

Chapter 7

Culturally Situated Design Tools: Generative Justice as a Foundation for STEM Diversity

Ron Eglash

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, USA

Charles Hathaway

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, USA

William Babbitt

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, USA

David Hughes

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, USA

Audrey Bennett

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, USA

Mukkai Krishnamoorthy

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, USA

Kathryn Bennett

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, USA

Michael Lachney

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, USA

Brian Callahan

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, USA

Michael Mascarenhas

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, USA

James Davis

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, USA

Shayla Sawyer

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, USA

John Drazan

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, USA

Kathleen Tully

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, USA

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-2005-4.ch007

Copyright ©2017, IGI Global. Copying or distributing in print or electronic forms without written permission of IGI Global is prohibited.

ABSTRACT

The “pipeline” model of STEM education conceives of underrepresentation by race, gender and class in terms of leaks that fail to deliver students to their destination in the science and technology workforce. But that model fails to consider the role of STEM in producing underrepresentation. This can only be solved by moving from the extractive approach of the pipeline model to a generative model in which the value produced by STEM students cycles back to their own communities. We report on our experience creating and evaluating Culturally Situated Design Tools. Using a framework of “generative justice”, we contrast the cyclic social damage, which reproduces underrepresentation with the potential for STEM education as a niche in the technosocial ecosystem that can address underrepresentation and causal factors.

INTRODUCTION

The “pipeline” model of STEM education envisions a stream of students entering the educational system, but because of “leaks” only a small percentage make it to the end. Low-income, female, and underrepresented ethnic groups leak out more than others, which “explains” their underrepresentation. This model has become so naturalized in STEM education that we no longer think of it as a model; it appears to be common sense. To think that the model itself is flawed may seem irrational. However scientists challenge models in search of better ones all the time.

Consider, for example, the origins of the pipeline model in the oil industry. If scientists and engineers approached the problem in the same way--the only solution to America’s rising fuel prices is to get more oil through the pipeline--we would be trapped forever in a world with accelerating global warming, middle-eastern petro-dictatorships, ocean oil spills, etc. Fortunately we now understand the importance of replacing these extractive industries with renewable energy. Biofuels based on waste products, for example, can suck up as much carbon in the plant growth part of the cycle as they release in the fuel part of the cycle. Similarly we must now replace an extractive approach to underrepresented students in STEM with a generative approach that embodies both social and environmental justice.

A common reaction to this view, especially from scientists and engineers, is that we are confusing two entirely different phenomena. Whatever our critique of the social and environmental damage caused by STEM may be, surely K-12 students are unaware of it. To the contrary, while underrepresented youth may not have the data or analytic tools to back up their intuition, few of those living poverty think they are inhabiting a system which treats them and their community in fair and just ways. Because they often lack the means to express this analytically, the reaction can appear irrational. In the case of underrepresented ethnic groups these include

18 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: www.igi-global.com/chapter/culturally-situated-design-tools/173053

Related Content

Sexism and Gender Discrimination in Pakistan's Mainstream News Media

Erum Hafeez and Luavut Zahid (2021). *Handbook of Research on Discrimination, Gender Disparity, and Safety Risks in Journalism* (pp. 60-89).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/sexism-and-gender-discrimination-in-pakistans-mainstream-news-media/267628

Voices in the Desert: Black Women Faculty in the American Southwest

Xeturah M. Woodley (2019). *International Journal of Bias, Identity and Diversities in Education* (pp. 1-13).

www.irma-international.org/article/voices-in-the-desert/231470

Socio-Cultural Factors and the Work Environment

(2021). *Asian Women in Corporate America: Emerging Research and Opportunities* (pp. 97-127).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/socio-cultural-factors-and-the-work-environment/270992

Digital Inequities and Digital Inclusion in Education: An Agenda for the Post-COVID-19 World

Babu George, Yaprak Dalat Ward and Elodie Jones (2022). *Implementing Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging Management in Organizational Change Initiatives* (pp. 260-267).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/digital-inequities-and-digital-inclusion-in-education/304655

Women Members on Boards of Directors: Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainability in the Tourism Sector

Serdar Yener and Helena Belchior Rocha (2023). *Women's Empowerment Within the Tourism Industry* (pp. 325-343).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/women-members-on-boards-of-directors/327659