AQUADEMIA
2025, 9(1), ep25002
ISSN 2542-4874 (Online)
https://www.aquademia-journal.com/

Review Article

OPEN ACCESS

The evolution of STEM education and the transition to STEAM/STREAM

Leonidas Gavrilas [1*], Konstantinos T. Kotsis [1]

[1] Department of Primary Education, University of Ioannina, Ioannina, GREECE
***Corresponding Author:** l.gavrilas@uoi.gr

Citation: Gavrilas, L., & Kotsis, K. T. (2025). The evolution of STEM education and the transition to STEAM/STREAM. *Aquademia, 9*(1), ep25002. https://doi.org/10.29333/aquademia/16313

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 10 Feb 2025

Accepted: 09 Apr 2025

ABSTRACT

STEM education has grown considerably in recent decades, reflecting the need for interdisciplinary and technology-rich learning. Transformations include adding the Arts to create STEAM and, more recently, incorporating reading/writing and reflective processes under STREAM. This paper explores these shifts, first examining the future of STEM against rapid technological advancements (e.g., AI, VR/AR) and evolving collaborations between schools, industries, and communities. It then discusses the transition from STEM to STEAM, highlighting the role of creative thinking. Finally, it presents STREAM, which integrates humanities-based reflection to promote critical thinking, human-centered design, and social responsibility. Alongside these opportunities, the paper addresses challenges such as unequal resource access, insufficient teacher development, and the need for supportive policies that foster inclusive, future-oriented education. Drawing on research and practical insights, it contends that STEAM and STREAM can cultivate learners' innovative capacities, ethical awareness, and adaptability, ultimately preparing them to engage responsibly in a rapidly evolving, interconnected world.

Keywords: STEM education, STEAM, STREAM, interdisciplinary learning, educational innovation

INTRODUCTION

STEM education has become a cornerstone of educational reform worldwide, driven by an urgent need to equip learners with scientific, technological, and engineering skills relevant to emerging professional and societal demands. Over the past few decades, the STEM paradigm has evolved from a primarily discipline-specific approach into a more integrated and project-based model, aiming to improve academic performance in science or mathematics and cultivate critical thinking, problem-solving, and adaptability. Governments, educators, and industry stakeholders increasingly view STEM education as essential for economic development and social progress, given the accelerating pace of scientific discovery and technological innovation (Holmlund et al., 2018; Li et al., 2020).

However, STEM's continued evolution has exposed critical gaps. Although existing programs can effectively transmit scientific content, many educators have noted a relative lack of creativity and humanistic or artistic perspectives. This recognition has led to the integration of Arts into STEM-known as STEAM-and, more recently, to the proposal of STREAM, which further emphasizes reading/writing, reflection, and a human-centered dimension in the learning process (Aguilera & Ortiz-Revilla, 2021; Radziwill et al., 2015). These shifts reflect broader social transformations and respond to calls for a more holistic pedagogical framework that teaches technical concepts and fosters creativity, collaboration, and social responsibility.

This paper offers a multi-faceted investigation into how STEM education is currently unfolding and how it may evolve. It examines key technological developments, including virtual reality (VR), augmented reality (AR), and artificial intelligence (AI), that are rapidly reshaping how scientific and technological concepts are introduced to learners. It also explores the increasingly important collaboration among schools, universities, community organizations, and industry, highlighting how these partnerships can bridge theory with real-world applications. Challenges such as unequal access to resources, limited teacher preparedness, and the need for more substantial policy support underscore that while the future of STEM education is promising, it also remains fraught with hurdles (Amalu et al., 2023; Aslam et al., 2023).

Subsequent sections delve into the transition from STEM to STEAM, explaining why creative and artistic elements are vital in nurturing the next generation of innovators capable of addressing complex global challenges. The discussion culminates in an exploration of STREAM, which adds an explicit reflective and humanities-based dimension to STEAM, encouraging learners to connect scientific knowledge with ethical, social, and cultural contexts. In doing so, it aims to produce graduates who not only master technological skills but also bring insight, empathy, and responsibility to their professional and civic lives (Badmus & Omosewo, 2020; Makrakis, 2018). The paper concludes by arguing that when well implemented, the STEAM and STREAM paradigms hold great promise in cultivating individuals prepared for the dynamic, interconnected world of the twenty-first century.

THE FUTURE OF STEM EDUCATION

The future trajectory of STEM education appears increasingly dynamic, shaped by emerging pedagogical innovations and technological breakthroughs that can revolutionize classroom practices. Rapid technological developments have already begun to alter how STEM subjects are taught and learned. Virtual reality (VR) and augmented reality (AR) tools enable immersive and interactive learning experiences. Students can explore virtual laboratories, manipulate three-dimensional scientific models, and participate in interactive simulations that bring complex processes to life (Anggaryani et al., 2023; Ismail et al., 2024). By transcending physical limitations, VR and AR can facilitate access to phenomena that would otherwise be too dangerous or distant to encounter in a typical classroom. This immediacy can deepen conceptual understanding and spark greater interest in scientific disciplines.

Another significant trend is the rise of artificial intelligence (AI) in educational platforms, which has the potential to offer personalized learning experiences tailored to each student's abilities and challenges (Alavi et al., 2022; Triplett, 2023). Intelligent tutoring systems and adaptive learning environments can identify patterns of misunderstanding and deliver targeted instructional materials, enabling students to progress at their own pace. Although such tools promise a more differentiated and student-centered approach, they raise important questions concerning equity and ethical oversight. If not carefully managed, AI-powered resources might exacerbate existing inequalities by favoring schools and communities with more excellent technical infrastructure or promoting algorithms lacking transparency or fairness.

Alongside these technological developments, the future of STEM education is increasingly tied to robust partnerships among educational institutions, universities, businesses, and community organizations. As economies become more reliant on technology and scientific research, the alignment between classroom instruction and market needs becomes more critical (Ankrah & Al-Tabbaa, 2015; Dieker et al., 2021; Gavrilas et al., 2022). Schools that collaborate with local industries can offer students internships, project-based learning opportunities, and exposure to real-world applications of their study content. Industry professionals can serve as mentors, providing insights into rapidly evolving fields such as renewable energy, robotics, or data analytics. This level of engagement helps students understand the theory behind scientific concepts and the tangible ways science, engineering, and mathematics intersect with the broader world (Papanikolaou et al., 2021).

Embedding authentic experiences within the curriculum reinforces that STEM is neither abstract nor disconnected from day-to-day life. It fosters a sense of relevance, motivating students to view their schoolwork as a pathway to meaningful societal contributions. Moreover, partnerships beyond the schools-such as local community projects or international collaborations-can promote civic responsibility and social awareness. Students participating in community-based engineering projects gain exposure to STEM's social contexts and ethical dimensions, which becomes even more crucial as technologies like AI and biotechnology raise questions about privacy, sustainability, and equity (Hands, 2023; Hurley et al., 2024; Papanikolaou et al., 2023).

Despite these optimistic developments, significant challenges must be overcome for the bright future of STEM education to materialize fully. One persistent obstacle is the unequal distribution of technological resources, contributing to disparities in academic achievement between well-resourced urban or suburban schools and underfunded rural or low-income schools (Amalu et al., 2023; Aslam et al., 2023). Comprehensive reforms involving government initiatives, private philanthropy, and local community efforts are necessary to ensure all students can access laboratory equipment, high-speed internet, and up-to-date software. Funding must also address teacher professional development, as many educators lack the training or confidence to integrate advanced technologies into their lessons effectively (Gardner et al., 2019).

Teacher training cannot be an afterthought. New pedagogical frameworks demand interdisciplinary understanding, innovative classroom management, and evolving evaluation methods. Educators need substantial support to develop practical skills in designing project-based or inquiry-based STEM lessons and to navigate emergent instructional tools such as online simulations and data analysis platforms (Gavrilas et al., 2024). Continuous professional learning communities can facilitate knowledge exchange among educators, enabling them to share successful practices, troubleshoot challenges, and remain abreast of rapid technological change (Nadelson et al., 2013).

Another formidable concern pertains to inclusivity in STEM. Although the rhetoric around STEM emphasizes future-oriented skills and opportunities, female students, students from underrepresented minorities, and those of low socioeconomic backgrounds often do not see STEM fields as accessible or relevant (Ahmed et al., 2020; Aquino et al., 2023). Addressing these longstanding inequities demands a multi-pronged approach. Schools must adopt culturally responsive teaching strategies, highlight diverse role models, and ensure classroom content resonates with learners' everyday experiences. Afterschool and extracurricular STEM clubs can serve as safe spaces where students explore robotics or coding in a less pressured environment. At the same time, mentorship programs can connect students with professionals with similar backgrounds. Furthermore, teacher preparation programs must challenge biases and stereotypes, educating future teachers in ways that allow them to foster inclusive classrooms (Ahmed, 2016; Idris et al., 2023).

Finally, educators and policymakers must remain alert to the risk of reducing STEM education to a purely technical or vocational endeavor. While the economic relevance of STEM is paramount, it is equally essential to emphasize creativity, communication, ethical reasoning, and emotional intelligence. Learning theories that highlight the learner as an active participant-collaborating with peers, reflecting on experiences, and applying knowledge in authentic contexts-align with these broader educational aims (Kayan-Fadlelmula et al., 2022; Marzuki et al., 2024). The following sections, which detail the evolution from STEM to STEAM and eventually STREAM, illustrate precisely how these broader goals can be integrated into the instructional process. STEM education can fulfill its transformative potential by acknowledging these complexities and working toward policies that value teacher development, inclusive practices, and community engagement.

THE SHIFT FROM STEM TO STEAM

The acronym STEAM adds "Arts" to STEM, indicating that creativity, design, and artistic thinking are pivotal in fostering well-rounded, innovative learners. This evolution from STEM to STEAM is not a superficial alteration of educational priorities but rather an acknowledgment that combining scientific inquiry and creative expression is crucial for breakthrough innovations in a modern, interconnected economy (Boy, 2013; Radziwill et al., 2015).

Over the twentieth century, science curricula focused predominantly on linear, mechanical perspectives, such as the design of automobiles or the operations of chemical factories. The twenty-first century requires a broader outlook that underscores holistic and non-linear modes of problem-solving, especially in networked systems like the Internet, air traffic management, and large-scale data analytics (Connor et al., 2015; Conradty & Bogner, 2019). The STEAM concept aligns with this shift by championing interdisciplinarity and long-range sociotechnical planning rather than a narrow, short-term focus on economic indicators (Videla et al., 2021).

Arts encompass a spectrum of disciplines-visual arts, music, theater, and design-emphasizing observational acuity, creative thinking, and the capacity to frame new questions. These competencies translate into scientific inquiry because they encourage learners to think more expansively. Students might design a robotic sculpture that embodies aesthetic principles and functional engineering in a classroom that integrates arts with technology and engineering. They learn to consider how the mechanism works and how it can inspire an emotional response or convey a particular message (Aguilera & Ortiz-Revilla, 2021). These fusion fosters divergent thinking and collaborative problem-solving, core attributes in a world that increasingly values entrepreneurial and cross-disciplinary skill sets.

Historically, individuals like Leonardo da Vinci and Michelangelo are often cited as exemplary of this combined scientific and artistic brilliance. However, formal education systems have frequently separated science and the arts. STEAM seeks to bridge this artificial divide, illustrating that STEM fields greatly benefit from creative processes. In mathematics, geometry can be taught through a synergy of abstract reasoning and artistic constructions. Students gain a deeper connection to geometry's relevance and aesthetic dimensions, making them more likely to grasp complex concepts and retain their learning (Snider, 2024).

In practical terms, STEAM adoption involves curriculum reforms, teacher training, and a reevaluation of assessment methods. Classrooms must be reconfigured to accommodate collaborative design work, digital storytelling, and hands-on experimentation. Educators need guidance in formulating lesson plans that blend scientific rigor with creative exploration. Traditional multiple-choice assessments or purely technical tests can undervalue the creative dimensions central to STEAM. Instead, more holistic evaluation approaches, such as project-based assessments or portfolios, can capture the design process, the originality of ideas, and the ability to iterate solutions (Radziwill et al., 2015).

Beyond the classroom, STEAM can invigorate students' interest in science by making it more relatable and enjoyable. Learners who see how scientific theories link with visual arts or music production often develop stronger motivation as the content resonates with personal passions. This approach helps mitigate issues of student disengagement, especially among those who initially do not identify with STEM fields. By illustrating that artistry and emotion can be integrated with mathematical and scientific thinking, educators break down stereotypes associated science solely with stoicism or dryness (Aguilera & Ortiz-Revilla, 2021).

While STEAM broadens the horizon of STEM education, it also intersects with another powerful trend: the pursuit of social and emotional learning. The "Arts" foster empathy, emotional awareness, and the capacity to collaborate. These qualities matter not only for well-functioning teams but also for ethical decision-making, a point becoming ever more crucial as scientific advances like genetic engineering or AI-raise profound moral dilemmas. By linking STEAM to discussions on global challenges, teachers can demonstrate that creative scientific thinkers must grapple with issues of environment, equity, and cultural diversity (Boy, 2013; Videla et al., 2021).

Critics of STEAM occasionally argue that adding Arts may dilute rigorous science or weaken the engineering and mathematical core. However, proponents counter that STEAM does not aim to reduce the intensity of scientific content but to enrich it. This enrichment rests on the premise that technological solutions are functional and must be user-friendly, attractive, and meaningful. In other words, a device that works is beneficial, but a device that works and resonates with users' preferences, cultural values, and sense of beauty has a far broader impact (Radziwill et al., 2015; Snider, 2024).

For STEAM to achieve genuine impact, systemic support is required. School leadership must champion multi-disciplinary collaborations. Teachers from different departments-science, art, language-must have coordinated planning times and resources to develop integrated units. Assessments must evolve to credit both creative processes and scientific accuracy. Professional development must guide educators in facilitating open-ended tasks, handling cross-disciplinary complexity, and encouraging students to reflect on the interplay between logic and aesthetics. At the same time, policymakers and curriculum designers must accept that the arts are not superfluous but integral to forging the flexible, inventive mindsets demanded by a knowledge-based, innovative-driven economy (Connor et al., 2015; Conradty & Bogner, 2019).

STEAM, in sum, acknowledges that advanced problem-solving in the modern era often arises from the synergy of rigorous analytical skills with imaginative, aesthetic, and human-centered perspectives. Rather than diluting science or technology, the arts catalyze deeper insight and broader engagement. The next step extends these principles further, incorporating explicit reflective learning and humanities-based approaches. This progression has been called STREAM, which moves beyond the integration of artistic expression to include reading, writing, and critical reflection, thus offering a more comprehensive outlook on how scientific knowledge can be internalized and applied ethically and empathetically in real-world contexts.

FROM STEAM TO STREAM

The evolution from STEM to STEAM reshapes education by integrating creativity and artistic dimensions into scientific and technological fields. The subsequent move toward STREAM (Science, Technology, Reading/Writing, Engineering, Arts, Mathematics) adds a further layer of humanistic thinking, reflective practice, and literacy skills to this already enriched pedagogical framework (Badmus & Omosewo, 2020; Makrakis, 2018). Where STEAM primarily emphasizes the creative and design-oriented elements that the arts bring to STEM, STREAM reinforces the humanities. It promotes a reflective process linking technical proficiency with understanding cultural contexts, ethical implications, and emotional resonance. Reading and writing, are not seen as mere "add-ons" but are woven into a broader curriculum aiming to form citizens who can reason critically, communicate effectively, and engage with diverse perspectives (Clements & Sarama, 2021). STREAM students are encouraged to articulate the rationale behind a particular engineering design, explore scientific theories' historical evolution, or express technological progress's societal impacts through reflective essays or presentations. They develop cognitive processes that blend analytic, aesthetic, and moral dimensions (Sun & Zhong, 2024).

Reflective learning lies at the core of this transformation. Traditional science instruction often focuses on content mastery and procedural knowledge. While these elements remain essential, STREAM prompts learners to question why specific scientific findings matter, what social or environmental consequences they hold, and how they connect to broader human experiences (Makrakis, 2018). Reflection can take many forms: personal journaling, peer dialogues, or structured classroom discussions, all aimed at encouraging metacognitive awareness. This metacognition helps students connect new knowledge with prior understanding, reinforcing a deeper comprehension beyond rote memorization.

Another defining characteristic of STREAM is the explicit inclusion of the humanities alongside scientific fields. Students are motivated to examine fundamental human questions-about ethics, justice, and identity-through the lens of scientific and technological development (Badmus & Omosewo, 2020). Projects might invite them to investigate how a particular innovation, such as facial recognition technology, influences personal privacy and civil liberties or how sustainable energy initiatives relate to environmental justice. These explorations foster technical skill-building and an appreciation for ethical decision-making and community engagement.

By weaving humanities-based perspectives into the science curriculum, STREAM aims to produce well-rounded graduates who do not merely know how to create functional devices but also grasp the social ramifications of their work. Such an integrative perspective is invaluable in biotechnology, artificial intelligence, or climate science. Rapid technological developments can yield far-reaching consequences that demand careful evaluation. Students who practice reflective thinking and incorporate ethical and cultural considerations are better equipped to propose solutions that balance innovation with human values (Clements & Sarama, 2021; Sun & Zhong, 2024).

STREAM builds on STEAM's commitment to creativity but frames creativity more expansively. The presence of reading, writing, and reflective discussion encourages a twofold creativity. On the one hand, it highlights imaginative design akin to that found in STEAM programs that stimulate artistic innovation. On the other, it underscores creativity in argumentation, discursive reasoning, and the capacity to synthesize insights from different disciplines. In this sense, learners are designing imaginative prototypes and crafting coherent narratives about why those prototypes matter and how they might evolve. This synergy of design and discourse can ignite curiosity and personal investment in learning while refining students' capacity for critical analysis (Radziwill et al., 2015).

Critically, the shift to STREAM addresses the concern that STEAM, in certain implementations, might remain superficial. Some STEAM initiatives incorporate the arts in a tokenistic fashion, failing to deepen the science curriculum or foster genuine interdisciplinary understanding. STREAM's reflective orientation calls for a more integrated approach. Lessons are intentionally designed so that scientific inquiry, technological application, artistic creativity, and humanistic reflection complement one another. Students may, for instance, research the chemistry of sustainable materials, produce an artistic piece that communicates the significance of ecological balance, and then write an essay reflecting on the socio-economic barriers to adopting such materials globally. This type of project moves beyond a fragmented or surface-level integration, helping learners see themselves as agents of change in a complex world (Makrakis, 2018; Sun & Zhong, 2024).

Furthermore, reflection bridges the gap between academic learning and lifelong personal growth. Traditional STEM or STEAM models might train proficient problem-solvers. However, STREAM endeavors to cultivate reflective problem-solvers who continuously evaluate their assumptions, empathize with stakeholders, and adapt to new evidence or contexts. In a future characterized by rapid technological shifts and environmental uncertainties, such reflective adaptability may be a defining attribute of effective leadership and responsible citizenship (Debroy, 2017; Makrakis, 2018).

The adoption of STREAM, however, poses its challenges. Schools and districts must revise curricula so that reading and writing tasks are not relegated to language arts classes but embedded in science or engineering projects. Teachers must receive adequate professional development to navigate interdisciplinary content, fostering a classroom environment encouraging curiosity, iterative experimentation, and reflective thinking (Gavrilas et al., 2024). Additionally, resources must be allocated to ensure that the humanities, art, and design are fully recognized as integral to scientific and technological education. This shift can be challenging in systems prioritizing standardized testing or measuring success predominantly through quantitative indicators. STREAM advocates must, therefore, demonstrate how reflective, humanities-driven learning can complement and enhance core scientific competencies rather than displace them (Badmus & Omosewo, 2020).

Policy frameworks also play a significant role. Forward-looking policies could incentivize schools to adopt integrated curricula, support ongoing research into best practices, and sustain professional learning communities. Collaboration among educators, tech companies, and academic researchers could yield robust evidence-based strategies for designing STREAM activities that merge science, technology, arts, reading, and reflection. The emphasis on evaluation and continuous iteration parallels the ethos of experimentation within scientific disciplines, suggesting that the success of STREAM depends on a willingness to refine curricula as new knowledge and contexts emerge (Kleinschmit et al., 2023; Subramaniam & Mok, 2023).

In essence, STREAM represents a broader, more human-centered vision of science education than STEM or STEAM, merging the imaginative power of the arts with reflective, humanities-driven inquiry. It acknowledges that learners must navigate a globalized environment fraught with ethical complexities, social inequalities, and cultural diversities. By cultivating reflective thinking, empathy, and the ability to communicate effectively, STREAM frameworks equip students to apply scientific and technological skills to serve innovation and the common good.

CONCLUSION

The evolution of STEM education-and its subsequent expansions into STEAM and STREAM-mirrors an ongoing quest to cultivate technically adept but also creative, reflective, and socially conscious learners. STEM's early focus on producing competent scientists, engineers, and mathematicians has been broadened by STEAM's emphasis on aesthetics and creative design, affirming that logic and creativity can coalesce to generate novel ideas and deeper engagement among students (Aguilera & Ortiz-Revilla, 2021; Radziwill et al., 2015). The progression to STREAM amplifies these ambitions further. By explicitly incorporating reading, writing, and reflective processes, educators guide learners toward holistic development, fostering ethical awareness, empathy, and a more nuanced understanding of societal and environmental complexities (Badmus & Omosewo, 2020; Makrakis, 2018).

As technology continues to transform classrooms, exemplified by VR, AR, AI, and advanced collaborative platforms, STEM education gains unprecedented opportunities for innovation. Students can experiment with virtual laboratories, personalize their learning paths, and engage in authentic projects that mirror real-world challenges (Gavrilas et al., 2025). Parallel collaborations with local industries, universities, and community organizations reinforce the relevance of classroom learning, ensuring that scientific and technological studies intersect with tangible societal needs (Ankrah & Al-Tabbaa, 2015; Dieker et al., 2021). Nonetheless, critical barriers remain, including disparities in resource allocation, shortages of professional development for teachers, and persistent social inequalities that hinder equitable participation in STEM fields (Gavrilas & Kotsis, 2024).

STEAM offers a pathway to address these shortcomings, bridging art and scientific logic to make technical disciplines more accessible and alluring. STREAM extends this bridging function by weaving in the humanities, reflective thinking, and literacy skills. Such a comprehensive approach aims to produce capable scientists and technicians and empathetic, culturally aware individuals who can responsibly shape the future of science and technology. In an era when concerns about climate change, data privacy, and biotechnology ethics are intensifying, nurturing critical reflection and holistic problem-solving is vital (Kotsis & Gavrilas, 2025).

Though promising, realizing STREAM's full potential requires systemic changes in policy, teacher preparation, and assessment. Policymakers must acknowledge the importance of an interdisciplinary framework that does not reduce the arts or humanities to peripheral roles but integrates them meaningfully into a learner-centered curriculum (Gavrilas & Kotsis, 2025). Schools must invest in teacher training that promotes inquiry-based, project-oriented, and reflective pedagogies. In addition, inclusive practices should guide all reforms, ensuring that historically marginalized communities' benefit from these educational evolutions rather than being left behind.

Ultimately, the shift from STEM to STEAM and onwards to STREAM reflects a deepening recognition that genuine innovation emerges from the intersection of rigorous scientific thinking, artistic creativity, social consciousness, and ethical reflection. This integrated approach can help learners connect knowledge with real-world contexts, grapple with multifaceted problems, and develop a sense of shared responsibility (Gontas et al., 2021). By embracing STREAM, educational systems can aspire to produce a generation of thinkers, innovators, and leaders who do not simply master advanced technologies but use them to foster sustainable progress, cultural vitality, and collective well-being.

Author contributions: All authors contributed to the conception, design, data collection, interpretation, writing, and critical revision of this review article. All authors have approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding: The authors received no financial support for the research and authorship of this article.

Ethical statement: The authors declared that this study did not require ethical approval or informed consent because it reviewed existing literature and did not involve new data collection from human participants.

Declaration of interest: The authors declare that there are no competing interests.

Availability of data and materials: All data analyzed in this study are included in this published article or are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

REFERENCES

Aguilera, D., & Ortiz-Revilla, J. (2021). Stem vs. steam education and student creativity: A systematic literature review. *Education Sciences*, *11*(7), Article 331. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11070331

Ahmed, H. O. K. (2016). Strategic future directions for developing stem education in higher education in egypt as a driver of innovation economy. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *7*(8), 127-145.

Ahmed, N., Urmi, T., & Tasmin, M. (2020). Challenges and opportunities for young female learners in stem from the perspective of bangladesh. *2020 IEEE International Conference on Teaching, Assessment, and Learning for Engineering (TALE)*, 39-46.

Alavi, A. H., Ouyang, F., Jiao, P., & McLaren, B. M. (2022). *Artificial intelligence in stem education: The paradigmatic shifts in research, education, and technology* (1st Ed.). CRC Press.

Amalu, E. H., Short, M., Chong, P. L., Hughes, D. J., Adebayo, D. S., Tchuenbou-Magaia, F., Lähde, P., Kukka, M., Polyzou, O., Oikonomou, T. I., Karytsas, C., Gebremedhin, A., Ossian, C., & Ekere, N. N. (2023). Critical skills needs and challenges for STEM/STEAM graduates increased employability and entrepreneurship in the solar energy sector. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *187*, Article 113776.

Anggaryani, M., Prastowo, T., Suprapto, N., Lassa, J., Madlazim, M., Alifteria, F. A., Agusty, A. I., & Lestari, N. A. (2023). Virtual reality as experiential learning to promote stem-drr in tertiary education. *ASM Science Journal*, *18*, 1-12.

Ankrah, S. N., & Al-Tabbaa, O. (2015). Universities-industry collaboration: A systematic review. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.

Aquino, B. M. A., Balocating, L. S. C., Candor, K. J. R., Daniel, F. C., & Dionglay, M. J. H. (2023). Exploring the opportunities, challenges, and ways forward of women in stem fields: A case study. *Cognizance Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, *3*(6), 341-359. https://doi.org/10.47760/cognizance.2023.v03i06.021

Aslam, S., Alghamdi, A. A., Abid, N., & Kumar, T. (2023). Challenges in implementing stem education: Insights from novice stem teachers in developing countries. *Sustainability*, *15*(19), Article 14455. https://doi.org/10.3390/su151914455

Badmus, O. T., & Omosewo, E. O. (2020). Evolution of stem, steam and stream education in Africa: The implication of the knowledge gap. *International Journal on Research in STEM Education*, *2*, 99-106. https://doi.org/10.31098/ijrse.v2i2.227

Boy, G. A. (2013). From STEM to STEAM: Toward a human-centred education, creativity & learning thinking. *Proceedings of the 31st European Conference on Cognitive Ergonomics*, 1-7.

Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2021). Stem or steam or stream? Integrated or interdisciplinary? In C. Cohrssen & S. Garvis (Eds.), *Embedding STEAM in Early Childhood Education and Care* (pp. 261–275). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65624-9_13

Connor, A. M., Karmokar, S., & Whittington, C. (2015). From stem to steam: Strategies for enhancing engineering & technology education. *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy*, *5*(2), 37-47. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v5i2.4458

Conradty, C., & Bogner, F. X. (2019). From stem to steam: Cracking the code? How creativity & motivation interacts with inquiry-based learning. *Creativity Research Journal*, *31*(3), 284-295.

Debroy, A. (2017). *What is stream education & why is it gaining popularity?* EdTech Review.

Dieker, L. A., Butler, M. B., Ortiz, E., & Gao, S. (2021). Reflecting upon 30 years of stem partnerships between industry, university, and public schools: Past lessons, current successes, and future dreams. *Education Sciences*, *11*(12), Article 760.

Gardner, K., Glassmeyer, D., & Worthy, R. (2019). Impacts of stem professional development on teachers' knowledge, self-efficacy, and practice. *Frontiers in Education*, *4*.

Gavrilas, L., & Kotsis, K. T. (2024). Investigating perceptions of primary and preschool educators regarding incorporation of educational robotics into STEM education. *Contemporary Mathematics and Science Education*, *5*(1), Article ep24003. https://doi.org/10.30935/conmaths/14384

Gavrilas, L., & Kotsis, K. T. (2025). Development and validation of a survey instrument towards attitude, knowledge, and application of educational robotics (Akaer). *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, *48*(1), 44-66. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2024.2358780

Gavrilas, L., Kotsis, K. T., & Papanikolaou, M.-S. (2022). Attitudes and behaviors of university students towards electromagnetic radiation of cell phones and wireless networks. *Aquademia*, *6*(2), Article ep22009. https://doi.org/10.30935/aquademia/12393

Gavrilas, L., Kotsis, K. T., & Papanikolaou, M.-S. (2024). Assessing teacher readiness for educational robotics integration in primary and preschool education. *Education 3-13*, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2023.2300699

Gavrilas, L., Papanikolaou, M. – S., & Kotsis, K. T. (2025). Exploring electricity in early childhood education: A 5E-based learning approach. *Science Activities*, *62*(1), 53-94. https://doi.org/10.1080/00368121.2024.2406208

Gontas, P., Gavrilas, L., & Kotsis, K. T. (2021). Prospective teachers' perceptions of renewable energy sources. *Science and Technology Issues in Education, 14*, 37-48.

Hands, C. M. (2023). School-community collaboration: Insights from two decades of partnership development. In B. Cleveland, S. Backhouse, P. Chandler, I. McShane, J. M. Clinton, & C. Newton (Eds.), *Schools as community hubs: Building 'more than a school' for community benefit* (pp. 31-43). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-9972-7_3

Holmlund, T. D., Lesseig, K., & Slavit, D. (2018). Making sense of "STEM education" in K-12 contexts. *International Journal of STEM Education*, *5*(1), Article 32. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-018-0127-2

Hurley, M., Butler, D., & McLoughlin, E. (2024). Stem teacher professional learning through immersive stem learning placements in industry: A systematic literature review. *Journal for STEM Education Research*, *7*(1), 122-152.

Idris, R., Govindasamy, P., Nachiappan, S., & Bacotang, J. (2023). Revolutionizing stem education: Unleashing the potential of stem interest careers in malaysia. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, *13*(7), 1741-1752. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v13-i7/17608

Ismail, I. N., Zahari, N. M., Hussin, M. H. M., Roslin, N. T., Aziz, N. A., Nurhikmah, F., Abidin, S. Z., & Zawawi, M. H. (2024). A review of virtual reality application on STEM based education. *AIP Conference Proceedings, 2799*(1), Article 020009.

Kayan-Fadlelmula, F., Sellami, A., Abdelkader, N., & Umer, S. (2022). A systematic review of STEM education research in the GCC countries: Trends, gaps and barriers. *International Journal of STEM Education*, *9*(1), Article 2. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-021-00319-7

Kleinschmit, A. J., Rosenwald, A., Ryder, E. F., Donovan, S., Murdoch, B., Grandgenett, N. F., Pauley, M., Triplett, E., Tapprich, W., & Morgan, W. (2023). Accelerating STEM education reform: Linked communities of practice promote creation of open educational resources and sustainable professional development. *International Journal of STEM Education*, *10*(1), Article 16.

Kotsis, K. T., & Gavrilas, L. (2025). Review of scientific literacy of pre-service teachers on electromagnetic radiation. *European Journal of Contemporary Education and E-Learning,* *3*(1), 55-64. https://doi.org/10.59324/ejceel.2025.3(1).05

Li, Y., Wang, K., Xiao, Y., & Froyd, J. E. (2020). Research and trends in STEM education: A systematic review of journal publications. *International Journal of STEM Education*, *7*(1), Article 11.

Makrakis, V. (2018). From STEM to STEAM and to STREAM enabled through meaningful critical reflective learning. *2nd International Conference on Innovating STEM Education*. Deutsch School Athens.

Marzuki, O. F., Lih, E. T. Y., Abdullah, W. N. Z. Z., Khairuddin, N., Inai, N. H., Saad, J. B. M., & Aziz, M. H. A. (2024). Innovating education: A comprehensive review of stem education approaches. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, *13*(1), 614-631. http://doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v13-i1/20490

Nadelson, L. S., Callahan, J., Pyke, P., Hay, A., Dance, M., & Pfiester, J. (2013). Teacher stem perception and preparation: Inquiry-based stem professional development for elementary teachers. *The Journal of Educational Research*, *106*(2), 157-168. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2012.667014

Papanikolaou, M.-S., Gavrilas, L., & Kotsis, K. T. (2023). Enhancing pre-school students' understanding of water pollution through educational intervention. In G. Stylos, & K. T. Kotsis (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 13th Panhellenic Conference on Education in Natural Sciences and Technology*.

Papanikolaou, M.-S., Plakitsi, K., Gavrilas, L., & Kotsis, K. T. (2021). Investigating preschool students' ideas for science concepts on understanding modern environmental problems. In *12th Panhellenic Conference on the Teaching of Natural Sciences and New Technologies in Education: "The Role of Science Education in 21st Century Society"*.

Radziwill, N., Benton, M., & Moellers, C. (2015). From stem to steam: Reframing what it means to learn. *STEAM*, *2*(1), 1-7.

Snider, A. D. (2024). *From stem to steam: A study of art from the perspective of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics*. Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-57316-3

Subramaniam, R., & Mok, I. A. C. (2023). Editorial: Future of STEM education: Multiple perspectives from researchers. *Frontiers in Education*, *7*. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.1077225

Sun, W., & Zhong, B. (2024). Integrating reading and writing with STEAM / STEM: A systematic review on STREAM education. *Journal of Engineering Education*, *113*(4), 939-958. https://doi.org/10.1002/jee.20569

Triplett, W. J. (2023). Artificial intelligence in stem education. *Cybersecurity and Innovative Technology Journal*, *1*(1), 23-29.

Videla, R., Aguayo, C., & Veloz, T. (2021). From stem to steam: An enactive and ecological continuum. *Frontiers in Education*, *6*.