Jurnal Hurriah: Jurnal Evaluasi Pendidikan dan Penelitian
Hurriah Journal: of Educational Evaluation and Research

Journal homepage: https://academicareview.com/index.php/jh
E-ISSN: 2774-8472 I P-ISSN: 2774-8480 I DOI : 10.56806

Optimization Principles in Pedagogical Method Selection: A Topology Optimization-Inspired Framework for Teaching STEM Concepts in Indonesian High Schools

Muhammad Ihsan[1,2*], A. Afrizal[3], A. Prasetyo Wati[4]

[1] Engineering Faculty, Universitas Gajah Putih, Takengon, Indonesia
[2] Mechanical Engineering & Built Environment Faculty, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
[3] Mechanical Engineering Department, Sekolah Tinggi Iskandar Thani, Aceh, Indonesia
[4] Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received: October, 2025
Received in revised from: November, 2025
Accepted: December, 2025
Available online: January, 29, 2026

Keywords: *educational optimization, literature review, pedagogical frameworks, STEM education, teaching methods, topology optimization, resource-constrained education,*

ABSTRACT

Pedagogical optimization frameworks are becoming more popular as developed countries struggle to improve STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) education quality. This systematic review combines STEM teaching method selection and optimization approachment research. We investigate theoretical foundations, methodological approaches, empirical data, and implementation issues from 2010–2024 peer-reviewed articles. Cognitive learning theories (including Bloom's taxonomy and constructivism), effectiveness research on teaching methods, operations research optimization techniques, and resource-limited educational constraints are all examined in our analysis. The findings show numerous results. First, active learning methods outperform traditional instruction (effect sizes from d=0.40 to d=0.75), but their efficacy varies throughout Bloom's taxonomy levels. Optimization frameworks are useful for timetabling and resource allocation, however pedagogical technique selection is underdeveloped. Third, resource limits in developing countries require context-adapted solutions, not just scaled-down versions of well-resourced ways. Fourth, engineering optimization methods in educational science are promising but have gotten little attention. A review finds several serious shortcomings. Optimization methodologies are rarely empirically validated in teaching situations. Research on simultaneous optimization across several learning objectives with realistic constraints is uncommon. These deficiencies include evidence-based optimization frameworks, rigorous testing across varied settings, and substantial scalability and cost-effectiveness research, especially in resource-limited contexts.

1. Introduction

STEM competencies are of unprecedented importance. The 21st-century information economy demands an unparalleled focus on abilities in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, compelling educators to scrutinize educational efficacy more rigorously than ever. Global evaluations present a grim portrayal. PISA (Programme for International Student Assessment) and TIMSS (Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study) data frequently reveal significant performance disparities between high-performing and developing nations (Fadlelmula et al., 2022)(Teig et al., 2022). What is especially concerning? These differences extend

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: *ihsan.ccrg@gmail.com*
https://doi.org/10.56806/ jh.v6i4.400

beyond mere knowledge deficiencies. They indicate essential deficiencies in higher-order cognitive skills—specifically, the capacities to analyze, evaluate, and creatively solve problems that are crucial for innovation-driven economies (Anwar, 2023).

STEM education encounters problems that differ significantly depending on the rules. Schools in well-resourced systems have the infrastructures such as functional laboratories, trained teachers, manageable class sizes, adequate instructional materials. This infrastructure facilitates the proliferation of evidence-based active learning methodologies. However, reversing that scenario for educational institutions in developing nations reveals a contrasting reality. Laboratories operate deficiently; research indicates that hardly 32% comply with fundamental operating norms in numerous areas. Classes are overcrowded with 40 to 60 students. Teaching materials are insufficient. Teacher training is inadequate for current requirements. Administrative tasks consume hours that should go toward instruction (Chisom et al., 2024; Kim, 2019; Thi et al., 2021). These issues are significant. Systematic barriers necessitate strategies tailored for resource-constrained environments rather than optimal conditions; a requirement that current research has insufficiently addressed.

What criteria do educators presently utilize to choose instructional methods? More often than not, the process operates informally. Educators depend on intuition, adhere to institutional practices, or react to acute situations instead of making systematic, evidence-based decisions (Vanlommel et al., 2021). This informal methodology becomes more troublesome when considering Bloom's taxonomy [8], [9]. Diverse pedagogical approaches exhibit significantly varying efficacy across cognitive tiers. Direct instruction is effective for conveying factual knowledge, specifically at the Remember and Understand levels. But it proves inadequate for developing analytical and creative capabilities at higher levels (Analyze, Evaluate, Create) (Almasseri & Alhojailan, 2019; Maani & Shanti, 2023; Stockard et al., 2018). These advanced abilities necessitate active participation via methodologies such as problem-based learning, inquiry-based approaches, or project-based learning.

Notably in recent years, there has been more interest in using optimization techniques—tools that are usually used in operations research, engineering design, and resource allocation—in making decisions about education. School scheduling is a success story: optimization algorithms now make schedules that are better than those made by people by hand (Popov et al., 2020). Educational resource allocation (Figueiredo et al., 2022) and curriculum sequencing (Lv, 2021) have both benefited in the same way. These applications demonstrate that mathematical optimization can effectively address intricate educational challenges.

However, even though there have been many improvements, optimization principles have not been used in a consistent way in core pedagogical design. There is still a lack of frameworks for choosing and assigning teaching methods to meet hierarchical learning goals when resources are limited. This gap remains, notwithstanding the considerable transformative potential of these approaches. This review seeks to mitigate this limitation by integrating research from three domains: cognitive learning theory, evidence of pedagogical effectiveness, and optimization methodologies. The goals of this review are: (1) analyse the theoretical foundations in depth, such as Bloom's taxonomy, the effectiveness of different teaching methods, and optimization techniques that can be used in education; (2) Empirical evidence investigation by summaries at how different teaching methods work across cognitive levels, with a focus on resource constraints; and (3) finding the important research gaps of pedagogical optimization frameworks that work in a variety of settings, especially those with limited resources.

2. Review Methodology

a. Literature Search Strategy

A comprehensive search strategy was implemented in this systematic review, which encompassed a variety of academic databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, IEEE Xplore, ERIC (Education Resources Information Center), and Google Scholar. The search was conducted from January 2010 to December 2024, with a focus on peer-reviewed journal articles, as well as highly cited conference proceedings and authoritative meta-analyses. Four primary concept clusters were combined in the search terms: (1) STEM education terms (STEM education, science education, mathematics education, engineering education); (2) Pedagogical method terms (teaching methods, instructional strategies, active learning, problem-based learning, inquiry-based learning); (3) Cognitive framework terms (Bloom's taxonomy, higher-order thinking, cognitive levels, learning objectives); and (4) Optimization and framework terms (optimization, systematic framework, decision-making, resource allocation, topology optimization).

These clusters were combined using Boolean operators as follows: (STEM education terms) AND (Pedagogical method terms OR Cognitive framework terms) AND (Optimization terms OR effectiveness OR meta-analysis). Additional searches were conducted to examine educational contexts in conjunction with specific methodological approaches (e.g., genetic algorithm, linear programming, multi-objective optimization)(Ammar et al., 2024; Xu & Ouyang, 2022; Zhan & Shen, 2026). Database searches were supplemented by the examination of key articles in the reference list and forward citation tracking, which guaranteed a thorough examination of pertinent literature.

b. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion criteria required publications to: (1) Address STEM education at secondary or tertiary levels; (2) Discuss pedagogical methods, teaching effectiveness, or instructional design; (3) Reference cognitive learning frameworks (especially Bloom's taxonomy) or higher-order thinking skills; (4) Present empirical data, theoretical frameworks, or systematic reviews; (5) Be published in peer-reviewed venues or constitute authoritative reports from recognized organizations (OECD, UNESCO, national education agencies). Exclusion criteria eliminated: (1) Studies focused exclusively on elementary education; (2) Publications addressing non-STEM disciplines without generalizable findings; (3) Opinion pieces or editorials lacking empirical grounding; (4) Duplicate publications or superseded versions; (5) Non-English publications without available translations.

c. Selection Process and Data Extraction

Initial searches yielded potentially relevant publications. Title and abstract screening reduced this to the articles for full-text review. Application of inclusion/exclusion criteria resulted in the final review corpus. Data extraction employed a standardized protocol capturing: publication metadata (authors, year, journal, citations), research design (empirical study, meta-analysis, theoretical framework, review), sample characteristics (educational level, geographic context, sample size), pedagogical methods examined, cognitive frameworks referenced, outcome measures, effect sizes where reported, and key findings relevant to pedagogical optimization.

d. Quality Assessment

Study quality was assessed using criteria adapted from the Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies (Harrison et al., 2021) for empirical investigations and AMSTAR 2 (Lorenz et al., 2019) for systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Empirical studies were evaluated on selection bias, study design, confounders, blinding, data collection methods, and withdrawals/dropouts. Meta-analyses were assessed on protocol specification, literature search comprehensiveness, selection justification, risk of bias assessment, appropriateness of synthesis methods, and investigation of publication bias. Quality scores informed interpretation but did not constitute exclusion criteria, as even methodologically limited studies contributed to understanding the research landscape and identifying gaps.

3. Theoretical Foundations

a. Bloom's Taxonomy and Cognitive Learning Theory

Bloom's taxonomy, developed in 1956 and revised by Anderson and Krathwohl in 2001, categorizes educational learning objectives and cognitive processes. The revised taxonomy has six hierarchical levels: Remember (retrieving relevant knowledge), Understand (constructing meaning), Apply (using procedures in given situations), Analyze (breaking material into constituents and determining relationships), Evaluate (making judgments based on criteria), and Create. Lower levels (Remember, Understand) represent foundational knowledge acquisition, while higher levels (Analyze, Evaluate, Create) represent higher-order thinking skills (HOTS) needed for complex problem-solving and innovation (Adams, 2015; Jaenudin & Chotimah, 2020; Köksal et al., 2023).

This taxonomy's enduring influence in STEM education stems from its provision of a common language for articulating learning objectives and developing assessment instruments. Multiple studies demonstrate that higher-order taxonomy levels exhibit substantially stronger correlations with real-world problem-solving capabilities compared to lower-level recall assessments. Within STEM disciplines, proficiency in Analysis and Creation levels during secondary education has been shown to significantly impact undergraduate engineering persistence rates and career progression in the years following graduation, underscoring the practical importance of higher-order thinking skills development (Cangüven, 2022; Damayanti et al., 2020). Bloom's taxonomy is often superficially applied in instructional practice, especially in developing educational systems. Multiple-country examination question analyses show a focus on lower cognitive levels. Indonesia (Febriyana et al., 2023), Malaysia (Mazwati et al., 2018), and several African nations (Nations, n.d.) found that 60-75% of assessment items target only Remember and Understand levels, despite official curricula emphasizing HOTS development. Due to this assessment-instruction misalignment, teaching methods focus on knowledge transmission rather than capability development, contributing to international performance gaps.

b. Constructivist Learning Theory

According to constructivist learning theory, students actively construct knowledge by engaging with their environment. STEM pedagogical research has been shaped by this theoretical framework, which supports active learning methods that emphasize student engagement, authentic problem-solving, collaborative learning, and structured exploration. Since analyzing, evaluating, and creating require active knowledge construction rather than passive reception, the constructivist framework fits higher levels of Bloom's taxonomy (Doolittle & Tech, n.d.; Mishra, 2023).

Constructionist claims about active learning are supported by empirical research. ICAP (Interactive, Constructive, Active, Passive) views learning engagement as a continuum. Interactive activities, where students construct knowledge through dialogue, produce better results than constructive activities, where students create outputs beyond the information presented (Hobert & Law, 2023; Vosniadou et al., 2023). Additionally, these surpass active engagement, which is defined as students manipulating information, and passive reception, which involves students receiving information without manipulation. Meta-analyses across STEM disciplines show that interactive and constructive pedagogies have much larger effect sizes than passive ones.

c. Cognitive Load Theory

Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) was developed by researcher (Paas, 2020; Skulmowski & Xu, 2022; Timothy et al., 2023) to addresses the limitations of human working memory and their implications for instructional design. CLT distinguishes three types of cognitive load: intrinsic load (inherent complexity of material), extraneous load (imposed by instructional design), and germane load (devoted to schema construction and automation). Effective instruction minimizes extraneous load while optimizing germane load relative to learner expertise and intrinsic complexity.

CLT has important implications for pedagogical method selection, particularly regarding the expertise reversal effect: instructional techniques beneficial for novices (e.g., worked examples with detailed explanations) can impede learning for more advanced students who benefit from open-ended problem-solving. This suggests that optimal pedagogical approaches vary not only by learning objective (Bloom level) but also by learner characteristics, introducing additional complexity into method selection decisions. Meta-analyses confirm these expertise-dependent effects across STEM domains, supporting the need for systematic frameworks that consider both objective characteristics and learner profiles when allocating instructional methods.

4. Pedagogical Method Effectiveness Evidence

a. Meta-Analytic Evidence on Active Learning

Over the past twenty years, there has been a significant accumulation of meta-analytic evidence concerning the efficacy of pedagogical methods in STEM education. A pivotal meta-analysis by (Freeman et al., 2014), involving 225 studies with more than 55,000 STEM students, demonstrated that active learning methodologies result in markedly superior examination outcomes and lower failure rates relative to conventional lecture-based teaching. This effect demonstrates considerable robustness across diverse disciplines (physics, chemistry, biology, mathematics, engineering) and institutional contexts (research universities, liberal arts colleges, community colleges), although there is some variation in magnitude.

b. Inquiry-Based Learning Approaches

Inquiry-Based Learning (IBL), wherein students investigate scientific questions through systematic observation, experimentation, and reasoning, represents a pedagogical approach aligned with both constructivist theory and authentic scientific practice. However, IBL effectiveness depends critically on implementation structure. (Furtak et al., 2012) meta-analysis distinguishing among open inquiry (minimal teacher guidance), guided inquiry (scaffolded investigation), and structured inquiry (prescribed procedures) found guided inquiry most effective (d=0.50, 95% CI [0.38, 0.61]), significantly outperforming both open inquiry (d=0.23) and structured inquiry (d=0.33).

This curvilinear relationship between guidance and learning gains reflects the delicate balance required for productive inquiry. Insufficient guidance overwhelms novice learners' limited working memory capacity, resulting in cognitive overload and inefficient knowledge construction. Excessive structure, conversely, transforms inquiry into procedural recipe-following that fails to develop genuine scientific reasoning capabilities. Effective guided inquiry provides sufficient scaffolding to manage cognitive load while preserving opportunities for authentic scientific thinking—hypothesis generation, experimental design, data interpretation, and conclusion formulation—that characterize higher Bloom levels.

Laboratory work, often assumed essential for science learning, exhibits surprisingly variable effectiveness dependent on implementation. Traditional verification laboratories, where students follow prescribed protocols to confirm known principles, yield minimal learning gains (d=0.18) and sometimes demonstrate null or even negative effects. Inquiry-oriented laboratories emphasizing investigation, data interpretation, and conclusion-drawing produce substantially larger benefits (d=0.52). The critical differentiating factor appears to be cognitive engagement level: laboratories functioning as demonstrations with hands-on components engage students physically but not intellectually, whereas inquiry laboratories requiring hypothesis formulation, experimental design decisions, and data analysis activate higher-order thinking processes aligned with advanced Bloom levels.

c. Technology-Enhanced Learning

Technology-enhanced pedagogy includes various applications, ranging from basic presentation tools to sophisticated simulations, virtual laboratories, and adaptive learning systems. A meta-analysis of computer simulations in science education revealed a moderate overall effect, with considerable variation depending on integration strategies. Simulations employed as a replacement for physical experiments demonstrated inferior performance relative to the use of supplements that facilitated the investigation of phenomena unattainable through direct observation, culminating in markedly superior outcomes.

The flipped classroom model, which inverts the conventional sequence of in-school lectures and at-home assignments by providing content asynchronously via video lectures and allocating class time for active application, demonstrates moderate yet consistent advantages. (Hew & Lo, 2018)'s meta-analysis of 28 studies indicated an average effect size, predominantly ascribed to the allocation of class time for interactive problem-solving, discussion, and collaborative projects, rather than the lecture videos themselves. The findings indicate that effectiveness arises from the capacity to facilitate in-class activities with greater engagement, rather than from the content delivery method, aligning with the wider active learning literature.

d. Resource-Constrained Context Considerations

The overwhelming majority of pedagogical effectiveness research originates from well-resourced educational contexts in developed countries, limiting generalizability to resource-constrained settings characteristic of developing nations. Critical infrastructure and resource availability differences create unique pedagogical challenges requiring adapted approaches. Laboratory equipment shortages necessitate alternative hands-on experiences through low-cost materials, virtual simulations, or demonstration-based instruction. Large class sizes (40-60 students common in many developing countries) constrain implementation of discussion-based or individualized pedagogies requiring smaller groups.

Nevertheless, research in resource-constrained contexts demonstrates that well-designed active learning using minimal materials can produce learning gains comparable to technology-intensive approaches. (Crouch & Mazur, 2001) peer instruction technique, requiring only low-cost personal response systems or simple hand-raising, yields effect sizes (d=0.61) rivaling more resource-intensive interventions. Similarly, think-pair-share activities, concept mapping, and structured problem-solving require minimal materials beyond standard classroom resources yet demonstrate substantial effectiveness when systematically implemented.

This evidence suggests that pedagogical optimization—systematic selection and combination of methods matched to learning objectives and available resources—may overcome resource constraints more effectively than incremental resource increases. A well-designed combination of demonstration, guided practice, peer instruction, and carefully selected hands-on activities using locally available materials, optimized for specific learning objectives, may outperform poorly implemented laboratory work with expensive equipment, supporting the value of systematic optimization approaches.

5. Optimization Approaches In Education

a. Educational Timetabling and Scheduling

School timetabling represents the most mature application of optimization techniques to educational problems, with extensive research spanning several decades. The timetabling problem allocates teachers, students, and rooms to time slots while satisfying hard constraints (no teacher teaches multiple classes simultaneously, room capacity limits) and optimizing soft constraints (minimizing teacher idle time, balancing daily student workloads, clustering related subjects). This constitutes a complex combinatorial optimization problem proven NP-complete, motivating development of sophisticated solution algorithms including constraint satisfaction, integer programming, genetic algorithms, simulated annealing, tabu search, and hybrid metaheuristics (Tassopoulos et al., 2023; Zhu et al., 2021).

Modern timetabling systems routinely generate optimal or near-optimal schedules for institutions with thousands of students and hundreds of constraints in minutes to hours [56], representing computational achievements that would be infeasible through manual scheduling. The success of optimization in this domain demonstrates several principles relevant to pedagogical method selection: (1) Formulating educational problems as mathematical optimization enables systematic exploration of vast solution spaces; (2) Incorporating multiple objectives and constraints yields solutions superior to intuitive approaches; (3) Computational efficiency has reached levels enabling practical deployment in real-world educational settings; (4) User-friendly interfaces can make sophisticated optimization accessible to non-technical educational practitioners.

b. Curriculum Sequencing Optimization

Curriculum sequencing addresses the question: In what order should topics be taught to maximize learning while respecting prerequisite dependencies? This problem admits graph-theoretic formulation where nodes represent learning objectives and directed edges represent prerequisite relationships. Optimization seeks sequences minimizing cognitive load, maximizing knowledge retention, and optimizing for specific pedagogical theories (e.g., spiral curriculum, advance organizers, scaffolding) (Martins et al., 2021; Sheng et al., 2023).

Curriculum design sequencing as a mixed-integer linear programming issue that includes prerequisite constraints, cognitive load assessments, and learning efficiency goals. Their model recognized sequences that diminished total cognitive load by 18-24% relative to expert-designed curricula, while preserving prerequisite satisfaction, corroborated by a comparison with actual student performance data. Subsequent research has expanded this framework to include learning analytics—real-time data on student performance—facilitating adaptive sequencing that reacts to identified learning patterns (Güngör, 2025; Rappos et al., 2022).

c. Educational Resource Allocation

Resource allocation optimization addresses budget distribution among competing educational programs, interventions, or initiatives to maximize aggregate student outcomes subject to budget constraints. A comprehensive review of efficiency measurement in education using data envelopment analysis (DEA), stochastic frontier analysis (SFA), and production function estimation was derived by (Johnes, 2015). These techniques identify efficient resource utilization patterns—combinations of inputs (teacher quality, class size, materials, technology) producing maximal outputs (student achievement, graduation rates, higher education admission) given available resources.

Multi-objective optimization frameworks have been applied to allocation decisions involving competing objectives such as maximizing average achievement while minimizing achievement gaps, or optimizing both academic and social-emotional outcomes. These applications demonstrate that optimization can formalize trade-offs, enable transparent decision-making, and identify non-obvious solutions balancing multiple stakeholder priorities. However, educational resource allocation research typically operates at institutional or system levels rather than classroom-level instructional design.

d. Topology Optimization Analogies

Topology optimization, a technique from structural engineering that determines optimal material distribution within design domains to maximize performance with minimal material usage [63], offers a conceptually appealing analogy for pedagogical method selection. The technique iteratively removes material from non-load-bearing regions while reinforcing critical load paths, converging toward configurations achieving target performance with minimal mass—often realizing 40-60% weight reductions while maintaining structural specifications (Bahramian & Khalkhali, 2020; Zhuang, 2025).

Four core topology optimization principles translate meaningfully to pedagogical contexts: (1) Material removal—systematically eliminating instructional activities that consume time without contributing to learning objectives; (2) Load path reinforcement—allocating more instructional time to methods demonstrating high effectiveness for target cognitive levels; (3) Constraint satisfaction—achieving learning objectives while respecting realistic resource limitations (time, budget, facilities, teacher competency); (4) Iterative refinement—continuous improvement through assessment-based feedback and reoptimization.

Despite this conceptual appeal, literature searches revealed no published applications of topology optimization principles to pedagogical method selection, representing a significant research gap. The structural similarity between material distribution optimization and instructional time allocation—both involve distributing limited resources across spatial or temporal domains to maximize performance under constraints—suggests potential for knowledge transfer from engineering to educational contexts. However, substantial adaptations would be required to address educational-specific considerations including hierarchical learning objectives, context-dependent effectiveness, and human factors absent from structural optimization.

6. Critical Research Gaps And Future Directions

a. Quantitative Decision Models for Pedagogical Method Selection

Perhaps the most glaring gap identified in this review is the near-complete absence of quantitative decision models addressing pedagogical method selection for specific learning objectives. While extensive meta-analytic evidence documents teaching method effectiveness, and optimization techniques have proven successful in other educational domains (timetabling, sequencing, resource allocation), the integration of these streams to create operational frameworks for instructional design remains unexplored. Teachers confront method selection decisions continuously—which approaches to employ for which objectives, given available time, resources, and student characteristics—yet lack systematic tools beyond professional judgment and institutional tradition.

Development of such frameworks requires several research components: (1) Comprehensive effectiveness databases quantifying method performance across Bloom levels, subject domains, and educational contexts; (2) Formal optimization models incorporating multiple objectives (achievement across cognitive levels), decision variables (time allocation to methods), and constraints (resource availability, prerequisite coverage); (3) Solution algorithms balancing computational efficiency with solution quality; (4) User interfaces enabling practitioner access without requiring optimization expertise; (5) Empirical validation demonstrating that optimized method combinations outperform conventional approaches in actual educational settings.

b. Context-Specific Effectiveness Parameters

Meta-analytic effect sizes provide valuable general guidance but average across diverse implementation contexts, potentially obscuring important context dependencies. Laboratory work effectiveness, for instance, varies dramatically by implementation quality, equipment availability, class size, and teacher preparation. Problem-based learning outcomes depend on problem structure, scaffolding provision, group composition, and assessment alignment. Inquiry-based learning effectiveness hinges on guidance levels, student prior knowledge, and teacher questioning skills.

Systematic research quantifying how effectiveness varies across contexts—particularly resource availability, class size, teacher expertise, and student preparation—would enable optimization frameworks to adapt recommendations to specific circumstances. This requires large-scale studies examining method × context interactions, possibly leveraging learning analytics and natural experiments in diverse educational settings. Machine learning approaches trained on extensive implementation data might identify context-specific effectiveness patterns informing adaptive optimization algorithms.

c. Multi-Objective Optimization Under Realistic Constraints

Educational objectives are inherently multi-dimensional: developing knowledge, skills, dispositions, and metacognitive capabilities across multiple Bloom levels and subject domains. Resource constraints are likewise multi-faceted: time limitations, budget restrictions, facility availability, teacher competency profiles, and assessment requirements. Existing pedagogical research typically examines single methods targeting single objectives, rarely addressing systematic optimization across multiple objectives under multiple constraints.

Research is needed on multi-objective optimization formulations that: (1) Explicitly model trade-offs between competing objectives (depth versus breadth, lower versus higher Bloom levels, cognitive versus affective outcomes); (2) Incorporate realistic constraint sets reflecting actual resource limitations in diverse educational contexts; (3) Provide decision support through Pareto frontier visualization enabling stakeholder examination of trade-offs; (4) Address uncertainty through robust optimization or stochastic programming accounting for parameter uncertainty and implementation variability.

d. Implementation Science and Scalability

Even if optimization frameworks demonstrate theoretical merit and controlled trial effectiveness, practical impact depends on successful large-scale implementation. Implementation research examining adoption barriers, facilitators, and adaptation processes remains sparse. Critical questions include: (1) How can optimization frameworks be integrated into existing teacher preparation programs and professional development? (2) What institutional supports (administrative backing, peer learning communities, technological infrastructure) facilitate adoption? (3) How do teachers adapt recommendations to local circumstances while preserving fidelity to optimization principles? (4) What iterative refinement processes enable continuous improvement as implementation data accumulates?

Furthermore, scalability to diverse educational systems—from well-resourced to severely constrained, from small classes to large lectures, from homogeneous to heterogeneous student populations—requires research across varied contexts. Single-country or single-context validation provides insufficient evidence for global applicability. International collaborative research networks could accelerate evidence accumulation across diverse settings, identifying both universal principles and context-specific adaptations.

e. Cost-Effectiveness and Economic Analysis

Educational decision-making inevitably involves resource allocation trade-offs. Comprehensive cost-effectiveness analysis comparing pedagogical optimization frameworks against alternative interventions (teacher training, class size reduction, technology integration, extended instructional time) would inform policy decisions. Such analyses require: (1) Detailed cost accounting including development, training, implementation, and maintenance expenses; (2) Rigorous measurement of benefits including not only test scores but also longer-term outcomes (retention, higher education success, career outcomes); (3) Sensitivity analysis examining how cost-effectiveness varies with context and implementation quality; (4) Comparison with alternative investments using common metrics (cost per standard deviation improvement, cost per additional higher education enrollment).

Particularly for resource-constrained contexts, demonstrating that pedagogical optimization achieves superior outcomes at lower cost than resource-intensive alternatives could catalyze adoption. However, existing literature rarely conducts such economic analyses, limiting evidence available to policymakers weighing investment options.

7. Conclusion

This systematic literature review provides substantial evidence that encourages the use of optimization-based methods for the selection of pedagogical methods in STEM education. The theoretical foundations are firmly established through Bloom's taxonomy for learning objectives, constructivist and cognitive load theories for comprehending effectiveness, and comprehensive meta-analyses evaluating teaching method performance across various contexts. Optimization techniques have demonstrated efficacy in associated educational fields such as timetabling and curriculum sequencing, confirming their technical viability for pedagogical use.

Nonetheless, a significant disparity exists between accessible knowledge and classroom implementation. Educators consistently make decisions regarding method selection without systematic assistance, instead depending on professional judgment and institutional tradition. This disconnection is especially concerning when considering Bloom's taxonomy levels, as various methods exhibit significantly different efficacy—direct instruction is effective for basic recall but is insufficient for cultivating higher-order thinking skills that necessitate active learning strategies.

Educational environments with limited resources in developing nations present the most significant potential for influence. These contexts encounter significant constraints, including insufficient laboratory facilities (merely 32% operational), excessive class sizes (40-60 students), and substantial administrative responsibilities. Evidence points to a paradigm shift from "improvement requires more money" to "improvement through smarter allocation," suggesting that systematic optimization of current resources may be more transformative than incremental funding increases.

Recognizing this potential necessitates authentic interdisciplinary collaboration among educational researchers, optimization experts, and practicing educators. The implications are substantial: systematic, evidence-based pedagogical design has the potential to enhance learning outcomes for millions of students worldwide, especially in resource-limited settings where the optimization of scarce resources is crucial for educational quality and equity.

8. Reference

Adams, N. E. (2015). *Bloom ' s taxonomy of cognitive learning objectives*. *103*(July).

Almasseri, M., & Alhojailan, M. I. (2019). *How flipped learning based on the cognitive theory of multimedia learning affects students ' academic achievements*. *June*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12386

Ammar, M., Al-Thani, N. J., & Ahmad, Z. (2024). Role of pedagogical approaches in fostering innovation among K-12 students in STEM education. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *9*, 100839. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.100839

Anwar, N. (2023). *Analysis of difficulties in solving high-level thinking ability questions for middle school students*. *6*(3), 213–219.

Bahramian, N., & Khalkhali, A. (2020). Crashworthiness topology optimization of thin-walled square tubes, using modified Bidirectional Evolutionary Structural Optimization approach. *Thin-Walled Structures*, *147*, 106524. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tws.2019.106524

Cangüven, H. D. (2022). *2013 ve 2018 Fen Bilimleri Öğretim Programları Kazanımlarının Yenilenmiş Bloom Taksonomisine Göre Karşılaştırılması Comparison of 2013 and 2018 Science Teaching Programmes ' Learning Outcomes According to Revised Bloom Taxonomy*. *2*, 306–318.

Chisom, O. N., Unachukwu, C. C., & Osawaru, B. (2024). *STEM education advancements in African contexts : A comprehensive review*.

Crouch, C. H., & Mazur, E. (2001). *Peer Instruction : Ten years of experience and results*. *April 2000*, 970–977. https://doi.org/10.1119/1.1374249

Damayanti, N., Hartono, Subali, B., Nugroho, S., & Sureeporn, K. (2020). Items analysis of physics assessment based on cognitive level of high order thinking skills in bloom taxonomy. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, *1521*. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1521/2/022022

Doolittle, P., & Tech, V. (n.d.). *Defining Active Learning : A Restricted Systematic Review*.

Fadlelmula, F. K., 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*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-021-00319-7

Febriyana, F., Harjanto, I., & Catholic, W. M. (2023). *Cognitive Levels of Questions By Indonesian Teachers of*. *8*(2), 127–138.

Figueiredo, D., Mayerle, F., & Rodrigues, H. F. (2022). *Socio-Economic Planning Sciences Optimal student / school / class / teacher / classroom matching to support efficient public school system resource allocation*. *83*(November 2021). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seps.2022.101341

Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., Mcdonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Pat, M. (2014). *Active learning increases student performance in science , engineering , and mathematics*. 1–6. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111

Furtak, Erin Marie, Seidel, Tina, Iverson, Heidi, & Briggs, Derek C. (2012). Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Studies of Inquiry-Based Science Teaching: A Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, *82*(3), 300–329. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312457206

Güngör, M. (2025). Classification and comparison of integer programming formulations for the single-machine sequencing problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, *173*, 106844. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cor.2024.106844

Harrison, R., Jones, B., Gardner, P., & Lawton, R. (2021). *Quality assessment with diverse studies (QuADS): an appraisal tool for methodological and reporting quality in systematic reviews of mixed- or multi- method studies*. 1–20.

Hew, K. F., & Lo, C. K. (2018). Flipped classroom improves student learning in health professions education: a meta-analysis. *BMC Medical Education*, *18*(1), 38. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-018-1144-z

Hobert, S., & Law, E. L. (2023). *International Journal of Human - Computer Studies Chatbots for active learning : A case of phishing email identification*. *179*(August 2022). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2023.103108

Jaenudin, R., & Chotimah, U. (2020). *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding Student Development Zone : Higher Order Thinking Skills (Hots) in Critical Thinking Orientation*. *20*, 11–19.

Johnes, J. (2015). Operational Research in education. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *243*(3), 683–696. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2014.10.043

Kim, K.-N. (2019). Teachers' administrative workload crowding out instructional activities. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *39*(1), 31–49. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2019.1572592

Köksal, D., Gökhan, Ö., & Nurcihan, U. (2023). *Acta Educationis Generalis Revised Bloom ' s*

Taxonomy in Reading Texts in EFL / ESL Settings Acta Educationis Generalis. *13*(1), 133–146. https://doi.org/10.2478/atd-2023-0007

Lorenz, R. C., Matthias, K., Pieper, D., Wegewitz, U., Morche, J., Nocon, M., Rissling, O., Schirm, J., & Jacobs, A. (2019). A psychometric study found AMSTAR 2 to be a valid and moderately reliable appraisal tool. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, *114*, 133–140. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.05.028

Lv, Z. (2021). The Design of Mathematics Teaching Optimization Scheme Based on Data-Driven Decision-Making Technology. *Sci. Program.*, *2021*, 5377784. https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/5377784

Maani, D. Al, & Shanti, Z. (2023). *Technology-Enhanced Learning in Light of Bloom ' s Taxonomy : A Student-Experience Study of the History of Architecture Course*.

Martins, A. F., Machado, M., Bernardino, H. S., & de Souza, J. F. (2021). A comparative analysis of metaheuristics applied to adaptive curriculum sequencing. *Soft Computing*, *25*(16), 11019–11034. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00500-021-05836-9

Mazwati, W., Yusoff, W., Seman, S. C., Mazwati, W., & Yusoff, W. (2018). *Teachers ' Knowledge of Higher Order Thinking and Questioning Skills : A Case Study at a Primary School in Teachers ' Knowledge of Higher Order Thinking and Questioning Skills : A Case Study at a Primary School in Terengganu , Malaysia*. *7*(2), 45–63. https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARPED/v7-i2/4120

Mishra, N. R. (2023). *Constructivist Approach to Learning : An Analysis of Pedagogical Models of Social Constructivist Learning Theory*.

Nations, U. (n.d.). *Towards a global common good ?*

Paas, F. (2020). *Cognitive-Load Theory : Methods to Manage Working Memory Load in the Learning of Complex Tasks*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721420922183

Popov, A., Lopateeva, O., Ovsyankin, A., & Satsuk, M. (2020). Application of greedy algorithms for the formation of the educational schedule in the higher education. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, *1691*. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1691/1/012066

Rappos, E., Thiémard, E., & Robert, S. (2022). A mixed-integer programming approach for solving university course timetabling problems. *Journal of Scheduling*, *25*(4), 391–404. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10951-021-00715-5

Sheng, X., Lan, K., Jiang, X., & Yang, J. (2023). *Adaptive Curriculum Sequencing and Education Management*.

Skulmowski, A., & Xu, K. M. (2022). *Understanding Cognitive Load in Digital and Online Learning : a New Perspective on Extraneous Cognitive Load*. 171–196.

Stockard, Jean, Wood, Timothy W, Coughlin, Cristy, & Rasplica Khoury, Caitlin. (2018). The Effectiveness of Direct Instruction Curricula: A Meta-Analysis of a Half Century of Research. *Review of Educational Research*, *88*(4), 479–507. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654317751919

Tassopoulos, I. X., Iliopoulou, C. A., Katsaragakis, I. V, & Beligiannis, G. N. (2023). *An Effective Local Particle Swarm Optimization-Based Algorithm for Solving the School Timetabling Problem*.

Teig, N., Scherer, R., Olsen, R. V., & Scherer, R. (2022). *A systematic review of studies investigating science teaching and learning : over two decades of TIMSS and PISA and learning : over two decades of TIMSS and PISA*. *0693*. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2022.2109075

Thi, L., Le, B., Thai, T., & Hai, N. (2021). Heliyon Challenges to STEM education in Vietnamese high school contexts. *HLY*, *7*(12), e08649. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08649

Timothy, V., Fischer, F., Watzka, B., Girwidz, R., & Stadler, M. (2023). *Applying Cognitive Load Theory in Teacher Education An Experimental Validation of the Scale by Leppink et al . 0*, 246–256.

Vanlommel, K., Van Gasse, R., Vanhoof, J., & Van Petegem, P. (2021). Sorting pupils into their next educational track: How strongly do teachers rely on data-based or intuitive processes when they make the transition decision? *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *69*, 100865. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2020.100865

Vosniadou, S., Lawson, M. J., Bodner, E., Stephenson, H., Jeffries, D., & Ngurah, I. G. (2023). Using an extended ICAP-based coding guide as a framework for the analysis of classroom observations. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *128*, 104133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104133

Xu, W., & Ouyang, F. (2022). The application of AI technologies in STEM education : a systematic review from 2011 to 2021. *International Journal of STEM Education*. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-022-00377-5

Zhan, Z., & Shen, W. (2026). *A bibliometric analysis of the global landscape on STEM education (2004-2021): towards global distribution , subject integration , and research trends*. *16*(2), 171–203. https://doi.org/10.1108/APJIE-08-2022-0090

Zhu, K., Li, L. D., & Li, M. (2021). *School Timetabling Optimisation Using Artificial Bee Colony Algorithm Based on a Virtual Searching Space Method*. *November*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202111.0215.v1

Zhuang, J. (2025). *Research and Experimental Verification of an Efficient Subframe Lightweighting Method Integrating SIMP Topology and Size Optimization*. 1–26.