

FOUR INNOVATIVE TEACHING METHODS. IS THERE A PLACE FOR POST-PEDAGOGY?

Hristo Chukurliev

New Bulgarian University, Sofia, Bulgaria



Abstract

The article examines the need for a new pedagogical framework in the context of contemporary higher education, influenced by digital innovations and generational change. It introduces four innovative pedagogical approaches – Description of an Object, Humanities Laboratory, Venus of Slatina, and Time Machine – which serve as a basis for discussing 'post-pedagogy'. The approaches are united by the goal of achieving priorities such as interdisciplinary training, critical thinking, and the encouragement of curiosity. By proposing the integration of these methods, the article aims to draw attention to the changed landscape of the educational field.

Keywords: post-pedagogy, innovative teaching approaches, learning styles

Article history:

Received: 19 March 2024

Reviewed: 22 April 2024

Accepted: 10 May 2024

Published: 22 June 2024

Copyright © 2024 Hristo Chikurliiev



This open access article is published and distributed under a [CC BY-NC 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. Permissions beyond the scope of this license may be available at hchukurliev@nbu.bg If you want to use the work commercially, you must first get the authors' permission.

Citation: Chukurliev, H. (2024). Four Innovative Teaching Methods. Is There a Place for Post-Pedagogy?. *English Studies at NBU*, 10(1), 43-58. <https://doi.org/10.33919/esnbu.24.1.3>

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hristo Chukurliev holds a Master's degree in Bulgarian Philology from Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski" and a Doctorate in Administration and Management from New Bulgarian University. He is a member of the Pedagogy Section in the Department of Foreign Languages and Cultures at New Bulgarian University. His research interests include management models, digital technologies, transformation processes, and the history of civilizations and religions. He focuses on transforming teaching methods in higher education and their link to future professions.

E-mail: hchukurliev@nbu.bg

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0006-6496-9752>

The classical university teaching method: theory-exercise-practice is breaking down into a multitude of new methods that use tools not described in pedagogical science. The working hypothesis of the study is that there is a need for a new type of pedagogy that corresponds to the changes in our environment, the characteristics of the new generations, and all of this in the context of the development of digital technologies, including various applications of artificial intelligence. This post-pedagogy is centered neither on the image of the teacher nor on that of the student. It is turned simultaneously towards both. The subject of the study is four innovative teaching methods: Description of an Object, Humanities Laboratory, Venus of Slatina, and Time Machine. The report aims, by presenting these innovative teaching methods, to draw attention to them and at the same time to present the basis for the construction of a post-pedagogy, subject to new rules and relationships, using a variety of methods.

Intelligences and Learning Styles

Bruner suggests that after the 1960s, the competition or 'war,' as he calls it, between different learning theories has subsided: 'After the end of the 1960s, learning theories are understood as concepts for the exchange of information without striving for dominance of one type of learning over another based on its characteristics' (Bruner, 2004, p.19). However, the science of pedagogy does not find peace and continues to deal with the description of the various emerging models of training, for which the present is more favorable than ever. There are many texts that, like Bruner's, consider the theories of learning in a historical perspective (Kamenov, 2022), but also their development, enhancement, and the emergence of new ones like those for connectivism, which Peycheva-Forsyth describes in the broader paradigm of diverse models for e-learning (Peycheva-Forsyth, 2022). The successful application of modern and postmodern training methods, different from the classical ones, such as the game method, begin to acquire theoretical features and turn into almost traditional (Stoyanova, et al., 2018).

In 2021, Annie Paul published a book with the curious title 'The Extended Mind: The Power of Thinking Outside the Brain' (Paul, 2021), in which she presents the idea of three major sections of extended thinking, each in turn divided into three sub-sections: thinking through the body (senses, movement, and gestures); through the environment surrounding us (natural spaces, man-made spaces, and spaces of ideas); through our connections with others (experts, colleagues, and peers). Paul's theory does not appear

out of nowhere in science and is closely related to education, as it happens in the same place – in the brain. In 1983, Howard Gardner presents his revolutionary idea of multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1983, 2004, 2011), which also does not appear out of nothing. He publishes at least a dozen texts before that, in which he examines the phenomenon of human intelligence and brain functions (p. xii), but it is this book and theory that gains wide popularity. In the preface to the 2011 edition, Gardner expands the original seven intelligences (intrapersonal, interpersonal, spatial, musical, logical, kinesthetic, and linguistic), which he offers to the public with two new ones: existential and naturalistic intelligences. Gardner himself and his colleagues in the two major projects he works on and through which he reaches his conclusions (Project Zero and Project Spectrum) use the theories of big names in cognitive and pedagogical science such as Louis Thurstone (1887-1955), who in the 1930s denies monolithic intelligence and talks about talents and innate abilities; Jean Piaget (1896-1980), who also does not synthesize his discoveries into the proclamation of multiple intelligences, but connects the different stages of child development with the acquisition and development of different skills; a little more indirectly, but again in connection is Lev Vygotsky's (1896-1934) understanding of the sociocultural context, which conditions behavior and thus distinguishes one cultural environment from another and those educated in them; also Edward L. Thorndike (1874-1949), who in the 1920s proposes three types of intelligence: abstract, mechanical, and social. After Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences (MI) in 1983, several models were developed to explain individual differences in learning styles. David Kolb's experiential learning theory from 1984 suggests that learning is a process where knowledge is created through the transformation of experience. His theory is structured around four different learning styles, which according to him correspond to four stages of the learning cycle: concrete experience (CE), reflective observation (RO), abstract conceptualization (AO), and active experimentation (AE). Kolb's model categorizes learners into four types based on their preferred learning activities: diverging (CE/RO), assimilating (AC/RO), converging (AC/AE), and accommodating (CE/AE). Peter Honey and Alan Mumford's *Learning Styles* (1986) adapt Kolb's model to the needs of business and adult education as four learning styles and the different preferences of people on how to interact with information. These styles are equated to roles in the company: activist (learns best by doing), reflector (learns best by observing and reflecting), theorist (learns best through models and theories), and pragmatist (learns best through practical application and

experimentation). Richard M. Felder and Linda K. Silverman's (Felder-Silverman) Learning Style Model from 1988 suggests dividing learners into four dimensions: sensory-intuitive, visual-verbal, active-reflective, and sequential-global. The model suggests that people have different preferences regarding these dimensions, affecting how they receive and process information and finds application in the context of higher education and STEM fields. Everything said so far leads to Neil Fleming's VARK model (from Visual, Aural, Read/Write, Kinesthetic), published in 1987 and 1992, after which it becomes especially popular and applicable. Fleming divides learners into four categories and, as expected, claims that each prefers to work with information depending on its modality. One of the first fables that a child in Europe becomes acquainted with is Aesop's about the fox and the stork and if the obvious moral is that they will treat you as you do to others, it seems to me that another is very visible – everyone has a different modality and if you treat someone with means from another's, they will not cope.

Theories of Learning

The associationist theory of learning is one of the oldest theories about how people learn. It is based on the principle that ideas and experiences strengthen each other and can be connected to improve the learning process. This theory is closely related to behaviorism and is developed based on the work of earlier philosophers and psychologists such as Aristotle, John Locke, and later by modern psychologists like Ivan Pavlov, John B. Watson, and B.F. Skinner. Learning occurs through the association of two stimuli. Pavlov's experiments with dogs show how a neutral stimulus, when combined with an unconditioned stimulus, can lead to a conditioned response. Operant conditioning (Skinner) claims that behavior is shaped and maintained by its consequences. Rewards and punishments affect the likelihood of a behavior being repeated. The stimulus-response (S-R) connection is part of the concept that suggests learning should form connections between stimuli and responses. The stronger the connection, the more likely the response is to occur in the presence of the stimulus.

In contrast, the configurational theory emphasizes the holistic processing of stimuli rather than simple stimulus-response associations. It suggests that individuals perceive and interpret stimuli in a unified way, taking into account the configuration or the entire pattern, not just individual parts. This theory is associated with Gestalt psychology, which posits that "the whole is different from the sum of its parts." Learning,

according to this view, is influenced by the way people organize and interpret sensory information. This organization is guided by principles such as proximity, similarity, continuity, and closure. Part of this is Köhler's idea of relational and transpositional learning, according to which information processing can occur through sudden understanding or perception of the relationships between parts of a problem, which can lead to its solution. Köhler opposes the behaviorism of Wundt and the theory that learning must adhere to the trial-and-error method proposed by the associationist views. Lewin develops this theory by assuming that behavior in learning is determined by complex interactions between the individual and the environment, taking into account psychological, social, and physical factors in a dynamic field.

The cognitive learning theory that emerged in the 1950s, which we said Bruner defines as the final moment of the conflict between the previous two major theories, focuses on the internal processes that occur in the brain and how they affect learning and behavior. Learning involves the use of memory, motivation, thinking, and reflection, not just reactions to stimuli or the environment. Key figures in its emergence are Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky (see above). Bruner, along with Piaget, influences the constructivist theory of learning, which posits that learners construct their own understanding and knowledge of the world through experiencing things and reflecting on those experiences. Learning is an active, constructive process where learners build new ideas or concepts based on their current/past knowledge.

According to the social learning theory proposed by Albert Bandura, observation and modeling of the behavior, attitudes, and emotional reactions of others are essential components. Bandura introduces the concept of learning through the Bobo doll, where people can learn new behavior or information by observing and imitating others. David Kolb's theory of learning through experience (see above) focuses on the learning process as a cycle that includes experiencing, reflecting, thinking, and acting. He postulates that learning is a process where knowledge is created through the transformation of experience. Kolb emphasizes concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation in the learning process.

Transformative learning represents a change in someone's beliefs, attitudes, or worldview. Jack Mezirow is a key figure in this theory, suggesting that transformative learning occurs through critical reflection, which can lead to a profound change in

personal understanding and potentially in how a person lives their life. The theory is particularly suitable for adult learning, relying on dialogue and critical reflection.

A relatively new theory, connectivism (Peycheva-Forsyth, 2022), proposed by George Siemens and Stephen Downes, is designed to examine the ways in which digital technologies affect how people live, communicate, and learn. It suggests that knowledge exists outside the individual and that learning is a process of navigating, expanding, and pruning connections in a networked environment. Therefore, learning is not just a mental process, but also a process of connecting specialized sources of information.

Discussion

This extensive review of learning theories and styles, long for the scope of this report, aims to create an understanding of their importance for the contemporary education system. The increasing significance of the learner's individuality over the learning objective creates an environment in which many processes are possible in not so unequivocal directions. The democratization and internationalization of education, and particularly higher education, are aspects that cannot be uncritically accepted. Willingham and Riener do this in a very short article, but at the same time, it is strong enough as an intellectual impulse (Willingham & Riener, 2010). According to them, learning styles not only exist but have been given too much importance and enjoy attention that is undeserved. The two authors argue that when the learning is appropriate for the learners, they follow the established method without claiming their own learning style. From the opposite perspective, we can become acquainted with this thesis in Shulman's article on knowledge and teaching and the need to lay the foundation for a new reform in them (Shulman, 1987). There Shulman begins his exposition with the example of teaching in the upper grades of secondary education and Nancy, an English language and literature teacher. Depending on the task, the circumstances, and her own physical condition, Nancy is able to change the teaching model, use different tools, and motivate her audience of students to a very high degree. Shulman attributes this to two factors - Nancy's innate propensity to teach and her vast 25 years of experience. If learners have different learning styles, then the teacher should also have a preferred teaching style. You understand that if we take these two positions to the extreme, we will cripple the learning process. What then is the viewpoint of hypothetical post-pedagogy?

Four New Teaching Methods

The quartet of teaching methods we've introduced encapsulates the essence of post-pedagogy, embodying its principles to such an extent that, when these methods are implemented in tandem, they have the potential to define the very contours of post-pedagogy's profile. This innovative educational approach doesn't merely aim to tweak existing frameworks; it seeks a profound transformation of the dynamics within the learning environment. Post-pedagogy is a call to revitalize the educator's role from a mere purveyor of information to a facilitator of wisdom, and to recalibrate the student-teacher relationship into a collaborative partnership driven by mutual respect and a shared quest for knowledge. Post-pedagogy is rooted in the soil of interdisciplinarity, branching out into the diverse fields of human knowledge, intertwining them in a rich mosaic of learning. It fosters critical thinking, not as an academic exercise, but as a habitual mindset, and stokes the fires of curiosity and the zest for exploration. This educational philosophy acknowledges the irrefutable impact of digital technologies and the undeniable allure of audio-visual content that has dominated the past two decades. Yet, it argues for a balanced approach where such tools are used not to overshadow but to complement and enhance traditional academic rigor. Post-pedagogy holds that while the digital age has transformed the modality of learning, the importance of nuanced language skills remains paramount. The ability to articulate complex thoughts and to vividly describe the intricacies of the world around us is an invaluable skill in the arsenal of a well-educated individual. Post-pedagogy, therefore, does not see digital evolution as a detractor but as a catalyst that, when wisely integrated with the nurturing of linguistic prowess, can elevate the educational experience to new heights. It proposes a holistic model where the digital and the linguistic are not at odds but are in concert, each enriching the learning journey in their unique ways.

Description of an Object

In the contemporary educational landscape, the method dubbed 'Description of an Object' has emerged as a beacon of hope against the backdrop of a disquieting trend: the functional illiteracy among youth (OECD, 2023). Despite rigorous matriculation exams and extensive courses in Bulgarian language and literature, a disconcerting number of students from various disciplines, not solely within the humanities and social sciences, are graduating without the crucial ability to engage deeply with text or to articulate their thoughts coherently. This begs the question: Where does the responsibility lie? While it is

tempting to place the onus on the learners themselves, a reflective gaze would suggest that perhaps as educators, we have not entirely succeeded in illuminating the path to the true value of these linguistic skills, nor in delineating their practical applications in a language they are meant to command.

Just recently, a sixth-grade student shared with me what they are studying in literature classes: "Under the Yoke" and "You Are Beautiful, My Forest" – two emblematic works for Bulgarian cultural environment and identity, but what practical application do they have? How likely, possible, and motivated is it to make an 11-year-old child master the old Bulgarian language of Ivan Vazov and Lyuben Karavelov? The ability to write a poem about Vasil Levski is another astonishing thing expected of this child. Beyond questions related to building national identity, the issue of the functional use of the Bulgarian language is particularly troubling here. It is not strange, after the example presented, that students do not master the language they are taught because they do not see how and where they can apply it. Can you imagine a person who has learned Vazov's language from "Under the Yoke" going into a hotel and asking at the reception: "I would request the boon of a chamber with two pallets?." Instead of: "I would like a room with twin beds?".

The prevailing penchant for photography over descriptive writing—a shift underscored by the advent of digital technologies—further complicates this challenge. The instantaneous nature of capturing and sharing images has unwittingly diminished the emphasis on detailed linguistic expression.¹ It is an era where auditory and visual stimuli reign supreme, facilitated by digital innovations. Students are distracted not out of disinterest alone but perhaps due to a disconnection from the relevance of what they are learning to their everyday lives.

In this light, 'Description of an Object' serves as a pedagogical intervention at Leuphana University, a strategy presented with the intent of recapturing students'

¹ Behind the behavior of Japanese tourists, who are famously passionate about taking photos during their travels at all kinds of places and poses, lies a much more complex process, encoded in the Japanese journaling culture with a centuries-old tradition. A large part of the classic works of Japanese literature are in diary form, which sets the general tone for every person in Japan to strive to replicate these patterns by keeping their own diary. The development of the camera, the reduction of the cost of the device itself, consumables, and printing of photos occurs precisely in Japan, and therefore there it proves to be a very convenient substitute for language as a means of reproducing daily notes – instead of notes, photographs. The much shorter time required to produce and review a photo, to encode and decode the information in it, reduces the time for concentration and attention.

engagement through detailed description and collective inquiry. This method, characteristic of foundational education stages, challenges students to describe an object with the utmost precision and breadth. It fosters a rediscovery of focus and contemplation—skills eroded in the digital deluge. Each week, students collaborate, inspiring one another and broadening their descriptive skills, ultimately fostering a rich exchange of perspectives.

Why, then, does such a method resonate so effectively at higher levels of education? The answer points to the core attributes of language that have been undermined: the dwindling opportunities for concentration, the decline in valuing linguistic prowess, and the diminished sense of language's functional use. This method counters that decline by reviving the descriptive vigor necessary for in-depth academic inquiry and practical application.

The tale of the 11-year-old tasked with interpreting the historical language of Vazov and Karavelov, and the expectation to compose poetry about national heroes, encapsulates the challenge at hand. The 'Description of an Object' method not only reaffirms the value of linguistic dexterity but also re-establishes the connection between the historical gravitas of language and its indispensable role in modern education.

In essence, the method underscores the pressing need for an educational paradigm shift—a post-pedagogical framework that preserves and promotes core skills, ensuring they do not vanish into an educational Bermuda Triangle but instead remain integral to a meaningful, applicable learning journey for students at all stages.

The Humanities Lab

The Humanities Lab stands as an intellectual crucible where the fear of educational ennui is transformed into a crucible of innovation. This trepidation, rooted in the concern that educators might inadvertently disengage their audience, galvanizes the pedagogical journey toward a realm where the potential for boredom catalyzes a quest for invigorating academic discourse. The fear is multifaceted, encompassing not only the dread of dullness but the sobering realization that irrelevant or non-applicable knowledge might be imparted—leaving students equipped with tools they cannot wield in the real world. Such a prospect is antithetical to the true essence of education, which ought to empower and enlighten.

Born from this confluence of fear and the daring spirit of experimentation, the Humanities Lab, as crafted by its founders (Feldt & Petersen, 2021), embodies a bold departure from pedagogical convention. The laboratory is a bastion of Scandinavian pragmatism, embracing the experimental ethos that propels educational practice into new frontiers. Here, teachers and students join forces, not in a hierarchical manner, but as intellectual equals, collaborators on a pilgrimage toward a future where universities are incubators of both thought and action.

The essence of the Humanities Lab at Roskilde University is its multidisciplinary nature, with the latent potential to become a fully interdisciplinary endeavor. As an academic initiative, it is at once a seminar and a sanctuary for inquiry, designed to challenge masters in history, philosophy, Danish language, and literature to ponder profoundly existential questions—those that tug at the very fabric of human existence. 'What makes life worth living?' is not merely a topic of discussion but the central thesis around which the lab orbits. With its inauguration in the spring of 2023, it has swiftly become a cornerstone of the university's academic offerings, rewarding its successful participants with 10 ECTS, a testament to its scholastic significance.

Weekly, the lab convenes, transforming into a collective brainstorming session where the boundaries of traditional academia are tested. Participants are encouraged to bring forth a diversity of responses to the seminar's central inquiry, ranging from textual analyses to lyrical compositions, from visual representations to musical renditions, thus reflecting the multifaceted nature of human understanding. This exercise in critical thinking and creative expression upends the conventional seminar format, provoking both students and educators to reflect on the pivotal elements of university life: the balance between order and chaos, the interplay of authority and individuality, and the quest for veracity in an era riddled with ambiguity.

Furthermore, the structure of the seminar opens a discourse on the very architecture of university education, questioning the dichotomy between structured learning and intellectual freedom. The laboratory blurs the lines between the roles of student and teacher, allowing participants to self-determine their evaluative criteria, thus fostering a learning environment where assessment is not a top-down decree but a

collaborative agreement. The interplay between these roles reflects a broader meditation on the nature of power and knowledge within academic institutions.

By taking ownership of their educational journey in the Humanities Lab, students actively engage with philosophical debates on pluralism, equality, and the democratization of knowledge. They grapple with the notion of interpretative freedom, recognizing the responsibility that accompanies the right to articulate their thoughts and ideas through the mediums they choose, whether in written word, visual art, or other forms of media. It is a realm where identity is not just discovered but actively constructed through dialogue and the exchange of diverse viewpoints. As the laboratory unfolds week by week, it is evident that the students are not only learners but also contributors to the ever-evolving narrative of humanities education. This participatory approach is a significant departure from passive consumption of knowledge, positioning students as co-creators who are empowered to challenge and redefine the value and application of humanistic studies.

When the Humanities Lab was presented to an external audience of educators from a different university, it incited a rich conversation on its potential to disrupt the conventional educational fabric. The laboratory's radical approach poses provocative questions: Can academic rigor coexist with unfettered creativity? How can institutions nurture an educational ecosystem that balances intellectual rigor with the freedom to explore and innovate? In what ways might such an endeavor recalibrate the compass of humanities education to better navigate the complexities of the 21st century?

In conclusion, the Humanities Lab serves as an experimental microcosm, a blueprint for a new model of higher education that prioritizes engagement, relevance, and applicative knowledge. It champions an education that dares to reimagine itself continuously, aspiring to equip students with the intellectual dexterity required to flourish in an increasingly complex world. As such, it encapsulates the ethos of post-pedagogy, advocating for a dynamic, transformative, and deeply humanistic approach to learning.

The 'Venus of Slatina'

The 'Venus of Slatina' method, while whimsical in name, anchors itself in the profound depths of history and pedagogical innovation. This methodology, christened

after an enigmatic artifact unearthed at the Neolithic Settlement Slatina in 2013, pays homage to one of Europe's most ancient and significant archaeological discoveries. The Venus of Slatina, now a centerpiece at the Regional History Museum of Sofia within the storied walls of the Central Bath, serves as a silent testament to the rich history of human civilization. Embracing this heritage, I integrated the Venus of Slatina into a general education course on Civilizations and Religions—a course I've passionately conducted since 2019. Over the academic year of 2022/2023, I observed the method's potent impact on students' engagement with our collective past, an experience so enriching that I am compelled to revisit it in the forthcoming year. This approach, however, is borne of a somber realization. Museums, as repositories of history and art, have long fascinated me, for they are more than mere collections; they are the physical manifestations of collectors' and curators' visions, each piece a narrative, each display a story untold.

Recent years have witnessed a digital renaissance in the museum experience—augmented, virtual, and mixed realities enhancing and expanding our perception of the artifacts that narrate our story. Museums themselves are historical monuments, creating a layered educational experience—history within history. Prior to the spring semester of 2022/2023, I embarked on a novel and ambitious venture. I aspired to take my students beyond the classroom, to immerse them in the tactile reality of the Archaeological Museum and the Sofia Museum. This seed of an idea grew into a collaborative effort with colleagues from the departments of archaeology and anthropology. Together, we envisioned a combined field trip that would intertwine our pedagogies and student groups into a rich educational tapestry. The invitation extended to Chief Assist. Dr. Petranka Nedelcheva and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Irena Bokova to join this endeavor was met with tempered expectations; despite their expertise, student turnout was modest. The initial enthusiasm waned, mirroring the six attendees of a highly specialized course. The anticipation that a third of my fifty students would attend was met with the stark reality of only three showing up. Such a disheartening turnout prompted introspection and self-reflection. The allure of the Archaeological Museum's collection, so vivid and compelling to me, had somehow failed to translate into student enthusiasm. This was a pivotal moment of educational clarity; the realization dawned on me that passion for history's treasures is not innate—it must be ignited. In response to this, I reevaluated my teaching strategy, seeking to intertwine educational value with an element of gamification. The creation of an 'escape room' scenario within the museum transformed the visit from a

passive walk-through into an active learning challenge. By weaving the narrative of the Venus of Slatina into a complex riddle, students were not merely observers but participants in a historical detective story. They were tasked with decoding the past, using descriptions to identify artifacts and conversely, creating vivid descriptions for items known only through images. This innovative approach turned the museum into a crucible of critical thinking and problem-solving, with a time-bound mission that both captivated and educated. The 'Venus of Slatina' method evolved into an immersive, interactive experience, marrying the intrigue of an escape room with the rich educational content of the museum. The students, once passive recipients of knowledge, became active agents in their educational journey. They delved into the nuances of historical inquiry, engaged with the material culture of the past, and learned the importance of interpretation and description in the understanding of history. As an educator, the method redefined my perception of teaching. It underscored the need for creativity in conveying the importance of historical literacy and highlighted the effectiveness of experiential learning. With every solved riddle and every item identified, students didn't just learn about history—they experienced it. They left the museum not only with a sense of accomplishment but also with an enhanced appreciation for the discipline of history and the detective work it often entails.

The 'Venus of Slatina' teaching method, thus, serves as a pioneering example of how educators can adapt to the changing landscapes of student engagement, using innovation and interactivity to bring the static pages of history to vibrant life. It challenges us to re-envision our approach to education, to bridge the gap between historical artifacts and the modern student, and to ensure that the essence of our shared past is not only learned but also lived and cherished.

The "Time Machine"

The "Time Machine" method, a creative exercise embedded in the 'Digital Technologies in Business Management' master's course, serves as a unique educational tool, blending historical insight with forward-thinking relevance. This pedagogical approach propels students not only through the curriculum but into the realm of active learning and critical engagement. When I presented my class with this challenge, inspired by Lyudmil Georgiev's advocacy for case-based learning as a collaborative endeavor, I did

so with the intention of dismantling the traditional hierarchy between student and teacher. Each master's student became a researcher, a historian, and a futurist, all in one.

Embarking on this intellectual journey, the students were tasked with traversing the annals of history to identify a figure of significant influence. This exercise was not merely about recollecting historical facts; it required a deep dive into the psyche and circumstances of these figures, understanding their motivations, strategies, and the resources at their disposal. This retrospection was coupled with a speculative twist: choosing up to five modern inventions that, if introduced in the chosen figure's era, could have potentially altered the course of history.

The "Time Machine" method transforms the classroom into a collaborative space where each participant brings their perspective, their analytical skills, and their creative visions to the table. Students grapple with the paradox of introducing contemporary technologies to past epochs, challenging them to evaluate the interplay between innovation, societal impact, and historical context. This reflection not only enhances their understanding of technological advancements but also enriches their appreciation for the intricacies of historical development. Students are encouraged to embody the historical figure, to adopt their ambitions and constraints, thus fostering a sense of empathy and a more profound connection to the past. They are prompted to theorize how the introduction of current-day technologies might have shifted the trajectory of their figure's endeavors. Could a smartphone have revolutionized communication in ancient empires? Would renewable energy sources have altered the landscape of industrial revolutions? Moreover, this methodological approach prompts a critical analysis of the limitations inherent in technological progress. By constraining the students to select a mere five items, they are compelled to prioritize, to distill the essence of innovation into a handful of transformative elements. This process cultivates an understanding of the value and potential of technology within societal evolution.

The "Time Machine" method does more than educate; it inspires. It dares students to envision history not as a static timeline but as a tapestry woven from the threads of human ingenuity, ambition, and the continual quest for advancement. As they project and predict the implications of their choices, they engage in a form of educational role-play that blurs the lines between past and present, theory and application, imagination and concrete understanding. As we move forward, this method stands as a testament to the

power of education to inspire change-makers. It exemplifies a model where learning is an immersive, dynamic process that equips students with the vision to see beyond the horizon of their current reality, into the past, and back to the future with fresh eyes. Through this exercise, students not only learn history—they have the opportunity to reshape it in their minds, considering the boundless potential of their knowledge and the technologies that shape our world today.

Conclusion

As we step into an era marked by rapid technological advancement and societal shifts, the imperative to reinvigorate the gravitas of higher education becomes more pronounced. In our pursuit to steer clear of the extremes of scholasticism and hedonism, we must embrace the dynamism inherent in the educational process. The multiplicity of intelligences and learning styles underscores the rich diversity of the student body, necessitating a pedagogical approach that is as fluid and adaptable as the learners it aims to serve. Furthermore, the introduction of innovative methods within the educational sphere signals a move towards a more holistic, student-centered model of learning, one that transcends traditional boundaries and encourages a symbiosis of various disciplines. This revolution in pedagogical thinking challenges us to reimagine the essence of teaching and learning, to reconstruct it in a way that it aligns with the evolving needs of a globalized, interconnected world.

The concept of post-pedagogy, therefore, emerges as a beacon of transformative change, advocating for a fundamental rethinking of the objectives and strategies of education. It calls for a foundational reestablishment that not only appreciates the historical trajectory of pedagogical theory but also proactively adapts to the unforeseeable complexities of the future. In essence, post-pedagogy demands an educational renaissance: a harmonious blend of reverence for the accumulated wisdom of the past and the innovative spirit needed to forge new paths in learning. As educators and scholars, we stand at the threshold of this new horizon, poised to redefine the very nature of higher education and its role in shaping the citizens of tomorrow. It is a call to action for all stakeholders in the educational ecosystem to collaboratively sculpt an environment that fosters critical inquiry, nurtures creativity, and above all, enkindles a lifelong zeal for learning.

References

- Bruner, J., (2004). A Short History of Psychological Theories of Learning. *Daedalus*, 133(1), 13-20. <https://doi.org/10.1162/001152604772746657>
- Feldt, E. J. & Petersen, E. B., (2021). Studying as Experimentation: Habits and Obstacles in the Ecology of the University. *Philosophy and Theory in Higher Education*, 3(3), 55-67. <https://doi.org/10.3726/PTIHE032021.0005>
- Gardner, H., (1983). *Frames of Mind. The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. Basic Books.
- Georgiev, L., (2011). *Teaching Through Cases [Prepodavane chrez kazusi]*. NBU Publishing House.
- Ivanov, I., (2005). Interactive Methods of Teaching [*Interaktivni Metodi na Obuchenie*] (pp. 1-17). Jubilee scientific conference with international participation 50 years DIPKU - Varna "Education and qualification of pedagogical personnel - development and projections in the 21st century" [*Yubileina nauchna konferentsiya s mezhdunarodno uchastie 50 godini DIPKU – Varna "Obrazovanie i kvalifikatsiya na pedagogicheskite kadri – razvitie i proeksii prez KHKHI vek"*]. <https://kim-kozloduy.com/docs/irz11.pdf>
- Kamenov, H., (2022). Theories of Learning. <https://nauka.bg/teorii-obuchenieto>
- OECD (2023), PISA 2022 Results (Volume I): The State of Learning and Equity in Education, PISA. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/53f23881-en>
- Paul, A. M., (2021). *The Extended Mind: The Power of Thinking Outside the Brain*. Mariner Books.
- Peycheva-Forsyth, R., (2022). Paradigms of Learning as a Theoretical Foundation for Implementing Various Models of E-learning. [*Paradigmi na ucheneto kato osnova za realizirane na raznoobrazni modeli na elektronno obuchenie*] <https://www.vedamo.com/bg/knowledge/paradigmi-na-ucheneto>
- Shulman, L. S., (1987). Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.57.1.j463w79r56455411>
- Stoyanova, M., Tuparova, D. & Samardzhiev, K., (2018). Theories of Learning and Gamification in Education [*Teoriite za uchene i igrovizatsiyata v obuchenieto*]. XI National Conference "Education and Research in the Information Society" [*XI Natsionalna konferentsia "Obrazovaniето i izsledvaniyata v informatsionnoto obshtestvo"*]. Plovdiv, Institute of Mathematics and Informatics at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Association for Information Society Development, pp. 31-40. <http://sci-gems.math.bas.bg/jspui/bitstream/10525/2944/1/ERIS2018-bookp03.pdf>
- Willingham, D. & Riener, C., (2010). The Myth of Learning Styles. *Change*, 42(5), 32-35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2010.503139>

Reviewers:

1. Anonymous
2. Anonymous

Handling Editor:

Stan Bogdanov, PhD
New Bulgarian University