Journal of Education and Educational Policy Studies (2024) Volume 2 EWA Publishing
Published online: 22 October 2024 DOI: 10.54254/3049-7248/2/2024010

Teaching for Social Justice: How Educators Address Inequalities in STEM Education

Xianghui Meng

Columbia University, New York

xm2346@columbia.edu

Abstract. Inequalities in STEM education remain a persistent issue, disproportionately affecting underrepresented groups, including women, minorities, and low-income students. This study aims to explore how educators address these inequalities through social justice frameworks in their teaching practices. Grounded in theories of culturally relevant pedagogy and critical pedagogy, the research investigates the role of teachers as key agents in promoting equity in STEM classrooms. A systematic literature review was conducted, drawing from case studies, academic articles, and policy reports, focusing on strategies that educators use to create more inclusive and supportive learning environments. The findings reveal that educators utilize a range of methods, such as differentiated instruction, inclusive curriculum design, and culturally responsive teaching, to address disparities in STEM education. However, significant challenges, including limited resources and inconsistent institutional support, hinder full implementation. This paper highlights the importance of teacher agency and the need for professional development programs that equip educators to better address social justice in STEM education. It contributes to existing literature by providing a comprehensive analysis of best practices while identifying gaps in research on long-term impacts and global applicability.

Keywords: STEM education inequalities, social justice pedagogy, culturally relevant teaching, differentiated instruction, inclusive curriculum, teacher agency in equity

1. Introduction

Inequalities in STEM education persist across various demographic lines, with women, racial minorities, and students from low-income backgrounds facing significant barriers in accessing and excelling in STEM fields. Despite numerous policy initiatives aimed at broadening participation, these groups continue to be underrepresented in both academic and professional STEM environments [1, 2]. Research by Gillespie (2021) on the current state of K-12 STEM education highlights how unequal access to resources, teacher quality, and culturally relevant curricula contribute to these disparities [3].

The framework of **social justice in education** posits that achieving equity in STEM requires not only addressing these systemic inequalities but also implementing inclusive and transformative teaching practices that actively confront social biases. Social justice pedagogy, based on the principles of **culturally responsive teaching** (Ladson-Billings, 1995) and **critical pedagogy** (Freire, 1970), argues that educators have a key role in shaping equitable classroom environments. In the STEM context, this involves integrating students' lived experiences, questioning dominant narratives, and fostering critical thinking through an inclusive curriculum [4, 5]. Teachers are thus central agents in the promotion of educational equity and have the potential to disrupt systemic inequalities through their day-to-day practices.

However, the application of social justice-oriented teaching strategies in STEM is still under-researched, particularly in terms of how these practices are implemented in different educational contexts. Fortney et al. (2019) have shown that many teachers struggle to adopt social justice frameworks due to insufficient training and the lack of institutional support, which often results in a gap between the intent to foster equity and the reality of classroom practice [6]. Similarly, Rodriguez and Suriel (2019) emphasize that many existing STEM curricula fail to address the intersectionality of race, gender, and class, further perpetuating inequalities in student outcomes [7].

2. Research Aims and Contributions

This study aims to explore how STEM educators are addressing inequalities through social justice teaching practices. Specifically, it will examine:

The strategies that teachers employ to make STEM education more inclusive.

The challenges teachers face in implementing social justice frameworks.

The impacts these practices have on student engagement and achievement in STEM fields.

The significance of this research lies in its focus on **teacher-led initiatives**, highlighting the practical methods educators use to promote equity in STEM classrooms. By drawing on recent studies that examine the intersection of **social justice and STEM education**, this paper contributes to a deeper understanding of how teachers can be better supported in creating equitable learning environments [6][8]. Furthermore, it offers actionable recommendations for educators and policymakers, particularly in under-resourced schools where inequalities are most pronounced.

3. Literature Review

3.1. Introduction: Justifying the Research Problem

The persistent underrepresentation of marginalized groups in STEM education remains a significant concern, despite numerous efforts and policy reforms aimed at increasing diversity in STEM fields. Research consistently shows that students from racial minorities, women, and those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds encounter various barriers, such as limited access to resources, underrepresentation of role models, and implicit biases that affect their participation and success in STEM disciplines [9, 10]. For instance, a study by Griffith (2020) found that despite initiatives to boost diversity in STEM, racial and gender disparities persist at both K-12 and higher education levels [11]. This highlights the gaps in existing interventions, especially in integrating **social justice principles** into the classroom, where meaningful change can directly influence marginalized students.

Rodriguez et al. (2019) argue that **teacher education programs** often fail to emphasize equity-focused pedagogies in STEM, which limits educators' ability to address systemic inequities effectively. Teachers are often unprepared to recognize and challenge the structural barriers within their classrooms that contribute to these disparities [12]. Given this gap, this study seeks to explore how **social justice frameworks** can be better integrated into STEM education, particularly focusing on the role of educators as key agents in promoting equity in day-to-day teaching.

3.1.1. Existing Gaps and Justification of the Research Problem

While many studies highlight the challenges faced by marginalized groups in STEM, few have investigated how **classroom interventions** can be used by teachers to directly mitigate these challenges. According to Li et al. (2020), much of the existing research focuses on **macro-level educational policies** and national programs, which often overlook the nuanced, micro-level changes that occur within classrooms, particularly in terms of how teachers can promote inclusion through everyday practices [11].

Moreover, Carnevale et al. (2018) emphasize that institutional diversity programs often fail to account for the role of **individual educators**, whose influence in the classroom can either reinforce or dismantle inequitable structures. While systemic change is necessary, Carnevale et al. argue that teachers must be empowered with tools to foster a more inclusive STEM environment [10]. This gap in the literature reveals the need for research that examines specific **teacher-led initiatives** designed to promote **social justice** at the classroom level, which is where students experience the most immediate and impactful interactions.

3.1.2. Tools and Strategies from Existing Literature

Several strategies have emerged as effective in promoting social justice in STEM classrooms. Fortney et al. (2019) advocate for **culturally responsive teaching** (CRT), which connects students' cultural backgrounds with the curriculum, making STEM more relatable and accessible to a diverse student population [12]. This approach encourages teachers to integrate students' lived experiences into STEM learning, thereby creating a more inclusive educational environment. For example, teachers who use CRT in science classrooms have been able to bridge gaps in understanding by making lessons more relevant to the everyday lives of marginalized students, resulting in improved engagement and achievement [12].

Additionally, **differentiated instruction** has proven successful in addressing disparities in STEM. By tailoring teaching methods to meet the needs of students with varying levels of understanding and learning preferences, teachers can provide more equitable access to STEM content. Inclusive practices such as group-based learning and **project-based inquiry** have also been shown to foster a more collaborative and supportive learning environment, particularly for students from minority and low-income backgrounds [10]. These methods not only increase student participation but also help reduce the **achievement gap** in STEM fields.

3.1.3. Broader Research Insights from Adjacent Fields

Beyond STEM, insights from **general education research** on social justice and equity provide valuable methods for addressing inequalities in the classroom. Gillespie (2021) argues that **real-world problem-solving** can enhance engagement and learning outcomes for marginalized students across various disciplines [9]. By making lessons applicable to students' lived experiences, educators can foster a sense of agency and relevance in learning, which aligns closely with the goals of **culturally relevant pedagogy** in STEM.

Similarly, research from non-STEM fields, such as **interdisciplinary teaching** and **project-based learning**, offers transferable strategies that can be adapted to STEM education. These methods have demonstrated success in promoting critical thinking and inclusivity, particularly by encouraging students to take ownership of their learning and apply it in practical, real-world contexts [12]. Integrating these approaches into STEM classrooms can provide new pathways for teachers to engage marginalized students and promote equity.

4. Summary of Findings

The literature reveals significant gaps in the application of **social justice frameworks** within STEM education. While **policy-level reforms** are crucial, the role of **classroom teachers** in promoting equity remains underexplored. The findings from this review suggest that empowering teachers with effective tools—such as **culturally relevant teaching** and **differentiated instruction**—can significantly impact marginalized students' experiences in STEM.

This study will build on these findings by focusing on **teacher-led initiatives**, providing a framework for implementing social justice strategies at the classroom level. Furthermore, the study will explore how these strategies can be scaled to benefit a broader range of students across diverse educational settings, addressing both the systemic and classroom-level barriers that continue to perpetuate inequalities in STEM education.

5. Methodology

5.1. Research Design

This study follows a **qualitative research design**, employing a **systematic literature review** to explore the integration of social justice principles into STEM education. By synthesizing insights from recent studies, the review will focus on the specific strategies educators use to address inequalities in STEM classrooms. Qualitative methods, such as reviewing case studies and thematic analysis, are particularly useful in exploring the nuanced ways social justice can be applied in educational contexts [14,15].

5.2. Data Collection

Systematic Literature Review: This review will focus on research from 2018 to 2023, covering STEM education, social justice, and diversity-focused teaching strategies. Databases such as ERIC, Google Scholar, and JSTOR will be used to gather peer-reviewed studies, reports, and policy documents. The inclusion criteria will require studies to discuss either teacher-led initiatives or STEM programs aimed at increasing equity and access for underrepresented groups [16, 17]. Studies focusing on the digital divide and its effects on STEM education in developing countries will also be included, as these insights are crucial for understanding how technology influences educational inequalities [18].

Case Studies: A secondary focus will be the analysis of published case studies that highlight successful interventions in STEM classrooms. These case studies will showcase how educators have adapted their teaching methods, developed inclusive curricula, and utilized differentiated instruction to promote equity in STEM education. Studies on digital pedagogy and the use of blended learning models in STEM will be particularly emphasized, especially those that explore their social justice implications [19, 20].

5.3. Data Analysis

The data will be analyzed using **thematic analysis**, which involves identifying patterns and themes related to social justice teaching strategies in STEM. The analysis will focus on strategies such as culturally relevant pedagogy, differentiated instruction, and digital inclusivity. Braun and Clarke's six-step thematic coding approach will be used to systematically identify recurring themes across the literature, ensuring a comprehensive and organized interpretation of the data [21, 22].

5.4. Ethical Considerations

Since this study relies on secondary data, there are minimal ethical concerns. However, due care will be taken to ensure that all data are accurately reported and that the original context of the case studies and research articles is respected. The findings will be presented in a way that acknowledges the limitations of each study and avoids overgeneralizing results from specific contexts [23].

5.5. Limitations

This research is limited by its reliance on secondary data, which may not fully capture the current state of STEM education across all contexts. Additionally, while the systematic review will provide valuable insights into teacher-led strategies, it may not reflect all the challenges educators face in real-time classroom environments. The study's scope is also limited to published literature from 2018 to 2023, potentially excluding relevant but older studies that could offer historical context [24].

6. Results and Findings

This study's findings are based on a systematic review of literature from 2018 to 2023, focusing on educator-led strategies promoting equity in STEM through social justice frameworks. The thematic analysis highlights four key areas where culturally relevant pedagogy, differentiated instruction, and digital pedagogy intersect with STEM education practices.

6.1. The Effectiveness of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy in STEM

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy (CRP) was found to be a vital component in making STEM more accessible and engaging for marginalized students. Research consistently shows that CRP enhances student achievement by linking curriculum content to the students' cultural backgrounds, making STEM subjects more relatable and easier to grasp for underrepresented groups. In a pilot study using the CReST (Culturally Relevant STEM) curriculum, teachers who applied CRP in Chemistry and History lessons saw improved academic performance, with Chemistry students achieving a 4% increase in scores and History students showing a 13% improvement [25, 26].

However, while CRP is effective, its widespread application is hindered by insufficient training and professional development for educators. Many teachers lack the resources to integrate CRP fully into their teaching practices, limiting the approach's potential reach in addressing systemic inequalities in STEM classrooms [27].

6.2. Differentiated Instruction and Its Role in Promoting Equity

Differentiated Instruction (DI), which involves tailoring educational experiences to meet the varied needs of students, emerged as another crucial strategy for fostering equity in STEM education. Studies show that DI, when applied in under-resourced classrooms, significantly enhances student outcomes. Teachers who employed DI reported a notable narrowing of the achievement gap, particularly among students who entered STEM disciplines with lower baseline academic knowledge [28].

For example, a study focused on middle school STEM teachers found that DI helped students from disadvantaged backgrounds to engage more deeply with the material, leading to improvements in overall participation and comprehension [29]. However, like CRP, the successful implementation of DI is hampered by a lack of institutional support and insufficient professional development for teachers, which remains a barrier to its broader adoption [30].

6.3. Digital Pedagogy: Opportunities and Challenges in STEM

Digital pedagogy emerged as a dual-edged factor in promoting equity in STEM education. On one hand, the incorporation of digital tools in STEM classrooms, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, provided new avenues for personalized learning and engagement. Digital platforms allowed teachers to adapt lessons to different learning styles and provide students with more flexible access to STEM content [31]. For instance, teachers using digital pedagogies found that marginalized students could engage with STEM subjects more interactively, especially in hybrid or remote learning environments [32].

However, the **digital divide**—the unequal access to digital resources—remains a significant challenge. Students from low-income backgrounds or rural areas often lacked the necessary technology or internet access, exacerbating existing inequalities [33]. This limitation highlights the importance of addressing the infrastructure and access issues in education if digital tools are to become a truly inclusive pedagogical resource.

6.4. Systemic Barriers to Implementing Social Justice in STEM

A recurring theme across the literature is the systemic and institutional barriers that prevent the full implementation of social justice frameworks in STEM education. Many educators reported facing resistance when attempting to introduce equity-focused teaching practices, especially in conservative or under-resourced districts. Additionally, the lack of institutional commitment to social justice often leaves teachers without the necessary support or resources to sustain these efforts in their classrooms [34].

For example, teachers in rural and urban schools expressed frustration over the absence of professional development programs focused on integrating social justice into STEM education. They also noted a disconnect between policy-level reforms aimed at promoting diversity and the actual tools and training available to implement these changes at the classroom level [35].

7. Summary of Findings

The findings from this review show that **Culturally Relevant Pedagogy** and **Differentiated Instruction** are effective strategies for addressing inequities in STEM education. However, their broader adoption is limited by a lack of professional development and systemic barriers. While **Digital Pedagogy** offers new opportunities for inclusion, the **digital divide** must be addressed to ensure that all students can benefit from these tools. For social justice principles to be fully integrated into STEM, schools need to prioritize teacher training, resource allocation, and institutional support.

8. Conclusion

This study set out to investigate how educators are addressing inequalities in STEM education through social justice frameworks, particularly in under-resourced and marginalized settings. By synthesizing recent case studies and literature, several key findings were highlighted:

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy: The research underscores the effectiveness of culturally relevant teaching methods in fostering inclusivity. Teachers who adapt their curriculum to reflect students' cultural backgrounds have seen increased engagement and success among minority students in STEM fields. This strategy, however, requires more consistent support in teacher training programs to be widely implemented [14, 15].

Differentiated Instruction: Differentiated instruction emerged as another powerful tool for addressing disparities in STEM. Teachers who adapt their methods to meet the diverse needs of students—such as providing varying levels of difficulty or alternative ways to engage with the material—can help close achievement gaps, particularly for students who might struggle in traditional teaching settings [16, 17].

Challenges in Implementation: Despite the potential of these strategies, there are significant challenges that educators face, such as a lack of resources, limited access to professional development, and systemic resistance to change. These obstacles often hinder the full application of social justice principles in STEM classrooms [18, 19].

Future Directions: To move forward, educational institutions need to provide more robust support systems, including increased funding for professional development and curricular resources that promote equity. Policy reforms should prioritize teacher empowerment and ensure that social justice becomes a core aspect of STEM teaching. Additionally, further research should explore the long-term impacts of these teaching strategies on student outcomes, with a focus on scalability in diverse educational contexts.

References

[1] Flores, G. M., Bañuelos, M., & Harris, P. R. (2023). Facilitating marginalized youths' identification with STEM through everyday science talk: The critical role of parental caregivers. *Science Education*, *106*(1), 57–87. https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.21688

[2] Sanabria, T., Palmer, R. T., & Jenkins, D. (2020). Barriers to STEM completion among Black and Latinx students. *International Journal of STEM Education*.

[3] Gillespie, A. (2021). What do the data say about the current state of K-12 STEM education in the US? Retrieved from https://beta.nsf.gov/science-matters/what-do-data-say-about-current-state-k-12-stem-education-us

[4] Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*.

[5] Stetsenko, A. (2022). Radical transformative agency: A framework for equity in education. *Frontiers in Education*, *7*, 940684. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.940684

[6] Fortney, B., Morrison, D., Rodriguez, A. J., & Upadhyay, B. (2019). Equity in science teacher education: Toward an expanded definition. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, *14*(2), 259–263.

[7] Rodriguez, A. J., & Suriel, R. (2019). Expanding and enacting transformative meanings of equity, diversity, and social justice in science education. *Cultural Studies in Science Education*, *14*, 265–281.

[8] Chen, A., & Mensah, F. (2018). Preparing socially just science educators: From theory to practice. *Journal of Teacher Education*.

[9] Li, Y., Wang, K., Xiao, Y., Froyd, J. E., & Nite, S. B. (2020). Research and trends in STEM education: A systematic analysis of publicly funded projects. *International Journal of STEM Education*, *17*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-020-00213-8

[10] Rodriguez, A. J., & Morrison, D. (2019). Expanding and enacting transformative meanings of equity, diversity, and social justice in science education. *Cultural Studies in Science Education, 14*, 265–281. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11422-019-09938-7

[11] Fortney, B., Morrison, D., Rodriguez, A. J., & Upadhyay, B. (2019). Equity in science teacher education: Toward an expanded definition. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, *14*(2), 259–263.
[12] Carnevale, A. P., Fasules, M. L., Quinn, M. C., & Campbell, K. P. (2018). *STEM: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics*. Center on Education and the Workforce, Georgetown University.
[13] Gillespie, A. (2021). What do the data say about the current state of K-12 STEM education in the US? Retrieved from https://beta.nsf.gov/science-matters/what-do-data-say-about-current-state-k-12-stem-education-us
[14] Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *25*, 54–67.
[15] Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). SAGE.
[16] Tang, G., El Turkey, H., Cilli-Turner, E., Savic, M., Karakok, G., & Plaxco, D. (2017). Inquiry as an entry point to equity in the classroom. *International Journal of Mathematics Education in Science and Technology*, *48*(S4), 135–145.
[17] Steele, C. M. (1997). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. *American Psychologist*, *52*(6), 613–629.
[18] Kearney, M., Oladejo, D. A., & Stahl, G. (2022). Social justice implications of digital STEM pedagogy in developing countries. *Education and Information Technologies*.
[19] Leggon, C. B., & Gaines, M. S. (2020). *STEM and social justice: Teaching and learning in diverse settings*. SpringerLink.
[20] Granberg, C., & Olsson, T. (2015). Enhancing student collaboration through digital STEM tools. *Journal of Educational Technology*.
[21] Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101.
[22] Theobald, E. J., Hill, M. J., Tran, E., & Agrawal, S. (2020). Active learning narrows achievement gaps for underrepresented students in undergraduate STEM. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *117*(23), 6476–6483.
[23] Boyi, A., & Makwana, S. (2022). Addressing social justice through equitable access to digital STEM education. *Journal of Science and Education Policy*.
[24] Pearson, G., & Tsui, L. (2022). Inclusion in practice: A systematic review of diversity-focused STEM programming. *International Journal of STEM Education*.
[25] Ferri, J., & White, R. (2024). Culturally relevant STEM: A pilot study in high school chemistry and world history. *Educational Sciences*, *14*(2), 182–196.
[26] Johnson, M. L., & Kier, M. W. (2022). Adapting digital technologies to promote culturally relevant education during COVID-19. *Education Sciences*, *12*(48), 25–37.
[27] Holland, N. (2022). Equity in STEM through culturally responsive pedagogy. *The Physics Teacher*, *60*(6), 616–617.
[28] Rodriguez, S., & Hughes, J. (2022). The role of differentiated instruction in addressing inequities in STEM. *STEM Education Journal*, *19*(3), 109–124.
[29] Freeman, T., & Gonzales, F. (2021). Digital pedagogy and STEM equity during the pandemic. *STEM Education Research Quarterly*, *58*(2), 112–130.
[30] Palmer, S., & Chen, Z. (2020). Institutional support for social justice-oriented teaching practices in STEM. *Educational Policy Journal*, *45*(1), 98–120.
[31] Weaver, L., & Powell, K. (2022). Digital tools for equity in STEM: Addressing the digital divide. *Journal of STEM Education Policy*, *47*(4), 188–199.
[32] Palmer, T., & Chen, J. (2022). Overcoming barriers to digital equity in STEM: Lessons from the pandemic. *Technology and Learning*, *39*(2), 156–170.
[33] Gonzales, F. R., & Hill, T. (2021). Challenges in implementing social justice in STEM education. *Journal of Educational Equity*, *30*(1), 45–61.
[34] Rabin, C., & Medin, D. (2021). Systemic barriers to equity in STEM: A case study of rural and urban districts. *Journal of STEM Education Research*, *22*(4), 88–109.
[35] Harding, M., & Brousseau, E. (2020). Professional development needs for culturally relevant teaching in STEM. *Journal of Teaching and Learning*, *16*(3), 55–71.