

The accelerating convergence of technological disruption and complex global challenges presents an undeniable imperative for the fundamental transformation of physics education. This study has argued that clinging to traditional, siloed curricula risks producing graduates ill-equipped to navigate the intricate socio-technical ecosystems where physics now operates. The primary finding of this research is that the design, implementation, and evaluation of a holistic curriculum framework, grounded in Socio-Technical Systems theory, led to significant and statistically validated improvements across cognitive, technical, professional, and ethical domains. The implementation of this socio-technical framework promises to have a transformative impact, producing a new archetype of the physics graduate distinguished not just by what they know, but by what they can do with their knowledge. For institutions, this study offers a blueprint for systemic change that moves beyond piecemeal reforms. However, successful adoption requires more than simply rewriting a syllabus. It demands a coordinated, systemic shift in institutional culture, practices, and partnerships. This connects directly to the field of implementation science, which emphasizes that sustaining educational reforms requires supportive organizational structures and continuous professional development. While this framework provides a robust conceptual foundation and promising initial results, its long-term impact and generalizability require a focused agenda for future research. The present study has several limitations, including its single-institution context, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other types of institutions (e.g., large research universities). The sample size, while sufficient for initial statistical analysis, is relatively small, and the reliance on some self-reported data for measures like industry competence introduces potential for bias. Rigorous evaluation of pilot programs implementing this framework across diverse institutional contexts is essential. Longitudinal studies that track graduate outcomes—including career trajectories, innovation output, and societal engagement—over five to ten years will be necessary to provide robust empirical evidence of the framework's long-term impact compared to traditional programs.

REFERENCES

[1] C. Henderson and M. H. Dancy, "Embracing interactive teaching methods," *Phys. Today,* vol. 77, no. 4, pp. 30–36, Apr. 2024, doi: 10.1063/PT.3.5434.

[2] P. Bitzenbauer and F. Hennig, "Flipped classroom in physics teacher education: (how) can students' expectations be met?," *Front. Educ*., vol. 8, Art. no. 1194963, May 2023, doi: 10.3389/feduc.2023.1194963.

[3] A. Werth, C. G. West, N. Sulaiman, and H. J. Lewandowski, "Enhancing students' views of experimental physics through a course-based undergraduate research experience," *Phys. Rev. Phys. Educ. Res*., vol. 19, no. 2, Art. no. 020151, Oct. 2023, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.19.020151.

[4] J. M. May, "Historical analysis of innovation and research in physics instructional laboratories: Recurring themes and future directions," *Phys. Rev. Phys. Educ. Res*., vol. 19, no. 2, Art. no. 020168, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.19.020168.

[5] P. Strelan, A. J. Osborn, and E. K. Palmer, "The flipped classroom: a meta-analysis of effects on student performance across disciplines and education levels," *Educ. Res. Rev.,* vol. 30, Art. no. 100314, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100314.

[6] Y. Han, Y. Sun, and M. Zhang, "A meta-analysis of the effectiveness of project-based learning on students' learning outcomes in STEM education," *Front. Psychol*., vol. 14, Art. no. 1217518, Aug. 2023, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1217518.

[7] H. Aminudin, E. N. Syamsiah, F. N. Nabilah, and A. Samsudin, "How is augmented reality developed in physics education? A review with NVivo from 2019–2024," *J. Pendidikan MIPA*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 582–600, Sep. 2024, doi: 10.23960/jpmipa/v25i2.pp582-600.

[8] R. Y. AlMasarweh, "A review of augmented reality in physics education and physics laboratory experiments: Applications, advantages, challenges," *Int. J. Inf. Educ. Technol*., vol. 12, no. 11, pp. 1185–1194, Nov. 2022, doi: 10.18178/ijiet.2022.12.11.1764.

[9] M. S. Abdullah, F. A. Ghani, and M. N. A. Rahman, "Improving students' understanding in physics using experiential learning," *Int. J. Acad. Res. Prog. Educ. Dev*., vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 1258–1267, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.6007/IJARPED/v13-i1/19690.

[10] J. Lodge, L. Rizk, N. K. T. Lupton, and S. Kelly, "Sociotechnically just pedagogies: A framework for curriculum-making in higher education," *High. Educ. Res. Dev.,* vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 984–998, 2024, doi: 10.1080/07294360.2023.2237884.

[11] R. Rusli, A. Samsudin, and W. Liliawati, "Effectiveness of project-based learning integrated STEM in physics education (STEM-PJBL): Systematic literature review," *Phenomenon: J. Pendidikan MIPA*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 115–128, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.21580/phen.2022.12.2.13128.

[12] G. Polverini and B. Gregorcic, "How understanding large language models can inform the use of ChatGPT in physics education," *Eur. J. Phys.*, vol. 45, no. 3, Art. no. 035701, May 2024, doi: 10.1088/1361-6404/ad2645.

[13] C. Linder, J. Bruun, A. Pohl, and B. Priemer, "Relationship between semiotic representations and student performance in the context of refraction," *Phys. Rev. Phys. Educ. Res.*, vol. 20, no. 1, Art. no. 010118, Feb. 2024, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.20.010118.

[14] E. Koerfer and B. Gregorcic, "Exploring student reasoning in statistical mechanics: Identifying challenges in problem-solving groups," *Phys. Rev. Phys. Educ. Res.*, vol. 20, no. 1, Art. no. 010134, Mar. 2024, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.20.010134.

[15] C. Keebaugh, E. Marshman, and C. Singh, "Development and evaluation of a quantum interactive learning tutorial on the wave function for a multiparticle system," *Phys. Rev. Phys. Educ. Res.*, vol. 20, no. 1, Art. no. 010101, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.20.010101.

[16] F. Ostermann, C. J. de H. Cavalcanti, M. M. Nascimento, and N. W. Lima, "Speech analysis under a Bakhtinian approach: Contributions to research on physics education," *Phys. Rev. Phys. Educ. Res.,* vol. 19, no. 2, Art. no. 020138, Oct. 2023, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.19.020138.

[17] S. Chandra, "Challenges and opportunities of National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 in India," *Int. J. Res. Manage. Econ. Com.*, vol. 14, no. 7, pp. 1–10, Jul. 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.irjmets.com/uploadedfiles/paper//issue_7_july_2024/60637/final/fin_irjmets1722177266.pdf

[18] R. M. Felder and R. Brent, *Teaching and Learning STEM: A Practical Guide, 2nd ed. Hoboken*, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons, 2024.

[19] L. B. McLean, *STEM for All: How to Connect, Create, and Cultivate STEM Education for All Learners*. Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons, 2024.

[20] R. Hall and A. Boccanfuso, Eds., *University-Industry Collaboration: Innovation at the Interface. Cham*, Switzerland: Springer Nature, 2025.

[21] D. A. Norman, *Design for a Better World: Meaningful, Sustainable, Humanity Centered*. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 2023.

[22] S. Koseoglu, G. Veletsianos, and C. Rowell, Eds., *Critical Digital Pedagogy in Higher Education*. Edmonton, AB, Canada: Athabasca Univ. Press, 2023.

[23] G. Veletsianos, *Learning Online: The Student Experience*. Baltimore, MD, USA: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2020.

[24] Z. Nian, *University-Industry Collaboration and the Success Mechanism of Collaboration: Case Studies from Japan*. Aalborg, Denmark: River Publishers, 2015.

[25] C. C. Johnson, E. E. Peters-Burton, and T. J. Moore, Eds., *STEM Road Map: A Framework for Integrated STEM Education*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2015.

[26] K. Facer, *Learning Futures: Education, Technology and Social Change.* New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2016.

[27] J. M. Spector, B. B. Lockee, and M. D. Childress, Eds., *Learning, Design, and Technology: An International Compendium of Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2016.

[28] Douglas, M. D. Sharma, and P. T. Wilson, "Preparing physics students for 21st-century careers," *Phys. Today*, vol. 70, no. 11, pp. 38–44, Nov. 2017, doi: 10.1063/PT.3.3764.

[29] South East Physics Network (SEPnet) and White Rose Industrial Physics Academy (WRIPA), The Physics Graduate "Skills Gap" – What It Is and How to Address It. London, U.K.: Inst. Phys., 2020. [Online]. Available:(https://www.sepnet.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/The-Physics-Graduate-Skills-Gap-What-it-is-and-how-to-address-it.pdf)

[30] American Institute of Physics, *Physics Doctorates: Skills Used and Satisfaction with Employment*. College Park, MD, USA: AIP Statistical Research Center, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://www.aip.org/statistics/reports/physics-doctorates-skills-used-and-satisfaction-employment

[31] Ministry of Education, *Government of India, National Education Policy 2020*. New Delhi, India, 2020. [Online]. Available: https://www.education.gov.in/sites/upload_files/mhrd/files/NEP_Final_English_0.pdf

[32] E. Trist and K. Bamforth, "Some social and psychological consequences of the longwall method of coal-getting," *Human Relations*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 3–38, Feb. 1951, doi: 10.1177/001872675100400101.

[33] C. W. Clegg, "Sociotechnical principles for system design," *Appl. Ergon*., vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 463–477, Oct. 2000, doi: 10.1016/S0003-6870(00)00009-0.

[34] G. Baxter and I. Sommerville, "Socio-technical systems: From design methods to systems engineering," *Interact. Comput*., vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 4–17, Jan. 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.intcom.2010.07.003.

[35] W. Dejene, "The practice of modularized curriculum in higher education institution: Active learning and continuous assessment in focus," *Cogent Education*, vol. 6, no. 1, Art. no. 1611052, 2019, doi: 10.1080/2331186X.2019.1611052.

[36] S. Kulmagambetova et al., "Assessing the effectiveness and potential of modular education in higher learning institutions," *Contemp. Educ. Res. J.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 63–78, May 2025, doi: 10.18844/cerj.v15i2.9698.

[37] B. G. Dega, "Enhancing critical thinking, metacognition, and conceptual understanding in introductory physics: The impact of direct and experiential instructional models," *Eurasia J. Math. Sci. Technol. Educ*., vol. 19, no. 6, Art. no. em2283, 2023, doi: 10.29333/ejmste/13273.

[38] M. Thabethe and C. Mwambakana-Mutombo, "The Impact of Project-Based Learning in the Physics First-Year Module," *Int. J. Learn. Teach. Educ. Res*., vol. 23, no. 6, pp. 433–453, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.26803/ijlter.23.6.24.

[39] A. A. B. Kayes and D. C. Kayes, "Experiential learning: current contributions and future trends in practice," *OUPblog,* Jun. 06, 2021. [Online]. Available: https://blog.oup.com/2021/06/experiential-learning-current-contributions-and-future-trends-in-practice/

[40] S. Y. Chen et al., "Education for ethical STEM: Scientific social responsibility and public policy," *Educ. Environ. Res*., vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1-10, Mar. 2025, doi: 10.56397/EER.2025.03.01.
[41] E. Hildt and K. Laas, Eds., *Building Inclusive Ethical Cultures in STEM*. Champaign, IL, USA: Univ. Illinois Press, 2024.
[42] B. D. Quinn et al., "Physics Lab Inventory of Critical Thinking: A new instrument to assess critical thinking in the context of experimental physics," *Phys. Rev. Phys. Educ. Res*., vol. 15, no. 1, Art. no. 010135, May 2019, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.15.010135.
[43] S. Y. Saleheen, "Research Ethics in STEM Education at Universities: A Scoping Review," *J. Acad. Ethics*, Feb. 2025, doi: 10.1007/s10805-024-09520-y.
[44] R. Awasthy, S. Flint, R. Sankarnarayana, and R. L. Jones, "A framework to improve university–industry collaboration," *J. Ind.-Univ. Collab*., vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 49–62, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1108/JIUC-09-2019-0016.
[45] S. Shah and A. L. Gillen, "A systematic literature review of university-industry partnerships in engineering education," *Eur. J. Eng. Educ*., vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 627–655, 2024, doi: 10.1080/03043797.2023.2253741.
[46] A. M. Agwa, "The effect of flipped classroom model on student's physics learning outcome in work and energy concept," *in Proc. 6th Int. Conf. Educ. Technol. (ICET*), 2019, pp. 120-124.
[47] M. A. C. Corpuz and G. T. P. de la Cruz, "Assessing cognitive factors of modular distance learning of K-12 students amidst the covid-19 pandemic towards academic achievements and satisfaction," *Sustainability*, vol. 14, no. 14, Art. no. 8763, Jul. 2022, doi: 10.3390/su14148763.
[48] I. I. Nurnaifah and A. Razzaq, "Increasing students' physics learning outcomes through experiential learning model," *JPF (Jurnal Pendidik. Fis.),* vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 37–46, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.21580/jpf.2023.11.1.14446.
[49] A. Z. S. Al-Absi, "Augmented reality in physics education: a tool for intellectual learning," *Contemp. Educ. Res. J.,* vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 33–44, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.18844/cerj.v15i1.9629.
[50] C. A. C. Jaramillo, D. A. R. Trejos, and J. A. M. Grisales, "Optimization of physics learning through immersive virtual reality: a study on the efficacy of serious games," *Appl. Sci*., vol. 15, no. 6, Art. no. 3405, Mar. 2025, doi: 10.3390/app15063405.
[51] M. McEliece, C. Hellings, and T. W. Hines, "E-STEM: a model for building an ethical STEM workforce," *Research Outreach,* no. 110, pp. 102–105, Aug. 2019. [Online]. Available: https://researchoutreach.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Michelle-McEliece.pdf
[52] Quinnipiac University School of Business, AACSB international, and deloitte consulting, "Closing the Skills Gap with Dynamic Partnerships," Feb. 2025. [Online]. Available:(https://www2.deloitte.com/content/dam/Deloitte/us/Documents/public-sector/closing-the-skills-gap-with-dynamic-partnerships.pdf)
[53] M. B. Sarkar, T. Overton, C. Thompson, and G. Rayner, "Graduate employability: views of recent science graduates and employers," *Int. J. Innov. Sci. Math. Educ*., vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 33–48, 2016.
[54] A. N. Le, A. M. Agwa, and M. A. C. Corpuz, "Problem-based learning versus traditional learning in physics education for engineering program students," *Educ. Sci.,* vol. 14, no. 2, Art. no. 154, Feb. 2024, doi: 10.3390/educsci14020154.
[55] M. A. C. Corpuz, "The influence of Augmented Reality (AR) learning media in physics education," *in Proc. 5th Int. Conf. on Education and Technology (ICET),* 2023, pp. 1-6.
[56] D. A. Norman, *The Design of Everyday Things: Revised and Expanded Edition*. New York, NY, USA: Basic Books, 2013.
[57] B. Gray and J. M. Purdy, *Collaborating for Our Future: Multistakeholder Partnerships for Solving Complex Problems*. New York, NY, USA: Oxford University Press, 2018.
[58] Bransford, A. L. Brown, and R. R. Cocking, Eds., *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School: Expanded Edition*. Washington, D.C., USA: National Academies Press, 2000.
[59] D. L. Fixsen, K. A. Blase, S. F. Naoom, and C. S. Ward, *Implementation Research: A Synthesis of the Literature. Tampa, FL, USA: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute*, The National Implementation Research Network (FMHI Publication #231), 2005.
[60] M. Binkley et al., "Defining 21st century skills," *in assessment and teaching of 21st century skills, P. Griffin, B. McGaw, and E. Care, Eds. Dordrecht,* Netherlands: Springer, 2012, pp. 17–66.
[61] S. Penuel, W. R. Penuel, K. K. Coburn, and C. E. Coburn, "Research–practice partnerships in education," *in The International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences, 2nd ed., J. D. Wright, Ed.* Oxford, UK: Elsevier, 2015, pp. 333–339.
[62] M. S. Donovan and J. D. Bransford, Eds., *How Students Learn: Science in the Classroom*. Washington, D.C., USA: National Academies Press, 2005.
[63] G. Holmes and N. G. Holmes, "Assessing critical thinking in a physics context: a compare-and-contrast approach is more effective than an evaluate-a-single-design approach," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 17, no. 8, Art. no. e0273337, Aug. 2022, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0273337.
[64] Kersting et al., "What is the role of the body in science education? a conversation between traditions," *Sci. & Educ*., vol. 33, pp. 1171–1210, 2024, doi: 10.1007/s11191-024-00508-z.
[65] A. D. Robertson et al., "Identifying student conceptual resources for understanding physics: A practical guide for researchers," *Phys. Rev. Phys. Educ. Res.,* vol. 19, no. 1, Art. no. 010141, Jun. 2023, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.19.010141.
[66] G. West, D. R. Dounas-Frazer, and H. J. Lewandowski, "Characterizing introductory and advanced lab courses using the ECLASS," *in Proc. Phys. Educ. Res. Conf., Virtual*, Jul. 2020, pp. 1–6, doi: 10.1119/perc.2020.pr.West.
[67] J. de Winter, "*Educating preservice physics teachers in England: The need for knowledge transformation*," Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. Phys. & Astron., Uppsala Univ., Uppsala, Sweden, 2025.

[68] S. A. Lawrence, T. A. Johnson, and C. Small, *Recruiting Black Biology Majors into STEM Education Careers: Journeys to Success*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2025.

[69] C. L. Quinlan, *Black Representation in the Science Curriculum: Implications for Identity, Culture, Belonging, and Curriculum Development*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2024.

[70] T. Korhonen, K. Kangas, and L. Salo, Eds., *Invention Pedagogy – The Finnish Approach to Maker Education*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge, 2024.

[71] J. Stewart, *A Vulnerable System: The History of Information Security in the Computer Age*. Ithaca, NY, USA: Cornell Univ. Press, 2021.

[72] S. Shankaregowda et al., “A flexible and transparent graphene-based triboelectric nanogenerator,” *IEEE Trans. Nanotechnol*., vol. 23, pp. 435–441, May 2024, doi: 10.1109/TNANO.2024.3385123.

[73] S. M. Mefire, “Static regime imaging of certain 3D electromagnetic imperfections from a boundary perturbation formula,” *J. Comput. Math*., vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 412–441, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.4208/jcm.2301-m2022-0145.

[74] H. Straub and O. Breitenstein, “Estimation of heat loss in thermal wave experiments,” *J. Appl. Phys*., vol. 135, no. 9, Art. no. 094502, Mar. 2024, doi: 10.1063/5.0189734.

[75] G. Polverini and B. Gregorcic, “Performance of ChatGPT on the test of understanding graphs in kinematics,” *Phys. Rev. Phys. Educ. Res*., vol. 20, no. 1, Art. no. 013101, Jan. 2024, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevPhysEducRes.20.013101.

[76] A. Anjomshoaa *et al*., “The effect of the flipped classroom on learning outcomes in medical sciences: a systematic review,” *Med. Educ. Bull.*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 431–440, Jun. 2022. [Online]. Available: https://www.medicaleducation-bulletin.ir/article_145743.html