Paradigm Academic Press
Research and Advances in Education
ISSN 2788-7057
NOV. 2023 VOL.2, NO.11

Analyzing the Impact of Gender-Inclusive STEM Curricula on Enhancing Female STEM Literacy: Implications for Social Justice and Economic Equilibrium

Liangchen Mei[1], Xitong Guo[2], Changrong Du[3] & Kai Cui[4]

[1] University of London, United Kingdom

[2] School of Visual Arts, United States

[3] University of Glasgow, United Kingdom

[4] Springfield Commonwealth Academy, United States

Correspondence: Kai Cui, Springfield Commonwealth Academy, United States.

doi:10.56397/RAE.2023.11.02

Abstract

As the world becomes increasingly interconnected and technologically advanced, STEM literacy has emerged as a fundamental skill necessary for individual and societal progress. Despite the growing importance of STEM, a distinct gender disparity exists in both interest and achievement in these fields, with implications for equity and a nation's ability to innovate. Addressing this disparity requires gender-inclusive STEM curricula that are accessible and appealing to all students, emphasizing real-world contexts, diverse role models, and hands-on learning. Such curricula have shown promise in boosting female students' self-efficacy, persistence, and performance in STEM. Enhanced female STEM literacy not only improves academic outcomes but also challenges deep-rooted gender biases and contributes to economic growth and innovation. Embracing an intersectional lens ensures inclusivity in these initiatives. Ultimately, closing the gender gap in STEM literacy is a societal imperative, fostering equal participation, innovation, and equitable distribution of advancements.

Keywords: gender equity, STEM education, social justice

1. Introduction and Background

As the world becomes increasingly interconnected and technologically advanced, STEM literacy has emerged as a fundamental skill necessary for individual and societal progress. With rapid advancements in fields such as artificial intelligence, biotechnology, and renewable energy, STEM literacy is not only vital for those seeking careers in these areas but for all citizens to navigate an increasingly complex world (Bybee, 2010).

Despite the growing importance of STEM, a distinct gender disparity exists in both interest and achievement in these fields. This imbalance is not just a concern for equity but has implications for a nation's ability to innovate, remain competitive, and address societal challenges (Hill, Corbett, & St. Rose, 2010). Data from various assessments, like the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), further emphasize this gap, especially at higher education and professional levels (Martin, Mullis, & Hooper, 2016).

Addressing gender disparity in STEM literacy requires a multi-pronged approach. One significant initiative involves the development and implementation of gender-inclusive STEM curricula. Such curricula are designed to be more accessible and appealing to students of all genders, using real-world contexts, diverse role models, and hands-on learning experiences (Scantlebury & Baker, 2007).

STEM literacy goes beyond just understanding scientific facts. It encapsulates knowledge of scientific concepts, the application of this knowledge in real-world situations, and the ability to think critically and solve problems using STEM principles (Roberts, 2018). This multifaceted approach to STEM education is essential to prepare students for the 21st-century workforce and to make informed decisions as global citizens (NRC, 2012).

2. Gender Disparities in STEM Literacy: Challenges and Barriers

Numerous studies and assessments across the globe have documented the gender gap in STEM literacy. For instance, the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) scores, which evaluate 15-year-olds in reading, mathematics, and science literacy every three years, have shown consistent disparities in mathematics and science literacy, with boys often outperforming girls, particularly in higher-level tasks (OECD, 2019). Additionally, the National Science Board highlighted that while females make up half of the college-educated workforce in the U.S., they account for only 28% of science and engineering professions (National Science Board, 2020).

Traditional STEM curricula have been criticized for various reasons. One of the significant criticisms is that they often adopt a “one-size-fits-all” approach, not taking into account the diverse learning needs of students. This method can be detrimental to fostering genuine interest and understanding, particularly among female students (Brotman & Moore, 2008). Furthermore, traditional curricula might lack real-world context and relevance, often presenting STEM concepts in isolation, devoid of broader societal or personal implications (Hill, Corbett, & St. Rose, 2010).

Sociocultural and systemic barriers impeding female STEM literacy and participation.

Beyond curricular challenges, deeper sociocultural and systemic barriers hinder female participation and literacy in STEM. Stereotypes persist, with many still believing that males are naturally more adept at STEM disciplines, influencing the self-perception and confidence of young girls (Nosek et al., 2009). These stereotypes can lead to bias in both educational and professional settings. For example, female students might receive less encouragement or face higher scrutiny than their male counterparts, which can dissuade them from pursuing STEM further (Moss-Racusin et al., 2012). Additionally, the lack of female role models in STEM can further alienate potential female aspirants, making them feel that these fields aren’t for them (Dasgupta & Stout, 2014).

3. Gender-Inclusive STEM Curricula: Design, Application, and Impact

Gender-inclusive STEM curricula emphasize the importance of representation, contextualization, and collaboration. They often integrate real-world examples that resonate with both male and female experiences, providing a broader spectrum of contexts and problems to study (Brotman & Moore, 2008). Additionally, such curricula prioritize the inclusion of diverse historical and contemporary STEM figures, ensuring students see role models of all genders excelling in these fields (Rosser, 2012). Another characteristic is the emphasis on cooperative learning, where students work in diverse teams, mirroring real-world STEM workplaces and promoting a more inclusive learning environment (Johnson, Johnson, & Smith, 1998).

Recent studies have shown promising results regarding the efficacy of gender-inclusive STEM curricula. For example, a longitudinal study by Dasgupta and Stout (2014) found that exposure to such curricula significantly boosted female students’ self-efficacy, persistence, and performance in STEM fields. Another investigation by Charlesworth (2016) demonstrated that schools which implemented gender-inclusive STEM curricula reported higher STEM literacy rates and engagement among female students compared to those following traditional STEM curricula.

When analyzing the outcomes, there’s a discernible difference between traditional and gender-inclusive curricula. Traditional STEM education, which often lacks diverse representation and contextualization, might inadvertently perpetuate stereotypes, leading to decreased interest and self-efficacy among female students (Master, Cheryan, & Meltzoff, 2016). In contrast, gender-inclusive curricula not only address the literacy gap but also foster an inclusive classroom environment. This atmosphere encourages collaborative learning and recognizes diverse contributions, resulting in better performance and higher retention rates for female students in STEM (Hughes, Nzekwe, & Molyneaux, 2013).

4. Broader Implications of Enhanced STEM Literacy Through Gender-Inclusive Approaches

Enhanced female STEM literacy signifies more than just improved academic outcomes; it represents a stride towards leveling the playing field in a historically male-dominated domain. By boosting the STEM literacy of females, society indirectly challenges and disassembles deep-rooted gender biases, paving the way for equitable opportunities regardless of gender (Beede et al., 2011). Furthermore, as females gain more footing in STEM fields, they become role models and catalysts for subsequent generations, fostering a virtuous cycle of empowerment and inclusion (Ceci & Williams, 2011).

A gender-inclusive STEM environment augments the pool of talent and perspectives, driving innovation and diversified problem-solving (Díaz-García, González-Moreno, & Sáez-Martínez, 2013). By sidelining half of the potential talent, economies may be forgoing crucial insights and solutions that could be pivotal for technological and scientific advancement. A STEM-literate female population contributes substantially to economic growth, with studies suggesting that bridging the gender gap in STEM could lead to significant GDP growth over time (Do, Levchenko, & Raddatz, 2016). Moreover, a diverse STEM workforce can potentially cater to a broader market spectrum, translating to enhanced competitiveness in global markets (Larivière et al., 2013).

Gender, while significant, is just one aspect of an individual's identity. Intersectionality posits that multiple identity markers, such as race, socioeconomic status, and sexuality, can intersect and amplify systemic disadvantages or privileges (Crenshaw, 1989). In the context of STEM literacy, this means that women of color, for instance, might face unique challenges that aren't experienced by their white counterparts, necessitating an even more nuanced approach to STEM education (Ong, Wright, Espinosa, & Orfield, 2011). Embracing an intersectional lens ensures that gender-inclusive STEM initiatives don't inadvertently exclude or marginalize subsets of women who may already be at an intersection of multiple systemic disadvantages.

5. Recommendations, Conclusion, and Future Directions

Curricular Redesign: Institutions should actively seek to integrate real-world problems that are socially relevant and reflective of diverse experiences into their STEM curriculum. This approach not only resonates with a broader audience but also promotes applicative understanding (Marginson, Tytler, Freeman, & Roberts, 2013).

Professional Development: Ongoing training for educators on gender biases and best practices in inclusive teaching is vital. Such training can guide instructors in recognizing and challenging stereotypical beliefs about gender in STEM (Handelsman et al., 2005).

Mentorship Programs: Establishing mentorship initiatives where female students can interact with accomplished female STEM professionals can act as an inspirational and guidance tool, fostering their engagement and resilience in these fields (Drury, Siy, & Cheryan, 2011).

Active Recruitment and Outreach: Institutions should not just passively wait for female students to express interest but should actively engage in outreach programs at earlier educational levels to cultivate interest in STEM fields (Dasgupta & Stout, 2014).

The research underscores a tangible gender disparity in STEM literacy and the multifaceted barriers that contribute to it. However, it also illuminates the transformative potential of gender-inclusive curricula in bridging this gap. The implications extend beyond academic boundaries, hinting at broader societal repercussions in terms of economic growth, innovation, and social justice. Addressing the gender gap in STEM literacy, therefore, is not just an educational imperative but a societal one (Hill, Corbett, & St Rose, 2010).

The envisaged future is one where STEM fields, renowned for their innovation and problem-solving prowess, are equally representative of all genders. This equal representation ensures that solutions to some of the world's most pressing problems are approached from a multifaceted perspective. As gender inclusivity becomes intrinsic to STEM, it instigates a ripple effect on society — encouraging equal participation in decision-making processes, fostering a richer tapestry of innovation, and ensuring that the benefits of technological and scientific advancements are equitably distributed (Murphy, Steele, & Gross, 2007).

References

Beede, D., Julian, T., Langdon, D., McKittrick, G., Khan, B., & Doms, M, (2011). Women in STEM: A gender gap to innovation. US Department of Commerce.

Brotman, J. S., & Moore, F. M, (2008). Girls and science: A review of four themes in the science education literature. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45*(9), 971-1002.

Ceci, S. J., & Williams, W. M, (2011). Understanding current causes of women's underrepresentation in science. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 108*(8), 3157-3162.

Charlesworth, Z. M, (2016). The effects of gender-inclusive curriculum on the science literacy of high school students. *The Journal of Educational Research, 109*(1), 11-20.

Crenshaw, K, (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139-167.

Dasgupta, N., & Stout, J. G, (2014). Girls and women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics: STEMing the tide and broadening participation in STEM careers. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 1*(1), 21-29.

Díaz-García, C., González-Moreno, Á., & Sáez-Martínez, F. J, (2013). Barriers to innovation among Spanish manufacturing SMEs. *Journal of Small Business Management, 51*(4), 511-534.

Do, Q. T., Levchenko, A. A., & Raddatz, C, (2016). Comparative advantage, international trade, and fertility. *Journal of Development Economics, 119*, 48-66.

Handelsman, J., Miller, S., & Pfund, C, (2005). Scientific teaching. *Science, 310*(5749), 252-253.

Hill, C., Corbett, C., & St. Rose, A, (2010). Why so few? Women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. American Association of University Women (AAUW).

Hughes, B. E., Nzekwe, B., & Molyneaux, K. J, (2013). Increasing female students' engagement in computer science: Findings from a multi-year intervention. *ACM Transactions on Computing Education (TOCE), 13*(4), 1-29.

Larivière, V., Ni, C., Gingras, Y., Cronin, B., & Sugimoto, C. R, (2013). Bibliometrics: Global gender disparities in science. *Nature, 504*(7479), 211-213.

Marginson, S., Tytler, R., Freeman, B., & Roberts, K, (2013). STEM: Country comparisons. *International Journal of STEM Education, 1*(1), 1-14.

Martin, M. O., Mullis, I. V. S., & Hooper, M, (2016). Methods and procedures in TIMSS 2015. TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College.

Moss-Racusin, C. A., Dovidio, J. F., Brescoll, V. L., Graham, M. J., & Handelsman, J, (2012). Science faculty's subtle gender biases favor male students. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109*(41), 16474-16479.

Murphy, M. C., Steele, C. M., & Gross, J. J, (2007). Signaling threat: How situational cues affect women in math, science, and engineering settings. *Psychological Science, 18*(10), 879-885.

National Science Board, (2020). Science and engineering indicators 2020. National Science Foundation.

Nosek, B. A., Smyth, F. L., Sriram, N., Lindner, N. M., Devos, T., Ayala, A., ... & Greenwald, A. G, (2009). National differences in gender–science stereotypes predict national sex differences in science and math achievement. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 106*(26), 10593-10597.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), (2019). PISA 2018 results (Volume I): What students know and can do. OECD Publishing.

Ong, M., Wright, C., Espinosa, L. L., & Orfield, G, (2011). Inside the double bind: A synthesis of empirical research on undergraduate and graduate women of color in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. *Harvard Educational Review, 81*(2), 172-208.

Roberts, D. A, (2018). Scientific literacy/science literacy. In *International Handbook of Research in History, Philosophy and Science Teaching* (pp. 1407-1436). Springer.