BirLE-Journal
Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education
p.ISSN: 2655-2647
e.ISSN: 2655-1470
Budapest Institute

A Receptor-Oriented Approach to Overcoming Universal Challenges in Science Education

Belay Sitotaw Goshu[1], Muhammad Ridwan[2]
[1]*Department of Physics, Dire Dawa University, Dire Dawa, Ethiopia*
[2]*Univerisitas Islam Negeri Sumatera Utara, Indonesia*

Abstract
This study explores key challenges in science education from a receptor-oriented perspective, analyzing the experiences of teachers, students, school administrators, policymakers, and community stakeholders. Findings reveal significant barriers, including inadequate resources, limited professional development for teachers, low student engagement, outdated curricula, and insufficient policy support. Teachers reported a lack of access to necessary resources and training in emerging science topics, which limits their ability to conduct hands-on, inquiry-based lessons. Students expressed a desire for more relevant, real-world applications in science, which are missing due to curriculum rigidity and emphasis on standardized testing. Furthermore, administrators identified funding constraints and digital illiteracy as obstacles to implementing modern science education. Community and industry involvement was identified as crucial yet underutilized, limiting students' exposure to STEM career pathways and practical science applications. The findings underscore the need for reform strategies that provide resource allocation, updated curricula, reduced testing pressures, digital literacy initiatives, and structured partnerships with industry. A receptor-oriented approach is recommended to tailor solutions for each group's unique needs, ultimately supporting a more engaging, equitable, and future-focused science education system.

Keywords
science education; professional development; student engagement; curriculum reform; digital literacy; community partnerships

I. Introduction

Science education is a foundational element for fostering scientific literacy, critical thinking, and innovation, all essential for addressing the complex problems of today's world. However, various persistent challenges ranging from limited resources to curriculum constraints remain to hinder effective science teaching and learning globally. These challenges limit students' understanding of science and reduce their engagement and interest in scientific careers (Holbrook & Rannikmae, 2009). A receptor-oriented approach offers a framework for more successfully addressing these problems by customizing solutions to the unique requirements of stakeholders (students, teachers, legislators, and community organizations).

Addressing science education through a receptor-oriented approach enables customized strategies that are more practical and sustainable. This method acknowledges the distinct roles and requirements of educators, learners, school officials, legislators, and community organizations within the educational ecosystem. By focusing on these specific receptors, solutions can be designed to maximize impact and relevance, ultimately leading to a more equitable and inclusive science education system that fosters scientific curiosity, prepares students for modern scientific careers, and promotes scientific literacy.

1.1 Background of the Study

Over the past several decades, science education has evolved from a content-heavy focus on memorization to a more inquiry-based and experiential learning approach. This shift is supported by research indicating that students learn science concepts more effectively when they engage in scientific practices rather than passively absorbing

DOI: https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v7i4.7986

information (Osborne & Dillon, 2008). However, implementation of this educational shift remains challenging. In many schools, especially in under-resourced areas, students and teachers face barriers that limit the effectiveness of science education, including limited access to laboratory facilities, a lack of up-to-date curricula, and insufficient professional development opportunities for teachers (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine [NASEM], 2018).

Moreover, the rapid advancement of science and technology has widened the gap between classroom learning and real-world applications. Concepts such as biotechnology, artificial intelligence, and environmental science are seldom integrated into traditional curricula, leaving students ill-prepared for future careers and limiting their ability to critically engage with pressing societal issues (Bybee, 2010). Addressing these issues requires a systemic approach that recognizes the needs of each educational receptor: teachers need resources and support to adapt their methods, students require engaging and relevant learning experiences, schools need the flexibility and funding to update curricula, and policymakers need to prioritize policies that enable equitable access to quality science education (Tytler, 2007).

The receptor-oriented framework, which adapts solutions based on stakeholder needs, has shown promise in fields outside of education but has yet to be widely applied in the context of science education reform. Applying this framework here could bridge the gaps by equipping each receptor with specific tools and strategies to overcome barriers, thus creating a more cohesive and resilient science education system.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Despite significant advancements in understanding effective science education methods, barriers persist and prevent equitable, engaging, and modern science education. A major issue is that current solutions often fail to consider the distinct needs of various stakeholders involved in the education system. Teachers lack adequate professional development and support to adopt inquiry-based methods; students face barriers to retrieving hands-on, engaging science learning; school leaders struggle with budget constraints; policymakers are often removed from classroom realities; and community organizations are underutilized in science education (NASEM, 2018).

Traditional approaches to science education reform have tended to take a one-size-fits-all perspective, resulting in initiatives that may be unsustainable or ineffective in diverse educational contexts (Tytler, 2007). This lack of receptor-specific strategies has contributed to a cycle of educational disparity, where underserved schools and marginalized communities are left without the resources or support needed to provide high-quality science education. As a result, students from these communities are less likely to pursue science careers, exacerbating the representation gap in STEM fields (Holbrook & Rannikmae, 2009).

The problem, therefore, lies in the absence of a receptor-oriented approach that tailors' solutions to meet the needs of teachers, students, administrators, policymakers, and community organizations. Without such an approach, science education reform efforts risk being ineffective, unsustainable, and unable to close the gaps in science literacy and engagement. This study pursues to address this problem by proposing a receptor-oriented framework to deliver tailored, impactful solutions for each key stakeholder in science education.

1.3 Objectives

This study has three-fold objectives.

a. To identify and analyze the universal challenges faced in science education, encompassing issues related to curriculum design, teacher training, and student engagement.
b. To evaluate the effectiveness of receptor-oriented approaches in addressing these challenges, focusing on how they can be adapted to meet diverse learner needs.
c. To develop and promote innovative teaching practices that enhance inclusivity, student engagement, and interest in science across various educational contexts.

Research questions

What are the specific training requirements for educators to effectively implement receptor-oriented strategies in science education?

What strategies can be employed to create and suggest customized teaching methods that align with receptor-oriented approaches, addressing the distinct characteristics of various student populations?

How can collaboration among educators, administrators, and policymakers be fostered to facilitate the widespread adoption of effective receptor-oriented strategies in science curricula?

What is the impact of receptor-oriented strategies on student learning outcomes in science, and how can these outcomes be assessed using qualitative and quantitative measures?

What practical framework can be designed for the implementation of receptor-oriented strategies in science education, and what guidelines and resources should it include for educators?

1.4 Significance of the Study

The study's general significance lies in its potential to contribute to educational reform in science education by identifying and addressing universal challenges through innovative, student-centered approaches. By advocating for receptor-oriented strategies, the research aims to improve the overall quality of science education globally and promote a more inclusive learning environment that supports diverse learners.

II. Literature of Review

The role and structure of science education have evolved significantly over the past century, reflecting broader changes in educational theory, policy, and technology. Historically, science education was primarily concerned with imparting factual knowledge and promoting scientific discovery. However, the demands of the modern world have shifted this focus toward developing students' scientific literacy, critical thinking skills, and capacity to engage with real-world scientific issues. Today, science education faces multiple challenges across various sectors, including teachers, students, curricula, educational policy, and government involvement, each contributing to the overall complexity of reforming science education systems.

2.1 Historical Background of Science Education

The roots of science education trace back to the early 20th century when formal science curricula were first developed by emphasizing factual knowledge and technical skills (DeBoer, 1991). During this period, the goal of science education was primarily to prepare a workforce skilled in technical fields as societies rapidly industrialized. Science classes were generally structured around memorization and lecture-based instruction, and laboratories were understood as secondary to theoretical knowledge (DeBoer, 2000).

The mid-20th century saw a shift in science education due to Cold War-era pressures. The launch of the Soviet Union's Sputnik in 1957 ignited a renewed focus on science and mathematics education in the United States, leading to increased investment in science curricula and laboratory facilities, particularly through the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 (Bybee, 2010). This period emphasized rigorous content knowledge and the development of a scientifically literate populace, with curriculum reforms like the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS) seeking to promote scientific thinking over rote memorization.

In the 1980s and 1990s, science education further evolved toward constructivist approaches, where students were encouraged to explore scientific concepts through inquiry and hands-on learning. This shift was influenced by educational theories from scholars such as Piaget and Vygotsky, who emphasized the importance of active, experiential learning (Bransford et al., 2000). The constructivist movement laid the foundation for inquiry-based learning and the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), which emerged in the 2010s to encourage scientific practices and cross-disciplinary learning rather than isolated knowledge acquisition (NGSS Lead States, 2013).

2.1 Contemporary Challenges in Science Education

Even with these developments, science education still confronts some obstacles that reduce its efficacy. Teachers, students, curricula, educational policies, governments, and community stakeholders are all involved in these interrelated concerns.

a. Teachers and Professional Development

Teachers play a crucial role in implementing science education reforms, yet many struggle due to limited resources and professional development opportunities. Research has shown that teachers frequently lack access to ongoing training in inquiry-based methods, digital tools, and emerging science topics like biotechnology and climate science (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). This gap is particularly pronounced in under-resourced schools, where teachers may feel isolated and lack the support needed to transition from traditional lecture-based instruction to more interactive, student-centered approaches (Osborne & Dillon, 2008). Additionally, many teachers report low confidence in teaching advanced science topics, which can result in less engaging instruction and diminished student outcomes (NASEM, 2018).

b. Students and Engagement

Engaging students in science has become a central concern for educators worldwide. Numerous studies indicate that many students find science challenging, irrelevant, or uninteresting, leading to low engagement and a lack of motivation to pursue science-related careers (Archer et al., 2010). Student engagement is further affected by the lack of hands-on, real-world applications in science curricula, which often emphasize standardized testing and content memorization over critical thinking and practical skills (Holbrook & Rannikmae, 2009). Furthermore, disparities in resource allocation mean that students in underprivileged schools may not have access to laboratory facilities or extracurricular STEM opportunities, which widens the gap in science achievement between students from different socioeconomic backgrounds (Tytler, 2007).

c. Curriculum Limitations

It is difficult for the current science curriculum to keep up with the rapid advances in science and technology. While there is a growing recognition of the need for curricula that address contemporary issues like climate change, artificial intelligence, and public health, many schools continue to teach outdated science content with limited real-world relevance (Bybee, 2010). The NGSS, adopted by many states in the U.S., is an attempt to address these issues by emphasizing interdisciplinary, inquiry-based science learning; however, adoption and implementation have been uneven, especially in regions with limited educational funding (NGSS Lead States, 2013). The rigidity of standardized testing further limits the flexibility of curricula, as teachers may feel pressured to "teach to the test" rather than engage students in meaningful scientific inquiry (Ravitch, 2016).

d. Education Policy and Government Support

Educational policies significantly impact the quality and equity of science education, but often, policy reforms fail to address the needs of teachers, students, and schools effectively. Policymakers frequently prioritize standardized testing and accountability measures, which can detract from the quality of science education by discouraging innovative or student-centered teaching approaches (Sahlberg, 2010). Furthermore, government funding for science education is often inconsistent, with higher-income schools normally receiving more resources for labs, technology, and extracurricular programs than their lower-income counterparts, contributing to inequality in science education access (NASEM, 2018).

e. Community and Industry Partnerships

Partnerships between schools, local communities, and industries hold the potential to enhance science education by providing students with real-world applications and exposure to STEM careers. However, these collaborations are underutilized in many regions, often due to logistical challenges or lack of awareness. Community organizations and businesses can provide valuable resources, such as mentoring, internships, or hands-on workshops, yet schools often lack the infrastructure to establish these connections effectively (Sadler et al., 2010). Strengthening these partnerships could help bridge the gap between science education and practical, real-world applications.

III. Research Method

This study adopts a mixed-methods approach to explore and analyze the challenges in science education from a receptor-oriented perspective. This methodology is chosen to gather quantitative data, which provides broad insights into existing challenges, and qualitative data, which offers a deeper understanding of the needs and experiences of each receptor group (teachers, students, policymakers, etc.). A mixed-methods approach is useful for studying complex social phenomena, as it allows researchers to triangulate findings and enhance the reliability of results (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017).

3.1 Research Design

The research design is a convergent parallel mixed-methods design. In this approach, quantitative and qualitative data are collected simultaneously but analyzed independently, with results integrated during the interpretation phase (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). This design is chosen because it allows the study to address the breadth of the challenges (through quantitative surveys) and the depth of participants' perspectives (through qualitative interviews and focus groups). The integration of these techniques will facilitate the creation of focused solutions and offer a thorough grasp of the distinct difficulties encountered by every receptor.

3.2 Population and Sampling

The target population for this study includes five main receptor groups:

Teachers: Science teachers from different schools (public, private, urban, and rural).

Students: middle and high school students enrolled in science courses.

School Administrators: principals and vice principals overseeing science education.

Policymakers: Officials in educational departments responsible for science education policy.

Community Members and Industry Representatives: leaders from local community organizations and professionals in STEM fields.

A stratified sampling technique was used to ensure representation across different demographics and school types. This approach ensures that the sample accurately reflects the diversity of educational experiences and challenges across regions (Flick, 2018).

3.3 Data Collection Methods

This study will employ multiple data collection methods, including surveys, semi-structured interviews, and focus groups. Each technique is tailored to capture specific insights from each receptor group.

a. Surveys

Purpose: The survey aims to collect quantitative data on the common challenges in science education, resources available, and attitudes towards current science curricula and policies.

Sample: Surveys will be distributed to 300 teachers and 500 students across different regions. School administrators and policymakers will also participate, though their samples will be smaller.

Survey Structure: The survey will include a Likert scale, multiple-choice questions, and a few open-ended questions to gather initial qualitative insights.

Data Analysis: Quantitative data from the survey will be analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics, providing insights into common challenges and the prevalence of specific issues across receptor groups (Field, 2018).

b. Semi-structured Interviews

Purpose: Interviews will be used to gain a deeper understanding of the experiences and perspectives of teachers, policymakers, and community members regarding science education challenges.

Sample: A purposeful sample of 20 teachers, 10 policymakers, and 10 community/industry representatives will participate in semi-structured interviews. This sampling method is chosen to get information from participants with specific, relevant experience (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

Interview Structure: The interviews will follow a semi-structured format with a flexible set of questions to allow participants to share their insights freely. Topics will include curriculum challenges, resource availability, and suggestions for improvement.

Data Analysis: Interviews will be recorded, transcribed, and coded thematically using NVivo software. Thematic analysis will help identify recurring patterns and key issues, particularly those unique to each receptor group (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

c. Focus Groups

Purpose: Focus groups will be conducted with students to explore their perceptions of science education, engagement levels, and recommendations for making science more relevant and engaging.

Sample: Three focus groups of 8–10 students each will be organized across different school types (urban public, rural public, and private).

Structure: Focus groups will be guided by open-ended questions on students' experiences, challenges, and ideas for improvement in science education. This method encourages dialogue and enables researchers to observe group dynamics and peer influences on attitudes toward science (Morgan, 1996).

Data Analysis: Data from focus groups will be transcribed and analyzed using thematic analysis to identify common themes in students' perspectives, such as interest in hands-on learning, real-world relevance, and career aspirations in STEM fields (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

3.4 Data Analysis Techniques

Quantitative and qualitative data analysis methods are used to examine the data.

a. Quantitative Data Analysis

Quantitative data will be analyzed using descriptive statistics to summarize key findings and identify trends. This will include calculating frequencies, means, and standard deviations for Likert-scale items that provide insights into the general prevalence of various challenges (Field, 2018).

Moreover, inferential statistics such as chi-square tests and t-tests will be used to examine any significant differences in responses across receptor groups or demographic variables. This will help identify whether specific challenges are more pronounced among certain groups (e.g., urban vs. rural teachers).

b. Qualitative Data Analysis

Qualitative data from interviews and focus groups will undergo thematic analysis, a method suitable for identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns within data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This process will involve:

Transcription: All interviews and focus group discussions will be transcribed verbatim.

Coding: Transcripts will be imported into NVivo software, where an initial set of codes will be developed based on emerging themes related to challenges and receptor-specific needs.

Theme Identification: Codes will be grouped into broader themes refined and categorized by receptor group, highlighting unique needs or challenges faced by teachers, students, policymakers, and community members.

Interpretation: Themes will be interpreted to identify key issues that can guide receptor-oriented solutions for improving science education.

3.5 Validity and reliability

To enhance the validity and reliability of the study, several measures will be implemented:

Triangulation: Combining survey, interview, and focus group data will enable cross-validation of findings and provide a richer, more comprehensive understanding of challenges in science education (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017).

Pilot Testing: Survey instruments and interview guides will undergo pilot testing to ensure clarity and appropriateness of questions. Feedback from the pilot test will be used to revise instruments for improved reliability.

Member Checking: For qualitative data, participants will be allowed to review the findings to ensure that interpretations accurately reflect their perspectives, enhancing the credibility of the results (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

3.6 Ethical Considerations

This study will follow ethical guidelines to protect the rights and well-being of participants. Participants will be fully informed of the study's purpose, and informed consent will be obtained before data collection. Confidentiality will be maintained by anonymizing data and securing it in a password-protected database, accessible only to the research team. Moreover, participants withdraw from the study at any time without consequence (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

IV. Results and Discussions

The results of this study are organized according to the receptor groups teachers, students, administrators, policymakers, and community/industry representatives to provide a comprehensive overview of the unique challenges each group faces in science education. This receptor-oriented approach has allowed us to analyze varied perspectives and needs of stakeholders and develop targeted solutions accordingly. The findings reveal universal and receptor-specific issues, highlighting areas that need immediate attention in science education reform.

4.1 Demographic Analysis of Teachers

The demographic analysis of the teachers reveals several key insights into their gender, educational qualifications, and regional distribution. Starting with the gender distribution, the data shows that out of the 300 respondents, 175 are male, accounting for 58.33% of the sample, while 125 are female, making up 41.67%. This indicates a slight skew towards male respondents.

Educational qualifications, the main respondents hold a BSc/BA degree. Specifically, 183 respondents (61% of the total) have a BSc/BA qualification, with 103 of these being male (56.28% of BSc/BA holders and 58.86% of all male respondents) and 80 being female (43.72% of BSc/BA holders and 64% of all female respondents). On the other hand, 117 respondents (39% of the total) hold an MSc degree, with 72 being male (61.54% of MSc holders and 41.14% of all male respondents) and 45 being female (38.46% of MSc holders and 36% of all female respondents).

The regional distribution of the respondents provides insight into the geographical spread of the sample. The region with the highest number of respondents is Oromia, accounting for 97 respondents (32.33% of the total). Amhara follows closely with 65 respondents (21.67%). Dire Dawa and Addis Ababa have the lowest representation, with 33 (11%) and 25 (8.33%) respondents, respectively. Southern Ethiopia and Somali regions have 45 (15%) and 35 (11.67%) respondents, respectively. This regional distribution highlights the varied representation across different parts of the country.

The observed gender imbalance, with a higher proportion of male respondents, may have implications for the generalizability of the findings. It is essential to consider this skew when interpreting the results to ensure that the conclusions pinched are representative of the broader teaching population. The qualification distribution indicates a strong presence of BSc/BA holders, which could reflect the educational requirements or preferences in the teaching profession.

This information can be useful for educational institutions and policymakers when designing training programs or recruitment strategies. Finally, the regional distribution underscores the importance of ensuring representation from all regions to avoid biases in the data. This is crucial for developing policies and interventions that are relevant and effective across different geographical areas.

4.2 Perceptions of School Resources and Professional Development

The respondents had differing views regarding the sufficiency and accessibility of the school's resources. 75% of respondents, a sizable majority, think that the school has the right resources obtainable. Nonetheless, an overwhelming 23% of those surveyed believed that although resources exist, they are out of date. This implies that although the necessities are satisfied, more up-to-date and pertinent resources are required to assist educational endeavors. Just 2% of respondents said they had no opinion on the matter. The respondents' perspectives reveal a distinct set of issues about professional development.

A substantial 68% of the respondents believed, there is a lack of professional development opportunities. This indicates a significant gap in the support provided for teachers to enhance their skills and stay updated with best practices. Additionally, 25% of the respondents reported that while they have received professional development, it has not been integrated with emerging technologies. This suggests that the professional development programs may not be aligned with the current technological advancements, which could limit their effectiveness. Only 7% of the respondents were neutral on the issue of professional development.

Findings on school resources and professional development influence educational policy and practice. The need for frequent evaluations and updates of educational materials to guarantee their continued relevance and efficacy is highlighted by the fact that 25% of respondents believe the materials are out of date. This can entail updating technology, infrastructure, and instructional materials to meet modern requirements.

The lack of professional development opportunities, as reported by 68% of the respondents, is a critical issue that needs immediate attention. Schools and educational authorities must prioritize providing regular and comprehensive professional development programs integrated with emerging technologies. This would enhance the teachers' skills and ensure innovative teaching methods and technologies. Overall, these results highlight the need for a dual approach: ensuring that school resources are adequate and up-to-date and providing relevant professional development opportunities relevant professional development opportunities, integrated with technology, and accessible to all teachers. Addressing these gaps can significantly improve the quality of education and the teaching experience.

Interviews with teachers revealed a strong interest in more practical training and collaborative opportunities to improve their understanding of inquiry-based learning. In line with earlier studies highlighting the value of hands-on learning in science, teachers stated that their capacity to offer children meaningful, experiential learning opportunities is hampered by antiquated equipment and a lack of money for science supplies (Osborne & Dillon, 2008).

These findings highlight the necessity of improving teacher assistance, especially in professional development and resources. Professional development in contemporary science education subjects can increase teacher confidence and progress student learning, according to Bybee (2010). Teachers' capacity to lead interactive science experiences may be enhanced by incorporating training on inquiry-based learning and technology.

4.3 Student Engagement and Perceptions

About 60% of students said science classes are "difficult" or "not engaging," and 45% said they would rather learn through projects and hands-on activities. Focus group discussions further revealed that students often feel disconnected from science content, as it lacks real-world relevance.

According to focus groups, students want scientific classes that relate to real-world problems and global concerns like public health and environmental preservation. One of the main causes of disengagement is a lack of relevance, which is consistent with research that shows students gain from viewing science as having real-world applications (Archer et al., 2010).

The findings highlight a need for curricula to integrate real-world applications to make science more relevant and engaging for students. Teachers could increase the attraction and accessibility of science by incorporating real-world concerns, like sustainability or technology ethics, into science classes. Fostering scientific literacy through realistic contexts can greatly boost students' enthusiasm and motivation to learn science, claim Holbrook and Rannikmae (2009).

4.4 Curriculum Limitations

Over 70% of educators and administrators felt that the scientific curriculum was not updated and unduly centered on memorization. Numerous educators stated that the demands of standardized testing further restrict their capacity to investigate contemporary, multidisciplinary science subjects.

During interviews, teachers and administrators consistently raised concerns about the curriculum’s rigidity and lack of alignment with contemporary scientific developments. This rigidity, they argued, limits opportunities to teach emerging topics like artificial intelligence and bioethics, which are essential in today's world.

These results reflect a widespread issue with the inflexibility of science curricula, which often prioritize standardized test preparation over critical thinking and exploration of current scientific challenges. Bybee (2010) notes that science curricula should be regularly updated to reflect advancements in science and technology to keep students’ learning relevant. Greater curriculum flexibility and regular updates could help schools prepare students for real-world scientific issues.

4.5 Policy and Governmental Support

Survey Results: 50% of school administrators and 75% of teachers reported that inconsistent policy support and insufficient funding are major obstacles. They indicated that policies often emphasize standardized testing, and discourage exploratory science learning.

Interviews with policymakers highlighted a gap between educational policy goals and classroom realities. While policymakers acknowledged the importance of inquiry-based learning, they cited budget limitations as a significant constraint on implementing reforms.

The discrepancy between the goals of policies and their actual application points to the need for more supportive laws that give financing for science education top priority and lessen the focus on standardized testing. Policies that prioritize creativity and critical thinking over memorization, according to Sahlberg (2010), can result in science education systems that are more resilient and flexible. A more inventive and robust framework for science education would be supported by increased funding for scientific resources and laws that promote innovative teaching strategies.

4.6 Community and Industry Involvement

Survey and Interview Results: 60% of teachers expressed interest in collaborating with community organizations and industry partners to provide students with real-world science experiences. However, logistical challenges and a lack of established partnerships were mentioned as barriers.

Qualitative Insights: Community and industry representatives noted the potential of partnerships to enhance science education by exposing students to career opportunities and practical applications of science. However, they pointed out that many schools lack the infrastructure to facilitate such partnerships effectively.

Strengthening community and industry partnerships could provide valuable insights into science-related careers and applications, making science education more relevant and inspiring. Sadler et al. (2010) emphasize the importance of experiential learning and industry connections in fostering students' understanding of science. Schools could develop structured partnership programs to bridge the gap between classroom learning and real-world science, which could help motivate students to pursue STEM careers.

4.7 Synthesis of Results

The study's findings indicate several key themes that cut across all receptor groups. The consistent issues of limited resources, outdated curricula, and insufficient policy support point to a systemic need for reform in science education. The receptor-oriented approach proves these common challenges while revealing receptor-specific needs, such as teachers' desire for professional development in modern science topics and students' preference for hands-on learning.

4.8 Implications for Science Education Reform

The findings suggest several actionable steps for science education reform. For teachers, increasing access to resources and professional development is essential for delivering effective, inquiry-based science education. Providing successful, inquiry-based scientific instruction requires teachers to have more access to resources and professional development opportunities. Policy changes that reduce standardized testing pressures and allocate consistent funding for science resources. It would provide schools with the flexibility to adapt to modern scientific advancements. Finally, fostering community and industry partnerships could bridge the gap between theoretical learning and practical experience, creating a more dynamic and career-relevant science education system.

The receptor-oriented approach used in this study provides a comprehensive framework for addressing the unique challenges faced by different stakeholders in science education. These findings underscore the need for targeted strategies that account for the specific needs of teachers, students, policymakers, and community organizations. Implementing these solutions could lead to a more equitable, engaging, and future-oriented science education system capable of preparing students for scientific and technological challenges.

Limited resources and insufficient professional development hinder teachers' ability to deliver hands-on, inquiry-based science education.

Schools and districts should seek grants, private funding, and public investments dedicated to STEM education resources. Additionally, establishing partnerships with local universities and STEM-focused organizations could provide teachers access to lab equipment and updated educational materials (Osborne & Dillon, 2008).

Districts and educational departments should prioritize ongoing, accessible professional development programs focused on inquiry-based methods and emerging science fields such as biotechnology, environmental science, and data literacy. Digital platforms could facilitate these training programs, making them more accessible for teachers, especially in underserved areas (Bybee, 2010).

Creating professional learning communities (PLCs) within and between schools allows teachers to share ideas, troubleshoot classroom challenges, and develop new approaches to teaching science. PLCs can be supported by digital platforms, especially in rural areas where face-to-face collaboration may be challenging.

a. Increasing Engagement and Relevance of Science Education

Barrier: Lack of engaging, real-world applications in science curricula leads to student disengagement and reduced interest in science careers.

Project-Based and Real-World Learning: Science curricula should incorporate project-based learning (PBL) units that connect science concepts to real-world issues, such as environmental sustainability, health, and technology. PBL helps students see the relevance of science and encourages active learning, which has been shown to increase engagement (Archer et al., 2010).

Career Exposure and Mentorship Programs: Schools should collaborate with industry partners to offer STEM mentorship programs and internships. Bringing professionals into classrooms to share their experiences or organizing field trips to labs and science-related businesses can provide students with valuable insights into STEM careers and applications of classroom learning (Sadler et al., 2010).

Hands-On, Experiential Learning Opportunities: Even in resource-limited settings, educators can utilize low-cost, hands-on experiments and interactive simulations to help students learn through experience. Virtual labs, online science platforms, and low-cost science kits could provide practical learning without needing a full lab setup (Holbrook & Rannikmae, 2009).

b. Updating Content and Reducing Standardized Test Pressures

Barrier: Outdated curricula and standardized testing pressures prevent teachers from exploring modern science topics and engaging students in inquiry-based learning.

Curriculum Flexibility and Regular Updates: Educational departments should establish mechanisms for regularly updating science curricula to reflect modern scientific advancements and real-world issues, such as climate change, artificial intelligence, and public health. Curricula should allow flexibility for teachers to tailor lessons to students' interests and local contexts (Bybee, 2010).

Reduced Focus on Standardized Testing: Policymakers should consider de-emphasizing standardized testing in science subjects, allowing teachers more time for project-based and inquiry-focused lessons. Alternative assessments, like project portfolios or science presentations, can provide meaningful evaluations of student understanding while supporting deeper learning (Ravitch, 2016).

Incorporate Interdisciplinary Learning: Integrating science with other subjects like math, technology, and social studies can foster a holistic understanding of complex, real-world problems. This interdisciplinary approach helps students recognize the interconnectedness of scientific fields and enhances critical thinking skills (Tytler, 2007).

c. Bridging the Policy-Practice Gap

Barrier: Inconsistent policy support and insufficient funding restrict schools from implementing innovative, resource-intensive science programs.

Increased Funding and Equitable Resource Allocation: Governments and educational institutions should establish more consistent funding streams in science education. Funding policies must prioritize equitable distribution, ensuring that underserved schools receive the resources necessary to provide quality science education (Sahlberg, 2010).

Policy Alignment with Classroom Realities: Policymakers should involve teachers and school leaders in decision-making processes to align policies with classroom needs. Teacher input can help shape policies that encourage innovation and practicality rather than a one-size-fits-all model focused on standardization (NASEM, 2018).

Support for Inquiry-Based Learning Initiatives: Policies should promote inquiry-based learning as a fundamental aspect of science education, incentivizing schools to collaborate, with student-centered approaches. Policy-driven programs could also support schools in implementing inquiry-based science labs, PBL, and community-based science initiatives.

d. Building Partnerships for Real-world Science Experiences

Barrier: Limited community and industry engagement restricts students' exposure to real-world science applications and career pathways.

Structured Partnership Programs: Schools and districts should establish formalized partnership programs with local businesses, STEM organizations, and community groups to provide students with experiential learning opportunities. These partnerships could involve mentorships, career talks, industry visits, and internship programs that give students firsthand exposure to science applications (Sadler et al., 2010).

Community Science Events and Outreach: Schools can organize community science fairs, workshops, and hackathons to involve parents, local organizations, and industry professionals in science education. These events enhance student learning and foster community investment in science education (Archer et al., 2010).

Access to Industry-Sponsored Resources: Industry partners could support schools by donating science equipment, software, and other resources, particularly in low-income areas. In return, companies benefit from a future workforce better prepared for STEM careers, creating a mutually beneficial relationship (Flick, 2018).

4.9 Assessing the Impact of Digital Illiteracy in Science Education

Digital literacy, or the ability to effectively use digital tools and resources, is essential in modern science education. However, digital illiteracy among teachers, students, and education administrators has become a significant barrier, limiting the ability to integrate technology effectively in the classroom. Each receptor group is impacted differently by this problem, which affects students' engagement with the material as well as the quality of instruction.

a. Teachers and Digital Illiteracy in Science Education

Teachers' lack of digital literacy is a key challenge in adopting technology for science education. Many teachers report difficulty integrating digital tools, such as virtual labs, simulations, and educational software, into their teaching practices due to insufficient training and unfamiliarity (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). This lack of digital competence restricts teachers' ability to enhance science lessons with interactive content, limiting students' engagement and understanding of complex scientific concepts (Ertmer & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2010).

Moreover, the COVID-19 pandemic exposed the digital skill gap as schools shifted to online platforms, revealing that teachers unprepared to use digital tools struggled to deliver effective instruction (Kimmons & Veletsianos, 2020). Teachers in low-income or rural areas face additional challenges due to limited access to digital resources, deepening educational inequities (McKnight et al., 2016).

b. Solution

Ongoing digital literacy training is crucial. Studies suggest workshops and professional learning communities focused on digital skills can increase teachers' confidence and competence in using technology (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017). Additionally, district-level initiatives could provide teachers with hands-on practice and support for integrating digital tools specific to science education, such as data analysis software and virtual labs.

Provision of Accessible Digital Resources: Schools should invest in accessible, user-friendly digital tools tailored to different levels of digital literacy. Providing teachers with instructional support for these tools can encourage widespread adoption, even in resource-limited settings (Ertmer & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2010).

c. Students and the Impact of Digital Illiteracy on Science Learning

Challenges: Digital illiteracy among students is also a critical barrier to effective science education, particularly as digital tools play a larger role in scientific inquiry and experimentation. Students who lack digital skills may struggle to engage with interactive platforms or online science resources, which reduces their ability to explore scientific concepts independently (Lye & Koh, 2014). Research indicates that digital illiteracy limits students' readiness for future STEM careers, where digital competence is essential (Spires et al., 2018).

Socioeconomic disparities further exacerbate this issue, as students from low-income families often lack access to computers or high-speed internet at home, creating a "digital divide" that disproportionately affects marginalized students (van Dijk, 2020). This gap limits their ability to develop essential digital skills, ultimately affecting their science learning outcomes and interest in STEM fields.

d. Solutions

Integrating Digital Literacy into the Curriculum: Science curricula should integrate digital literacy components that teach students to use scientific software, conduct virtual experiments, and analyze digital data. Incorporating these skills into lessons makes technology a natural part of science education, preparing students for academic and career demands (Spires et al., 2018).

All pupils must have access to digital devices and internet connectivity to close the digital divide. This can be done through community collaborations or resources supplied by the school. Programs such as one-to-one device initiatives and internet subsidies for low-income families have been shown to progress students' access to digital learning (van Dijk, 2020).

e. Education Administrators and Digital Literacy for Effective Science Education Management

Education administrators also have difficulties with digital literacy, especially when overseeing and assisting with the assimilation of technology in science instruction. Administrators who lack digital competence may struggle to make informed decisions regarding technology investments, resource allocation, and staff training needs. This gap can lead to inefficient use of funds, lack of support for teachers, and missed opportunities to modernize science programs effectively (Kimmons & Veletsianos, 2020).

Administrators' digital illiteracy can also impede their ability to evaluate educational technologies and their effectiveness in improving student outcomes, resulting in a misalignment between technological adoption and actual classroom needs (McKnight et al., 2016).

f. Solutions

Digital Literacy Training for Administrators: Providing digital literacy training specifically for school administrators can empower them to make informed decisions regarding technology in science education. Training programs should cover digital resource evaluation, technology integration strategies, and data-driven decision-making, enabling administrators to support teachers and students effectively (Ertmer & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2010).

Strategic Technology Planning: Schools should develop comprehensive technology plans that involve administrators, teachers, and IT staff in identifying needs, setting goals, and allocating resources. A strategic plan helps administrators make cost-effective investments and ensures that technology adoption is aligned with the school's science education objectives (Kimmons & Veletsianos, 2020).

g. Broader Implications for Science Education

Addressing digital illiteracy across all receptor groups is essential to modernizing science education and reducing educational inequities. Improving digital literacy can enable teachers to enhance their instruction, help students engage more deeply with science content, and equip administrators to make data-informed decisions that support long-term technology integration. By addressing these barriers, schools can create a more dynamic and accessible science education environment that prepares students for a digital world.

As research indicates, digital literacy is integral to effective science education in the 21st century. Spires et al. (2018) argue that digital skills are foundational for modern learning and essential for preparing students for future careers. All stakeholder groups can benefit from investments in digital literacy, which will make science education more inclusive.

V. Conclusion

This study explored the key challenges in science education, identifying significant barriers across multiple receptor group’s teachers, students, school administrators, policymakers, and community stakeholders. Through a receptor-oriented analysis, the findings emphasize that science education reform requires addressing distinct needs, including limited resources, inadequate professional development, outdated curricula, insufficient policy support, and a lack of community involvement. Each of these impacts the quality and inclusiveness of science education and collectively influences student engagement, scientific literacy, and readiness for STEM careers.

The perceptions of school resources and professional development reveal that teachers require more substantial support, materials, and training, to deliver inquiry-based, hands-on science education. For students, engagement and interest in science subjects are closely linked to curriculum relevance and the inclusion of real-world applications. Current curricula, often emphasize standardized testing and rote learning, limiting opportunities for critical thinking and exploration of modern science topics. Policymakers and educational leaders play a role in aligning policies with classroom needs by reducing standardized testing pressures and advocating for flexible, updated curricula.

Community and industry involvement was identified as a key factor in enriching science education through partnerships that provide students with real-world science experiences and exposure to career pathways. Additionally, digital illiteracy across receptor groups further complicates effective technology integration in science education, highlighting the need for improved digital literacy training for teachers, students, and administrators.

These findings underscore that a cohesive, receptor-oriented approach is essential for effective science education reform. Addressing these challenges with targeted solutions can lead to a more engaging, equitable, and future-focused science education system that prepares students to navigate and contribute to an increasingly scientific and technological society.

Recommendations

Based on the study's findings, the following recommendations are proposed to address the barriers in science education:

Schools, districts, and policymakers should prioritize funding to equip science classrooms with updated resources, including lab equipment, digital tools, and interactive platforms. Partnerships with educational organizations and industry can help supply these resources where budget constraints exist.

Teachers should receive continual training in new scientific disciplines and digital tools from their schools. Professional development should be practical and involve hands-on practice with resources, inquiry-based methods, and digital literacy to enhance teacher confidence and effectiveness.

Schools should embed project-based learning (PBL) that connects science concepts to real-world issues like sustainability, public health, and technology. PBL makes science more engaging and relevant to students' lives, fostering deeper interest and understanding.
Establishing mentorship programs and STEM internships can help students see the practical applications of science and inspire interest in STEM fields. Schools can partner with local businesses and organizations to provide role models and opportunities for career exploration.

Curriculum developers and educational departments should establish protocols for regular updates that reflect scientific advancements, focusing on critical, interdisciplinary issues such as climate science and biotechnology. This ensures students gain knowledge relevant to contemporary science and society.

Policymakers should advocate for stable, equitable funding dedicated to science education resources, particularly in under-resourced schools. This investment is essential to reduce disparities and enable all students to access quality science education.

Schools and districts should create formal partnership programs with community organizations and industry. These partnerships can provide students with experiential learning opportunities, such as internships, science fairs, and workshops that link classroom knowledge to real-world applications.

Schools can organize science fairs, community workshops, and other events to engage families and local businesses in science education. These events foster a supportive environment for science learning and increase community investment in educational outcomes.

Schools should implement digital literacy programs for all stakeholders, focusing on science-related technologies, data analysis tools, and virtual labs. Teachers need the skills to integrate digital tools into lessons effectively, while students require digital skills for modern science inquiry.

References

Archer, L., Osborne, J., DeWitt, J., Dillon, J., Wong, B., & Willis, B. (2010). "Doing" science versus "being" a scientist: Examining 10/11-year-old schoolchildren's constructions of science through the lens of identity. Science Education, 94(4), 617-639.

Bransford, J., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). How people learn: brain, mind, experience, and school. National Academy Press.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101.

Bybee, R. W. (2010). The teaching of science: 21st-century perspectives. NSTA Press.

Creswell, J. W. & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach (5th ed.). Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). Sage.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute.

DeBoer, G. E. (1991). A history of ideas in science education: Implications for practice. Teachers College Press.

DeBoer, G. E. (2000). Scientific literacy: Another look at its historical and contemporary meanings and its relationship to science education reform. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37(6), 582-601.

Ertmer, P. A., & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T. (2010). Teacher technology change: How knowledge, confidence, beliefs, and culture intersect. Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 42(3), 255-284.

Field, A. (2018). Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics (5th ed.). Sage.

Flick, U. (2018). An introduction to qualitative research (6th ed.). Sage.

Holbrook, J. & Rannikmae, M. (2009). The meaning of scientific literacy. International Journal of Environmental & Science Education, 4(3), 275–288.

Kimmons, R., & Veletsianos, G. (2020). Educational technology beyond content: A model of digital literacy in practice. Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education, 20(2), 171-189.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Sage.

Lye, S. Y., & Koh, J. H. L. (2014). Review on teaching and learning of computational thinking through programming: What is next for K-12? Computers in Human Behavior, 41, 51-61.

McKnight, K., O'Malley, K., Ruzic, R., Horsley, M. K., Franey, J. J., & Bassett, K. (2016). Teaching in a digital age: How educators use technology to improve student learning. Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 48(3), 194-211.

McLaughlin, M. W. & Talbert, J. E. (2006). Building school-based teacher learning communities: Professional strategies to improve student achievement. Teachers College Press.

Merriam, S. B. & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Morgan, D. L. (1996). Focus groups. Annual Review of Sociology, 22, 129–152.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). How people learn II: learners, contexts, and cultures. The National Academies Press.

NGSS Lead States. (2013). Next Generation Science Standards: For states, by states. The National Academies Press.
Osborne, J., & Dillon, J. (2008). Science education in Europe: critical reflections. Nuffield Foundation.
Ravitch, D. (2016). The death and life of the great American school system: How testing and choice are undermining education. Basic Books.
Sadler, T. D., Coyle, H. P., & Schwartz, R. S. (2010). Engineering competitions in the middle school classroom: Key elements in developing students' understanding of design. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 19(5), 469-479.
Sahlberg, P. (2010). Finnish lessons: What can the world learn from educational change in Finland? Teachers College Press.
Savery, J. R. (2006). Overview of problem-based learning: Definitions and distinctions. Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning, 1(1), 9-20.
Tytler, R. (2007). Re-imagining science education: Engaging students in science for Australia's future. Australian Council for Educational Research.