HANDBOOK OF

Research on Science Education

VOLUME II

Edited by Norman G. Lederman Sandra K. Abell

ROUTLEDGE

HANDBOOK OF RESEARCH ON SCIENCE EDUCATION

Building on the foundation set in Volume I—a landmark synthesis of research in the field—Volume II is a comprehensive, state-of-the-art new volume highlighting new and emerging research perspectives.

Features of Volume II

- International range of authors who are the most prominent scholars in the field
- Overarching attention to research paradigms and their relationship to learning theory, research design, data collection, data analysis
- Coverage of both global issues (such as policy) and the teaching and learning of specific disciplines
- Balanced treatment of research on teaching and research on learning

The contributors, all experts in their research areas, represent the international and gender diversity in the science education research community. The volume is organized around six themes: theory and methods of science education research; science learning; culture, gender, and society and science learning; science teaching; curriculum and assessment in science; and science teacher education. Each chapter presents an integrative review of the research on the topic it addresses—pulling together the existing research, working to understand the historical trends and patterns in that body of scholarship, describing how the issue is conceptualized within the literature, how methods and theories have shaped the outcomes of the research, and where the strengths, weaknesses, and gaps are in the literature.

Providing guidance to science education faculty and graduate students and leading to new insights and directions for future research, the *Handbook of Research on Science Education*, Volume II is an essential resource for the entire science education community.

Norman G. Lederman is Professor and Chair, Department of Mathematics and Science Education, Illinois Institute of Technology, USA.

Sandra K. Abell (deceased) was MU Curators Professor of Science Education, University of Missouri, USA. A renowned researcher and author nationally and internationally, she was named a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), the American Educational Research Association (AERA), and the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) and received numerous awards for her teaching and mentoring of students.

This page intentionally left blank

HANDBOOK OF RESEARCH ON SCIENCE EDUCATION

Volume II

Edited by

Norman G. Lederman

Sandra K. Abell



First published 2014 by Routledge 711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

and by Routledge 2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2014 Taylor & Francis

The right of the editor to be identified as the author of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark Notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Handbook of research on science education / edited by Sanda K. Abell and Norman G. Lederman.

p. cm.
1. Science—Study and teaching—Research. I. Abell, Sandra K. II. Lederman, Norman G. Q181.H149 2006
507.1—dc22

ISBN: 978-0-415-62937-9 (hbk) ISBN: 978-0-415-62955-3 (pbk) ISBN: 978-0-203-09726-7 (ebk)

Typeset in Times by Apex CoVantage, LLC

Dedication

Volume I of this *Handbook* grew from conversations between Sandi and Naomi Silverman, who at that time was at Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Sandi then reached out to me to serve as a co-editor. Sandi's influence on the research preceding and following the publication of Volume I was strong and continues to be as strong and visionary as ever. Consequently, it would be a crime not to include Sandi as co-editor for Volume II. Sandi and I were already discussing this new volume prior to the time of her unfortunate passing. Throughout Sandi's career, she was an excellent scholar in the area of teacher education, among other areas, a strong mentor (I think one of her PhD students described her as the master of tough love), global leader in science education, and a role model for us all. She had the perfect balance of theory and practice that many of us only aspire to develop. Personally, I always respected Sandi's work, but I also could always rely on her honesty and integrity when it related to my work and a wide variety of other professional and personal topics. I miss Sandi greatly, and it is my sincerest hope that Volume II of the *Handbook of Research on Science Education* will help continue her legacy, not that her legacy needs any additional help. We miss you, Sandi!!

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

Preface		xi
Acl	Acknowledgments	
Sec Sec	ction I. Theory and Methods of Science Education Research tion Editor: David F. Treagust	
1	Paradigms in Science Education Research David F. Treagust, Mihye Won, and Reinders Duit	3
2	Quantitative Research Designs and Approaches Hans E. Fischer, William J. Boone, and Knut Neumann	18
3	Contemporary Qualitative Research: Toward an Integral Research Perspective <i>Peter Charles Taylor</i>	38
Sec Sec	tion II. Science Learning tion Editor: Richard Lehrer	
4	Student Conceptions and Conceptual Change: Three Overlapping Phases of Research Tamer G. Amin, Carol L. Smith, and Marianne Wiser	57
5	Attitudes, Identity, and Aspirations Toward Science Russell Tytler	82
6	Classroom Learning Environments: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives Barry J. Fraser	104
7	Learning Science Outside of School Léonie J. Rennie	120
8	Teaching Learning Progressions: An International Perspective Per-Olof Wickman	145
Sec Sec	ction III. Diversity and Equity in Science Learning tion Editors: Cory A. Buxton and Okhee Lee	
9	Unpacking and Critically Synthesizing the Literature on Race and Ethnicity in Science Education <i>Eileen Carlton Parsons</i>	167
10	Gender Matters: Building on the Past, Recognizing the Present, and Looking Toward the Future <i>Kathryn Scantlebury</i>	187
11	English Learners in Science Education Cory A. Buxton and Okhee Lee	204

viii	Contents				
12	Special Needs and Talents in Science Learning J. Randy McGinnis and Sami Kahn	223			
13	Science Education in Urban Contexts: New Conceptual Tools and Stories of Possibilities Angela Calabrese Barton, Edna Tan, and Tara O'Neill	246			
14	Rural Science Education: New Ideas, Redirections, and Broadened Definitions J. Steve Oliver and Georgia W. Hodges	266			
15	Culturally Responsive Science Education for Indigenous and Ethnic Minority Students Elizabeth McKinley and Mark J. S. Gan	284			
Sec.	Section IV. Science Teaching Section Editor: Jan H. van Driel				
16	General Instructional Methods and Strategies David F. Treagust and Chi-Yan Tsui	303			
17	Discourse Practices in Science Learning and Teaching Gregory J. Kelly	321			
18	Promises and Challenges of Using Learning Technologies to Promote Student Learning of Science Joseph S. Krajcik and Kongju Mun	337			
19	Elementary Science Teaching Kathleen J. Roth	361			
20	Interdisciplinary Science Teaching Charlene M. Czerniak and Carla C. Johnson	395			
21	High School Biology Curricula Development: Implementation, Teaching, and Evaluation from the 20th to the 21st Century <i>Reuven Lazarowitz</i>	412			
22	Teaching Physics Reinders Duit, Horst Schecker, Dietmar Höttecke, and Hans Niedderer	434			
23	The Many Faces of High School Chemistry Onno De Jong and Keith S. Taber	457			
24	Earth System Science Education Nir Orion and Julie Libarkin	481			
25	Environmental Education Justin Dillon	497			
26	From Inquiry to Scientific Practices in the Science Classroom Barbara A. Crawford	515			
Sec Sec	Section V. Curriculum and Assessment in Science Section Editor: Paul Black				
27	Scientific Literacy, Science Literacy, and Science Education Douglas A. Roberts and Rodger W. Bybee	545			
28	The History of Science Curriculum Reform in the United States George E. DeBoer	559			

	Contents	ix
29	Scientific Practices and Inquiry in the Science Classroom Jonathan Osborne	579
30	Research on Teaching and Learning of Nature of Science Norman G. Lederman and Judith S. Lederman	600
31	The Evolving Landscape Related to Assessment of Nature of Science Fouad Abd-El-Khalick	621
32	Cultural Perspectives in Science Education Heidi B. Carlone, Angela Johnson, and Margaret Eisenhart	651
33	Culturally Relevant Schooling in Science for Indigenous Learners Worldwide: Stressing the <i>All</i> in Science Literacy for All Eleanor Abrams, Larry D. Yore, Megan Bang, Bryan McKinley Jones Brayboy, Angelina Castagno, Joanna Kidman, Huei Lee, Mary Grace Villanueva, Ming Huey Wang, Paul Webb, and Chiung-Fen Yen	671
34	Socioscientific Issues as a Curriculum Emphasis: Theory, Research, and Practice <i>Dana L. Zeidler</i>	697
35	Project Assessment: Its History, Evolution, and Current Practice Sarah Beth Woodruff and Jane Butler Kahle	727
36	Precollege Engineering Education Christine M. Cunningham and William S. Carlsen	747
37	Review of Science Education Program Evaluation Frances Lawrenz and Mao Thao	759
38	The Central Role of Assessment in Pedagogy Paul Black and J. Myron Atkin	775
39	Large-Scale Assessments in Science Education Edward D. Britton and Steven A. Schneider	791
Section VI. Science Teacher Education Section Editor: J. John Loughran		
40	Developing Understandings of Practice: Science Teacher Learning J. John Loughran	811
41	Science Teacher Attitudes and Beliefs: Reforming Practice M. Gail Jones and Megan Leagon	830
42	Research on Science Teacher Knowledge Jan H. van Driel, Amanda Berry, and Jacobiene Meirink	848
43	Learning to Teach Science Tom Russell and Andrea K. Martin	871
44	Research on Teacher Professional Development Programs in Science Julie A. Luft and Peter W. Hewson	889
Co	ntributors	911
Sut	Subject Index	
Au	Author Index	

This page intentionally left blank

Preface

This volume builds on the foundation presented in Volume I. Volume I will remain in print, as what is provided here builds on but does not simply repeat what was previously published. This volume consists of updated chapters from Volume I. These chapters are not repetitions of previous chapters, and overlap only exists where necessary to understand current and emerging trends in the field. Most of the chapters have been written by chapter authors from the previous volume, but some new authors have also been included. Since the publication of Volume I, Taylor & Francis and I have been surveying members of the science education community about topics omitted from Volume I or those topics needing expansion or reduction. In response, this volume also includes numerous chapters, written by prominent scholars, on topics of critical importance to researchers and theoreticians in science education.

As with Volume I, the contributors to this volume are experts in their research areas and represent the international and gender diversity in the science education research community. The volume is organized around six themes: theory and methods of science education research; science learning; diversity and equity in science learning; science teaching; curriculum and assessment in science; and science teacher education. Each chapter presents an integrative review of the research on the topic it addresses—pulling together the existing research, working to understand the historical trends and patterns in that body of scholarship, and describing how the issue is conceptualized within the literature, how methods and theories have shaped the outcomes of the research, and where the strengths, weaknesses, and gaps are in the literature.

Each of the aforementioned sections was organized and monitored by a section editor prominent in the field, who reviewed each manuscript and integrated the evaluations by at least two external reviewers. Finally, the overall sets of chapters were reviewed by myself as the primary editor for the *Handbook*. To this end, the compilations of chapters were thoroughly peer reviewed.

Since the publication of Volume I, research on teaching and learning in science has remained a highly active area of study. Our continued quest to improve science teaching and learning has been further fueled, in recent years, by the proliferation of international comparisons and the emergence of numerous standards for teaching and learning throughout the world. The primary goal continues to be scientific literacy, but how this construct is defined has been changing, and perspectives on how it is achieved are equally varied. The continued emergence of the learning sciences has altered researchers' perspectives on the interpretation of classroom practice, classroom environments, and student learning. This is reflected in the expanded section on Science Learning edited by **Richard Lehrer**.

In-depth discussions of theory and methods of science education research were not provided in the previous volume. A separate section, edited by **David F. Treagust**, on these perspectives has been added as the opening section to the *Handbook* in an effort to create an overall perspective from which to interpret what follows. The section addresses both qualitative and quantitative perspectives, and there is no intended prominence or favor given to one approach versus another. There is intentionally not a separate chapter on mixed-methods research, but the authors of both the qualitative and quantitative chapters have addressed the mixed-methods perspective.

In response to reviewers and growing emphasis within the science education community, the section on diversity and equity in science learning, under the editorship of Cory A. Buxton and Okhee Lee, has been significantly expanded and enhanced. In particular, much more attention is given to indigenous knowledge and English language learners. A separate chapter on inquiry teaching has been added to the science teaching section, which is edited by Jan H. van Driel. In addition, there are now new chapters in the curriculum and assessment in science section, edited by **Paul Black**, on socioscientific issues and precollege engineering education. The section on science teacher education, edited by J. John Loughran, primarily consists of enhanced and updated chapters from Volume I. As you would expect, the emphasis on the nature and development of pedagogical content knowledge remains a strong theme.

At the end of the Preface for the previous *Handbook*, Sandi and I included a section titled "The Future of Science Education." In this section, we provided some suggested guidelines for researchers to consider related to our overall purpose of improving teaching and learning, keeping an open mind with respect to alternative theoretical perspectives, grounding our research in the *real world*, and communicating our research to teachers. The two former guidelines need not be repeated here, but I would like to return to the latter two. I think Sandi would agree with this decision.

Science education and education in general is an applied field. I know some would like to hold on to the importance of theoretical research that may or may not have applications in the future. After all, some research that seems quite theoretical now may be of practical use in a decade. Realistically speaking (given the constraints within which we operate and the mandate of the public), somewhere along the way our research and our research-derived suggestions must be grounded in the real world of teachers and students. Our research must address the concerns of teachers and students, and it must be applicable in our school systems and society. To have any warrant, our research must address questions of educational importance. Each chapter contains a section addressing the implications of its topic. We need to think carefully about the meaning of these sections and not let them fall into the category of an article section that must be included. We continue to have a problem with the gap between research and practice. I have heard this since I was a PhD student. We need to work more on communicating our research to teachers and policy makers. All too often, our meetings and journals are set up so we are only speaking with other researchers. On a personal level, when I attend National Association for Research in Science Teaching or other research meetings and present my work on nature of science, the audience is very interested in my research design, data analysis, and conclusions, and there is very little interest in or time to discuss how I actually teach people about nature of science. When I attend NSTA or other practitioner-oriented meetings, the audience is primarily interested in what I actually do with students and teachers and not as interested in the specifics of research design and data analysis. You certainly notice a similar pattern in articles printed in "teacher" journals and "researcher" journals. The problem is multifaceted, but we must continue to work on communicating our research to teachers. It is our responsibility.

This *Handbook of Research on Science Education* is written for researchers, and it will be read almost exclusively by researchers. It would not be the best choice for a preservice or inservice teaching strategies course. We need to make the conscious effort to translate what is presented in the pages of this *Handbook* into a form that is readily understandable and usable by teachers, with the ultimate goal of helping their students. It is not often talked about, but we must work on developing our pedagogical content knowledge for teacher education.

Acknowledgments

Serving as a volume editor can be as labor intensive as one wants to make it. However, there is always a variety of important tasks that would not be completed without significant help. I want to thank Dionysius Gnanakkan, research assistant at Illinois Institute of Technology, for all his help related to substantive editing, clerical editing, formatting of chapters, and the development and application of the *Handbook* database. Because of Dion's extensive knowledge of science education and science education research, his assistance exceeded what could be expected from a general editor. This *Handbook* could not have come to fruition without his help. I hope he doesn't graduate too soon!

This page intentionally left blank

Section I

Theory and Methods of Science Education Research

SECTION EDITOR: DAVID F. TREAGUST

This page intentionally left blank

1

Paradigms in Science Education Research

DAVID F. TREAGUST, MIHYE WON, AND REINDERS DUIT

Why Discuss Research Paradigms?

From the nature of science studies, science education researchers are familiar with Thomas Kuhn's (1962) theory of paradigm shifts. Kuhn's main focus was on scientific inquiry and the scientific community, not on social or educational research, but his term "paradigm" provides a convenient reference point to talk about different sets of beliefs, values, and methodologies in educational research (Schwandt, 2001). A paradigm in educational research is recognized as a worldview that sets the value of research and asks such questions as (Guba & Lincoln, 1994): What is counted as social knowledge, action, and meaning? What are the main goals of educational research? What are the roles of educational researchers? How do we carry out our research projects? As Anderson (1998) notes, "How you see the world is largely a function of where you view it from" (p. 3). Consequently, the research paradigms guide the researchers throughout the empirical research process, from setting the research purpose to selecting data collection methods to analyzing the data and reporting the findings.

Despite their importance, research paradigms are rather hidden from plain view, especially for novice educational researchers. Many introductory research methods books do not extensively talk about research paradigms and philosophical backgrounds, except for the procedural differences between quantitative and qualitative research (Creswell, 2012; Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012; Punch, 2005; Wiersma & Jurs, 2005). Rather, they focus on "practical" aspects of data collection and analysis-that is, step-by-step how-to procedures, such as how to phrase survey questions, how to use statistical packages, or how to conduct effective interviews. In such discussions of the research process, educational researchers view their studies mainly in terms of technicalities, without recognizing the worldviews that shape and validate their knowledge claims (Kincheloe & Tobin, 2009). The fact that many people conduct studies without seriously considering research paradigms may be interpreted as the practical aspects of identifying a research paradigm not being as paramount as some researchers believe (Bryman, 2008). Some researchers even regard discussion of paradigms as a purely philosophical exercise, a remnant of the paradigm wars in the 1980s and 1990s (Morgan, 2007). A seminal article published by Gage (1989, written as though it was 2009) described the situation of the paradigm wars from a vantage point of 20 years hence. As discussed in this article, positivist and post-positivist research flourished in the 1980s and was later challenged by alternative paradigms, namely those of an interpretivist and critical nature. Much of what Gage wrote about has turned out to be what occurred in practice. However, initial antagonism of proponents of one paradigm toward another appears to have been somewhat moderated with the development and use of mixed-methods research (Bryman, 2008) and the wider acknowledgement of the contributions that research from different paradigms brings to the education community (Bredo, 2009).

Nevertheless, in recent years, we have witnessed some heated discussion on the diversity of research paradigms and what it means in the practice of educational research (Moss et al., 2009). Many education philosophers and researchers have found that the education research guidelines and policies published in 2002 in the United States by the National Research Council and by other research funding organizations dogmatically promote a certain type of research studies under the banner of evidence-based, scientific research. These educational authors believe that it is dangerous to have such a limited view on what "other" types of research could contribute to establishing better education. (For more detailed discussion of this issue, please refer to the journals Educational Researcher in 2002 [volume 31, issue 8] and 2009 [volume 38, issues 6–7] and Qualitative Inquiry in 2004 [volume 10, issue 1].)

Without an analytical understanding of each research paradigm, it is easy to misjudge the quality and the value of research studies and miss the opportunities to learn from them (Moss et al., 2009). In the education community and the science education community in particular, there is a tendency to ignore/dismiss research studies in other research paradigms (Kincheloe & Tobin, 2009). Post-positivists may think that interpretivist studies are anecdotal and not methodically rigorous enough, and critical theory studies are too politically oriented. Interpretivists may regard that post-positivist studies are superficial or limiting. Critical theorists may consider that postpositivist studies are exacerbating educational inequality. Yet there is great need to have an open mind to learn from the differences (Maxwell, 2004; Moss et al., 2009). The philosophical and practical diversity in the education research community not only supports building more balanced knowledge in education (St. Pierre, 2002) but also makes ways for more comprehensive research efforts with common goals (Bredo, 2009).

In this chapter, we outline three research paradigms and describe how each paradigm is realized in various research studies in science education and conclude with a discussion of the pragmatic approaches taken by mixed-methods researchers. This is not an attempt to pin research studies on one category of paradigm or another. Rather, by describing how different paradigms play out in the science education research field, we attempt to reflect on our own research practices and facilitate a dialogue across paradigms among science education researchers. While there are many different categorizations and boundary drawings of research paradigms (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 2000; Moss et al., 2009; Taylor, Taylor, & Luitel, 2012), we have used the categories of positivist/post-positivist, interpretivist, and critical theory and illustrated the characteristics of each paradigm in relation to one another. We intentionally did not use the common categories of quantitative and qualitative research in this chapter because they could be misleading—as if paradigm is limited to the choice of data collection methods. As mentioned, we believe a research paradigm is much more encompassing than the choice of data types.

Positivist/Post-Positivist Research Paradigm

Philosophical Backgrounds of Positivist Research

Positivism is understood as "any approach that applies scientific method to the study of human action" (Schwandt, 2001, p. 199). Following the empirical science tradition, positivist researchers assert that in order to make a meaningful knowledge claim, research studies should be firmly supported by *logical reasoning and empirical data* that are self-evident and verifiable (Schwandt, 2001). Many science education researchers may find this ideology of positivism familiar because it is well integrated within Western academic culture—such as viewing objective, scientific, logical, evidence-based research as the most desirable form of research (Howe, 2009; Kincheloe & Tobin, 2009). In contemporary discourse, however, positivism carries some negative implications due to its link to naïve realism, and modified forms of positivism are quite prevalent and influential in the education field. Next, we present post-positivism as a variation of positivism (logical empiricism) rather than as a counterpart of positivism.

Different from positivists, post-positivists do admit that our culture, personal value systems, and other surroundings influence our perception of the world in both positive and negative ways (Phillips & Burbules, 2000)-positive because it guides what to look for and how to make a reasonable, logical explanation but negative because it may lead to tunnel vision, limiting our understanding of the phenomenon in the truest form. Because of the negative influence of our prejudices, we cannot be sure whether our knowledge claims really reflect the truth. Yet this does not mean that the truth does not exist or that the truth does not matter. For example, a group of teachers may personally prefer a didactic teaching method based on their experience. Their reluctance to recognize alternative teaching methods, however, does not mean that there could be certain teaching methods that are more effective and yield better outcomes with students. Here, the role of post-positivist researchers is, as objective investigators, to systematically approach the truth as best as they can. Rather than simply relying on prior experiences, the researchers endeavor to collect comprehensive empirical data methodically and compare the different teaching methods objectively. By conducting a systematic empirical inquiry, post-positivist researchers believe that they can reach close to the truth and are able to inform the people of interest (teachers, policy makers, parents, students, etc.) in order to help make wise decisions, for example, on a new educational program or educational improvement plans (in this case, informing teachers which teaching method is better).

Examples of Post-Positivist Research

Similar to research in the natural sciences or psychology, the post-positivist tradition focuses on seeking a scientific causal or at least a correlational explanation—for example, the effectiveness of a new teaching method on students' achievement, the relationship of students' family background and their attitudes toward schooling, or the influence of students' perceptions toward science on their academic performance. Naturally, post-positivist researchers regularly adopt comparative experimental designs or survey designs to find a causal or correlational explanation. To help readers understand the distinct characteristics of post-positivist research, we introduce three research studies from the science education literature.

Kihyun Ryoo and Marcia Linn (2012) followed this post-positivist research tradition and investigated the effectiveness of an educational program in terms of students' conceptual achievement through pre- and posttests. This study resembles much of an experiment report in the natural sciences. The authors conservatively designed their study in advance, strictly followed the research protocols, and methodically elaborated the research procedures in the report to convince the readers that they fulfilled the quality standards of the post-positivist experimental design. At the beginning of their report, they posed their research question, "How do dynamic visualizations, compared to static illustrations, improve middle school students' understanding of energy transformation in photosynthesis?" The researchers divided students into an experimental group with dynamic visualization and one control group with static visualization. While the researchers did put the effort in making the experimental education program attractive (in this case, dynamic visualization), they tried to make the control and experimental conditions similar as much as possible, except for the instruction materials (that is, independent variable of dynamic versus static visualization). To equalize those two conditions, the researchers adopted a few measures: they selected two teachers with similar teaching experience (5 years); within each teacher's class, the students were randomly assigned to two groups after a pretest; the students went through identical lessons and assessments except for the visualization modes; and the number of students was large enough to make analytical claims based on statistics (200 students in total). After the lesson and assessments, the researchers categorized the students' written answers based on an assessment rubric to decide on the improvements of students' understanding of the concept. Once the data were in, the researchers used a set of statistical packages to analyze the data and backed up their research findings using various sources of data and triangulation. In order to convince the reader that procedures had been followed faithfully, the researchers provided an extensive explanation of the research procedures with statistical significance, internal validity, and external validity of the study. After the data analysis, the researchers informed the readers of the educational implications of the findings and the limitations of the study, such as where the results can and cannot be generalized to and possible ways to increase the educational effects for further studies.

Another post-positivist study by Sunitadevi Velayutham, Jill Aldridge, and Barry J. Fraser (2011) examined the affective domain. The researchers developed a survey instrument to measure students' motivation and self-regulation in science learning. Based on a literature review, the researchers identified a few key components that reportedly influence students' motivation in science learning, such as learning goal orientation, task value, self-efficacy, and self-regulation. Here, we notice the researchers' firm belief that extensive utilization of previous research studies is the effective way to make a reliable instrument to measure students' perception of themselves (Jaeger, 1997). They painstakingly identified the possible factors and wrote the questionnaire items, because the wording of the questions is regarded as being very important to obtaining the corresponding response. They conducted a pilot study and interviewed some teachers and students. The interviews were not a substantial part of the study but were used to check whether students' responses in the survey matched with what they said in their interviews. After the confirmation, the researchers distributed the survey to a large number of students (1,360 students in 78 classes). The students were the data source, and any personal connection with them was neither necessary nor desirable to make an unbiased, scientific claim. After the data collection, the researchers ran a series of statistical analyses to validate the instrument. With the numbers neatly organized in a table format, the researchers methodically claimed that their survey instrument has internal consistency reliability, concurrent validity, and predictive validity. They also claimed that they took stringent measures to safeguard themselves against methodical biases during their study. The researchers concluded the report with possible uses of the instrument for future studies.

Another research domain that lends itself to a postpositivist research paradigm includes studies that assess national standards or competencies of learning. National standards have been introduced worldwide (Waddington, Nentwig, & Schanze, 2007) and, for the evaluation of these standards, quantitative measures have been developed and evaluated for the various competencies addressed (DeBoer, 2011). These competencies include understanding and application of science concepts, principles and views of the nature of science, and also the competences to evaluate and judge the role of science knowledge in understanding key problems of society and lifeworld. In Germany, Julia Holstenbach, Hans Fischer, Alexander Kauertz, Jürgen Mayer, Elke Sumfleth, and Maik Walpuski (2011) developed a model of these competencies that is theoretically based and empirically validated by a test composed of items allowing large-scale assessment. The model includes the following areas of competence: (1) science knowledge, (2) knowledge about science, (3) communication, and (4) evaluation and judgment. The work draws on earlier work on evaluation and judgment competence in the field of biology education by Eggert and Bögeholz (2006), who presented a theoretically based competence model for decision making in the area of sustainable development. This work discusses the difficult task of developing instructional settings and materials to guide students in achieving the complex competencies addressed.

Common Features of Post-Positivist Research

Common research topics. The primary concern of positivist/post-positivist research is to provide a rational explanation for a variety of educational phenomena, but it is often linked with a scientific test for effectiveness or efficiency of a teaching program or educational system—in other words, investigating what works and why it works for evidence-based educational practice (Feuer, Towne, & Shavelson, 2002). Studies that typically are within a post-positivist paradigm include intervention studies as seen in Ryoo and Linn's (2012) study and other educational software studies such as the one by van Borkulo, van Joolingen, Savelsbergh, and de Jong (2012); largescale assessment studies such as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in the United States (Dee & Jacob, 2011) and the National Assessment Program—Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) in Australia (Dulfer, Polesel, & Rice, 2012); and international comparison studies such as the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS; Thomson, Hillman, & Wernert, 2012) and the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA; Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2010).

Common research designs. Based on logical empiricism, post-positivists painstakingly focus on establishing formal research designs and data that can self-evidently explain what is happening within education programs/systems and why. In order to make their knowledge claim more scientific and generalizable to other educational systems, post-positivists may adopt various research designs but frequently choose experiments (Ryoo & Linn, 2012) or large-scale surveys (Velayutham et al., 2011). For such research designs, researchers adopt comprehensive sampling strategies (e.g., stratified, systematic, or cluster sampling) to represent the target population, and they endeavor to control the variables (e.g., dependent, independent, or confounding variables) in various ways to establish a clear causal relationship (Porter, 1997). They also spend a significant amount of time methodically developing a quantitative instrument or rubric to record the research participants' understanding, perceptions, or behaviors (Jaeger, 1997). The general standards of quantitative study, such as reliability, internal and external validity, and statistical precision, are faithfully attended to (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). While qualitative data may be collected for such research designs through interviews, observations, or students' essays, the data are converted into numbers to correspond to preset categories (Ryoo & Linn, 2012) or used to support or elaborate on the quantitative data as a form of triangulation (Velayutham et al., 2011).

Role of the researcher in relation to the participants. Like natural scientists, post-positivist education researchers aim to be unbiased, knowledgeable experts who contemplate an educational phenomenon at a distance (Schwandt, 2001). The researchers primarily rely on the previously established body of knowledge, their intellectual reasoning power, and their impartiality to the study to make knowledge claims (Moss et al., 2009). Their personal values/beliefs or their involvement with the research participants may damage the objectivity of the study, and post-positivist researchers strive not to become too involved with the participants to proceed with the study fairly. In Ryoo and Linn's (2012) study, the researchers were not directly involved in teaching the students themselves; rather, they were outsiders who sat in class to check the intervention protocols and collect the necessary data. They did not try to build any personal connection with the participating students. Similarly, for the studies of Velayutham and colleagues (2011) and of Holstenbach and colleagues (2011), the same basic relationship was established between the researchers and the participants, with no personal attachment with the participants.

Because of the limited connections with the participants, the ethical obligations of the post-positivist researchers to the researched are seemingly straightforward. They follow the ethical guidelines outlined by the Institutional Review Board or Ethics Committee (see, for example, the ethics approval process of the American Educational Research Association, 2011, and the Australian Association for Research in Education, 2005, or similar institutional departments). These guidelines involve voluntary participation, informing participants about the research procedures in advance, being sure to avoid physical and psychological harm to the participants, safeguarding the anonymity of the participants, and reporting the data honestly (Fraenkel et al., 2012).

Common quality standards. While many researchers characterize positivism/post-positivism in terms of rigorous research methods and verifiable data (Kincheloe & Tobin, 2009), D.C. Phillips (2005) argues that researchers in this tradition value not just the methods but also how the overall case is made. He explains that a research study should be firmly based on objective, comprehensive data, but the arguments of the study should also be meticulously structured to present the main argument convincingly. Robert Floden (Moss et al., 2009) focuses on the connection of the research study to the research community and to the established body of knowledge and lists three important criteria to judge the quality of research in this tradition: (a) clear definition of concepts/constructs that are employed in the study; (b) strong, logical reasoning throughout the research process-from literature review to interpretation of the empirical data to drawing of its conclusions; and (c) significant contribution of the study findings to educators or policy makers.

Common Report Styles: Most post-positivist researchers follow the traditional scientific research report format: starting from the literature review, research problem/questions, research design, data analysis, and discussion of research findings, and finishing with limitations and educational implications. The flow of the report is logically organized to demonstrate how scientifically the study was conducted. The procedures are elaborately described to enable replications. The report is frequently written in a passive voice or third-person narrative, such as "the data were collected" rather than "I collected the data," to give an impersonal, objective tone.

Interpretivist Research Paradigm

Philosophical Backgrounds of Interpretivist Research

Interpretivism emerged as the reaction against the prevalent "scientific" positivism research. Different from positivists and their search for the objective, generalizable truth of the world, interpretivists focus on the localized meanings of human experience. Stemming from the relativist ontology and constructivist epistemology, the researchers in this tradition focus on the fact that people construct their understanding based on their experiences, culture, and context. Even one simple action of shaking hands could be interpreted differently-as pleasant, too formal, or repulsive-depending on the social convention, location, time, and company. Likewise, when an educational program is introduced, a young, enthusiastic, personable Ms. Alison may interpret and implement it differently from an experienced, charismatic Mr. Buckley. Consequently, the "proven" effects of the educational program may have little relevance to the students in Ms. Alison's class because of the local educational context. Thus, interpretivist researchers are scornful of the positivists' effort to gloss over the specifics to generalize their research findings. They argue that measuring and generalizing human understanding and behaviors-as in positivist studies-do not tell the more important part of human action-the situated meanings that people make out of such social, educational interactions. Researchers in the interpretivist tradition thus do not overly claim generalizability of their findings into other situations, because people's meanings and intentions are contextual, temporal, and particular. While academic researchers often feel the urge to make generalizable knowledge claims-that could go beyond the immediate context of the study to be widely applicable to address the situation at hand—interpretivists aim to describe in detail people's lived experiences (Dewey, 1925/1981) regarding educational phenomena. If the audience of the study finds the researcher's interpretation plausible, informative, or thought provoking, the research is regarded as worthwhile (Wolcott, 2009).

Researching people's localized, subjective interpretation of social phenomena, however, involves multiple layers of complication. For example, how do we know researchers identified the true local meanings? Understanding people's lived experience is not the same as interviewing and transcribing every word into a research paper. Researchers need to interpret what the research participants have shared with them, and the participants would share only what they want to share with the researchers. Based on researchers' own personal, social, and cultural experiences, the information from the participants could be interpreted quite differently. In order for researchers to claim that they have a good understanding of the educational phenomenon or of the participants' lived experiences, they usually spend an extended period of time with the participants, build rapport, empathize with the participants to make better sense of the situation, and review their own interpretation with the participants and against the literature. While the interpretivist researchers strive to examine their own values and experiences to establish better understanding of the situation by conducting member checks, audit trails, and other means (Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Merriam, 2009), the researchers do not claim that their knowledge claim is a complete or the right one but that it is a sensible interpretation of the situation.

The subjectivity issue becomes more complicated when considering the audience of the research report. When interpretivist researchers describe their understanding of the educational phenomenon and of the research participants, the audience has to reinterpret the research findings. Based on the readers' lived experience, the meaning drawn from the research report would be different. Aware of the multiple levels of subjectivity—from the social interaction to the research participants, from the research participants to the researcher, and from the researcher to the audience—the researchers in this tradition often offer "thick descriptions" of the situation to communicate the researchers' interpretation (Geertz, 1973).

Examples of Interpretivist Research

Similar to researchers in anthropology, science education researchers in the interpretivist paradigm set out to examine in some detail the way that individuals—be they teachers, students, administrators, or parents—develop an understanding of their experiences and activities. Consequently, researchers spend much time studying participants and collecting large amounts of (mostly) qualitative data from observations, interviews, descriptive narratives, and the like. Interpretivist studies vary widely in the amount of structure, the length of time, and the level of engagement of the researchers with the participants. The following examples provide some evidence of the variety of interpretivist studies.

An example of a more methodical interpretivist research position is one by David Treagust, Roberta Jacobowitz, James J. Gallagher, and Joyce Parker (2001). The study explored how a middle school teacher used assessment embedded within her teaching the topic of sound. Jim Gallagher had studied ethnographic research methods under Fred Erickson and had been influential in disseminating interpretivist research methods in science education through national and international contacts. During an academic leave, Treagust joined Gallagher in conducting this case study and regularly went to the research site-a Grade 8 science class with 23 students-to explore how the teacher "incorporated assessment tasks as an integral part of her teaching about the topic of sound" (p. 140). Despite the fact that one of the co-authors (Jacobowitz) was the teacher of the class, the rest of the researchers made minimal interference of the classroom activities. After 3 weeks of intensive observations of science class and interviews with the teacher and the students, the researchers combed through the data to identify how the assessment strategies were used and contributed to or detracted from learning the sound concepts of the lessons. Consistent with the qualitative research design espoused by Erickson (1986, 2012), analysis of the data enabled the development of five assertions that focused on the embedded assessment tasks. Each of the assertions was supported by detailed data from the classroom observations, as well as interviews and analysis of materials produced by the students during the lessons. The research showed

that nearly every activity had an assessment component integrated into it, that students had a wide range of opportunities to express their knowledge and understanding through writing tasks and oral questioning, and that individual students responded to and benefited from the different assessment techniques in various ways.

(p. 137)

Taking a more philosophical perspective, Beth Warren, Cynthia Ballenger, Mark Ogonowski, Ann Rosebery, and Josiane Hudicourt-Barnes (2001) at the Cheche Konnen Center illustrated how Haitian immigrant elementary school children develop scientific discourse in relation to their everyday interactions. The science education researchers in the sociocultural tradition often regard science as a discourse of a scientific community and science learning as crossing borders or gaining control of multiple discourses (C.W. Anderson, 2007). Warren and her colleagues, however, argued that children's everyday discourse and a scientific one are not dichotomous but are in a continuum. Using detailed descriptions of students' and scientists' interactions, the researchers in this study support their points. One of the episodes in the study was about Jean-Charles. He was a Haitian immigrant student who spoke Haitian Creole (known not to contain technical, scientific, abstract terms) as his first language. The researchers had known the student and the class for a considerably long time, and they were able to describe the usual modes of Jean-Charles's interactions with his peers, how it took a long time for him to speak about his ideas, how his drawings were admired by others, and so forth. In analyzing a class dialogue on metamorphosis, the researchers dissected the meaning of each student's sentences-both literal and contextual meanings in which they were understood by the members of the class-and how the casual language use and the class environment contributed to the sense making of the metamorphosis of insects in relation to the human growth. In analyzing an interview with Jean-Charles, the researchers discovered how the use of his everyday language helped the young child to distinguish growth and transformation in a unique way. Questioning the value of dichotomy between everyday language and scientific language, the researchers concluded that educators need to observe more deeply and carefully how the students' negotiation of meanings could help their scientific sense making.

Heidi B. Carlone (2004) conducted an ethnographic case study, entering the field with a research question: How do students, especially girls, make sense of science and being a good science participant in a reform-based physics class? The focus is on the female students' experiencesthe meanings they build from the instruction and the local culture within which they operate. Science learning is understood not as a cognitive activity but as a sociocultural activity that integrates students' identities, discourses, and values. Different from post-positivist researchers, Carlone actively sought to get to know the students and spent much time in their naturalistic setting-the physics classroom. Six weeks may not be regarded as a long enough time to call this study an ethnography, but she stayed at school as a participant observer and collected an extensive data set utilizing ethnographic practices-as did Treagust and colleagues (2001). She took field notes in class, talked with students informally and in interviews, collected students' documents, and interviewed the teacher and school administrators. Any verbal or behavioral data were entered into the data set. She might have had an initial research design, but as she was accumulating data, she redirected the research to follow up on the preliminary results of data analysis. Instead of summarizing students' responses to the interview questions, Carlone endeavored to portray the participants' experiences, values, and ways of thinking through their own words and actions. She allocated an extensive portion of the paper to demonstrate the subtle way the participants' experiences are integrated into their way of communicating by directly quoting them. Because of the thick description of the situation, readers feel as if they are sitting in the classroom or seeing through the participants' minds. In conclusion, rather than giving a definite answer to the research question, Carlone shows the complexities in implementing an inclusive science curriculum for diverse students and calls for more nuanced understanding of students' participation in science learning.

Interpretivist studies in German physics classrooms by Reinders Duit and his colleagues involved an examination of nonlinear systems, which play a significant role in contemporary science but are seldom discussed in school science. A research and development program investigated the educational significance of this new topic, and explorative studies were carried out to find out which ideas of nonlinear systems may be taught to Grade 10 students. In one of the major studies, 25 students worked in small groups and tried to investigate key features of simple chaotic systems. The work in three groups was videodocumented. Using a methodological approach fusing conceptual change and a discourse perspective allowed descriptions and analyses of students' learning trajectories both in terms of conceptual change and in terms of minute shifts of students' language games (Duit, Roth, Komorek, & Wilbers, 1998). The studies were carried out within the framework of a theoretical model for instructional planning, the Model of Educational Reconstruction (Duit, Gropengießer, Kattmann, Komorek, & Parchmann, 2012). This model shares major features of design-based research (Cobb, Confrey, diSessa, Lehrer, & Schauble, 2003). In the first steps of investigating whether a topic so far not included in the curriculum should be taught and may be taught in ordinary classroom settings, the results show how interpretive research designs are powerful. In this instructional program, the analytical and empirical (interpretive) research concerning the educational significance of the topic in question (understanding nonlinear systems) and the empirical (qualitative) research on the means to teach the new topic in schools resulted in a preliminary teaching and learning sequence. In addition, insights into the fine structure of analogy use were gained that in subsequent interpretive studies resulted in a model of analogy use. Briefly summarized, the studies resulted in preliminary ideas on teaching key issues of nonlinear systems and provided new insights in the fine structure of analogy use, partly challenging the predominating cognitive science approaches (Duit, Roth, Komorek, & Wilbers, 2001). Finally, another related exploratory study resulted in a "heuristic" model of analogy use (Wilbers & Duit, 2005), explaining why analogies provided by teachers often fail to achieve their intended aim.

Common Features of Interpretivist Research

Common research topics. Interpretivist studies focus on the cultures (Carlone, 2004), language use (Warren, Ballenger, Ogonowski, Rosebery, & Hudicourt-Barnes, 2001), classroom interactions (Gallas, 1995; Paley, 1981; Treagust et al., 2001), and lived experiences of students, teachers, scientists, and community members (Wong, 2002). Through the researcher's empathic identification with the participants and through reflection on the beliefs and values of the researcher and the society, researchers aim to understand the research participants' meaning making around science teaching and learning. Even when a new educational intervention program is implemented, the researchers in this tradition highlight the dynamic interactions between the program and the local contexts, and consider how the local participants interact with and understand the new program (Erickson & Gutierrez, 2002). The interpretivists do not expect that their research results could be readily or directly translated into general science education policies or strategies (Bryman, 2012).

Common research designs. As an interpretivist research study is perceived as a sense-making process for the researchers involved, the research design itself can evolve as illustrated by the studies by Duit and colleagues (2001), which is consistent with grounded theory. As the researchers immerse themselves in the situation, they get to know the "prominent" research questions better, develop a clearer focus, and may change the research design accordingly. The evolving research design is not something that is frowned upon, as in post-positivist research, but a natural process of interpretivist research designs, such as case study, ethnography, narrative, and phenomenological

research. The qualitative data collection methods tend to be interviews, observations, and document analysis. To capture the everyday experiences of the research participants, studies usually occur in naturalistic settings rather than experimental comparative settings as in postpositivist studies.

Role of the researcher in relation to the participants. Within the interpretivist paradigm, researchers do not aim to claim objectivity attained by disinterested, unbiased researchers. Because interpretivists believe that meanings are not pregiven but are co-created through hermeneutic dialogues (Schwandt, 2000), researchers often aim to study by engaging with the activities of the research participants (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007; Guba & Lincoln, 2005; Wolcott, 2009). As the sense maker and narrator of the situation under study, the researcher may solicit the views of the research participants and sometimes seeks immersion in the situation to experience it him/herself. Because of the close relationship with the participants, researchers are obligated to consider many ethical issues beyond the Institutional Review Board guidelines, such as how to draw a boundary between the stories that are intriguing to readers and the stories that are too personal to pry into or too consequential to report, or how much to honor the participants' willingness to share their stories when they do not fully grasp the meaning of participating in a research project (Clark & Sharf, 2007; Einarsdottir, 2007; Etherington, 2007; Jones & Stanley, 2008).

Common quality standards. Interpretivist researchers admit that the quality of research depends on the skills, sensitivity, and integrity of the researcher because research itself is a sense-making process. Frederick Erickson (Moss et al., 2009) categorizes the criteria to judge quality interpretivist research study into two areas: the technical aspects and the educational imagination. Technical aspects involve: (a) prolonged, meaningful interaction in the field; (b) careful, repeated sifting through the data; (c) reflective analysis of the data; and (d) clear, rich reporting. However, interpretivists focus more on the substance than on the methodical rigor by itself, and that is what Erickson meant by educational imagination. One of the criteria most interpretivist researchers uphold is crystallization (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Like a clear crystal that casts multiple colors, the researchers endeavor to create a strong image of the lived experiences of the participants through comprehensive deliberation and persuasive presentation (p. 5). As a general guideline for interpretivist research studies, Tracy (2010) offers eight criteria: a worthy, relevant, significant topic; rich data and appropriate theoretical construct; researcher's reflexivity and transparency in value and biases; credible data through thick description and respondents' validation; aesthetic representation of findings; significant contribution in theory and practice; ethical; and meaningful coherence of study. Interestingly

enough, a few of these criteria sound very similar to the post-positivist quality standards listed earlier.

Common report styles. The most distinctive feature of interpretivist studies is that the data are qualitative, much of which is thick description of the situation (individuals, contexts, or events). Lengthy transcripts or rich, verbal descriptions of a situation often characterize interpretivist research. The report could take the form of a traditional empirical study with literature review, methods description, and data analysis (Carlone, 2004). Or it could take a narrative format of describing a daily procedure of a schoolteacher or children's discussion in class (Gallas, 1995, 1997; Paley, 1981). In such narrative reports, researchers do not make a long validity claim or methodological justification; they simply describe what they have done and explain why. Yet the writing is not an easy task for interpretivist researchers. It is "endlessly creative and interpretive" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 14). Researchers often ask questions such as: How much contextual description is enough for the readers? How much analysis and how much description are adequate? Through whose voice is the story told? (Wolcott, 2009). The rich description of research participants' lived experience needs to be artfully woven into researchers' interpretations, and the researchers' writing ability (or storytelling ability) is counted critical. Interpretivist researchers do not regard their interpretation of the situation as the absolute truth, so they tend not to provide the final words (or conclusions) of the study (Wolcott, 2009).

However, in science education research journals, the extent of this thick description is often limited by the page requirements of the journal, and only short episodes can be reported. Depending on who reviews such work, these abbreviated thick descriptions or dialogues can be seen as not meeting the necessary criteria. In addition, many research reports lack the detailed description of how the researchers selected the participants, why they chose to focus on certain aspects or data collection methods, what they did to ensure the quality of data analysis, and how they considered alternative interpretations. Yet, in recent years, sociocultural, interpretivist research studies appear more frequently in major science education journals such as Journal of Research in Science Teaching and Science Education (Carter, 2007; Hammond & Brandt, 2004). Cultural Studies in Science Education publishes articles with this particular focus and has greatly widened the scope of work that is designed to better understand science as a cultural practice. Research studies in this tradition aim to integrate students' cognition with the context (Hammond & Brandt, 2004).

Critical Theory¹ Research Paradigm

Philosophical Backgrounds of Critical Theory Research

Similar to interpretivist researchers, critical theory researchers acknowledge that people's values, ideas, and facts are shaped by social, political, cultural, economic, gender, and ethnic experiences. Critical theory researchers, however, put more focus on the inequality and the power dynamics in human interactions because they understand that all ideas and social interactions are "fundamentally mediated by power relations" (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005, p. 304). This tradition could be traced back to Marxism in terms of the exploration of unequal power relationships and power struggles. They view that "social reality is not always what it should or could be," but the social arrangements make people feel comfortable with the status quo (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005). Academia contributes to such social arrangements by making people develop false consciousness to believe the existing body of knowledge is neutral and scientific (rather than a tool to serve a certain group of people), effectively preventing people from questioning the status quo (Kincheloe & Tobin, 2009). Clandinin and Rosiek (2007) observe that the critical theory researchers believe that "large scale social arrangements conspire not only to physically disempower individuals and groups but also to epistemically disempower people" (p. 47).

Because the social narrative is conceptualized that way, researchers strive to examine the current social values and roles in historical and cultural contexts and problematize many taken-for-granted ideas for the benefit of socially marginalized people, such as: Is science learning or educational reform really beneficial for everyone (Barton & Osborne, 2001; Eisenhart, Finkel, & Marion, 1996)? Why don't ethnic minority students or female students participate in school science as much as their white male counterparts (Lee, 2002; Noddings, 1998)? Isn't there something that inherently discourages them from learning science at school (Aikenhead & Jegede, 1999; Allen & Crawley, 1998; Brickhouse, Lowery, & Schultz, 2000; Harding, 1991)?

By asking such philosophical questions, researchers in this tradition focus on uncovering the unequal power relationship in societies and institutions. They aim not just to expand the knowledge of the society but to contribute to transform the society and emancipate the disempowered people (Kincheloe, 2003). Carter (2007) argued, "science education should not only work toward a deeper understanding of our planetary systems but also toward the explicit goals of creating a more just, equitable, and sustainable world" (p. 175). Researchers ask themselves, "If the society or science education is not open, democratic and equal, what should we do to change, as teacher, educational researcher, and concerned community member?" (Bouillion & Gomez, 2001; Elmesky & Tobin, 2005; Fusco, 2001; Roth & Desautels, 2002; Tan & Barton, 2008). In order to enact changes in the lives of the socially, economically, and historically marginalized people, they often go into the low-income, ethnic-minority-neighborhood schools and become involved in some type of an action project.

Examples of Critical Theory Research

Critical theory research studies may look quite different from more "traditional" research studies in terms of their (1) critique of the social discourse/structure; (2) orientation toward social action and change; (3) explicit analysis on the researchers' identities, values, and intentions; and (4) experimental way of writing research reports (Kincheloe, 2003). The first two studies discussed (by Bouillion & Gomez and by Elmesky & Tobin) illustrate how science education researchers attempted to change how schooling or social research is done. They first pointed out the limitations of the status quo and then enacted alternative ways. Their primary goal was not only to observe but also to change the situation and empower the students and their community for the betterment of the people involved. The third study (by Tan & Barton) was conducted in the same vein as the first two, but this study may look very similar to an interpretivist study in terms of the authors' defense of research methods, presentation of results, and interpretations. The last study (by Eisenhart) is a critical autoethnographic study in which the author conveys her own experience and reflections as "data." The author made clear that her critical interpretation of the social phenomena was socially and politically motivated. These studies follow different research methods and reporting styles. Despite the difference, we put them in this critical research tradition because of their explicit focus on challenging the inequality of the status quo and the commitment toward social change (Maulucci, 2012).

Lisa Bouillion and Louis Gomez (2001) conducted an action-oriented, transformative research study at an elementary school in a low-income urban neighborhood in Chicago, Illinois. Instead of following the traditional school learning model, the researchers along with the teachers at the school implemented a science project in which science was taught beyond the school walls and promoted the school-community partnership. The project was called the Chicago River Project. As students recognized illegally dumped garbage was a major community problem, they investigated the environmental issues scientifically in terms of river pollution and water safety. They shared the results with other community members through writing. They organized a series of actions to change the situation. The project was not just one of interesting school activities for the teachers and students. It was their own community problem that they found intimately relevant and in need of action. As the project evolved, the researchers not only collected data for the research report, they also helped the students and teachers make the action project successful. The researchers aimed to change the existing practice of science teaching at the school and to break down several existing power relations or boundaries through the study: between students and science as they become users and producers of scientific knowledge with the help from local community activist-scientists; between teachers and students as students' ideas were purposefully incorporated into the activity planning and execution; between education researchers and schoolteachers as they became equal contributors in the collaborative project; and between students and the city council as the students'

persistent effort persuaded the city to act on behalf of the community. While the research report may look similar to a qualitative study, a major goal of this study was to effect a change in the community and the identity of students and teachers within their learning environments.

In conventional educational research, students are often the ones who supply data for the research project by filling out questionnaires, answering competency tests, or responding to interview questions, while researchers design, execute, and analyze the study. Rowhea Elmesky and Kenneth Tobin (2005) conducted a study trying to change the power imbalance in the research process. Instead of following the conventional model of objectifying students' ideas, Elmesky and Tobin involved students as the collaborative researchers rather than as subjects. Elmesky and Tobin framed their research study as an alternative to the status quo educational research in American inner-city (low-income, ethnic-minority neighborhood) schools. They started their study by questioning the effectiveness or the true intention of educational programs in improving the scientific literacy of students in socially marginalized communities. Because they saw that the cultural deficit view on the marginalized is oppressive and hegemonic, the researchers adopted a research method that would value the students' cultural resources and empower them. Following the model of Joe Kincheloe and Shirley Steinberg (1998), the researchers recruited high school students as collaborative researchers so as to equip them with critical research skills and to challenge the conventional role of students as the researched. The students were not only provided with multiple research opportunities to reflect on their own ideas and their school life, but they also worked as a resource to shed a new light on the ways to appreciate their culture and educate how to teach in low-income-neighborhood schools. When presenting their research project, the researchers used a transcript format (as if they were research participants) for their interpretation of students and sometimes they used a research narrative format (as if they were the authoritative researchers). The mixed formats of presenting their interpretations gave the impression that they were just telling their version of the stories, not the authoritative interpretation.

Edna Tan and Angela Barton (2008) started their study in a similar tone to Elmesky and Tobin's by critiquing the implementation of the American national initiative for scientific literacy. Tan and Barton argued that the current education initiatives focus on the test scores and marginalize low-income, ethnic-minority students by framing them as "problem" or "failure" and by depriving them of learning opportunities to make meaningful personal connections to science. After a discussion of a feminist stance on the global knowledge economy, the researchers carefully described how two sixth-grade ethnic-minority girls from a low-income-neighborhood school negotiated their identities through various school science activities and their interactions with the teacher and peers. While the researchers adopted the format of an ethnographic case study in analyzing and presenting the students' interactions, they did so to problematize the status quo in school science and education research.

Within the frame of critical autoethnographic, reflective research, Margaret Eisenhart (2000) told her own story of publishing a book on women's participation in various venues of science. At the beginning of the paper, she explicitly mentioned that her story is not value neutral-rather, it is positioned with certain values and purpose. She intended to critically reflect on how she, as an established academic, conceptualizes and practices science education research, and how the larger sociocultural discourse shapes or constrains her practice. Retelling her story in two parts, she straightforwardly described why she wanted to investigate various science-related activities in which women were successfully participating and how she designed a multiple-case study, including a case of the pro-choice and pro-life activist groups' use of science. She portrayed that the participants in the pro-choice and prolife groups were highly educated, politically charged, and strongly committed to learn and use science, but their use of science was "unsophisticated" and "divisive" (p. 48). In the second part of her story, she described a series of encounters with strong discouragement to include the story of the pro-choice and pro-life groups in the book. Publishers and reviewers adamantly noted that those groups' stories did not add anything new or valuable to the book. Initially, she blamed her inability to write persuasive, convincing arguments and tried to revise the writing. However, from the fear of not being able to publish the book, she conformed to the expectation of the publisher and the society. Eisenhart later reflected on the reason people isolated the pro-choice and pro-life groups' stories, how the invisible boundary of what's counted as scientific activities played a role in their omission, and what she could have done differently. In the paper, Eisenhart continuously reminded the reader what she was doing and why-for example, why she constructed her story in a more academically conventional way and how placing the blame for what happened to the larger social discourse eased her guilty conscience when relating to her co-author. This reflective, honest piece of writing leads us to reconsider the social meaning of what we do in the research process in a new light.

Common Features of Critical Theory Research

Common research topics. While a large portion of science education studies focuses on the technical aspects of how to teach science better, critical theory researchers concentrate on the political and historical aspects of education and educational inequality, seeking to challenge the status quo. The obvious topic for the critical researchers is investigating multiple, subtle ways to discourage or marginalize the participation of socially disadvantaged people in schooling or science. For example, Sandra Harding (1991) questioned how science and science education are framed in our society and how they have systematically

discouraged women's participation and contribution. Allen and Crawley (1998) investigated how school science excludes the worldview of Native American students and the elders and how it prevents their successful learning. Barton and her colleagues (Barton, 1998; Barton & Osborne, 1998; Barton & Yang, 2000) investigated how families in a homeless shelter were dissuaded from succeeding in school science.

Common research designs. The designs of critical theory research are often very similar to those of interpretivist studies, but with more explicit emphasis on larger social ideologies and power relationships. Critical theory researchers believe that empirical research and its data, no matter how rigorous the research methods are, cannot escape the dominant narrative of the society (Kincheloe, 2003). Because of this limitation, researchers in this tradition try to be critical of researchers' own assumptions and their relationship with the researched. Interpretivist researchers often display reflexivity in their relation with the research participants in terms of their values and experiences in understanding the participants. Critical theory researchers, on the other hand, show their reflexivity in terms of power dynamics between the researchers and the researched and even what the research participants have shared as their experiences. In critical ethnography, "[researchers] will be listening through the person's story to hear the operation of broader social discourses shaping that person's story of their experience" (Clandinin & Rosiek, 2007, p. 55). Listening to people's stories is a way to uncover the larger social discourse and false consciousness to enlighten the public.

Another common research design is participatory action research that actively addresses the inequalities in school and community. Researchers go into a low-income neighborhood and involve students and community members to recognize the issue of the community and take actions to change situations and their identities. Studies by Bouillion and Gomez (2001) and by Elmesky and Tobin (2005) could be examples.

Role of the researcher. The main goal of research is not expanding the body of knowledge but challenging and transforming the society and institution for the betterment of the people involved. Rather than distant, unbiased scholars, the critical theory researchers claim they are enlightened intellectuals and activists, working for social justice and for the people who are socially and politically disempowered (Fine, Weis, Weseen, & Wong, 2000).

Common quality standards. Because critical theory researchers are skeptical of unbiased research through rigorous methodical measures, they do not provide a set of guidelines on how to ascertain quality research. Rather, they argue that by explicitly discussing the biases of researchers and societies, they are conducting more "objective" research studies because they are not operating

under any "hidden agenda" or exacerbating social inequality. However, they highly value the democratic procedures in research (e.g., egalitarian relationship with research participants, democratic decision making, and shared contributions to study) and the social impact of the study in transforming society (e.g., greater understanding of the society, the empowerment of the participants, and prompting or enacting changes in social/personal practices) (G. Anderson, Herr, & Nihlen, 1994; Greenwood & Levin, 1998; Griffiths, 1998).

Common report styles. Because they are consciously problematizing what is given or conventional, critical theory researchers intentionally do not follow the traditional fabric of research report. They experiment with the reporting of the study, such as adopting a performance or writing the story as a fiction (Flores-González, Rodriguez, & Rodriguez-Muniz, 2006). Some social-action-oriented research studies could be regarded as less methodically rigorous, thus not meeting the criteria of many academic journals. Consequently, to address this potential concern, many critical theory researchers adopt less radical, more traditional forms of ethnographic research reports, such as those by Barton (1998) and by Eisenhart (2000).

Paradigmatic or Pragmatic Research in Science Education

Science education researchers, like any other social science researchers, strive to establish the credibility and validity of their studies. Locating their studies within a particular research tradition or paradigm gives researchers philosophical, methodological, and practical guidelines to design and conduct a persuasive and convincing research project. In the preceding pages, we have described three research traditions and identified relevant studies that illustrate post-positivist, interpretivist, and critical theory paradigms in terms of the underlying epistemological, ontological, and methodological differences. We aimed to show how a research paradigm frames research effort by conditioning the research topics to be studied, the research designs used, the role of the researcher in relation to the participants, the common quality standards, and the common report styles presented. As we noted in the introduction to this chapter, we do not distinguish between different paradigms on the basis of whether the data are qualitative or quantitative, even though there is a tendency for post-positivist researchers to use mainly quantitative data and for interpretivist and critical theory researchers to use qualitative data extensively.

However, some science education researchers might wonder why we have not included mixed-methods approach as a research paradigm. Many contemporary research studies have both quantitative and qualitative data, and they may not seem to fit nicely into any specific research paradigm. Mixed-methods researchers (e.g., Creswell, 2012; Morgan, 2007) are not committed to any particular perspective on the nature of knowledge or reality, and they believe that dichotomizing quantitative and qualitative is not only unproductive but fallacious (Ercikan & Roth, 2006). They even question the practical value of research paradigms. David Morgan (2007), for example, claims that when designing and executing research projects, researchers tend to focus on practical aspects of research design and methods rather than worldviews or paradigms. Evaluative educational researchers, on the other hand, focus on diverse stakeholders' demands (Greene, 2008). No matter the worldview of the researchers, they are obligated to adopt various research approaches to satisfy the demands of diverse stakeholders (e.g., large-scale statistical analysis for policy makers or contextual vignettes for parents of students' welfare programs). Other mixed-methods researchers claim that the mixed use of quantitative and qualitative data enables a thorough triangulation of the findings and makes stronger knowledge claims (Creswell, 2012; Mathison, 1988; Reeves, 1997). Philosophically, though, Bryman (2012) regards this mixed-methods approach as qualitative researchers' practical attempts to establish themselves in a post-positivist-dominated academic world without committing themselves too much to the interpretivists' research paradigm. Others (e.g., Greene, 2008) focus on the practical problem-solving approach and the dynamic interplay of theory and practice in this tradition and list John Dewey's (1938/1991) pragmatism as their philosophical framework.

Given the circumstances, the authors of this chapter had a dilemma: whether to regard mixed methods as a separate research paradigm or as a research design. As Bryman (2008) notes, combining different research methods is an area in which researchers still have different views. While many post-positivist researchers welcome such adjustment as a way to increase the validity of research findings, interpretivist researchers are rather critical of such approaches. Denzin and Lincoln (2011), for example, regard it as a remnant of positivist legacies that relies on numbers as scientific evidence, resisting acknowledging the value of interpretivist qualitative studies and the political issue of what counts as evidence. Next, we list a few studies that adopt mixed-methods approaches to help readers recognize the similarities and differences between paradigmatic research studies and mixed-methods research studies.

Using an overtly described two-phase, sequential mixed-methods study, Sedat Ucar, Kathy Cabe Trundle, and Lawrence Krissek (2011) examined the effects of an intervention with preservice teachers at various educational levels in terms of their conceptual understanding. Following inquiry-based instruction using archived, online data about tides, a total of 79 preservice teachers completed a questionnaire, and subsequently a subset of 29 participants was interviewed. From the qualitative and quantitative data, the authors described and measured the impact of the intervention. The manner in which

the quantitative and qualitative data were analyzed was described in detail, including reliability and trustworthiness measures. The findings were presented as a response to the research questions and discussed in relation to previous literature, with implications made for teacher education and future research.

As an example of another clearly described mixedmethods study, Liesl Hohenshell and Brian Hand (2006) investigated whether differences in student performance on science tests was a direct result of the implementation of a science writing program when the students in Grades 9 and 10 were learning cell biology. In this "mixedmethod, quasi-experimental [study] . . . with a non-random sample" (p. 267), the researchers investigated the students' performance and explored students' perceptions of the writing activities using a survey and semistructured interviews. The authors emphasized the complementary role of quantitative and qualitative methods by using the quantitative results to document science achievement while using the qualitative data to enhance their interpretation of any findings arising from the quantitative data. The data interpretation was presented separately for the quantitative and qualitative analyses, as were the initial results. In drawing five assertions arising from the study, the authors integrated the analysis of the quantitative and qualitative data.

In a similar manner, Renee Clary and James Wandersee (2007) used a concurrent mixed-methods research design to investigate whether an integrated study of petrified wood could help students gain an improved geobiological understanding of fossilization, geologic time, and evolution. The researchers adopted Creswell's QUAL and QUAN approaches "to cross validate, confirm or corroborate the findings" (p. 1016). A survey about petrified wood was used pre- and postinstruction in a quasi-experimental setting, with the treatment class receiving the integrated petrified wood instruction. In addition to the quantitative data from the survey, qualitative data were collected from the content analysis of students' free responses on the survey as well as from the discussion board feedback and researchers' field notes. Some of the qualitative data were later quantified. Although there were quantitative and qualitative data from this investigation, the qualitative data were used to support the findings from the quantitative data. The students who experienced the integrated petrified wood instruction showed greater knowledge about aspects of petrified wood and geologic time; geochemistry of fossilization remained problematic for both groups.

Vaughan Prain and Bruce Waldrip (2006) conducted research with a group of teachers and their Year 4 through 6 students when they engaged with multiple representations of the same science concepts in electrical circuits and collisions and vehicle safety. Using "a mixedmethods approach entailing collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data within the same study, including triangulation of different data sources" (p. 1848), the authors identified teachers' and students' practices and beliefs in using multimodal representations of science concepts. Based on survey responses from 20 teachers and their students, 6 teachers and their classes were selected for a case study of their classroom practice with a multimodal focus. The data included classroom observations and interviews with students when they were involved in classroom activities. Two science classes were observed. While these two teachers used various modes to engage students, the researchers observed that the teachers were not systematic in developing students' knowledge integration and their effective use of different modes. Students who recognized the relationships between modes.

So what are the differences and what are the commonalities between these examples of overtly mixed-methods studies compared to those studies we have described based on a specific paradigm? From this review, what becomes evident to us is that mixed methods often involve an intervention and its evaluation, and mixed-methods researchers essentially work within an unstated post-positivist paradigm. They use quantitative and qualitative data in a complementary manner as far as possible. However, as we noted in the introduction of this chapter, we acknowledge that the development and use of mixed methods has, to a certain degree, moderated the antagonism between researchers working in different paradigms (Bryman, 2008). Jennifer Greene (2008) writes,

A mixed-methods way of thinking is an orientation toward social inquiry that actively invites us to participate in dialogue about multiple ways of seeing and hearing, multiple ways of making sense of the social world, and multiple standpoints on what is important and to be valued and cherished.

(p. 20)

Greene believes that "the mixed-methods approach to social inquiry has the potential to be a distinctive methodology within the honoured traditions of social science. . . because it embraces multiple paradigm traditions" (p. 20). If readers are interested in further discussions about the character and value of research paradigms and mixedmethods research, please further refer to Greene's paper.

In this chapter, we have reviewed how three wellknown research paradigms are presented or practiced in science education research in recent years. The landscape of conducting research within these paradigms has gradually changed over the years, and in the concluding section, we have indicated how once-incommensurable paradigmatic positions have been embraced in mixed-methods research approaches. In the years ahead, we can imagine that approaches to research will continuously evolve to incorporate new issues and ideas. We hope our review can contribute to productive discussion of science education researchers across different paradigms, including pragmatic research with mixed methods.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Bruce Waldrip and John Staver, who carefully and critically reviewed this chapter. We hope that we have done justice to their critiques and constructive suggestions.

Note

 Critical theory studies include several research traditions, such as feminism, postcolonialism, poststructuralism, emancipatory/participatory, postmodernism, etc.

References

- Aikenhead, G.S., & Jegede, O.J. (1999). Cross-cultural education: A cognitive explanation of a cultural phenomenon. *Journal of Research* in Science Teaching, 36(3), 269–287.
- Allen, N. J., & Crawley, F. E. (1998). Voices from the bridge: Worldview conflicts of Kickapoo students of science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 35(2), 111–132.
- American Educational Research Association. (2011). Code of ethics. *Educational Researcher*, 40(3), 145–156.
- Anderson, C.W. (2007). Perspectives on science learning. In S. K. Abell & N.G. Lederman (Eds.), *Handbook of research on science education* (pp. 3–30). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Anderson, G. (1998). Fundamentals of educational research (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Anderson, G., Herr, K., & Nihlen, A.S. (1994). Studying your own school: An educator's guide to qualitative practitioner research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Australian Association for Research in Education. (2005). Annotated bibliography—Ethics in educational research. Retrieved June 2013, from www1.aare.edu.au/pages/static/aareethc.htm
- Barton, A.C. (1998). Teaching science with homeless children: Pedagogy, representation, and identity. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 35(4), 379–394.
- Barton, A.C., & Osborne, M.D. (1998). Marginalized discourses and pedagogies: Constructively confronting science for all. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 35(4), 339–340.
- Barton, A. C., & Osborne, M. D. (2001). Introduction. *Teaching science in diverse settings: Marginalized discourses and classroom practice*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Barton, A. C., & Yang, K. (2000). The culture of power and science education: Learning from Miguel. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 37(8), 871–889.
- Bouillion, L.M., & Gomez, L.M. (2001). Connecting school and community with science learning: Real world problems and school–community partnerships as contextual scaffolds. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 38(8), 878–898.
- Bredo, E. (2009). Comments on Howe: Getting over the methodology wars. *Educational Researcher*, 38(6), 441–448. doi:10.3102/ 0013189x09343607
- Brickhouse, N. W., Lowery, P., & Schultz, K. (2000). What kind of a girl does science? The construction of school science identities. *Journal* of Research in Science Teaching, 37(5), 441–458.
- Bryman, A. (2008). The end of paradigm wars? In P. Alasuutari, L. Bickman, & J. Brannen (Eds.), SAGE handbook of social research methods (pp. 12–26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bryman, A. (2012). Social research methods (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carlone, H.B. (2004). The cultural production of science in reformbased physics: Girls' access, participation, and resistance. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 41(4), 392–414.
- Carter, L. (2007). Sociocultural influences on science education: Innovation for contemporary times. *Science Education*, 92(1), 165–181. doi:10.1002/sce.20228

- Clandinin, D.J., & Rosiek, J. (2007). Mapping a landscape of narrative inquiry: Borderland spaces and tensions. In D.J. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology* (pp. 35–75). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clark, M.C., & Sharf, B.F. (2007). The dark side of truth(s): Ethical dilemmas in researching the personal. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 13(3), 399–416. doi:10.1177/1077800406297662
- Clary, R. M., & Wandersee, J. H. (2007). A mixed methods analysis of the effects of an integrative geobiological study of petrified wood in introductory college geology classrooms. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 44(8), 1011–1035. doi:10.1002/tea.20178
- Cobb, P., Confrey, J., diSessa, A., Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2003). Design experiments in educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 32(1), 9–13.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). Research methods in education (7th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- DeBoer, G. E. (2011). The globalization of science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48(6), 567–591. doi:10.1002/tea.20421
- Dee, T.S., & Jacob, B. (2011). The impact of No Child Left Behind on student achievement. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 30(3), 418–446.
- Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2011). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), SAGE handbook of qualitative research (4th ed., pp. 1–19). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dewey, J. (1925/1981). Experience and nature. In J.A. Boydston (Ed.), John Dewey: The later works, 1925–1953 (Vol. 1). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. (Reprinted from: 1997).
- Dewey, J. (1938/1991). Logic: The theory of inquiry. In J.A. Boydston (Ed.), John Dewey: The later works, 1925–1953 (Vol. 12). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Duit, R., Gropengießer, H., Kattmann, U., Komorek, K., & Parchmann, I. (2012). The model of educational reconstruction—A framework for improving teaching and learning science. In D. Jorde & J. Dillon (Eds.), Science education research and practice in Europe: Retrospective and prospective (pp. 13–38). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Duit, R., Roth, W.M., Komorek, M., & Wilbers, J. (1998). Conceptual change cum discourse analysis to understand cognition in a unit on chaotic systems: Towards an integrative perspective on learning in science. *International Journal of Science Education*, 20(9), 1059– 1073. doi:10.1080/0950069980200904
- Duit, R., Roth, W.M., Komorek, M., & Wilbers, J. (2001). Fostering conceptual change by analogies—between Scylla and Charybdis. *Learning and Instruction*, 11(4), 283–303. doi:10.1016/S0959– 4752(00)00034–7
- Dulfer, N., Polesel, J., & Rice, S. (2012). The experience of education: The impacts of high stakes testing on school students and their families. Sydney, Australia: Whitlam Institute, University of Western Sydney.
- Eggert, S., & Bögeholz, S. (2006). Göttinger Modell der Bewertungskompetenz—Teilkompetenz "Bewerten, Entscheiden und Reflektieren" für Gestaltungsaufgaben nachhaltiger Entwicklung [The Göttingen Model of evaluation and judgment competence—evaluating, deciding, and reflecting in the area of sustainable development]. Zeitschrift für Didaktik der Naturwissenschaften, 12, 177–197.
- Einarsdottir, J. (2007). Research with children: Methodological and ethical challenges. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 15(2), 197–211. doi:10.1080/13502930701321477
- Eisenhart, M. (2000). Boundaries and selves in the making of science. *Research in Science Education*, 30(1), 43–55.
- Eisenhart, M., Finkel, E., & Marion, S. (1996). Creating conditions for scientific literacy: A re-examination. *American Educational Research Journal*, 33(2), 261–295.
- Elmesky, R., & Tobin, K.G. (2005). Expanding our understandings of urban science education by expanding the roles of students as

researchers. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 42(7), 807–828. doi:10.1002/tea.20079

- Ercikan, K., & Roth, W.-M. (2006). What good is polarizing research into qualitative and quantitative? *Educational Researcher*, 35(5), 14–23. doi:10.3102/0013189X035005014
- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 119–161). New York: MacMillan.
- Erickson, F. (2012). Qualitative research methods for science education. In B.J. Fraser, K.G. Tobin, & C.J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (Vol. 2, pp. 1451–1469). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Erickson, F., & Gutierrez, K. (2002). Comment: Culture, rigor, and science in educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 31(8), 21–24. doi:10.3102/0013189x031008021
- Etherington, K. (2007). Ethical research in reflexive relationships. Qualitative Inquiry, 13(5), 599–616. doi:10.1177/1077800407301175
- Feuer, M.J., Towne, L., & Shavelson, R.J. (2002). Scientific culture and educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 31(8), 4–14. doi:10.3102/0013189x031008004
- Fine, M., Weis, L., Weseen, S., & Wong, L. (2000). For whom?: Qualitative research, representations, and social responsibilities. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 107–131). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Flores-González, N., Rodriguez, M., & Rodriguez-Muniz, M. (2006). From hip-hop to humanization: Batey Urbano as a space for Latino youth culture and community action. In S. Ginwright, P. Noguera, & J. Cammorota (Eds.), *Beyond resistance! Youth activism and community change* (pp. 175–196). New York: Routledge.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). How to design and evaluate research in education (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fusco, D. (2001). Creating relevant science through urban planning and gardening. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38(8), 860–877.
- Gage, N.L. (1989). The paradigm wars and their aftermath: A "historical" sketch of research on teaching since 1989. *Educational Researcher*, 18(7), 4–10.
- Gallas, K. (1995). Talking their way into science: Hearing children's questions and theories, responding with curricula. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gallas, K. (1997). Sometimes I can be anything: Power, gender, and identity in a primary classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic Books.
- Greene, J.C. (2008). Is mixed methods social inquiry a distinctive methodology? *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 2(1), 7–22. doi:10.1177/1558689807309969
- Greenwood, D.J., & Levin, M. (1998). Introduction to action research: Social research for social change. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Griffiths, M. (1998). Educational research for social justice: Getting off the fence. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1989). Judging the quality of fourth generation evaluation. London: Sage.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), SAGE handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed., pp. 191–215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hammond, L., & Brandt, C. (2004). Science and cultural process: Defining an anthropological approach to science education. *Studies in Science Education*, 40(1), 1–47. doi:10.1080/03057260408560202
- Harding, S. (1991). Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Hohenshell, L., & Hand, B. (2006). Writing-to-learn strategies in secondary school cell biology: A mixed method study. *International Journal of Science Education*, 28(2–3), 261–289. doi:10.1080/ 09500690500336965

- Holstenbach, J., Fischer, H., Kauertz, A., Mayer, J., Sumfleth, E., & Walpuski, M. (2011). Modellierung der Bewertungskompetenz in den Naturwissenschaften zur Evaluation der Nationalen Bildungsstandards [Modeling the evaluation and judgment competence in science to evaluate national educational standards]. Zeitschrift für Didaktik der Naturwissenschaften, 17, 261–287.
- Howe, K.R. (2009). Positivist dogmas, rhetoric, and the education science question. *Educational Researcher*, 38(6), 428–440. doi:10.3102/ 0013189X09342003
- Jaeger, R. M. (1997). Survey research methods in education. In R. M. Jaeger (Ed.), *Complementary methods for research in education* (2nd ed., pp. 449–476). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Jones, M., & Stanley, G. (2008). Children's lost voices: Ethical issues in relation to undertaking collaborative, practice-based projects involving schools and the wider community. *Educational Action Research*, 16(1), 31–41. doi:10.1080/09650790701833089
- Kincheloe, J. L. (2003). Critical research in science education. In B.J. Fraser & K.G. Tobin (Eds.), *International handbook of science education* (Vol. 2, pp. 1191–1205). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2005). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 303–342). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kincheloe, J.L., & Steinberg, S.R. (1998). Students as researchers: Critical visions, emancipatory insights. In S.R. Steinberg & J.L. Kincheloe (Eds.), *Students as researchers: Creating classrooms that matter* (pp. 2–19). London: Falmer Press.
- Kincheloe, J.L., & Tobin, K.G. (2009). The much exaggerated death of positivism. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 4, 513–528. doi:10.1007/s11422–009–9178–5
- Kuhn, T.S. (1962). The structure of scientific revolution. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lee, O. (2002). Promoting scientific inquiry with elementary students from diverse cultures and languages. *Review of Research in Education*, 26, 23–69.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). Paradigm controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 163–188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? *Educational Researcher*, 17(2), 13–17.
- Maulucci, M. S. R. (2012). Social justice research in science education: Methodologies, positioning, and implications for future research. In B. J. Fraser, K.G. Tobin, & C.J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (Vol. 1, pp. 583–594). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Maxwell, J.A. (2004). Reemergent scientism, postmodernism, and dialogue across differences. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(1), 35–41. doi:10.1177/1077800403259492
- Merriam, S.B. (2009). Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Morgan, D.L. (2007). Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained: Methodological implications of combining qualitative and qualitative methods. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 1(1), 48–76. doi:10.1177/2345678906292462
- Moss, P.A., Phillips, D.C., Erickson, F.D., Floden, R.E., Lather, P.A., & Schneider, B.L. (2009). Learning from our differences: A dialogue across perspectives on quality in education research. *Educational Researcher*, 38(7), 501–517. doi:10.3102/0013189X09348351
- Noddings, N. (1998). Perspectives from feminist philosophy. Educational Researcher, 27(5), 17–18. doi:10.3102/0013189X027005017
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2010). *PISA* 2009 results: What students know and can do: Student performance on reading mathematics and science (Vol. 1). Paris, France: OECD Publishing.

Paley, V. G. (1981). Wally's stories. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Phillips, D.C. (2005). The contested nature of empirical educational research (and why philosophy of education offers little help). *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 39(4), 577–597. doi:10.1111/ j.1467-9752.2005.00457.x
- Phillips, D.C., & Burbules, N.C. (2000). Postpositivism and educational research. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Porter, A.C. (1997). Comparative experiments in educational research. In R.M. Jaeger (Ed.), *Complementary methods for research in education* (2nd ed., pp. 523–544). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Prain, V., & Waldrip, B. (2006). An exploratory study of teachers' and students' use of multi-modal representations of concepts in primary science. *International Journal of Science Education*, 28(15), 1843–1866. doi:10.1080/09500690600718294
- Punch, K.F. (2005). Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Reeves, T. (1997). Educational paradigms. In C.R. Dills & A.J. Romiszowski (Eds.), *Instructional development paradigms* (pp. 163–178). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Roth, W.-M., & Desautels, J. (2002). Science education as/for sociopolitical action: Charting the landscape. In W.-M. Roth & J. Désautels (Eds.), *Science education as/for sociopolitical action* (pp. 1–16). New York: Peter Lang.
- Ryoo, K., & Linn, M.C. (2012). Can dynamic visualization improve middle school students' understanding of energy in photosynthesis? *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 49(2), 218–243. doi:10. 1002/tea.21003
- Schwandt, T.A. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructionism. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 189–214). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schwandt, T.A. (2001). Dictionary of qualitative inquiry (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- St. Pierre, E. A. (2002). Comment: "Science" rejects postmodernism. Educational Researcher, 31(8), 25–27. doi:10.3102/0013189x031008025
- Tan, E., & Barton, A.C. (2008). Unpacking science for all through the lens of identities-in-practice: The stories of Amelia and Ginny. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 3(1), 43–71. doi:10.1007/ s11422–007–9076–7
- Taylor, P. C., Taylor, E., & Luitel, B. C. (2012). Multi-paradigmatic transformative research as/for teacher education: An integral perspective.

In B.J. Fraser, K.G. Tobin, & C.J. McRobbie (Eds.), *Second international handbook of science education* (Vol. 1, pp. 373–387). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

- Thomson, S., Hillman, K., & Wernert, N. (2012). Monitoring Australian Year 8 student achievement internationally: TIMSS 2011. Camberwell, Victoria: Australian Council of Educational Research Ltd.
- Tracy, S.J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight "big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837–851. doi:10.1177/1077800410383121
- Treagust, D.F., Jacobowitz, R., Gallagher, J.L., & Parker, J. (2001). Using assessment as a guide in teaching for understanding: A case study of a middle school science class learning about sound. *Journal* of Research in Science Teaching, 85(2), 137–157.
- Ucar, S., Trundle, K.C., & Krissek, L. (2011). Inquiry-based instruction with archived, online data: An intervention study with preservice teachers. *Research in Science Education*, 41(2), 261–282. doi:10.1007/s11165–009–9164–7
- van Borkulo, S. P., van Joolingen, W. R., Savelsbergh, E. R., & de Jong, T. (2012). What can be learned from computer modeling? Comparing expository and modeling approaches to teaching dynamic systems behavior. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 21(2), 267–275. doi:10.1007/s10956-011-9314-3
- Velayutham, S., Aldridge, J., & Fraser, B.J. (2011). Development and validation of an instrument to measure students' motivation and self-regulation in science learning. *International Journal of Science Education*, 33(15), 2159–2179. doi:10.1080/09500693.2010. 541529
- Waddington, D., Nentwig, P., & Schanze, S. (2007). Making it comparable: Standards in science education. Münster, Germany: Waxmann.
- Warren, B., Ballenger, C., Ogonowski, M., Rosebery, A. S., & Hudicourt-Barnes, J. (2001). Rethinking diversity in learning science: The logic of everyday sense-making. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 38(5), 529–552.
- Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S.G. (2005). Research methods in education: An introduction (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Wilbers, J., & Duit, R. (2005). Post-festum and heuristic analogies. In P.J. Aubusson, A. G. Harrison, & S. M. Richie (Eds.), *Metaphors and analogy in science education* (Vol. 32, pp. 1073–1098). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
- Wolcott, H. F. (2009). Writing up qualitative research (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wong, E. D. (2002). To appreciate variation between scientists: A perspective for seeing science's vitality. *Science Education*, 86(3), 386–400.

Paradigms in Science Education Research

Aikenhead, G. S., & Jegede, O. J. (1999). Cross-cultural education: A cognitive explanation of a cultural phenomenon. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36 (3), 269–287.

Allen, N. J., & Crawley, F. E. (1998). Voices from the bridge: Worldview conflicts of Kickapoo students of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35 (2), 111–132.

American Educational Research Association . (2011). Code of ethics. Educational Researcher, 40 (3), 145–156.

Anderson, C. W. (2007). Perspectives on science learning. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 3–30). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Anderson, G. (1998). Fundamentals of educational research (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Anderson, G. , Herr, K. , & Nihlen, A. S. (1994). Studying your own school: An educator's guide to qualitative practitioner research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Australian Association for Research in Education . (2005). Annotated bibliography—Ethics in educational research. Retrieved June 2013, from www1.aare.edu.au/pages/static/aareethc.htm

Barton, A. C. (1998). Teaching science with homeless children: Pedagogy, representation, and identity. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35 (4), 379–394.

Barton, A. C., & Osborne, M. D. (1998). Marginalized discourses and pedagogies: Constructively confronting science for all. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35 (4), 339–340.

Barton, A. C., & Osborne, M. D. (2001). Introduction. Teaching science in diverse settings: Marginalized discourses and classroom practice. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

Barton, A. C. , & Yang, K. (2000). The culture of power and science education: Learning from Miguel. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37 (8), 871–889.

Bouillion, L. M., & Gomez, L. M. (2001). Connecting school and community with science learning: Real world problems and

school–community partnerships as contextual scaffolds. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (8), 878–898. Bredo, E. (2009). Comments on Howe: Getting over the methodology wars. Educational Researcher, 38 (6), 441–448.

doi:10.3102/0013189x09343607

Brickhouse, N. W., Lowery, P., & Schultz, K. (2000). What kind of a girl does science? The construction of school science identities. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37 (5), 441–458.

Bryman, A. (2008). The end of paradigm wars? In P. Alasuutari , L. Bickman , & J. Brannen (Eds.), SAGE handbook of social research methods (pp. 12–26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bryman, A. (2012). Social research methods (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carlone, H. B. (2004). The cultural production of science in reform-based physics: Girls' access, participation, and resistance. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (4), 392–414.

Carter, L. (2007). Sociocultural influences on science education: Innovation for contemporary times. Science Education, 92 (1), 165–181. doi:10.1002/sce.20228

Clandinin, D. J., & Rosiek, J. (2007). Mapping a landscape of narrative inquiry: Borderland spaces and tensions. In D. J. Clandinin (Ed.), Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology (pp. 35–75). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Clark, M. C., & Sharf, B. F. (2007). The dark side of truth(s): Ethical dilemmas in researching the personal. Qualitative Inquiry, 13 (3), 399–416. doi:10.1177/1077800406297662

Clary, R. M., & Wandersee, J. H. (2007). A mixed methods analysis of the effects of an integrative geobiological study of petrified wood in introductory college geology classrooms. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (8), 1011–1035. doi:10.1002/tea.20178

Cobb, P., Confrey, J., diSessa, A., Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2003). Design experiments in educational research. Educational Researcher, 32 (1), 9–13.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). Research methods in education (7th ed.). London: Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

DeBoer, G. E. (2011). The globalization of science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (6), 567–591. doi:10.1002/tea.20421

Dee, T. S., & Jacob, B. (2011). The impact of No Child Left Behind on student achievement. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 30 (3), 418–446.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), SAGE handbook of qualitative research (4th ed., pp. 1–19). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dewey, J. (1925/1981). Experience and nature. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), John Dewey: The later works, 1925–1953 (Vol. 1). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press. (Reprinted from: 1997).

Dewey, J. (1938/1991). Logic: The theory of inquiry. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), John Dewey: The later works, 1925–1953 (Vol. 12). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Duit, R., Gropengießer, H., Kattmann, U., Komorek, K., & Parchmann, I. (2012). The model of educational reconstruction—A framework for improving teaching and learning science. In D. Jorde & J. Dillon (Eds.), Science education research and practice in Europe: Retrospective and prospective (pp. 13–38). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Duit, R., Roth, W. M., Komorek, M., & Wilbers, J. (1998). Conceptual change cum discourse analysis to understand cognition in a unit on chaotic systems: Towards an integrative perspective on learning in science. International Journal of Science Education, 20 (9), 1059–1073. doi:10.1080/0950069980200904

Duit, R. , Roth, W. M. , Komorek, M. , & Wilbers, J. (2001). Fostering conceptual change by analogies—between Scylla and Charybdis. Learning and Instruction, 11 (4), 283–303. doi:10.1016/S0959–4752(00)00034–7

Dulfer, N., Polesel, J., & Rice, S. (2012). The experience of education: The impacts of high stakes testing on school students and their families. Sydney, Australia: Whitlam Institute, University of Western Sydney.

Eggert, S. , & Bögeholz, S. (2006). Göttinger Modell der Bewertungskompetenz—Teilkompetenz "Bewerten, Entscheiden und Reflektieren" für Gestaltungsaufgaben nachhaltiger Entwicklung [The Göttingen Model of evaluation and judgment competence—evaluating, deciding, and reflecting in the area of sustainable development]. Zeitschrift für Didaktik der Naturwissenschaften, 12, 177–197.

Einarsdottir, J. (2007). Research with children: Methodological and ethical challenges. European Early Childhood Education Research Journal, 15 (2), 197–211. doi:10.1080/13502930701321477

Eisenhart, M. (2000). Boundaries and selves in the making of science. Research in Science Education, 30 (1), 43-55.

Eisenhart, M., Finkel, E., & Marion, S. (1996). Creating conditions for scientific literacy: A re-examination. American Educational Research Journal, 33 (2), 261–295.

Elmesky, R., & Tobin, K. G. (2005). Expanding our understandings of urban science education by expanding the roles of students as researchers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42 (7), 807–828. doi:10.1002/tea.20079

Ercikan, K., & Roth, W.-M. (2006). What good is polarizing research into qualitative and quantitative? Educational Researcher, 35 (5), 14–23. doi:10.3102/0013189X035005014

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed., pp. 119–161). New York: MacMillan.

Erickson, F. (2012). Qualitative research methods for science education. In B. J. Fraser , K. G. Tobin , & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (Vol. 2, pp. 1451–1469). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Erickson, F., & Gutierrez, K. (2002). Comment: Culture, rigor, and science in educational research. Educational Researcher, 31 (8), 21–24. doi:10.3102/0013189x031008021

Etherington, K. (2007). Ethical research in reflexive relationships. Qualitative Inquiry, 13 (5), 599–616. doi:10.1177/1077800407301175 Feuer, M. J., Towne, L., & Shavelson, R. J. (2002). Scientific culture and educational research. Educational Researcher, 31 (8), 4–14. doi:10.3102/0013189x031008004

Fine, M., Weis, L., Weseen, S., & Wong, L. (2000). For whom?: Qualitative research, representations, and social responsibilities. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed., pp. 107–131). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Flores-González, N., Rodriguez, M., & Rodriguez-Muniz, M. (2006). From hip-hop to humanization: Batey Urbano as a space for Latino youth culture and community action. In S. Ginwright, P. Noguera, & J. Cammorota (Eds.), Beyond resistance! Youth activism and community change (pp. 175–196). New York: Routledge.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). How to design and evaluate research in education (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill. Fusco, D. (2001). Creating relevant science through urban planning and gardening. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (8), 860–877.

Gage, N. L. (1989). The paradigm wars and their aftermath: A "historical" sketch of research on teaching since 1989. Educational Researcher, 18 (7), 4–10.

Gallas, K. (1995). Talking their way into science: Hearing children's questions and theories, responding with curricula. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gallas, K. (1997). Sometimes I can be anything: Power, gender, and identity in a primary classroom. New York: Teachers College Press. Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic Books.

Greene, J. C. (2008). Is mixed methods social inquiry a distinctive methodology? Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 2 (1), 7–22. doi:10.1177/1558689807309969

Greenwood, D. J., & Levin, M. (1998). Introduction to action research: Social research for social change. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Griffiths, M. (1998). Educational research for social justice: Getting off the fence. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Judging the quality of fourth generation evaluation. London: Sage.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 105–117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), SAGE handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed., pp. 191–215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hammond, L., & Brandt, C. (2004). Science and cultural process: Defining an anthropological approach to science education. Studies in Science Education, 40 (1), 1–47. doi:10.1080/03057260408560202

Harding, S. (1991). Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hohenshell, L., & Hand, B. (2006). Writing-to-learn strategies in secondary school cell biology: A mixed method study. International Journal of Science Education, 28 (2–3), 261–289. doi:10.1080/09500690500336965

Holstenbach, J., Fischer, H., Kauertz, A., Mayer, J., Sumfleth, E., & Walpuski, M. (2011). Modellierung der Bewertungskompetenz in den Naturwissenschaften zur Evaluation der Nationalen Bildungsstandards [Modeling the evaluation and judgment competence in science to evaluate national educational standards]. Zeitschrift für Didaktik der Naturwissenschaften, 17, 261–287.

Howe, K. R. (2009). Positivist dogmas, rhetoric, and the education science question. Educational Researcher, 38 (6), 428–440. doi:10.3102/0013189X09342003

Jaeger, R. M. (1997). Survey research methods in education. In R. M. Jaeger (Ed.), Complementary methods for research in education (2nd ed., pp. 449–476). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Jones, M., & Stanley, G. (2008). Children's lost voices: Ethical issues in relation to undertaking collaborative, practice-based projects involving schools and the wider community. Educational Action Research, 16 (1), 31–41. doi:10.1080/09650790701833089

Kincheloe, J. L. (2003). Critical research in science education. In B. J. Fraser & K. G. Tobin (Eds.), International handbook of science education (Vol. 2, pp. 1191–1205). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2005). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed., pp. 303–342). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (1998). Students as researchers: Critical visions, emancipatory insights. In S. R. Steinberg & J. L. Kincheloe (Eds.), Students as researchers: Creating classrooms that matter (pp. 2–19). London: Falmer Press.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Tobin, K. G. (2009). The much exaggerated death of positivism. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 4, 513–528. doi:10.1007/s11422–009–9178–5

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). The structure of scientific revolution. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lee, O. (2002). Promoting scientific inquiry with elementary students from diverse cultures and languages. Review of Research in Education, 26, 23–69.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). Paradigm controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed., pp. 163–188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? Educational Researcher, 17 (2), 13–17.

Maulucci, M. S. R. (2012). Social justice research in science education: Methodologies, positioning, and implications for future research. In B. J. Fraser , K. G. Tobin , & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (Vol. 1, pp. 583–594). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Maxwell, J. A. (2004). Reemergent scientism, postmodernism, and dialogue across differences. Qualitative Inquiry, 10 (1), 35–41. doi:10.1177/1077800403259492

Merriam, S. B. (2009). Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morgan, D. L. (2007). Paradigms lost and pragmatism regained: Methodological implications of combining qualitative and qualitative methods. Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1 (1), 48–76. doi:10.1177/2345678906292462

Moss, P. A., Phillips, D. C., Erickson, F. D., Floden, R. E., Lather, P. A., & Schneider, B. L. (2009). Learning from our differences: A dialogue across perspectives on quality in education research. Educational Researcher, 38 (7), 501–517. doi:10.3102/0013189X09348351 Noddings, N. (1998). Perspectives from feminist philosophy. Educational Researcher, 27 (5), 17–18. doi:10.3102/0013189X027005017 Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development . (2010). PISA 2009 results: What students know and can do: Student performance on reading mathematics and science (Vol. 1). Paris, France: OECD Publishing.

Paley, V. G. (1981). Wally's stories. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Phillips, D. C. (2005). The contested nature of empirical educational research (and why philosophy of education offers little help). Journal of Philosophy of Education, 39 (4), 577–597. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9752.2005.00457.x

Phillips, D. C., & Burbules, N. C. (2000). Postpositivism and educational research. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Porter, A. C. (1997). Comparative experiments in educational research. In R. M. Jaeger (Ed.), Complementary methods for research in education (2nd ed., pp. 523–544). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Prain, V., & Waldrip, B. (2006). An exploratory study of teachers' and students' use of multi-modal representations of concepts in primary science. International Journal of Science Education, 28 (15), 1843–1866. doi:10.1080/09500690600718294

Punch, K. F. (2005). Introduction to social research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Reeves, T. (1997). Educational paradigms. In C. R. Dills & A. J. Romiszowski (Eds.), Instructional development paradigms (pp. 163–178). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Roth, W.-M., & Desautels, J. (2002). Science education as/for sociopolitical action: Charting the landscape. In W.-M. Roth & J. Désautels (Eds.), Science education as/for sociopolitical action (pp. 1–16). New York: Peter Lang.

Ryoo, K., & Linn, M. C. (2012). Can dynamic visualization improve middle school students' understanding of energy in photosynthesis? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (2), 218–243. doi:10. 1002/tea.21003

Schwandt, T. A. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructionism. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed., pp. 189–214). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schwandt, T. A. (2001). Dictionary of qualitative inquiry (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

St. Pierre, E. A. (2002). Comment: "Science" rejects postmodernism. Educational Researcher, 31 (8), 25–27.

doi:10.3102/0013189x031008025

Tan, E., & Barton, A. C. (2008). Unpacking science for all through the lens of identities-in-practice: The stories of Amelia and Ginny. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3 (1), 43–71. doi:10.1007/s11422–007–9076–7

Taylor, P. C., Taylor, E., & Luitel, B. C. (2012). Multi-paradigmatic transformative research as/for teacher education: An integral perspective. In B. J. Fraser, K. G. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (Vol. 1, pp. 373–387). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Thomson, S., Hillman, K., & Wernert, N. (2012). Monitoring Australian Year 8 student achievement internationally: TIMSS 2011. Camberwell, Victoria: Australian Council of Educational Research Ltd.

Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight "big-tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research. Qualitative Inquiry, 16 (10), 837–851. doi:10.1177/1077800410383121

Treagust, D. F., Jacobowitz, R., Gallagher, J. L., & Parker, J. (2001). Using assessment as a guide in teaching for understanding: A case study of a middle school science class learning about sound. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 85 (2), 137–157.

Ucar, S. , Trundle, K. C. , & Krissek, L. (2011). Inquiry-based instruction with archived, online data: An intervention study with pre-service teachers. Research in Science Education, 41 (2), 261–282. doi:10.1007/s11165–009–9164–7

van Borkulo, S. P., van Joolingen, W. R., Savelsbergh, E. R., & de Jong, T. (2012). What can be learned from computer modeling? Comparing expository and modeling approaches to teaching dynamic systems behavior. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 21 (2), 267–275. doi:10.1007/s10956-011-9314-3

Velayutham, S., Aldridge, J., & Fraser, B. J. (2011). Development and validation of an instrument to measure students' motivation and self-regulation in science learning. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (15), 2159–2179. doi:10.1080/09500693.2010. 541529 Waddington, D., Nentwig, P., & Schanze, S. (2007). Making it comparable: Standards in science education. Münster, Germany: Waxmann.

Warren, B., Ballenger, C., Ogonowski, M., Rosebery, A. S., & Hudicourt-Barnes, J. (2001). Rethinking diversity in learning science: The logic of everyday sense-making. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (5), 529–552.

Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2005). Research methods in education: An introduction (8th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Wilbers, J., & Duit, R. (2005). Post-festum and heuristic analogies. In P. J. Aubusson , A. G. Harrison , & S. M. Richie (Eds.), Metaphors and analogy in science education (Vol. 32, pp. 1073–1098). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Wolcott, H. F. (2009). Writing up qualitative research (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wong, E. D. (2002). To appreciate variation between scientists: A perspective for seeing science's vitality. Science Education, 86 (3), 386–400.

Quantitative Research Designs and Approaches

Bacon, F. (1904). Novum organum (translated by W. Wood). In J. Devey (ed.), The physical and metaphysical works of Lord Bacon, including the advancement of learning and novum organum (pp. 380–567). London: Bell and Sons.

Baumert, J., Kunter, M., Blum, W., Brunner, M., Voss, T., Jordan, A., & Tsai, Y.-M. (2010). Teachers' mathematical knowledge, cognitive activation in the classroom, and student progress. American Educational Research Journal, 47, 133–180.

Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). Research in education (10th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Blalock, H. M. (1968). Measurement problem: A gap between the languages of theory and research. In Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., & Ann B. Blalock (Eds.), Methodology in social research (pp. 5–27). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Boone, W., Townsend, S., & Staver, J. (2011). Using Rasch theory to guide the practice of survey development and survey data analysis in science education and to inform science reform efforts: An exemplar utilizing STEBI self-efficacy data. Science Education, 95 (2), 258–290.

Boone, W. J., & Scantlebury, K. (2006). The role of Rasch analysis when conducting science education research utilizing multiple-choice tests. Science Education, 90, 253–269.

Boone, W. J., Staver, J., & Yale, M. (2014). Rasch Analysis in the Human Sciences. Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Bortz, J. (2005). *Statistik für Human- und Sozialwissenschaftler: Mit 242 Tabellen* (6., vollständig überarbeitete und aktualisierte Aufl.). [Statistics for human- and social sciences: including 242 tables (6th edition, completely revised and updated)]. Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer.

Breuer, F., & Reichertz, J. (2002). FQS debates: Standards of qualitative social research. Historical Social Research, 27 (4), 258–269. Brown, T., Unsworth, C., & Lyons, C. (2009). An evaluation of the construct validity of the developmental test of visual-motor integration using the Rasch measurement model. Therapy Journal, 56 (6), 393–402.

Bryk, A. S., & Raudenbush, S. W. (1992). Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods. Newbury Park, CA, London, New Delhi: Sage.

Chi, M. (1994). Eliciting self-explanations improves understanding. Cognitive Science, 18 (3), 439–477. doi:10.1016/0364-0213(94)90016-7

Clausen, M. (2000). Wahrnehmung von Unterricht, Übereinstimmung, Konstruktvalidität und *Kriteriumsvalidität in der Forschung zur Unterrichtsqualität* (Dissertation). [Perceiving lessons, accordance, construct validity and criterion validity in research on quality of instruction]. Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin.

Clauser, B., & Linacre, J. M. (1999). Relating Cronbach and Rasch reliabilities. Rasch Measurement Transactions, 13 (2), 696. Cronbach, L., & Snow, R. (1977). Aptitudes and instructional methods: A handbook for research on interactions. New York: Irvington. Ditton, H. (2000). Qualitätskontrolle und Qualitätssicherung in Schule und Unterricht: Ein Überblick zum Stand der empirischen Forschung. [Quality control and quality management for school and instruction.] In A. Helmke , W. Hornstein , & E. Terhart (Eds.), *Qualität und Qualitätssicherung im Bildungsbereich: Schule, Sozialpädagogik, Hochschule* (S. 73–92) [Quality and quality management in education: School, social pedagogy, university]. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik, 41. Beiheft*.

Driver, R., Leach, J., Scott, P., & Wood-Robinson, C. (1994). Young people's understanding of science concepts: Implications of crossage studies for curriculum planning. Studies in Science Education, 24, 75–100.

Duit, R. (1984). Learning the energy concept in school—empirical results from the Philippines and West Germany. Physics Education, 19, 59–66.

Family Report . (2012). Family Report interpretive guide for Ohio achievement assessments. Ohio Department of Education, Columbus Ohio. Retrieved April 19, 2013, from http://education.ohio.gov/Topics/Testing/Ohio-Achievement-Assessments/Family-Report-Interpretive-Guide-for-Ohio-Achievem

Field, A. (2005). Discovering statistics using SPSS. London: Sage Publications.

Fischer, H. E., Klemm, K., Leutner, D., Sumfleth, E., Tiemann, R., & Wirth, J. (2005). Framework for empirical research on science teaching and learning. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 16, 309–349.

Fischer, H. E., & Neumann, K. (2012). Video analysis as tool for understanding science instruction. In D. Jorde & J. Dillon (Eds.), Science education research and practice in Europe (pp. 115–140). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Fisher, W., Jr. (1992). Reliability, separation, strata statistics. Rasch Measurement Transactions, 6 (3), 238.

Fricke, K., van Ackeren, I., Kauertz, A., & Fischer, H. E. (2012). Students' perceptions of their teacher's classroom management in elementary and secondary science lessons. In T. Wubbels, J. van Tartwijk, P. den Brok, & J. Levy (Eds.), Interpersonal relationships in education (pp. 167–185). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Furtak, E. M., Seidel, T., Iverson, H., & Briggs, D. (2012). Experimental and quasi-experimental studies of inquiry-based science teaching: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 82 (3), 300–329.

Gess-Newsome, J. , & Lederman, N. G. (Eds.). (1999). Examining pedagogical content knowledge. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Granger, C. (2008). Rasch analysis is important to understand and use for measurement. Rasch Measurement Transactions, 21 (3), 1122–1123.

Gwet, K. L. (2012). Handbook of inter-rater reliability, the definitive guide to measuring the extent of agreement among raters. Gaithersburg, MD: Advanced Analytics, LLC.

Hammer, D. (1996). More than misconceptions: Multiple perspectives on student knowledge and reasoning, and an appropriate role for education research. American Journal of Physics, 64, 1316.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77, 81–112.

Haynes, S. N., Richard, D. C. S., & Kubany, E. S. (1995). Content validity in psychological assessment: A functional approach to concepts and methods. Psychological Assessment, 7 (3), 238–247.

Hestenes, D., Wells, M., & Swackhamer, G. (1992). Force concept inventory. The Physics Teacher, 30, 141–166. Hiebert, J., Gallimore, R., Garnier, H., Bogard Givvin, K., Hollingsworth, H., & Jacobs, J. (2003). Teaching mathematics in seven countries: Results from the TIMSS 1999 video study. Retrieved February 20, 2013, from http://research.acer.edu.au/timss_video/5 Hox, J. J. (2010). Multilevel analysis: Techniques and applications. New York: Routledge.
Kapadia, K., Coca, V., & Easton, J. Q. (2007). Keeping new teachers— research report, consortium on Chicago school research (CCSR). Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research (CCSR).

Kauertz, A., & Fischer, H. E. (2006). Assessing students' level of knowledge and analyzing the reasons for learning difficulties in physics by Rasch analysis. In X. Liu & W. J. Boone (Eds.), Applications of Rasch measurement in science education (pp. 212–246). Maple Grove, MN: JAM Press.

Klieme, E., Pauli, C., & Reusser, K. (Eds.). (2006). Dokumentation der Erhebungs-und Auswertungsinstrumente zur schweizerischdeutschen Videostudie "Unterrichtsqualität, Lernverhalten und mathematisches Verständnis." Teil 3: Videoanalysen (Materialien zur Bildungsforschung, Bd. 15, Deutsches Institut für internationale pädagogische Forschung). [Documentation of the instruments of the Swiss-German video study, lesson quality, learning behavior, and mathematical understanding Part 3: Video analysis (material for educational research, volume 15, German Institute for International Educational Research)]. Frankfurt am Main: GFPF.

Kolen, M. J., & Brennan, R. L. (2004). Test equating, scaling, and linking: Methods and practices (2nd ed.). New York: Springer. Krajcik, J., Drago, K., Sutherland, L. A., & Merritt, J. (2012). The promise and value of learning progression research. In S. Bernholt, P. Nentwig, & K. Neumann (Eds.), Making it tangible—learning outcomes in science education (pp. 261–283). Münster: Waxmann. Lederman, N. G. (2006). Syntax of nature of science within inquiry and science instruction. In L. B. Flick & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Scientific inquiry and nature of science (pp. 301–317). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Lederman, N. G. (2007). Nature of science: Past, present, and future. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 831–879). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lederman, N. G., Abd-El Khalick, F., Bell, R. L., & Schwartz, R. (2002). Views of nature of science questionnaire: Toward valid and meaningful assessment of learners' conceptions of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 30, 497–521. Lee, H.-S., & Liu, O. L. (2010). Assessing learning progression of energy concepts across middle school grades: The knowledge integration perspective. Science Education, 94 (4), 665–688. doi:10.1002/sce.20382.

Linacre, J. M. (1994). Sample size and item calibrations stability. Rasch Measurement Transactions, 7 (4), 328.

Linacre, J. M. (1997). KR-20 or Rasch reliability: Which tells the "truth"? Rasch Measurement Transactions, 11 (3), 580-581.

Liu, X., & McKeough, A. (2005). Developmental growth in students' concept of energy: Analysis of selected items from the TIMSS database. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42 (5), 493–517.

Magnusson, S., Krajcik, J., & Borko, H. (1999). Nature, sources and development of pedagogical content knowledge for science teaching. In J. Gess-Newsome & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Examining pedagogical content knowledge (pp. 95–132). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Press.

Mayring, P. (1995). Möglichkeiten fallanalytischen Vorgehens zur Untersuchung von Lernstrategien. Empirische Pädagogik, 9 (2), 155–171.

Mayring, P. (2007). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods. In P. Mayring , G. L. Huber , L. Gürtler , & M. Kiegelmann (Eds.), Mixed methodology in psychological research (pp. 27–36). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Neumann, I., Neumann, K., & Nehm, R. (2011). Evaluating instrument quality in science education: Rasch-based analyses of a nature of science test. International Journal of Science Education, 10 (33), 1–33. doi:10.1080/09500693.2010.511297

Neumann, K., Kauertz, A., & Fischer, H. E. (2012). Quality of instruction in science education. In B. Fraser, K. Tobin, & C. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 247–258). New York: Springer.

Neumann, K., Viering, T., Boone, W. J., & Fischer, H. E. (2013). Towards a learning progression of energy. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50 (2), 162–188. doi:10.1002/tea.21061

New York Science Teacher . (2013). Common science conceptions. Retrieved February 2014 from

http://newyorkscienceteacher.com/sci/pages/miscon/subject-index.php

Niedderer, H., Buty, C., Haller, K., Hucke, L., Sander, F., Fischer, H. E., ... Tiberghien, A. (2002). Talking physics in labwork contexts—a category based analysis of videotapes. In D. Psillos & H. Niedderer (Eds.), Teaching and learning in the science laboratory (pp. 31–40). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Niedderer, H., Tiberghien, A., Buty, C., Haller, K., Hucke, L., Sander, F., ... Welzel, M. (1998). Category based analysis of videotapes from labwork (CBAV)—the method and results from four case studies. In Working paper 9 from the European project labwork in science education (Targeted Socio-Economic Research Programme, Project PL 95-2005), 51 pages.

Nordine, J., Krajcik, J., & Fortus, D. (2011). Transforming energy instruction in middle school to support integrated understanding and future learning. Science Education, 95 (4), 670–699. doi:10.1002/sce.20423

Oevermann, U., Allert, T., Konau, E., & Krambeck, J. (1979). Die Methodologie einer "objektiven Hermeneutik" und ihre allgemeine forschungslogische Bedeutung in den Sozialwissenschaften. In H.-G. Soeffner (Hrsg.): *Interpretative Verfahren in den Sozial-und Textwissenschaften* (S. 352–434). [The methodology of an "objective hermeneutic? and its general research logical significance in social sciences. In H.-G. Soeffner (Ed.): Interpretative methods in social sciences and text analysis]. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Oevermann, U., Allert, T., Konau, E., & Krambeck, J. (1987). Structures of meaning and objective hermeneutics. In V. Meja, D. Misgeld, & N. Stehr (Eds.), Modern German sociology, European perspectives: A series in social thought and cultural criticism (pp. 436–447). New York: Columbia University Press.

Ohle, A. (2010). Primary school teachers' content knowledge in physics and its impact on teaching and students' achievement. Berlin: Logos.

Ohle, A., Fischer, H. E., & Kauertz, A. (2011). Der Einfluss des physikalischen Fachwissens von Primarstufenlehrkräften auf Unterrichtsgestaltung und Schülerleistung. [The impact of physics content knowledge of primary school teachers on lesson design and students' performance]. Zeitschrift für Didaktik der Naturwissenschaften, 17, 357–389.

Olszewski, J. (2010). The impact of physics teachers' pedagogical content knowledge on teacher action and student outcomes (unpublished dissertation). Essen: University of Duisburg-Essen.

Olszewski, J., Neumann, K., & Fischer, H. E. (2009). Measuring physics teachers' declarative and procedural PCK. In Proceedings of the 7th International ESERA Conference, Istanbul, Turkey.

Osborne, J., Collins, S., Ratcliffe, M., Millar, R., & Duschl, R. (2003). What "ideas-about-science" should be taught in school science? A Delphi study of the expert community. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40 (7), 692–720.

Park, S. , & Oliver, S. J. (2008). Revisiting the conceptualization of pedagogical content knowledge (PCK): PCK as a conceptual tool to understand teachers as professionals. Research in Science Education, 38 (3), 261–284.

Popper, K. R. (1959). The logic of scientific discovery. London: Hutchinson.

Prenzel, M. (Ed.). (2004). *PISA 2003: Der Bildungsstand der Jugendlichen in Deutschland—Ergebnisse des zweiten internationalen Vergleichs* [PISA 2003: Student competence in Germany—Results from the second international comparison]. Münster, München, Berlin: Waxmann.

Rasch, G. (1960). Probabilistic models for some intelligence and attainment tests (reprint, with Foreword and Afterword by B. D. Wright, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980). Copenhagen, Denmark: Danmarks Paedogogiske Institut.

Raudenbush, S. W. , & Bryk, A. S. (2002). Hierarchical linear models (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Roth, K. J. , Druker, S. L. , Garnier, H. E. , Lemmens, M. , Chen, C. , Kawanaka, T. , ... Gallimore, R. (2006). Teaching science in five countries: Results from the TIMSS 1999 video study statistical analysis report. (NCES 2006–011). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved February 2014 from http://nces.ed.gov Ruiz-Primo, M. A. , Briggs, D. , Shepard, L. , Iverson, H. , & Huchton, M. (2008). Evaluating the impact of instructional innovations in engineering education. (Evaluando el impacto de las innovaciones instruccionales en la enseñaza de la ingeniería.) In M. Duque (Ed.), Engineering education for the XXI century: Foundations, strategies and cases (pp. 241–274). Bogotá, Colombia: ACOFI Publications. Seidel, T. , & Prenzel, M. (2006). Stability of teaching patterns in physics instruction: Findings from a video study. Learning and Instruction, 16 (3), 228–240.

Seidel, T., Prenzel, M., & Kobarg, M. (Eds.). (2005). How to run a video study. Technical report of the IPN Video Study. Münster: Waxmann.

Shavelson, R. J., & Towne, L. (Eds.). (2002). Scientific research in education. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Shrout, P. E., & Fleiss, J. L. (1979). Intraclass correlation: Uses in assessing rater reliability. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 420–428.

Smith, R. M. (1986). Person fit in the Rasch model. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 46 (2), 359-372.

Smith, R. M. (1991). The distributional properties of Rasch item fit statistics. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 51 (3), 541–565.

Smith, R. M. (1996). Polytomous mean-square fit statistics. Rasch Measurement Transactions, 10 (3), 516–517.

Smith, R. M., Linacre, J. M., & Smith, Jr., E. V. (2003). *Journal of Applied Measurement*, guidelines for manuscripts (n.d.). Jampress.org. Retrieved April 27, 2013, from www.rasch.org/guidelines.htm. Reprinted from Guidelines for Manuscripts. Journal of Applied Measurement, 4, 198–204.

Stelmack, J., Szlyk, J., Stelmack, T., Babcock-Parziale, J., Demers-Turco, P., Williams, R. T., & Massof, R. W. (2004). Use of Rasch person item map in exploratory data analysis: A clinical perspective. Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development, 41, 233–242. Stigler, J. W., & Hiebert, J. (1997). Understanding and improving mathematics instruction: An overview of the TIMSS Video Study. Phi Delta Kappa, 79 (1), 7–21.

Stigler, J. W., & Hiebert, J. (1999). The teaching gap: Best ideas from the world's teachers for improving education in the classroom. New York: Free Press.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (2008). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wright, B. D. (1995). Which standard error? Rasch Measurement Transactions, 9 (2), 436.

Wright, B. D., & Masters, G. N. (1982). Rating scale analysis: Rasch measurement. Chicago: MESA Press.

Wright, B. D., & Stone, M. H. (1979). Best test design: Rasch measurement. Chicago: MESA Press.

Contemporary Qualitative Research

Abrams, E., Taylor, P. C., & Guo, C. J. (2013). Contextualizing culturally relevant science and mathematics teaching for indigenous learning. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 11 (1), 1–21.

Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1994). Observational techniques. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 377–392). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Afonso-Nhalevilo, E. (2010). Endless journeys: An autoethnographic search for culturally inclusive philosophy of science teacher education in Mozambique. Saarbruken, Germany: VDM Publishing Group.

Banks, S. (2008). Writing as theory: In defense of fiction. In J. G. Knowles & A. L. Cole (Eds.), Handbook of the arts in qualitative research (pp. 155–164). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Barone, T. (2008). Creative nonfiction and social research. In J. G. Knowles & A. L. Cole (Eds.), Handbook of the arts in qualitative research (pp. 105–115). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Barone, T., & Eisner, E. W. (2012). Arts based research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bekoff, M. (2009). Foreword. In S. Esbjorn-Hargens & M. Zimmerman , Integral ecology: Uniting multiple perspectives on the natural world (pp. xix–xxxii). Boston, MA: Integral Books.

Belsey, C. (2002). Poststructuralism: A very short introduction. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Beverley, J. (2000). Testimonio, subalternity, and narrative authority. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed., pp. 555–565). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bohm, D., & Peat, F. D. (1987). Science, order, and creativity. New York: Bantam Books.

Bronner, S. E. (2011). Critical theory: A very short introduction. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Brookfield, S. D. (1995). Becoming a critically reflective teacher. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bryman, A. (2012). Social research methods (4th ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Carr, W. , & Kemmis, S. (1986). Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action. London: Falmer.

Chase, S. E. (2005). Narrative inquiry: Multiple lenses, approaches, voices. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed., pp. 651–679). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1994). Personal experience methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 413–427). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). Research methods in education (7th ed.). Abingdon, OX: Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Davis, B. , & Sumara, D. (2006). Complexity and education: Inquiries into learning, teaching and research. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Denzin, N. K. (1997). Interpretive ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st century. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Denzin, N. K. (2003). Performance ethnography: Critical pedagogy and the politics of culture. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Giardina, M. D. (Eds.). (2006). Qualitative inquiry and the conservative challenge. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Denzin, N. K., & Giardina, M. D. (Eds.). (2008). Qualitative inquiry and the politics of evidence. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Denzin, N. K. , & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (1994). Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed., pp. 1–28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2005a). The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005b). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed., pp. 1–32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Donmoyer, R., & Donmoyer, J. Y. (2008). Readers' theatre as a data display strategy. In J. G. Knowles & A. L. Cole (Eds.), Handbook of the arts in qualitative research (pp. 209–224). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Eisenhart, M. A. (1988). The ethnographic research tradition and mathematics education research. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 19 (2), 99–114.

Eisner, E. (2008). Art and knowledge. In J. G. Knowles & A. L. Cole (Eds.), Handbook of the arts in qualitative research (pp. 3–12). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ellis, C. (1997). Evocative autoethnography: Writing emotionally about our lives. In W. G. Tierney & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Representation and the text: Re-framing the narrative voice (pp. 115–139). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ellis, C. (2004). The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about auto-ethnography. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed., pp.?119–159). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Esbjorn-Hargens, S., & Zimmerman, M. E. (2009). Integral ecology: Uniting multiple perspectives on the natural world. Boston, MA: Integral Books.

Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens: Reinventing self and other in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 70–82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gallagher, J. J. (Ed.). (1991). Interpretive research in science education. NARST Monograph, No 4. National Association for Research in Science Teaching. Manhattan, KS: Kansas State University.

Gergen, M. (2004). Once upon a time: A narratologist's tale. In C. Daiute & C. Lightfoot (Eds.), Narrative analysis: Studying the development of individuals in society (pp. 267–285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Goswami, A. (1993). The self-aware universe: How consciousness creates the material world. New York, NY: Tarcher/Putnam/Penguin. Green, J. L., Camilli, G., & Elmore, P. B. (Eds.). (2006). Handbook of complementary methods in education research. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Guba, E. G. (1990). The alternative paradigm dialog. In E. G. Guba (Ed.), The paradigm dialog (pp. 17–27). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1988). Naturalistic and rationalistic enquiry. In J. P. Keeves (Ed.), Educational research, methodology, and measurement: An international handbook (pp. 81–85). Sydney, Australia: Pergamon Press.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 105–117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of gualitative research (3rd ed., pp. 191–215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2003). Postmodern interviewing. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Haarman, H. (2007). Foundations of culture: Knowledge-construction, belief systems and worldview in their dynamic interplay. Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.

Habermas, J. (1972). Knowledge and human interests (J. J. Shapiro , Trans.). London: Heinemann.

Hamilton, D. (1977). Beyond the numbers game: A reader in educational evaluation. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.

Hamilton, D. (1994). Traditions, preferences, and postures in applied qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin , & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.),

Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 60–69). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Howell, K. E. (2013). An introduction to the philosophy of methodology. London: Sage.

House, E. R. (2006). Methodological fundamentalism and the quest for control(s). In N. K. Denzin & M. D. Giardina (Eds.), Qualitative inquiry and the conservative challenge (pp. 93–108). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Huxley, A. (1959). The doors of perception and heaven and hell. New York, NY: Bantam Books.

Janesick, V. J. (1994). The dance of qualitative research design. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 209–219). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2007). Critical pedagogy in the twenty-first century. In P. McLaren & J. L. Kincheloe (Eds.), Critical pedagogy: Where are we now? (pp. 9–42). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (1993). A tentative description of post-formal thinking: The critical confrontation with cognitive thinking. Harvard Educational Review, 63, 296–320.

Kincheloe, J., & Tobin, K. (2009). The much exaggerated death of positivism. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 4, 513–528.

Knowles, J. G., & Cole, A. L. (Eds.). (2008). Handbook of the arts in qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kuhn, T. S. (1962). The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kvale, S. (1996). InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lassonde, C. A., Galman, S., & Kosnik, C. (Eds.). (2009). Self-study research for teacher educators. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Lightfoot, C. (2004). Fantastic self: A study of adolescents' fictional narratives, and aesthetic activity as identity work. In C. Daiute & C. Lightfoot (Eds.), Narrative analysis: Studying the development of individuals in society (pp. 21–37). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Institutional review boards and methodological conservatism: The challenge to and from phenomenological paradigms. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed., pp. 165–181). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S. (2009). "What a long, strange trip it's been ..." Twenty-five years of qualitative and new paradigm research. Qualitative Inquiry, 16 (1), 3–9.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Denzin, N. K. (1994). The fifth moment. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 575–586). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lyotard, J. F. (2004). The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge (G. Bennington & B. Massumi , Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. (Original work published 1979)

Malisa, M. (2010). (Anti) narcissisms and (anti) capitalisms: Human nature and education in the works of Mahatma Gandhi, Malcolm X, Nelson Mandela and Jurgen Habermas. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense publishers.

Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? Educational Researcher, 17, 13–17.

McNiff, J., & Whitehead, J. (2011). All you need to know about action research (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mutua, K., & Swadener, B. B. (Eds.). (2004). Decolonizing research in cross-cultural contexts: Critical personal narratives. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Neumayr, E., & Taylor, P. C. (2001). A cosy bedding for science education research? Ken Wilber's integral philosophy. In S. Gunn & A. Begg (Eds.), Mind, body & society: Emerging understandings of knowing and learning (pp. 109–116). Melbourne, Australia: Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Melbourne.

Nhalevilo, E. Z. de F. (2013). Rethinking the history of inclusion of IKS in school curricula: Endeavouring to legitimate the subject. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 11 (1), 23–42.

Osborne, R. (1992). Philosophy for beginners. New York, NY: Writers and Readers Publishing.

Paul, J. L. , & Marfo, K. (2001). Preparation of educational researchers in philosophical foundations of inquiry. Review of Educational Research, 71, 525–547.

Pinar, W. F. (1997). Regimes of reason and the male narrative voice. In W. G. Tierney & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Representation and the text: Re-framing the narrative voice (pp. 82–113). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Pithouse, K., Mitchell, C., & Moletsane, R. (Eds.). (2010). Making connections: Self-study & social action. New York, NY: Peter Lang. Polkinghorne, D. E. (1997). Reporting qualitative research as practice. In W. G. Tierney & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Representation and the text: Re-framing the narrative voice (pp. 3–21). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Prendergast, M., Leggo, C., & Sameshima, P. (Eds.). (2009). Poetic inquiry: Vibrant voices in the social sciences. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Rahmawati, Y. (2012). Revealing and reconceptualising teaching identity through the landscapes of culture, religion, transformative learning, and sustainability education: A transformation journey of a science educator (Doctoral thesis, Curtin University, Perth, Australia). Retrieved from http://espace.library.curtin.edu.au

Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (2001). Introduction: Inquiry and participation in search of a world worthy of human aspiration. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice (pp. 1–14). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. Reed-Danahay, D. E. (Ed.). (1997). Auto/ethnography: Rewriting the self and the social. Oxford, UK: Berg.

Richardson, L. (1994). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 516–529). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rossenblum, B., & Kuttner, F. (2011). Quantum enigma: Physics encounters consciousness (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Roth, W.-M. (Ed.). (2005). Auto/biography and auto/ethnography: Praxis of research method. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Runte, R. (2008). Blogs. In J. G. Knowles & A. L. Cole (Eds.), Handbook of the arts in qualitative research (pp. 299–312). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Saldana, J. (2008). Ethnodrama and ethnotheatre. In J. G. Knowles & A. L. Cole (Eds.), Handbook of the arts in qualitative research (pp. 195–207). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sarbin, T. (2004). The role of the imagination in narrative construction. In C. Daiute & C. Lightfoot (Eds.), Narrative analysis: Studying the development of individuals in society (pp. 5–20). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schon, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Schwandt, T. A. (2001). Dictionary of qualitative inquiry (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Simons, H. (Ed.). (1980). Towards a science of the singular. Norwich, UK: University of East Anglia, Centre for Applied Research in Education.

Smith, D. G. (2008). From Leo Strauss to collapse theory: Considering the neoconservative attack on modernity and the work of education. Critical Studies in Education, 49 (1), 33–48.

Smith, L. (1994). Biographical method. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 286–305). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Snow, C. P. (1993). Two cultures and the scientific revolution. London, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Stack, S. J. (2006). Integrating science and soul in education: The lived experience of a science teacher bringing holistic and integral perspectives to the transformation of science teaching (Doctoral thesis, Curtin University of Technology, Perth, Australia). Retrieved from http://espace.library.curtin.edu.au

Stokes, P. (2002). Philosophy: 100 essential thinkers. London: Arcturus Publishing.

Taylor, E., Taylor, P. C., & Chow M. L. (2013). Diverse, disengaged and reactive: A teacher's adaptation of ethical dilemma story pedagogy as a strategy to re-engage learners in education for sustainability. In N. Mansour & R. Wegerif (Eds.), Science education for diversity: Theory and practice (pp. 97–117). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Taylor, P. C. (2002). On being impressed by college teaching. In P. C. Taylor , P. J. Gilmer & K. Tobin (Eds.), Transforming undergraduate science teaching (pp. 3–43). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Taylor, P. C. (2013). Research as transformative learning for meaning-centred professional development. In O. Kovbasyuk & P. Blessinger (Eds.), Meaning-centred education: International perspectives and explorations in higher education (pp. 168–185). New York, NY:

Routledge.

Taylor, P. C., Gilmer, P. J., & Tobin, K. (Eds.). (2002). Transforming undergraduate science teaching: Social constructivist perspectives. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Taylor, P. C., & Medina, M. N. D. (2013). Educational research paradigms: From positivism to multiparadigmatic. Journal for Meaning-Centered Education, 1. Retrieved from www.meaningcentered.org/journal/volume-01/educational-research-paradigms-from-positivismtomultiparadigmatic/

Taylor, P. C. , Taylor, E. , & Luitel, B.C. (2012). Multi-paradigmatic transformative research as/for teacher education: An integral perspective. In B. J. Fraser , K. G. Tobin , & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 373–387). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Taylor, P. C., & Wallace, J. (Eds.). (2007). Contemporary qualitative research: Exemplars for science and mathematics educators. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Tierney, W. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1997). Introduction: Explorations and discoveries. In W. G. Tierney & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Representation and the text: Re-framing the narrative voice (pp. vii–xvi). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Tobin, K. (Ed.). (1993). The practice of constructivism in science education. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tuckman, B. W. (1978). Conducting educational research (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

van Maanen, J. (1988). Tales of the field: On writing ethnography. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

van Manen, M. (1990). Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy. London, Ontario: State University of New York.

van Manen, M. (1991). The tact of teaching: The meaning of pedagogical thoughtfulness. Albany: State University of New York Press. Walker, R. (1980). The conduct of educational case studies: Ethics, theory and procedures. In W. B. Dockerell & D. Hamilton (Eds.), Rethinking educational research (pp. 30–63). London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Wheatley, G. (1991). Constructivist perspectives on science and mathematics learning. Science Education, 75 (1), 9–21.

Wilber, K. (1999). The collected works of Ken Wilber: Volume 4. Boston, MA: Shambhala.

Willis, J. W. (2007). Foundations of qualitative research: Interpretive and critical approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wolcott, H. (1990). On seeking—and rejecting—validity in qualitative research. In E. W. Eisner & A. Peshkin (Eds.), Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate (pp. 121–152). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Young, R. (1990). A critical theory of education: Habermas and our children's future. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Student Conceptions and Conceptual Change

Acher, A., Arca, M., & Sanmarti, N. (2007). Modeling as a teaching learning process for understanding materials: A case study in primary education. Science Education, 91, 398–418.

Amin, T. G. (2009). Conceptual metaphor meets conceptual change. Human Development, 52, 165–197.

Amin, T. G., Jeppsson, F., Haglund, J., & Strömdahl, H. (2012). Arrow of time: Metaphorical construals of entropy and the second law of thermodynamics. Science Education, 96 (5), 818–848.

Andersson, B., & Wallin, A. (2006). On developing content oriented theories taking biological evolution as an example. International Journal of Science Education, 28 (6), 673–695.

Ault, C. R., Novak, J. D., & Gowin, D. B. (1988). Constructing Vee-maps for clinical interviews on energy concepts. Science Education, 72 (4), 515–545.

Ausubel, D. P. (1968). Educational psychology: A cognitive view. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Barsalou, L. W. (1999). Perceptual symbol systems. Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 22, 577-660.

Barsalou, L. W. , & Wiemer-Hastings, K. (2005). Situating abstract concepts. In D. Pecher & R. Zwaan (Eds.), Grounding cognition: The role of perception and action in memory, language, and thought (pp. 129–163). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beeth, M. (1998). Teaching for conceptual change: Using status as a metacognitive tool. Science Education, 82 (3), 343-354.

Brookes, D. T. (2006). The role of language in learning physics. Ph.D. Dissertation submitted to Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Brookes, D. T., & E. Etkina, (2007). Using conceptual metaphor and functional grammar to explore how language used in physics affects student learning. Physical Review Special Topics: Physics Education Research, 3 (1), 1–16.

Brown, A. (1978). Knowing when, where, and how to remember: A problem of metacognition. In R. Glaser (Ed.), Advances in instructional psychology (Vol. 1, pp. 77–165). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brown, D. , & Hammer, D. (2008). Conceptual change in physics. In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), International handbook of research on conceptual change (pp. 127–154). New York: Routledge.

Brown, D. E., & Clement, J. (1989). Overcoming misconceptions via analogical reasoning: Abstract transfer versus explanatory model construction. Instructional Science, 18 (4), 237–261.

Carey, S. (1985a). Are children fundamentally different types of thinkers and learners than adults? In S. Chipman , J. Segal , & R. Glaser (Eds.), Thinking and learning skills (Vol. 2, pp. 485–517). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Reprinted by Open University Press: *Open University Readings in Cognitive Development*.

Carey, S. (1985b). Conceptual change in childhood. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Carey, S. (2009). The origin of concepts. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Carey, S., Evans, R., Honda, M., Jay, E., & Unger, C. (1989). An experiment is when you try it and see if it works. International Journal of Science Education, 11 (5), 514–529.

Carey, S., & Smith, C. (1993). On understanding the nature of scientific knowledge. Educational Psychologist, 28 (3), 235-251.

Cheng, M.-F., & Brown, D. (2010). Conceptual resources in self-developed explanatory models: The importance of integrating conscious and intuitive knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 32 (17), 2367–2392.

Chi, M. , Hutchinson, J. , & Robin, A. (1989). How inferences about novel domain-related concepts can be constrained by structured knowledge. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 35 (1), 27–62.

Chi, M. T. H. (1992). Conceptual change within and across ontological categories: Examples from learning and discovery in science. In R. Giere (Ed.), Cognitive models of science: Minnesota studies in the philosophy of science (pp. 129–186). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Chi, M. T. H. (2005). Common sense conceptions of emergent processes. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 14, 161–199.

Chi, M. T. H., & Slotta, J. D. (1993). The ontological coherence of intuitive physics. Commentary on A. diSessa's "Toward an epistemology of physics." Cognition and Instruction, 10 (2, 3), 249–260.

Chinn, C., Buckland, L., & Samarapungavan, A. (2011). Expanding the dimensions of epistemic cognition: Arguments from philosophy and psychology. Educational Psychologist, 46, 141–167.

Clark, A. (2008). Supersizing the mind: Embodiment, action and cognitive extension. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clark, D. B. (2006). Longitudinal conceptual change in students' understanding of thermal equilibrium: An examination of the process of conceptual restructuring. Cognition and Instruction, 24 (4), 467–563.

Clark, D. B., & Linn, M. (2003). Designing for knowledge integration: The impact of instructional time. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 12 (4), 451–493.

Clement, J. (1993). Using bridging analogies and anchoring intuitions to deal with students' preconceptions in physics. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 30 (10), 1241–1257.

Clement, J. (2008). Creative model construction in scientists and students: The role of imagery, analogy and mental simulation. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Cobb, P., Confrey, J., diSessa, A., Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2003). Design experiments in educational research. Educational Researcher, 32 (1), 9–13.

Corcoran, T., Mosher, F., & Rogat, A. (2009). Learning progressions in science: An evidence based approach to reform. Unpublished CPRE Research Report #RR-63. Teachers College, Columbia University.

diSessa, A. (1993a). Towards an epistemology of physics. Cognition and Instruction, 10 (2/3), 105–224.

diSessa, A. (1993b). Ontologies in pieces: Response to Chi and Slotta. Cognition and Instruction, 10 (2/3), 272-280.

diSessa, A. (1996). What do "just plain folk" know about physics? In D. R. Olson & N. Torrance (Eds.), Handbook of education and human development (pp. 709–730). Oxford: Blackwell.

diSessa, A. (2002). Why "conceptual ecology" is a good idea. In M. Limon & L. Mason (Eds.), Reconsidering conceptual change. Issues in theory and practice (pp. 29–60). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

diSessa, A. (2006). A history of conceptual change research: Threads and fault lines. In R. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 265–281). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

diSessa, A., & Sherin, B. (1998). What changes in conceptual change? International Journal of Science Education, 20 (10), 1155–1191. Donaldson, M. (1978). Children's minds. Glasgow: William Collins.

Doubler, S. , Carraher, D. , Tobin, R. , Asbell-Clarke, J. , Smith, C. , & Schliemann, A. (2011). The inquiry project: Final report. Submitted to the National Science Foundation DRK-12 Program.

Driver, R. (1983). The pupil as scientist? Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.

Driver, R., Asoko, H., Leach, J., Mortimer, E., & Scott, P. (1994). Constructing scientific knowledge in the classroom. Educational Researcher, 23 (7), 5–12.

Driver, R., & Easley, J. (1978). Pupils and paradigms: A review of the literature related to concept development in adolescent science students. Studies in Science Education, 5, 61–84.

Driver, R. Guesne, E., & Tiberghien, A. (1985). Children's ideas in science. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Driver, R., Leach, J., Millar, R., & Scott, P. (1996). Young children's images of science. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Duit, R. (1991). On the role of analogies and metaphors in learning science. Science Education, 75 (6), 649–672.

Duit, R. (2009). STCSE—Bibliography—Students and teachers conceptions and science learning. Kiel, Germany: IPN—Leibniz Institute for Science and Mathematics Education.

Duit, R., Roth, W.-M., Komorek, M., & Wilbers, J. (1998). Conceptual change cum discourse analysis to understand cognition in a unit on chaotic systems: Towards an integrative perspective on learning in science. International Journal of Science Education, 20 (9), 1059–1073.

Duncan, R. (2007). The role of domain specific knowledge in generative reasoning about complicated multi-level phenomena. Cognition and Instruction, 25 (4), 271–336.

Duncan, R., Rogat, A., & Yarden, A. (2009). A learning progression for deepening students' understandings of modern genetics across the 5th to 10th grades. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (6), 655–674.

Elby, A., & Hammer, D. (2010). Epistemological resources and framing. In L. D. Bendixen & F. C. Feucht (Eds.), Personal epistemology in the classroom: Theory, research, and implications for practice (pp. 409–434). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Flavell, J. (1976). Metacognitive aspects of problem solving. In L. Resnick (Ed.), The nature of intelligence (pp. 231–236). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Garfinkel, H. , & Sacks, H. (1970). On formal structures of practical actions. In J. C. McKinney & E. A. Tiryakian (Eds.), Theoretical sociology (pp. 338–366). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Geier, R., Blumenfeld, R., Marx, R., Krajcik, J., Fishman, B., Soloway, E., Jay-Chambers, J. (2008). Standardized test outcomes of students engaged in inquiry-based science curricula in the context of urban reform. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (8), 922–938.

Gelman, R., & Baillargeon, R. (1983). A review of Piagetian concepts. In P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.) & J. H. Flavell & E. M. Markman (Vol. Eds.), Handbook of child psychology (4th ed., Vol. 3, pp. 167–230). New York: Wiley.

Gentner, D. (1983). Structure-mapping: A theoretical framework for analogy. Cognitive Science, 7, 155–170.

Gentner, D. (2003). Why we are so smart. In D. Gentner & S. Goldin-Meadow (Eds.), Language in Mind (pp. 195–235). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Gentner, D. , & Stevens, A. (1983). Mental models. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Giere, R. N. (1988). Explaining science: A cognitive approach. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Giere, R. N. (2002). Scientific cognition as distributed cognition. In P. Curruthers , S. Stich , & M. Siegal (Eds.), The cognitive basis of science (pp. 285–299). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, C., & Heritage, J. (1990). Conversational analysis. Annual Review of Anthropology, 19, 283–307.

Gopnik, A., & Wellman, H. M. (1994). The theory theory. In L. A. Hirschfeld & S. A. Gelman (Eds.), Mapping the mind (pp. 257–293). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grosslight, L., Unger, C., Jay, E., & Smith, C. (1991). Understanding models and their use in science: Conceptions of middle and high school students and experts. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 28 (9), 799–822.

Gupta, A., Hammer, D., & Redish, E. (2010). The case for dynamic models of learners' ontologies in physics. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 19, 285–321.

Hammer, D. (1994). Epistemological beliefs in introductory physics. Cognition and Instruction, 12 (2), 151–184.

Hammer, D., & Elby, A. (2002). On the form of a personal epistemology. B. K. Hofer & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), Personal epistemology: The psychology of beliefs about knowledge and knowing (pp. 169–190). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hammer, D., Gupta, A., & Redish, E. (2011). On static and dynamic intuitive ontologies. Journal of Learning Sciences, 20 (1), 163–168. Hatano, G., & Inagaki, K. (1991). Sharing cognition through collective comprehension activity. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.), Perspectives on socially shared cognition (pp. 331–348). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Hennessey, M. G. (2003). Metacognitive aspects of students' reflective discourse: Implications for intentional conceptual change teaching

Hennessey, M. G. (2003). Metacognitive aspects of students' reflective discourse: Implications for intentional conceptual change teaching and learning. In G. M. Sinatra & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), Intentional conceptual change (pp. 103–132). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Herrenkohl, L. R., Palincsar, A. S., DeWater, L. S., & Kawasaki, K. (1999). Developing scientific communities in classrooms: A sociocognitive approach. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 8, 451–493.

Hofer, B., & Pintrich, P. (1997). The development of epistemological theories: Beliefs about knowledge and knowing and their relation to learning. Review of Educational Research, 67, 88–140.

Howe, C. (2009). Collaborative group work in middle childhood: Joint construction, unresolved contradiction and the growth of knowledge. Human Development, 52, 215–239.

Howe, C. J., McWilliam, D., & Cross, G. (2005). Chance favors only the prepared mind: Incubation and the delayed effects of peer collaboration. British Journal of Psychology, 96, 67–93.

Howe, C. J., Tolmie, A., & Rodgers, C. (1992). The acquisition of conceptual knowledge in science by primary school children: Group interaction and the understanding of motion down an incline. British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 10, 113–130.

Inhelder, B. , Piaget, J. , Parsons, A. , & Milgram, S. (1958). The growth of logical thinking from childhood to adolescence. New York: Basic Books.

Jeppsson, F., Haglund, J., Amin, T., & Strömdahl, H. (2013). Exploring the use of conceptual metaphors in solving problems on entropy. Journal of Learning Sciences, 22(1), 70–120.

Johnson-Laird, P. (1983). Mental models. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ke, J. L., Monk, M., & Duschl, R. (2005). Learning introductory quantum mechanics: Sensori-motor experience and mental models. International Journal of Science Education, 27 (13), 1571–1594.

Keil, F. (1979). Semantic and conceptual development: An ontological perspective. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Keil, F. (2011). The problem of partial understanding. Current Trends in LSP Research: Aims and Methods Series: Linguistic Insights, 44, 251–276.

Keil, F., Stein, C., Webb, L., Billings, V., & Rozenblit, L. (2008). Discerning the division of cognitive labor: An emerging understanding of how knowledge is clustered in other minds. Cognitive Science: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 32 (2), 259–300.

Kitchener, K. S. (1983). Cognition, metacognition, and epistemic cognition. Human Development, 26, 222–232.

Kesidou, S., & Roseman, J. (2002). How well do middle school science programs measure up? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (6), 522–549.

Krajcik, J., MacNeill, K., & Reiser, B. (2008). Learning goals driven design model: Developing curricular materials that align with national standards and incorporate project based pedagogy. Science Education, 92 (1), 1–23.

Krajcik, J. S., Sutherland, L. M., Drago, K., & Merritt, J. (2011). The promise and value of learning progression research. In S. Bernholt, K. Neumann, & P. Nentwig (Eds.), Making it tangible—Learning outcomes in science education (pp. 261–284). Münster: Waxmann.

Kuhn, D. (1989). Children and adults as intuitive scientists. Psychological Review, 96 (4), 674–689.

Kuhn, D. (2000). Theory of mind, metacognition, and reasoning. In P. Mitchell & K. Riggs (Eds.), Children's reasoning and the mind (pp. 301–326). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.

Kuhn, T. (1962). The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kuhn, T. (1977). The essential tension: Selected studies in scientific tradition and change. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and the challenge to Western thought. New York: Basic Books.

Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2000). Developing model-based reasoning in mathematics and science. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 21 (1), 39–48.

Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2006). Scientific thinking and scientific literacy. In W. Damon, R. Lerner, K. Renninger, & I. Sigel (Eds.), Handbook of child psychology, child psychology in practice (pp. 156–196). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2012). Seeding evolutionary thinking by modeling its foundations. Science Education, 96 (4), 701–724.

Lehrer, R., Schauble, L., Carpenter, S., & Penner, D. E. (2000). The interrelated development of inscriptions and conceptual

understanding. In P. Cobb , E. Yackel , & K. McClain (Eds.), Symbolizing and communicating in mathematics classrooms: Perspectives on discourse, tools and instructional design (pp. 325–360). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lehrer, R., Schauble, L., & Lucas, D. (2008). Supporting the development of the epistemology of inquiry. Cognitive Development, 23, 512–529.

Lehrer, R., Schauble, L., Strom, D., & Pligge, M. (2003). Similarity of form and substance: Modeling material kind. In D. Klahr & S. Carver (Eds.), Cognition and instruction: 25 years of progress (pp. 39–74). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Levrini, O., & diSessa, A. (2008). How students learn from multiple contexts: Proper time as a coordination class. Physics Education Research, 4 (1), 1–18.

Linn, M. (2008). Teaching for conceptual change: Distinguish or extinguish ideas. In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), International handbook of research on conceptual change (pp. 694–722). New York: Routledge.

Linn, M., & Hsi, S. (2000). Computers, teachers, peers: Science learning partners. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lising, L., & Elby, A. (2005). The impact of epistemology on learning: A case study from introductory physics. American Journal of Physics, 73 (4), 372–382.

Lutz, D. R., & Keil, F. C. (2002). Early understanding of the division of cognitive labor. Child Development, 73, 1073–1084. Magnusson, S., & Palincsar, A. (2005). Teaching to promote the development of scientific knowledge and reasoning about light at the

elementary school level. In S. Donovan & J. Bransford (Eds.), How students learn: Science in the classroom (pp. 421–474). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Mandler, J. (2004). The foundations of mind: Origins of conceptual thought. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Marx, R., Blumenfeld, P., Krajcik, J., Fishman, B., Soloway, E., Geier, R., & Tal, R. (2004). Inquiry-based science in the middle grades: Assessment of learning in urban systemic reform. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (10), 1063–1080.

Mason, L. (2007). Bridging the cognitive and sociocultural approaches to research on conceptual change: Is it feasible? Educational Psychologist, 42 (1), 1–7.

Mason, L., & Boscolo, P. (2000). Writing and conceptual change: What changes? Instructional Science, 28, 199–226.

May, B., & Etkina, E. (2002). College physics students' epistemological self-reflection and its relationship to conceptual learning. American Journal of Physics, 70 (12), 1249–1258.

McCloskey, M. (1983). Naïve theories of motion. In D. Gentner & A. Stevens (Eds.), Mental models (pp. 299–324). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Metz, K. (1995). Reassessment of developmental constraints on children's science instruction. Review of Educational Research, 65, 93–127.

Minstrell, J. (1982). Explaining the "at rest" condition of an object. The Physics Teacher, 20, 10–14.

Minstrell, J. (1984). Teaching for the development of understanding of ideas: Forces on moving objects. In C. Anderson (Ed.), AETS Yearbook: Observing science classrooms: Observing science perspectives from research and practice (pp. 55–73). Columbus: Ohio State University.

Montgomery, D. E. (1992). Young children's theory of knowing: The development of a folk epistemology. Developmental Review, 12, 410–430.

Murphy, G. L., & Medin, D. L. (1982). The role of theories in conceptual coherence. Psychological Review, 92, 289–316.

National Research Council (NRC) . (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science in grades K–8. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Nersessian, N. (1989). Conceptual change in science and science education. Synthese, 80 (1), 163–183.

Nersessian, N. (1992). How do scientists think? Capturing the dynamics of conceptual change in science. In. R. Giere (Ed.), Cognitive models of science (pp. 3–44). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Nersessian, N. (2008). Creating scientific concepts. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Niebert, K., Marsch, S., & Treagust, D. F. (2012). Understanding needs embodiment: A theory-guided reanalysis of the role of metaphors and analogies in understanding science. Science Education, 96 (5), 849–877.

Nordine, J., Krajcik, J., & Fortus, D. (2011). Transforming energy instruction in middle school to support integrated understanding and future learning. Science Education, 95, 670–699.

Novak, J. D. (1977). A theory of education. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Nussbaum, J., & Novick, S. (1982). Alternative frameworks, conceptual conflict, and accommodation: Towards a principled teaching strategy. Instructional Science, 11, 183–200.

Osborne, R., & Freyberg, P. (1985). Learning in science: The implications of children's science. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Education Books.

Pea, R. D. (1994). Seeing what we build together: Distributed multimedia learning environments for transformative communications. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 3 (3), 285–299.

Perkins, D. , & Grotzer, T. A. (2005). Dimensions of causal understanding: The role of complex causal models in students' understanding of science. Studies in Science Education, 41, 117–165.

Piaget, J. (1995). Sociological studies. London: Routledge. (Original work published 1977).

Piaget, J., & Inhelder, B. (1942). The child's construction of quantities: Conservation and atomism. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. Redish, E., & Hammer, D. (2009). Reinventing college physics for biologists: Explicating an epistemological curriculum. American Journal of Physics, 77 (7), 629–642.

Rogat, A., Anderson, C., Foster, J., Goldberg, F., Hicks, J., Kanter, D., Krajcik, J., Lehrer, R., Resier, B., & Wiser, M. (2011). Developing learning progressions in support of the new science standards: A RAPID Workshop Series. CPRE. Teachers College, Columbia University.

Roschelle, J. (1992). Learning by collaborating: Convergent conceptual change. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 2 (3), 235–276. Sandoval, W. (2005). Understanding students' practical epistemologies and their effect on learning through inquiry. Science Education, 89 (4), 634–656.

Schauble, L., Klopfer, L., & Ragavan, K. (1991). Students' transition from an engineering model to a science model of experimentation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 28 (9), 859–882.

Scherr, R. E., Close, H. G., McKagan, S. B., & Vokos, S. (2012). Representing energy. I. Representing a substance ontology for energy. Physical Review—Special Topics: Physics Education Research, 8 (2), 1–11.

Schwab, J. (1964). The teaching of science as enquiry. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Scott, P. H., Asoko, H. M., & Driver R. H. (1992). Teaching for conceptual change: Review of strategies. In R. Duit, F. Goldberg, & H. Niederer (Eds.), Research in physics learning: Theoretical issues and empirical studies (pp. 310–329). Kiel, Germany: IPN—Institute for Science Education.

Scott, P., Asoko, H., & Leach, J. (2007). Student conceptions and conceptual learning in science. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 31–54). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sherin, B. (2001). How students understand physics equations. Cognition and Instruction, 19 (4), 479–541.

Sherin, B. (2006). Common sense clarified: The role of intuition knowledge in physics problem solving. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43 (6), 535–555.

Sinatra, G., & Pintrich, P. (2003). The role of intentions in conceptual change learning. In G. Sinatra & P. Pintrich (Eds.), Intentional conceptual change (pp. 1–18). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Slotta, J. (2011). In defense of Chi's ontological incompatibility hypothesis. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 20 (1), 151–162.

Slotta, J. D., & Chi, M. T. H. (2006). The impact of ontology training on conceptual change: Helping students understand the challenging topics in science. Cognition and Instruction, 24 (2), 261–289.

Slotta, J. D., Chi, M. T. H., & Joram, E. (1995). Assessing students' mis-classifications of physics concepts: An ontological basis for conceptual change. Cognition and Instruction, 13 (3), 373–400.

Smith, C. (2007). Bootstrapping processes in the development of students' commonsense matter theories. Cognition and Instruction, 25 (4), 337–398.

Smith, C. , Maclin, D. , Grosslight, L. , & Davis, H. (1997). Teaching for understanding: A comparison of two approaches to teaching students about matter and density. Cognition and Instruction, 15 (3), 317–393.

Smith, C., Maclin, D., Houghton, C., & Hennessey, M. G. (2000). Sixth grade students' epistemologies of science: The impact of school science experiences on epistemological development. Cognition & Instruction, 18, 349–422.

Smith, C., Snir, J., & Grosslight, L. (1992). Using conceptual models to facilitate conceptual change: The case of weight-density differentiation. Cognition and Instruction, 9 (3), 221–283.

Smith, J., diSessa, A., & Roschelle, J. (1993). Misconceptions reconceived: A constructivist analysis of knowledge in transition. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 3 (2), 115–163.

Songer, N., & Linn, M. (1991). How do students' views of science influence knowledge integration? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 28 (9), 761–784.

Stathopoulou, C., & Vosniadou, S. (2007a). Conceptual change in physics and physics-related epistemological beliefs: A relationship under scrutiny. In S. Vosniadou, A. Baltas, & X. Vamvakoussi (Eds.), Reframing the conceptual change approach in learning and instruction (pp. 145–163). New York: Elsevier.

Stathopoulou, C., & Vosniadou, S. (2007b). Exploring the relationship between physics-related epistemological beliefs and physics understanding. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 32, 255–281.

Stephens, L., & Clement, J. (2010). Documenting the use of expert scientific reasoning processes by high school physics students. Physical Review Special Topics—Physics Education Research, 6 (2). Retrieved from

http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.6.020122

Strike, K. A., & Posner, G. J. (1985). A conceptual change view of learning and understanding. In L. H. West & A. L. Pines (Eds.), Conceptual structure and conceptual change (pp. 189–210). Orlando, FL: Academic Press, Inc.

Strike, K. A., & Posner, G. J. (1992). A revisionist theory of conceptual change. In R. Duschl & R. Hamilton (Eds.), Philosophy of science, cognitive psychology, and educational theory and practice (pp. 147–174). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Thagard, P. (2012). The cognitive science of science: Explanation, discovery, and conceptual change. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Vosniadou, S. (1994). Capturing and modeling the process of conceptual change. Learning and Instruction, 4, 45–69.

Vosniadou, S. (2008). Conceptual change research: An introduction. In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), International handbook of research on conceptual change (pp. xiii–xxviii). New York: Routledge.

Vosniadou, S., & Brewer, W. F. (1987). Theories of knowledge restructuring in development. Review of Educational Research, 57, 51–67. Vosniadou, S., Vamvakoussi, X., & Skopeliti, I. (2008). The framework theory approach to the problem of conceptual change. In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), International handbook of research on conceptual change (pp. 3–34). New York: Routledge.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Waxman, S. R., & Markow, D. B. (1995). Words as invitations to form categories: Evidence from 12- to 13-month-old infants. Cognitive Psychology, 29, 257–302.

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. White, B. Y. (1995). The ThinkerTools project: Computer microworlds as conceptual tools for facilitating scientific inquiry. In S. M. Glynn & R. Duit (Eds.), Learning science in the schools: Research reforming practice (pp. 201–227). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. White, B. Y., & Frederiksen, J. R. (1998). Inquiry, modeling, and meta-cognition: Making science accessible to all students. Cognition and Instruction, 16 (1), 3–118.

Wilensky, U., & Novak, M. (2010). Teaching and learning evolution as an emergent process: The BEAGLE project. In R. Taylor & M. Ferrari (Eds.), Epistemology and science education: Understanding the evolution vs. intelligent design controversy (pp. 243–268). New York: Routledge.

Wilensky, U., & Reisman, K. (2006). Thinking like a wolf, sheep, or firefly: Learning biology through constructing and testing computation theories—an embodied modeling approach. Cognition and Instruction, 24 (2), 171–209.

Williams, J. M., & Tolmie, A. (2000). Conceptual change in biology: Group interaction and the understanding of inheritance. British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 18, 625–649.

Wiser, M. (1995). Use of history of science to understand and remedy students' misconceptions about heat and temperature. In D. N. Perkins , J. L. Schwartz , M. M. West , & M. S. Stone (Eds.), Software goes to school (pp. 23–38). New York: Oxford University Press. Wiser, M. , & Amin, T. (2001). "Is heat hot?" Inducing conceptual change by integrating everyday and scientific conceptions. Learning and Instruction, 11, 331–355.

Wiser, M., & Amin, T. G. (2002). Computer-based interactions for conceptual change in science. In M. Limon & L. Mason (Eds.), Reconsidering conceptual change: Issues in theory and practice (pp. 357–387). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Wiser, M., & Smith, C. (2013). Learning and teaching about matter in the middle school years: How can the atomic-molecular theory be meaningfully introduced? In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), International handbook of research on conceptual change (2nd ed., pp. 177–194). New York: Routledge.

Wiser, M., Smith, C., & Doubler, S. (2012). Learning progressions as tools for curriculum development: Lessons from the Inquiry Project. In A. Alonzo & A. Gotwals (Eds.), Learning progressions in science: Current challenges and future directions (pp. 359–404). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Attitudes, Identity, and Aspirations Toward Science

Adamuti-Trache, M., & Andres, L. (2008). Embarking on and persisting in scientific fields of study: Cultural capital, gender, and curriculum along the science pipeline. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (12), 1557–1584.

Aikenhead, G. (1973). The measurement of high school students' knowledge about science and scientists. Science Education, 57, 539–549.

Aikenhead, G. (2001). Students' ease in crossing cultural borders into school science. Science Education, 85 (2), 180–188.

Aikenhead, G. (2006). Science education for everyday life: Evidence based practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Aikenhead, G., & Ogawa, M. (2007). Indigenous knowledge and science revisited. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 2 (3), 539-620.

Ainley, M., & Ainley, J. (2011). Student engagement with science in early adolescence: The contribution of enjoyment to students'

continuing interest in learning about science. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 36, 4–12.

Alexander, R. (2005). Towards dialogic teaching. York, UK: Dialogos.

Andrée, L., & Hansson, L. (2012). Marketing the 'broad line': Invitations to STEM education in a Swedish recruitment campaign. International Journal of Science Education. Retrieved November 5, 2012, from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2012.695880 Applebaum, P., & Clark, S. (2001). Science! Fun? A critical analysis of design/content/evaluation. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 33 (5), 583–600.

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

Archer, L., Hollingworth, S., & Halsall, A. (2007). "University's not for me—I'm a Nike person": Urban, working-class engagement young people's negotiations of "style," identity and education. Sociology, 41 (2), 219–237.

Archer, L., Pratt, S., & Phillips, D. (2001). Working class men's constructions of masculinity and negotiations of (non)participation in higher education. Gender and Education, 13 (4), 431–449.

Archer, L., & Yamashita, H. (2003). Theorising inner-city masculinities: "race," class, gender and education. Gender & Education, 15 (2), 115–132.

Aschbacher, P., Li, E., & Roth, E. (2010). Is science me? High school students' identities, participation and aspirations in science, engineering, and medicine. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 564–582.

Assessment of Performance Unit . (1988). Science at age 15: A review of the APU survey findings. London: HMSO.

Au, W. (2007). High stakes testing and curricular control: A qualitative metasynthesis. Educational Researcher, 36 (5), 258–267.

Azevedo, F. (2011). Lines of practice: A practice-centered theory of interest relationships. Cognition and Instruction, 29 (2), 147-184.

Azevedo, F. (2012). The tailored practice of hobbies and its implication for the design of interest-driven learning environments. The Journal of the Learning Sciences. doi:10.1080/10508406.2012.730082

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: W. H Freeman and Company.

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (2001). Self-efficacy beliefs as shapers of children's aspirations and career trajectories. Child Development, 72, 187–206.

Barber, M., & Mourshed, M. (2007). How the world's best-performing school systems come out on top. New York: McKinsey & Company.

Barton, A., Kang, H., Tan, E., O'Neill, T., Bautista-Guerra, J., & Brecklin, C. (2013). Crafting a future in science: Tracing middle school girls' identity work over time and space. American Educational Research Journal, 50 (1), 37–75.

Barton, A. C. (2003). Teaching science for social justice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Beck, U., & Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2002). Individualization. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Blalock, C. L., Lichtenstein, M. J., Owen, S., Pruski, L., Marshall, C., & Toepperwein, M. (2008). In pursuit of validity: A comprehensive review of science attitude instruments. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (7), 961–977.

Blenkinsop, S., McCrone, T., Wade, P., & Morris, M. (2006). How do young people make choices at 14 and 16? Slough, UK: National Foundation for Educational Research, Department for Education and Skills (DfES).

Blickenstaff, J. C. (2005). Women and science careers: Leaky pipeline or gender filter? Gender and Education, 17 (4), 369–386.

Boaler, J. (1997). Reclaiming school mathematics: The girls fight back. Gender and Education, 9 (3), 285–305.

Bøe, M. (2012). Science choices in Norwegian upper secondary school: What matters? Science Education, 96, 1-20.

Bøe, M. V., Henriksen, E. K., Lyons, T., & Schreiner, C. (2011). Participation in science and technology: Young people's achievementrelated choices in late modern societies. Studies in Science Education, 47 (1), 37–71.

Breakwell, G. M., & Beardsell, S. (1992). Gender, parental and peer influences upon science attitudes and activities. Public Understanding of Science, 1 (2), 183–197.

Brophy, J. (2009). Connecting with the Big Picture. Educational Psychologist, 44, 147–157.

Brotman, J. S., & Moore, F. M. (2008). Girls and science: A review of four themes in the science education literature. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (9), 971–1002.

Brown, B. (2006). "It isn't no slang that can be said about this stuff": Language, identity and appropriating science discourse. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43, 96–126.

Buck, G. A., Plano, V. L., Diandra, C., Pelecky, L., Lu, Y., & Cerda-Lizarraga, V. (2008). Examining the cognitive processes used by adolescent girls and women scientists in identifying science role models: A feminist approach. Science Education, 92 (4), 688–707. Butz, W. P., Bloom, G. A., Gross, M. E., Kelly, T. K., Kofner, A., & Rippen, H. E. (2003). Is there a shortage of scientists and engineers? How would we know? Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Cerinsek, G., Hribar, T., Glodez, N., & Dolinsek, S. (2012). Which are my future career priorities and what influenced my choice of studying science, technology, engineering or mathematics? Some insights on educational choice—case of Slovenia. International Journal of Science Education. Retrieved September 17, 2012, from http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2012.681813

Chambers, D. (1983). Stereotypic images of the scientist: The draw-a-scientist test. Science Education, 67 (2), 255–265.

Chetcuti, D., & Kioko, B. (2012). Girls' attitudes towards science in Kenya. International Journal of Science Education, 34, 1571–1589. Christidou, V. (2011). Interest, attitudes and images related to science: Combining students' voices with the voices of school science, teachers, and popular science. International Journal of Environmental & Science Education, 6, 141–159.

Cleaves, A. (2005). The formation of science choices in secondary school. International Journal of Science Education, 27 (4), 471–486. Cohen, G. L., Garcia, J., Apfel, N., & Master, A. (2006). Reducing the racial achievement gap: A social-psychological intervention. Science, 313 (5791), 1307–1310. Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education . (2003). Australia's teachers: Australia's future, advancing innovation, science, technology and mathematics—Background data and analysis. Canberra: Department of Education Science and Training (DEST), Commonwealth of Australia.

Connell, R. W. (1989). Cool guys, swots and wimps: The interplay of masculinity and education. Oxford Review of Education, 15 (3), 291–303.

Cooper, P., & McIntyre, D. (1996). Effective teaching and learning: Teachers' and students' perspectives. Buckingham, UK, and Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Crowley, K., Callanan, M. A., Tenenbaum, H. R., & Allen, E. (2001). Parents explain more often to boys than to girls during shared scientific thinking. Psychological Science, 12, 258–261. doi:10.1111/1467–9280.00347

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1992). The flow experience and its significance for human psychology. In M. Csikszentmihalyi & I. S. Csikszentmihalyi (Eds.), Optimal experience: Psychological studies of flow in consciousness (pp. 15–35). Cambridge: University of Cambridge.

Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Schneider, B. (2000). Becoming adult: Preparing teenagers for the world of work. New York: Basic Books. Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. University of Washington: Centre for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2007). The flat earth and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future. Educational Researcher, 36 (16), 318–334.

DEST . (2006). Youth attitudes survey: Population study on the perceptions of science, mathematics and technology study at school and career decision making. Canberra, Australia: Department of Education Science and Training.

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think. Boston: DC Heath.

Dewey, J. (1934/1980). Art as experience. New York: Berkley.

DeWitt, J., Archer, L., & Osborne, J. (2012). Nerdy, brainy and normal: Children's and parents' constructions of those who are highly engaged with science. Research in Science Education. doi:10.1007/s11165-012-9315-0

DeWitt, J., Archer, L., Osborne, J., Dillon, J., Willis, B., & Wong, B. (2011). High aspirations but low progression: The science aspirations– careers paradox amongst minority ethnic students. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 9, 243–271. Eccles, J. (2009). Who am I and what am I going to do with my life? Personal and collective identities as motivators of action. Educational Psychologist, 44 (2), 78–89.

Eccles, J. S., Adler, T. F., Futterman, R., Goff, S. B., Kazcala, C. M., Meece, J. L., (1983). Expectations, values and academic behaviors. In T. Spence (Ed.), Achievement and achievement motivations (pp. 75–146). San Francisco: W. H Freeman.

Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (1992). The development of achievement-task values: A theoretical analysis. Developmental Review, 12, 265–310.

Engineering and Technology Board . (2005). Factors influencing Year 9 career choices: London: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Epstein, J. L., & McPartland, J. M. (1976). The concept and measurement of the quality of school life. American Educational Research Journal, 13, 15–30.

European Commission . (2004). Europe needs more scientists: Report by the High Level Group on Increasing Human Resources for Science and Technology. Brussels: Author.

Farland-Smith, D. (2012). Development and field test of the modified draw-a-scientist test and the draw-a-scientist rubric. School Science and Mathematics, 112 (2), 109–116.

Fender, J. G., & Crowley, K. (2007). How parent explanation changes what children learn from everyday scientific thinking. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 28, 189–210.

Fensham, P. (1985). Science for all: A reflective essay. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 17 (4), 415–435.

Fouad, N., Byars-Winston, A., & Angela, M. (2005). Cultural context of career choice: Meta-analysis of race/ethnicity differences. Career Development Quarterly, 53 (3), 223–233.

Fouad, N., Hackett, G., Haag, S., Kantamneni, N., & Fitzpatrick, M. E. (2007, August). Career choice barriers: Environmental influences on women's career choices. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association Convention, San Francisco, CA.

Francis, B. (2000). The gendered subject: Students' subject preferences and discussions of gender and subject ability. Oxford Review of Education, 26 (1), 35–48.

Gardner, P. L. (1975). Attitudes to science. Studies in Science Education, 2, 1–41.

Gee, J. (1996). Social linguistics and literacies: Ideologies in discourse (2nd ed.). London: Taylor & Francis.

Gee, J. P. (2004). Language in the science classroom: Academic social languages as the heart of school-based literacy. In E. W. Saul (Ed.), Crossing borders in literacy and science instruction: Perspectives in theory and practice (pp. 13–32). Newark, DE: International Reading Association/National Science Teachers Association.

German, P. J. (1988). Development of the attitude toward science in school assessment and its use to investigate the relationship between science achievement and attitude toward science in school. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 25 (8), 689–703. Girod, M., Rau, C., & Schepige, A. (2003). Appreciating the beauty of science ideas: Teaching for aesthetic understanding. Science Education, 87 (4), 574–587. doi:10.1002/sce.1054.

Girod, M., & Wong, D. (2002). An aesthetic (Deweyan) perspective on science learning: Case studies of three fourth graders. The Elementary School Journal, 102(3), 199–224.

Goodrum, D., Hackling, M., & Rennie, L. (2001). The status and quality of teaching and learning of science in Australian schools. Canberra, Australia: Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs.

Grissmer, D., Flanagan, A., Kawata, J., & Williamson, S. (2000). Improving student achievement: What state NAEP test scores tell us. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Hadzigeorgiou, Y. (2012). Fostering a sense of wonder in the science classroom. Research in Science Education, 42, 985–1005. Haeusler, C. , & Kay, R. (1997). School subject selection by students in the post-compulsory years. Australian Journal of Career Development, 6 (1), 32–38.

Harackiewicz, J. M., Rozek, C. S., Hulleman, C. S., & Hyde, J. S. (2012). Helping parents to motivate adolescents in mathematics and science: An experimental test of a utility-value intervention. Psychological Science, 23 (8), 899–906.

Haste, H. (2004). Science in my future: A study of the values and beliefs in relation to science and technology amongst 11–21 year olds. London. Nestlé Social Research Programme.

Haste, H., Muldoon, C., Hogan, A., & Brosnan, M. (2008, Sept 11). If girls like ethics in their science and boys like gadgets, can we get science education right? Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Liverpool, UK.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77 (1), 81–112.

Haussler, P., & Hoffmann, L. (2002). An intervention study to enhance girls' interest, self-concept, and achievement in physics classes. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (9), 870–888.

Haworth, C. M. A., Dale, P., & Plomin, R. (2008). A twin study into the genetic and environmental influences on academic performance in science in nine-year-old boys and girls. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (8), 1003–1025.

Hazari, Z., Sonnert, G., Sadler, P., & Shanahan, M.-C. (2010). Connecting high school physics experiences, outcome expectations, physics identity, and physics career choice: A gender study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 978–1003.

Head, J. (1985). The personal response to science. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heimlich, J. E., & Ardoin, N. M. (2008). Understanding behavior to understand behavior change: A literature review. Environmental Education Research, 14 (3), 215–237.

Helme, S., & Lamb, S. (2007). Student experiences of VCE Further Mathematics. Paper presented at the Mathematics Essential Research, Essential Practice: 30th Annual conference of the Mathematics Education Research Group of Australasia. Hobart, Tasmania, Australia.

Hidi, S. , & Renninger, K. A. (2006). The four-phase model of interest development. Educational Psychologist, 41 (2), 111–127. doi:10.1207/s15326985ep4102_4

Hill, C. , Corbett, C. , & St. Rose, A. (2010). Why so few? Women in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Washington, DC: AAUW.

HM Treasury . (2006). Science and Innovation investment framework: Next steps. London: HMSO.

Ho, E. S. C. (2010). Family influences on science learning among Hong Kong adolescents: What we learned from PISA. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 8 (3), 409–428.

Hobbs, L. (2012). Examining the aesthetic dimensions of teaching: Relationships between teacher knowledge, identity and passion. Teaching & Teacher Education, 28 (5), 718–727. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2012.01.010

Hubber, P., Tytler, R., & Haslam, F. (2010). Teaching and learning about force with a representational focus: Pedagogy and teacher change. Research in Science Education, 40 (1), 5–28.

Jagger, N. (2007). Internationalising doctoral careers. Paper presented at the Conference on The National Value of Science Education. September, University of York, York, UK.

Jakobson, B., & Wickman, P.-O. (2008). The roles of aesthetic experience in elementary school science. Research in Science Education, 38 (1), 45–66.

Jenkins, E., & Nelson, N. W. (2005). Important but not for me: Students' attitudes toward secondary school science in England. Research in Science & Technological Education, 23 (1), 41–57.

Jenkins, E. W., & Pell, R. G. (2006). The relevance of science education project (ROSE) in England: A summary of findings. Centre for Studies in Science and Mathematics Education, University of Leeds, UK.

Johnson, A. C. (2007). Unintended consequences: How science professors discourage women of color. Science Education, 91 (5), 805–821.

Jones, G., Howe, A., & Rua, M. (2000). Gender differences in students' experiences, interests, and attitudes towards science and scientists. Science Education, 84, 180–192.

Jovanovic, J., & King, S. S. (1998). Boys and girls in the performance-based science classroom: Who's doing the performing? American Educational Research Journal, 35 (3), 477–496.

Kenway, J., & Gough, A. (1998). Gender and science education in schools: A review "with attitude." Studies in Science Education, 31, 1–30.

Klopfer, L. E. (1971). Evaluation of learning in science. In B. S. Bloom , J. T. Hastings , & G. F. Madaus (Eds.), Handbook of formative and summative evaluation of student learning. London: McGraw-Hill.

Krogh, L., & Andersen, H. (2012). "Actually, I may be clever enough to do it." Using identity as a lens to investigate students' trajectories towards science and university. Research in Science Education. doi:10.1007/s11165-012-9285-2

Krogh, L. B., & Thomsen, P. V. (2005). Studying students' attitudes towards science from a cultural perspective but with a quantitative methodology: Border crossing into the physics classroom. International Journal of Science Education, 27 (3), 281–302.

Lamb, R. L. , Annetta, L. , Meldrum, J. , & Vallett, D. (2012). Measuring science interest: Rasch validation of the science interest survey. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 10, 643–668.

Lamb, S., & Ball, K. (1999). Curriculum and careers: The education and labour market consequences of Year 12 subject choice. Longitudinal Surveys of Australian Youth: Research Report Number 12. Camber-well: Australian Council for Educational Research. Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Lee, J. D. (2002). More than ability: Gender and personal relationships influence science and technology involvement. Sociology of Education, 75 (4), 349–373.

Lee, Y. J. (2012). Identity-based research in science education. In B. J. Fraser , K. Tobin , & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 34–45). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2012). Seeding evolutionary thinking by engaging children in modeling its foundations. Science Education, 96 (4), 701–724.

Leonardi, A., Syngollitou, E., & Kiosseoglou, G. (1998). Academic achievement, motivation and future selves. Educational Studies in Mathematics, 24, 153–163.

Lightbody, P., & Durndell, A. (1996a). Gendered career choice: Is sexstereotyping the cause or the consequence? Educational Studies in Mathematics, 22 (2), 133–146.

Lightbody, P., & Durndell, A. (1996b). The masculine image of careers in science and technology—fact or fantasy. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 66 (2), 231–246.

Lindahl, B. (2007). A longitudinal study of Students' attitudes towards science and choice of career. Paper presented at the 80th NARST International Conference New Orleans, Louisiana.

Losh, S., Wilke, R., & Pop, M. (2008). Some methodological issues with "draw a scientist tests" among young children. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (6), 773–792.

Lynn, L., & Salzman, H. (2006). Collaborative advantage: New horizons for a flat world. Issues in Science and Technology, Winter, 74–81. Lyons, T. (2003). Decisions by science proficient Year 10 students about post-compulsory high school science enrolment: A sociocultural exploration. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of New England, Armidale, NSW, Australia.

Lyons, T. (2006a). Different countries, same science classes: Students' experience of school science classes in their own words. International Journal of Science Education, 28 (6), 591–613.

Lyons, T. (2006b). The puzzle of falling enrolments in physics and chemistry courses: Putting some pieces together. Research in Science Education, 36 (3), 285–311.

Lyons, T., & Quinn, F. (2010). Choosing science. Understanding the declines in senior high school science enrolments. Research report to the Australian Science Teachers Association. Armidale: University of New England, NSW, Australia. Retrieved September 8, 2012, from www.une.edu.au/simerr/pages/projects/131choosingscience.pdf

Maltese, A. (2008). Persistence in STEM: An investigation of the relationship between high school experiences in science and mathematics and college degree completion in STEM fields. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Virginia, Charlottesville. Maltese, A., & Tai, R. (2008). Eyeballs in the fridge: Sources of early interest in science. Paper presented at the American Educational

Research Association. New York, NY. McKinley, E. (2005). Brown bodies, white coats: Postcolonialism, Maori women and science. Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of

Education, 26 (4), 481–496. Manz, E. (2012). Understanding the codevelopment of modeling practice and ecological knowledge. Science Education, 96 (6), 1071–1105.

Marginson, S., Tytler, R., Freeman, B., & Roberts, K. (2013). STEM: Country comparisons. Melbourne: Australian Council of Learned Academies. Retrieved February 8, 2014, from www.acola.org.au

Mayer, V., & Richmond, J. (1982). An overview of assessment instruments in science. Science Education, 66, 49–66.

Mead, M., & Metraux, R. (1957). Image of the scientist among high school students: A pilot study. Science, 126, 384–390.

Mendick, H. (2006). Masculinities in mathematics. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Millar, R., & Osborne, J. F. (Eds.). (1998). Beyond 2000: Science education for the future. London: King's College London.

Moore, R. W., & Sutman, F. X. (1970). The development, field test and validation of an inventory of scientific attitudes. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 7, 85–94.

Mullis, I. V., Martin, M. O., Foy, P., & Arora, A. (2012). TIMSS 2011 international results in science. Boston: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.

Munro, M., & Elsom, D. (2000). Choosing science at 16: The influence of science teachers and career advisers on students' decisions about science subjects and science and technology careers. Cambridge, UK: National Institute for Careers Education and Counselling (NICEC).

Murphy, C., & Beggs, J. (2003). Children's attitudes towards school science. School Science Review, 84 (308), 109-116.

Murphy, C., & Beggs, J. (2005). Primary science in the UK: A scoping study. Final Report to the Wellcome Trust. London: Wellcome Trust. Murphy, P., & Whitelegg, E. (2006). Girls in the physics classroom: A review of research of participation of girls in physics. London: Institute of Physics.

National Academy of Sciences: Committee on Science Engineering and Public Policy . (2005). Rising above the gathering storm: Energizing and employing America for a brighter economic future. Washington, DC: Author.

National Commission on Mathematics and Science Teaching for the 21st Century . (2000). Before it's too late. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Nature Editorial . (2009). A crisis of confidence. Nature, 457 (7230), 635–635.

OECD . (2006). Evolution of student interest in science and technology studies policy report. Paris: Author.

OECD . (2007). PISA 2006: Science competencies for tomorrow's world: Volume 1: Analysis. Paris: Author.

Office of the Chief Scientist . (2012). Health of Australian science. Canberra: Australian Government. Retrieved February 8, 2014, from www.chiefscientist.gov.au/2012/05/health-of-australian-science-report-2/

Ogura, Y. (2006). Graph of student attitude v student attainment. Based on data from Martin, M. O., et al. (2000). TIMSS 1999 international science report: Findings from IEA's repeat of the Third International Mathematics and Science Study at the eighth grade. Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College; National Institute for Educational Research: Tokyo.

Oliveira, A., Sadler, T., & Suslak, D. (2007). The linguistic construction of expert identity in professor-student discussions of science. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 2, 119–150.

Olsen, R., Prenzel, M., & Martin, R. (2011). Interest in science: A many-faceted picture painted by data from the OECD PISA study. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (1), 1–6.

Osborne, J. F. (2008). Engaging young people with science: Does science education need a new vision? School Science Review, 89 (328), 67–74.

Osborne, J. F., & Collins, S. (2001). Pupils' views of the role and value of the science curriculum: A focus-group study. International Journal of Science Education, 23 (5), 441–468.

Osborne, J., & Dillon, J. (2008). Science education in Europe: Critical reflections: London: Nuffield Foundation.

Osborne, J., Simon, S., & Collins, S. (2003). Attitudes towards science: A review of the literature and its implications. International Journal of Science Education, 25, 1049–1079.

Palmquist, S. D., & Crowley, K. (2007). From teachers to testers: Parents' role in child expertise development in informal settings. Science Education, 91 (5), 712–732.

Pekrun, R., Frenzel, A. C., Goetz, T., & Perry, R. P. (2007). The control-value theory of achievement emotions: An integrative approach to emotions in education. In P. A. Schutz & R. Pekrun (Eds.), Emotion in education (pp. 13–36). San Diego, CA: Elsevier Inc.

Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Titz, W., & Perry, R. P. (2002). Academic emotions in students' self-regulated learning and achievement: A program of qualitative and quantitative research. Educational Psychologist, 37 (2), 91–105.

Pell, T., & Jarvis, T. (2001). Developing attitude to science scales for use with children of ages from five to eleven years. International Journal of Science Education, 23 (8), 847–862.

Pintrich, P. R., Marx, R. W., & Boyle, R. A. (1993). Beyond cold conceptual change: The role of motivational beliefs and classroom contextual factors in the process of conceptual change. Review of Educational Research, 63 (2), 167–199.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). Discourse and social psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour. London: Sage Publications. Pugh, K. J., & Girod, M. (2007). Science, art, and experience: Constructing a science pedagogy from Dewey's aesthetics. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18, 9–27.

Putnam, R. (2001). Community-based social capital and educational performance. In D. Ravitich & J. Viteritti (Eds.), Making good citizens: Education and civil society (pp. 58–95). London: Yale University Press.

Putnam, R. (2004). Education, diversity, social cohesion and "social capital." Paper delivered at meeting of OECD Education Ministry-Raising the Quality of Learning for All. Dublin, Ireland: March 18.

Rathunde, K. , & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1993). Undivided interest and the growth of talent: A longitudinal study of adolescents. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 22 (4), 385–405.

Rattansi, A., & Phoenix, A. (2005). Rethinking youth identities: Modernist and postmodernist frameworks. Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 5 (2), 97–123.

Renninger, K. , & Hidi, S. (2011). Revisiting the conceptualization, measurement, and generation of interest. Educational Psychologist, 46 (3), 168–184.

Research Business, The . (1994). Views of science among students, teachers and parents. London: Institution of Electrical Engineers. Research Councils UK . (2008). Public attitudes to science 2008: A survey. London: Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills. Riegle-Crumb, C. , Moore, C. , & Ramos-Wada, A. (2011). Who wants to have a career in science or math? Exploring adolescents' future aspirations by gender and race/ethnicity. Science Education, 95, 458–476.

Rivkin, S. , Hanushek, E. A. , & Kain, J. (2005). Teachers, schools, and academic achievement. Econometrics, 73 (2), 417–458. Rowe, K. (2003). The importance of teacher quality. Paper presented to the Australian Council for Educational Research Conference, Melbourne, Australia.

Royal Society, The . (2006). Taking a Leading role. London: Author.

Ryan, A., & Aikenhead, G. (1992). Students' preconceptions about the epistemology of science. Science Education, 76 (6), 559–580.

Ryder, J. (2001). Identifying science understanding for functional scientific literacy. Studies in Science Education, 36, 1–42.

Saleh, I. M., & Khine, M. S. (Eds.). (2011). Attitude research in science education: Classic and contemporary measurements. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Sanders, W., Wright, S. P., & Horn, S. (1997). Teacher and classroom context effects on student achievement: Implications for teacher evaluation. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 11 (1), 57–67.

Schibeci, R. A. (1984). Attitudes to science: An update. Studies in Science Education, 11, 26–59.

Schreiner, C. (2006). Exploring a ROSE-garden: Norwegian youth's orientations towards science seen as signs of late modern identities. Oslo: University of Oslo.

Schreiner, C., & Sjøberg, S. (2007). Science education and youth's identity construction—two incompatible projects? In D. Corrigan, J. Dillon, & R. Gunstone (Eds.), The re-emergence of values in the science curriculum (pp. 231–247). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Sfard, A. , & Prusak, A. (2005). Telling identities: In search of an analystic tool for investigating learning as a culturally shaped activity. Educational Researcher, 34, 14–22.

Simpkins, S. D., Davis-Kean, P. E., & Eccles, J. S. (2006). Math and science motivation: A longitudinal examination of the links between choices and beliefs. Developmental Psychology, 42 (1), 70–83. doi:10.1037/

Simpson, R. D., & Oliver, J. S. (1985). Attitude toward science and achievement motivation profiles of male and female science students in grades six through ten. Science Education, 69 (4), 511–526.

Sinatra, G. (2005). The "warming trend" in conceptual change research: The legacy of Paul R. Pintrich. Educational Psychologist, 40 (2), 107–115.

Sinatra, G., & Pintrich, P. (Eds.). (2002). Intentional conceptual change. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Sjaastad, J. (2012). Sources of inspiration: The role of significant persons in young people's choice of science in higher education. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (10), 1615–1636. doi:10.1 080/09500693.2011.590543

Sjøberg, S., & Schreiner, C. (2005). How do learners in different cultures relate to science and technology? Results and perspectives from the project ROSE. Asia Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching, 6 (2), 1–16.

Speering, W., & Rennie, L. (1996). Students' perceptions about science: The impact of transition from primary to secondary school. Research in Science Education, 26, 283–298.

Stagg, P. (2007). Careers from science: An investigation for the Science Education Forum: Warwick, UK: Centre for Education and Industry (CEI).

Steinke, J., Lapinski, M., Crocker, N., Zietsman-Thomas, A., Williams, Y., Evergreen, S., & Kuchibhotia, S. (2007). Assessing media influences on middle school-aged children's perceptions of women in science using the Draw-a-Scientist Test (DAST). Science Communication, 29 (1), 35–64.

Stokes, H., & Wyn, J. (2007). Constructing identities and making careers: Young people's perspectives on work and learning. International Journal of Lifelong Education, 26 (5), 495–511.

Strauss, R. P., & Sawyer, E. A. (1986). Some new evidence on teacher and student competencies. Economics of Education Review, 5 (1), 41–48.

Symington, D., & Tytler, R. (2004). Community leaders' views of the purposes of science in the compulsory years of schooling. International Journal of Science Education, 26 (11), 1403–1418.

Tai, R. H., Qi Liu, C., Maltese, A. V., & Fan, X. (2006). Planning early for careers in science. Science, 312, 1143–1145.

Teitelbaum, M. (2007). Do we need more scientists and engineers? Paper presented at the Conference on The National Value of Science Education. University of York, York, UK.

Tenenbaum, H. R., & Leaper, C. (2003). Parent–child conversations about science: The socialization of gender inequities? Developmental Psychology, 39 (1), 34–47.

Thomson, S., & De Bortoli, L. (2008). Exploring scientific literacy: How Australia measures up. Camberwell, Victoria, Australia: ACER. Tobin, K., & Fraser, B. (1990). What does it mean to be an exemplary science teacher? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 27 (1), 3–25.

Tobin, K., Tippins, D. J., & Gallard, A. J. (1994). Research on instructional strategies for teaching science. In D. L. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 45–93). New York: MacMillan.

Tytler, R. (2003). A window for a purpose: Developing a framework for describing effective science teaching and learning. Research in Science Education, 30(3), 273–298.

Tytler, R., Osborne, J. F., Williams, G., Tytler, K., Clark, J. C., Tomei, A., (2008). Opening up pathways: Engagement in STEM across the primary-secondary school transition. A review of the literature concerning supports and barriers to science, technology, engineering and mathematics engagement at primary-secondary transition. Commissioned by the Australian Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations. Melbourne, Australia: Deakin University.

Tytler, R., Prain, V., Hubber, P., & Waldrip, B. (Eds.). (2013). Constructing representations to learn science. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Tytler, R., Waldrip, B., & Griffiths, M. (2004). Windows into practice: Constructing effective science teaching and learning in a school change initiative. International Journal of Science Education, 26 (2), 171–194.

Ulriksen, L., Møller Madsen, L., & Holmegaard, H. T. (2010). What do we know about explanations for drop out/opt out among young people from STM higher education programmes? Studies in Science Education, 46 (2), 209–244.

van Lier, L. (1996). Interaction in the language curriculum. New York: Longman.

Varelas, M., Kane, J., & Wylie, C. (2011). Young African American children's representations of self, science, and school: Making sense of difference. Science Education, 95 (5), 824–851.

Varelas, M., Kane, J., & Wylie, C. (2012). Young black children and science: Chronotopes of narratives around their science journals. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 568–596.

Walker, E. (2007). The structure and culture of developing a mathematics tutoring collaborative in an urban high school. High School Journal, 91 (1), 57–67.

Walker, K. , Alloway, N. , Dalley-Trim, L. , & Patterson, A. (2006). Counsellor practices and student perspectives: Perceptions of career counselling in Australian secondary schools. Australian Journal of Career Development, 15 (1), 37–45.

Walkerdine, V. (1990). Schoolgirl fictions. London: Verso.

Watt, H. (2005). Exploring adolescent motivations for pursuing maths-related careers. Australian Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology, 5 (2005), 107–116.

Wayne, A., & Youngs, P. (2003). Teacher characteristics and student achievement gains: A review. Review of Educational Research, 73 (1), 89–122.

Weinburgh, M. (1995). Gender differences in student attitudes toward science: A meta-analysis of the literature from 1970 to 1991. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 32 (4), 387–398.

Whitfield, R. C. (1980). Educational research & science teaching. School Science Review, 60, 411–430.

Wickman, P.-O. (2006). Aesthetic experience in science education: Learning and meaning-making as situated talk and action. London; Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Woolnough, B. (1994). Effective science teaching. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Wyn, J. (2011). The sociology of youth. Youth Studies Australia, 30 (3), 34–39.

Wyn, J., & White, R. (1997). Rethinking youth. London: Sage.

Yager, R. E., & Penick, J. E. (1986). Perception of four age groups toward science classes, teachers, and the value of science. Science and Education, 70 (4), 355–363.

Zhao, D., & Singh, M. (2011). Why do Chinese-Australian students outperform their Australian peers in mathematics? A comparative case study . International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 9 (1), 69–87.

Classroom Learning Environments

Afari, E., Aldridge, J. M., Fraser, B. J., & Khine, M. S. (2013). Students' perceptions of the learning environment and attitudes in gamebased mathematics classrooms. Learning Environments Research, 16, 131–150.

Aldridge, J. M., Dorman, J. P., & Fraser, B. J. (2004). Use of multitraitmultimethod modelling to validate actual and preferred forms of the Technology-Rich Outcomes-Focused Learning Environment Inventory (TROFLEI). Australian Journal of Educational and Developmental Psychology, 4, 110–125.

Aldridge, J. M., & Fraser, B. J. (2000). A cross-cultural study of classroom learning environments in Australia and Taiwan. Learning Environments Research, 3, 101–134.

Aldridge, J. M., & Fraser, B. J. (2008). Outcomes-focused learning environments: Determinants and effects. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Aldridge, J. M., Fraser, B. J., Bell, L., & Dorman, J. P. (2012). Using a new learning environment questionnaire for reflection in teacher action research. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23, 259–290.

Aldridge, J. M., Fraser, B. J., & Huang, I. T.-C. (1999). Investigating classroom environments in Taiwan and Australia with multiple research methods. Journal of Educational Research, 93, 48–62.

Aldridge, J. M., Fraser, B. J., & Ntuli, S. (2009). Utilising learning environment assessments to improve teaching practices among inservice teachers undertaking a distance education programme. South African Journal of Education, 29, 147–170.

Aldridge, J. M., Fraser, B. J., & Sebela, M. P. (2004). Using teacher action research to promote constructivist learning environments in South Africa. South African Journal of Education, 24, 245–253.

Aldridge, J. M., Fraser, B. J., Taylor, P. C., & Chen, C.-C. (2000). Constructivist learning environments in a cross-national study in Taiwan and Australia. International Journal of Science Education, 22, 37–55.

Aldridge, J. M., Laugksch, R. C., & Fraser, B. J. (2006). School-level environment and outcomes-based education in South Africa. Learning Environments Research, 9, 123–147.

Aldridge, J. M., Laugksch, R. C., Seopa, M. A., & Fraser, B. J. (2006). Development and validation of an instrument to monitor the implementation of outcomes-based learning environments in science classrooms in South Africa. International Journal of Science Education, 28, 45–70.

Allen, D., & Fraser, B. J. (2007). Parent and student perceptions of the classroom learning environment and its association with student outcomes. Learning Environments Research, 10, 67–82.

Anderson, G. L., & Walberg, H. J. (1968). Classroom climate group learning. International Journal of Educational Sciences, 2, 175–180. Brekelmans, M., Levy, J., & Rodriguez, R. (1993). A typology of teacher communication style. In Th.Wubbels & J. Levy (Eds.), Do you know what you look like? Interpersonal relationships in education (pp. 46–55). London: Falmer Press.

Brekelmans, M. , Wubbels, Th., & van Tartwijk, J. (2005). Teacher- student relationships across the teaching career. International Journal of Educational Research, 43, 55-71.

Chandra, V., & Fisher, D. L. (2009). Students' perceptions of a blended web-based learning environment. Learning Environments Research, 12, 31–44.

Chang, V., & Fisher, D. (2003). The validation and application of a new learning environment instrument for online learning in higher education. In M. S. Khine & D. Fisher (Eds.), Technology-rich learning environments: A future perspective (pp. 1–20). Singapore: World Scientific.

Chionh, Y. H., & Fraser, B. J. (2009). Classroom environment, achievement, attitudes and self-esteem in geography and mathematics in Singapore. International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education, 18, 29–44.

Chua, S. L., Wong, A. F. L., & Chen, D.-T. (2011). The nature of Chinese language classroom learning environments in Singapore secondary schools. Learning Environments Research, 14, 75–90.

den Brok, P., Fisher, D., Rickards, T., & Bull, E. (2006). Californian science students' perceptions of their classroom learning environments. Educational Research and Evaluation, 12 (1), 3–25.

den Brok, P., Fisher, D. L., & Scott, R. H. (2005). The importance of teacher interpersonal behaviour for student attitudes in Brunei primary science classes. International Journal of Science Education, 27, 765–779.

den Brok, P., Telli, S., Cakiroglu, J., Taconis, R., & Tekkaya, C. (2010). Learning environment profiles of Turkish secondary biology students. Learning Environments Research, 13, 187–204.

Dhindsa, H. S., & Fraser, B. J. (2004). Culturally-sensitive factors in teacher trainees' learning environments. Learning Environments Research, 7, 165–181.

Dhindsa, H. S., & Fraser, B. J. (2011). Culturally sensitive factors in the learning environment of science classrooms in Brunei Darussalam. The Open Education Journal, 4, 90–99.

Dorman, J. P. (2003). Cross-national validation of the What Is Happening In This Class? (WIHIC) questionnaire using confirmatory factor analysis. Learning Environments Research, 6, 231–245.

Dorman, J. P. (2008). Use of multitrait-multimethod modelling to validate actual and preferred forms of the What Is Happening In This Class? (WIHIC) questionnaire. Learning Environments Research, 11, 179–193.

Dorman, J. P. , Aldridge, J. M. , & Fraser, B. J. (2006). Using students' assessment of classroom environment to develop a typology of secondary school classrooms. International Education Journal, 7, 909–915.

Dorman, J., Fraser, B., & McRobbie, C. (1995). Associations between school-level environment and science classroom environment in secondary schools. Research in Science Education, 25, 333–351.

Dorman, J. P., Fraser, B. J., & McRobbie, C. J. (1997). Classroom environment in Australian Catholic and government secondary schools. Curriculum and Teaching, 12 (1), 3–14.

Ferguson, P. D., & Fraser, B. J. (1998). Changes in learning environment during the transition from primary to secondary school. Learning Environments Research, 1, 369–383.

Fisher, D. L., & Fraser, B. J. (1981). Validity and use of My Class Inventory. Science Education, 65, 145–156.

Fisher, D., & Fraser, B. (1983a). Validity and use of Classroom Environment Scale. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 5, 26I–27I.

Fisher, D. L., & Fraser, B. J. (1983b). A comparison of actual and preferred classroom environment as perceived by science teachers and students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 20, 55–61.

Fisher, D. L., Henderson, D., & Fraser, B. J. (1997). Laboratory environments and student outcomes in senior high school biology. American Biology Teacher, 59, 214–219.

Fisher, D. L., & Khine, M. S. (Eds.). (2006). Contemporary approaches to research on learning environments: Worldviews. Singapore: World Scientific.

Fisher, D. L., & Waldrip, B. G. (1997). Assessing culturally sensitive factors in learning environments of science classrooms. Research in Science Education, 27, 41–48.

Fisher, D. L., & Waldrip, B. G. (1999). Cultural factors of science classroom learning environments, teacher-student interactions and student outcomes. Research in Science and Technological Education, 17, 83–96.

Fraser, B. (1979). Evaluation of a science-based curriculum. In H. Walberg (Ed.), Educational environments and effects: Evaluation, policy, and productivity (pp. 218–234). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Fraser, B. (1986). Classroom environment. London, UK: Croom Helm. (Reprinted by Routledge in 2012.)

Fraser, B. J. (1990). Individualised classroom environment questionnaire. Melbourne, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Fraser, B. J. (1999a). "Grain sizes" in learning environment research: Combining qualitative and quantitative methods. In H. C. Waxman & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), New directions for teaching practice and research (pp. 285–296). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Fraser, B. J. (1999b). Using learning environment assessments to improve classroom and school climates. In H. J. Freiberg (Ed.), School climate: Measuring, improving and sustaining healthy learning environments (pp. 65–83). London: Falmer Press.

Fraser, B. J. (2001). Twenty thousand hours: Editor's introduction. Learning Environments Research, 4, 1–5.

Fraser, B. J. (2007). Classroom learning environments. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 103–124). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Fraser, B. J. (2012). Classroom learning environments: Retrospect, context and prospect. In B. J. Fraser, K. G. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 1191–1239). New York: Springer.

Fraser, B. J. , Aldridge, J. M. , & Adolphe, F. S. G. (2010). A cross-national study of secondary science classroom environments in Australia and Indonesia. Research in Science Education, 40, 551–571.

Fraser, B. J., Aldridge, J. M., & Soerjaningsih, W. (2010). Instructor- student interpersonal interaction and student outcomes at the university level in Indonesia. The Open Education Journal, 3, 32–44.

Fraser, B. J. , & Fisher, D. L. (1982). Predicting student outcomes from their perceptions of classroom psychosocial environment. American Educational Research Journal, 19, 498–518.

Fraser, B. J., & Fisher, D. L. (1983). Use of actual and preferred classroom environment scales in person–environment fit research. Journal of Educational Psychology, 75, 303–313.

Fraser, B., & Fisher, D. (1986). Using short forms of classroom climate instruments to assess and improve classroom psychosocial environment. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 23, 387–413.

Fraser, B., Fisher, D., & McRobbie, C. (1996, April). Development, validation, and use of personal and class forms of a new classroom environment instrument. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY. Fraser, B. J., Giddings, G. J., & McRobbie, C. J. (1995). Evolution and validation of a personal form of an instrument for assessing science laboratory classroom environments. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 32, 399–422.

Fraser, B. J., & Kahle, J. B. (2007). Classroom, home and peer environment influences on student outcomes in science and mathematics: An analysis of systemic reform data. International Journal of Science Education, 29, 1891–1909.

Fraser, B. J., & Lee, S. S. U. (2009). Science laboratory classroom environments in Korean high schools. Learning Environments Research, 12, 67–84.

Fraser, B., & McRobbie, C. (1995). Science laboratory classroom environments at schools and universities: A cross-national study. Educational Research and Evaluation, 1, 289–317.

Fraser, B., & Northfield, J. (1981). A study of ASEP in its first year of availability. Canberra: Australian Curriculum Development Centre. Fraser, B., Okebukola, P., & Jegede, O. (1992). Assessment of the learning environment of Nigerian science laboratory classes. Journal of the Science Teachers Association of Nigeria, 27 (2), 1–17.

Fraser, B., & The, G. (1994). Effect sizes associated with micro-PROLOG-based computer-assisted learning. Computers and Education: An International Journal, 23, 187–196.

Fraser, B. , & Walberg, H. (Eds.). (1991). Educational environments: Evaluation, antecedents and consequences. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

Goh, S. C., & Fraser, B. J. (1998). Teacher interpersonal behaviour, classroom environment and student outcomes in primary mathematics in Singapore. Learning Environments Research, 1, 199–229.

Goh, S. C., Young, D. J., & Fraser, B. J. (1995). Psychosocial climate and student outcomes in elementary mathematics classrooms: A multilevel analysis. Journal of Experimental Education, 64, 29–40.

Haertel, G. D., Walberg, H. J., & Haertel, E. H. (1981). Socio-psychological environments and learning: A quantitative synthesis. British Educational Research Journal, 7, 27–36.

Helding, K. A., & Fraser, B. J. (2013). Effectiveness of NBC (National Board certified) teachers in terms of learning environment, attitudes and achievement among secondary school students. Learning Environments Research, 16, 1–21.

Henderson, D., Fisher, D. L., & Fraser, B. J. (2000). Interpersonal behavior, learning environments and student outcomes in senior biology classes. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37, 26–43.

Idiris, S., & Fraser, B. (1997). Psychosocial environment of agricultural science classrooms in Nigeria. International Journal of Science Education, 19, 79–91.

Jegede, O., Fraser, B., & Okebukola, P. (1994). Altering socio-cultural beliefs hindering the learning of science. Instructional Science, 22, 137–152.

Khine, M. S., & Fisher, D. (Eds.). (2003). Technology-rich learning environments: A future perspective. Singapore: World Scientific. Khoo, H. S., & Fraser, B. J. (2008). Using classroom psychosocial environment in the evaluation of adult computer application courses in Singapore. Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 17, 53–67.

Kim, H. B., Fisher, D. L., & Fraser, B. J. (1999). Assessment and investigation of constructivist science learning environments in Korea. Research in Science and Technological Education, 17, 239–249.

Kim, H. B., Fisher, D. L., & Fraser, B. J. (2000). Classroom environment and teacher interpersonal behaviour in secondary science classes in Korea. Evaluation and Research in Education, 14, 3–22.

Koul, R. B., & Fisher, D. L. (2005). Cultural background and students' perspectives of science classroom learning environment and teacher interpersonal behaviour in Jammu, India. Learning Environments Research, 8, 195–211.

Lee, S. S. U., Fraser, B. J., & Fisher, D. L. (2003). Teacher-student interactions in Korean high school science classrooms. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 1, 67–85.

Lightburn, M. E., & Fraser, B. J. (2007). Classroom environment and student outcomes among students using anthropometry activities in high-school science. Research in Science and Technological Education, 25, 153–166.

MacLeod, C., & Fraser, B. (2010). Development, validation and application of a modified Arabic translation of the What Is Happening In This Class? (WIHIC) questionnaire. Learning Environments Research, 13, 105–125.

Majeed, A., Fraser, B. J., & Aldridge, J. M. (2002). Learning environment and its associations with student satisfaction among mathematics students in Brunei Darussalam. Learning Environments Research, 5, 203–226.

Maor, D., & Fraser, B. J. (1996). Use of classroom environment perceptions in evaluating inquiry-based computer assisted learning. International Journal of Science Education, 18, 401–421.

Margianti, E. S., Aldridge, J. M., & Fraser, B. J. (2004). Learning environment perceptions, attitudes and achievement among private Indonesian university students. International Journal of Private Higher Education. Retrieved March 10, 2006, from www.xaiu.com/xaiujournal

Martin-Dunlop, C., & Fraser, B. J. (2008). Learning environment and attitudes associated with an innovative course designed for prospective elementary teachers. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 6, 163–190.

McRobbie, C. J., & Fraser, B. J. (1993). Associations between student outcomes and psychosocial science environment. Journal of Educational Research, 87, 78–85.

Moos, R. H. (1974). The social climate scales: An overview. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Moos, R. H. (1978). A typology of junior high and high school classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 15, 53–66. Moos, R. H. (1979). Evaluating educational environments: Procedures, measures, findings, and policy implications. San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass. Moos, R. H., & Trickett, E. J. (1974). Classroom environment scale manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press. Nix, R. K., & Fraser, B. J. (2010). Using computer-assisted teaching to promote constructivist practices in teacher education. In B. A. Morris & G. M. Ferguson (Eds.), Computer-assisted teaching: New developments (pp. 93–115). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers. Nix, R. K., Fraser, B. J., & Ledbetter, C. E. (2005). Evaluating an integrated science learning environment using the Constructivist Learning Environment Survey. Learning Environments Research, 8, 109–133.

Ogbuehi, P. I., & Fraser, B. J. (2007). Learning environment, attitudes and conceptual development associated with innovative strategies in middle-school mathematics. Learning Environments Research, 10, 101–114.

Peiro, M. M., & Fraser, B. J. (2009). Assessment and investigation of science learning environments in the early childhood grades. In M. Ortiz & C. Rubio (Eds.), Educational evaluation: 21st century issues and challenges (pp. 349–365). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Pickett, L. H., & Fraser, B. J. (2009). Evaluation of a mentoring program for beginning teachers in terms of the learning environment and student outcomes in participants' school classrooms. In A. Selkirk & M. Tichenor (Eds.), Teacher education: Policy, practice and research (pp. 1–15). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Quek, C. L., Wong, A. F. L., & Fraser, B. J. (2005a). Teacher-student interaction and gifted students' attitudes toward chemistry in laboratory classrooms in Singapore. Journal of Classroom Interaction, 40 (1), 18–28.

Quek, C. L., Wong, A. F. L., & Fraser, B. J. (2005b). Student perceptions of chemistry laboratory learning environments, student–teacher interactions and attitudes in secondary school gifted education classes in Singapore. Research in Science Education, 35, 299–321. Rentoul, A., & Fraser, B. (1979). Conceptualization of enquiry-based or open classroom learning environments. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 11, 233–245.

Rickards, T., den Brok, P., & Fisher, D. L. (2005). The Australian science teacher: A typology of teacher-student interpersonal behaviour in Australian science classes. Learning Environments Research, 8, 267–287.

Robinson, E., & Fraser, B. J. (2013). Kindergarten students' and parents' perceptions of science classroom environments: Achievement and attitudes. Learning Environments Research, 16, 1–17, 16(2), 151–167.

Scott, R. H., & Fisher, D. L. (2004). Development, validation and application of a Malay translation of an elementary version of the Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction (QTI). Research in Science Education, 34, 173–194.

Scott Houston, L., Fraser, B. J., & Ledbetter, C. E. (2008). An evaluation of elementary school science kits in terms of classroom environment and student attitudes. Journal of Elementary Science Education, 20, 29–47.

Sinclair, B. B., & Fraser, B. J. (2002). Changing classroom environments in urban middle schools. Learning Environments Research, 5, 301–328.

Sink, C. A., & Spencer, L. R. (2005). My Class Inventory—Short Form as an accountability tool for elementary school counsellors to measure classroom climate. Professional School Counseling, 9, 37–48.

Taylor, P. C., Fraser, B. J., & Fisher, D. L. (1997). Monitoring constructivist classroom learning environments. International Journal of Educational Research, 27, 293–302.

The, G. , & Fraser, B. J. (1994). An evaluation of computer-assisted learning in terms of achievement, attitudes and classroom environment. Evaluation and Research in Education, 8, 147–161.

The, G., & Fraser, B. (1995). Development and validation of an instrument for assessing the psychosocial environment of computerassisted learning classrooms. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 12, 177–193.

Tobin, K., & Fraser, B. (1998). Qualitative and quantitative landscapes of classroom learning environments. In B. J. Fraser & K. G. Tobin (Eds.), The international handbook of science education (pp. 623–640). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Wahyudi , & Treagust, D. F. (2004). The status of science classroom learning environments in Indonesian lower secondary schools. Learning Environments Research, 7, 43–63.

Walberg, H. J. (Ed.). (1979). Educational environments and effects: Evaluation, policy and productivity. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan. Welch, A. G., Cakir, M., Peterson, C., & Ray, C. M. (2012). A cross-cultural validation of the Technology-Rich Outcomes-Focussed Learning Environment Inventory (TROFLEI) in Turkey and the USA. Research in Science and Technological Education, 30, 49–63. Wolf, S. J., & Fraser, B. J. (2008). Learning environment, attitudes and achievement among middle-school science students using inquiry-based laboratory activities. Research in Science Education, 38, 321–341.

Wong, A. F. L., & Fraser, B. J. (1996). Environment–attitude associations in the chemistry laboratory classroom. Research in Science and Technological Education, 14, 91–102.

Wong, A. F. L., Young, D. J., & Fraser, B. J. (1997). A multilevel analysis of learning environments and student attitudes. Educational Psychology, 17, 449–468.

Wubbels, Th., & Brekelmans, M. (1998). The teacher factor in the social climate of the classroom. In B. J. Fraser & K. G. Tobin (Eds.), International handbook of science education (pp. 565–580). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Wubbels, Th., & Brekelmans, M. (2012). Teacher–students relationships in the classroom. In B. J. Fraser , K. G. Tobin , & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 1241–1255). New York: Springer.

Wubbels, Th., Brekelmans, M., den Brok, P., & van Tartwijk, J. (2006). An interpersonal perspective on classroom management in secondary classrooms in the Netherlands. In C. Evertson & C. Weinstein (Eds.), Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues (pp. 1161–1191). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wubbels, Th., den Brok, P., van Tartwijk, J., & Levy, J. (Eds.). (2012). Interpersonal relationships in education: An overview of research. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Wubbels, Th., & Levy, J. (Eds.). (1993). Do you know what you look like? Interpersonal relationships in education. London: Falmer Press. Yarrow, A., Millwater, J., & Fraser, B. J. (1997). Improving university and primary school classroom environments through preservice teachers' action research. International Journal of Practical Experiences in Professional Education, 1 (1), 68–93.

Zandvliet, D. B., & Fraser, B. J. (2004). Learning environments in information and communications technology classrooms. Technology, Pedagogy and Education, 13, 97–123.

Zandvliet, D. B., & Fraser, B. J. (2005). Physical and psychosocial environments associated with networked classrooms. Learning Environments Research, 8, 1–17.

Learning Science Outside of School

Achiam, M. F. (2013). A content-oriented model for science exhibit engineering. International Journal of Science Education, Part B: Communication and Public Engagement, 3 (3), 214–232. doi:10.1080/21548 455.2012.698445

Afonso, A. S., & Gilbert, J. K. (2007a). Educational value of different types of exhibits in an interactive science and technology center. Science Education, 91 (6), 967–987.

Afonso, A. S., & Gilbert, J. K. (2007b). The nature of exhibits about acoustics in science and technology centers. Research in Science Education, 38 (5), 633–651.

Afonso, A. S., & Gilbert, J. K. (2013). The role of "popular" books in informal chemistry education. International Journal of Science Education, Part B: Communication and Public Engagement, 3 (1), 77–99.

Afterschool Alliance . (2011). STEM learning in Afterschool: An analysis of impacts and outcomes. Retrieved from www.afterschoolalliance.org/STEM-Afterschool-Outcomes.pdf

Allen, S. (2004). Designs for learning: Studying science museum exhibits that do more than entertain. Science Education, 88 (Suppl. 1), S17–S33.

Allen, S., Gutwill, J., Perry, D. L., Garibay, C., Ellenbogen, K., Heimlich, J. E., ... Klien, C. (2007). Research in museums: Coping with complexity. In J. H. Falk, L. D. Dierking, & S. Foutz (Eds.), In principle, in practice: Museums as learning institutions (pp. 229–245). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Anderson, D., Kisiel, J., & Storksdieck, M. (2006). Understanding teachers' perspectives on field trips: Discovering common ground in three countries. Curator: The Museum Journal, 49 (3), 365–386.

Anderson, D., Piscitelli, B., & Everett, M. (2008). Competing agendas: Young children's museum field trips. Curator: The Museum Journal, 51 (3), 253–273.

Anderson, D., Storksdieck, M., & Spock, M. (2007). Understanding the long-term impacts of museum experiences. In J. H. Falk, L. D. Dierking, & S. Foutz (Eds.), In principle, in practice: Museums as learning institutions (pp. 197–215). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press. Annetta, L. A. (2008). Video games in education: Why they should be used and how they are being used? Theory Into Practice, 47 (3), 229–239.

Archer, L., DeWitt, J., Osborne, J., Dillon, J., Willis, B., & Wong, B. (2012). Science aspirations, capital, and family habitus: How families shape children's engagement and identification with science. American Educational Research Journal, 49 (5), 881–908. Aschbacher, P. R., Li, E., & Roth, E. J. (2010). Is science me? High school students' identifies, participation and aspirations in science,

engineering, and medicine. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (5), 564–582.

Ash, D., Crain, R., Brandt, C., Loomis, M., Wheaton, M., & Bennett, C. (2007). Talk, tools, and tensions: Observing biological talk over time. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (12), 1581–1602.

Ash, D. B., Lombana, J., & Alcala, L. (2012). Changing practices, changing identities as museum educators: From didactic telling to scaffolding in the ZPD. In E. Davidsson & A. Jakobsson (Eds.), Understanding interactions at science centers and museums (pp. 23–44). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Association for Science and Discovery Centres (ASDC) . (2010). Assessing the impact of UK science and discovery centres: Towards a set of common indicators. Bristol, UK: Author. Retrieved from www.sciencecentres.org.uk

Association of Science-Technology Centers (ASTC) . (2012). 2011 science center and museum statistics. Washington, DC: Author. Astor-Jack, T. , Whaley, K. L. K. , Dierking, L. D. , Perry, D. L. , & Garibay, C. (2007). Investigating socially-mediated learning. In J. H. Falk , L. D. Dierking , & S. Foutz (Eds.), In principle, in practice: Museums as learning institutions (pp. 217–228). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Bamberger, Y., & Tal, T. (2007). Learning in a personal context: Levels of choice in a free choice learning environment in science and natural history museums. Science Education, 91 (1), 75–95.

Bamberger, Y., & Tal, T. (2008). Multiple outcomes of class visits to natural history museums: The students' view. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 17, 274–284.

Barnett, M. , Wagner, H. , Gatling, A. , Anderson, J. , Houle, M. , & Kafka, A. (2006). The impact of science fiction film on student understanding of science. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 15 (2), 179–191.

Barriault, C., & Pearson, D. (2010). Assessing exhibits for learning in science centers: A practical tool. Visitor Studies, 13 (1), 90–106. Bell, A. (2011). Science as "horrible": Irreverent deference in science communication. Science as Culture, 20 (4), 491–512.

Bell, P. , Lewenstein, B. , Shouse, A. W. , & Feder, M. A. (Eds.). (2009). Learning science in informal environments: People, places, and pursuits. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Bencze, J. L., & Bowen, G. M. (2009). A national science fair: Exhibiting support for the knowledge economy. International Journal of Science Education, 31 (18), 2459–2483.

Bergman, K. (2012). Girls just wanna be smart? The depiction of women scientists in contemporary science fiction. International Journal of Gender, Science and Technology, 4 (3). Retrieved from http://genderandset.open.ac.uk/index.php/genderandset/article/viewFile/224/438 Boyle, E. A., Connolly, T. M., & Hainey, T. (2011). The role of psychology in understanding the impact of computer games. Entertainment Computing, 2, 69–74.

Briseño-Garzón, A., & Anderson, D. (2012). "My child is your child"; Family behavior in a Mexican science museum. Curator: The Museum Journal, 55 (2), 179–201.

British Science Association . (2012). Evaluation report: National Science & Engineering Week 2012. Retrieved from

www.britishscienceassociation.org/national-science-engineering-week/archive/evaluation-reports

Brossard, D., & Scheufele, D. A. (2013). Science, new media, and the public. Science, 339, 40–41.

Bultitude, K., McDonald, D., & Custead, S. (2011). The rise and rise of science festivals: An international review of organised events to celebrate science. International Journal of Science Education, Part B: Communication and Public Engagement, 1 (2), 165–188.

Bultitude, K., & Sardo, A. M. (2012). Leisure and pleasure: Science events in unusual locations. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (18), 2775–2795.

Butt, S. , Clery, E. , Abeywardana, V. , & Phillips, M. (National Centre for Social Research). (2010). Wellcome Trust Monitor Survey report (September 2009 updated November 2012). London: Wellcome Trust.

Chan, T.-W., Roschelle, J., Hsi, S., Kinshuk, Sharples, M., Brown, T., ... Hoppe, U. (2006). One-to-one technology-enhanced learning: An opportunity for global research collaboration. Research and Practice in Technology-Enhanced Learning, 1 (1), 3–29. Retrieved from http://telearn.archives-ouvertes.fr/docs/00/19/06/32/PDF/A132_Chan-etal2006_OneToOne.pdf Charitonos, K. , Blake, C. , Scanlon, E. , & Jones, A. (2012). Museum learning via social and mobile technologies: (How) can online interactions enhance the visitor experience? British Journal of Educational Technology, 43 (5), 802–819.

Clayton, S., Fraser, J., & Saunders, C. D. (2009). Zoo experiences: Conversations, connections, and concern for animals. Zoo Biology, 28, 377–397.

Clemence, M. , Gilby, N. , Shah, J. , Swiecicka, J. , & Warren, D. (Ipsos MORI). (2013). Wellcome Trust Monitor: Wave 2. London: Wellcome Trust.

Connolly, T. M., Boyle, E. A., MacArthur, E., Hainey, T., & Boyle, J. M. (2012). A systematic literature review of empirical evidence on computer games and serious games. Computers & Education, 59, 661–686.

Crilley, G. (2011). Visitor expectations and visit satisfaction at zoos. In W. Frost (Ed.), Zoos and tourism: Conservation, education, entertainment? (pp. 171–185). Bristol, UK: Channel View Publications.

Dabney, K. P., Tai, R. H., Almarode, J. T., Miller-Friedmann, J. L., Sonnert, G., Sadler, P. M., & Hazari, Z. (2012). Out-of-school time science activities and their association with career interest in STEM. International Journal of Science Education, Part B: Communication and Public Engagement, 2 (1), 63–79.

Davidson, S. K., Passmore, C., & Anderson, D. (2010). Learning on zoo field trips: The interaction of the agendas and practices of students, teachers, and zoo educators. Science Education, 94 (1), 122–141.

Dawson, E., & Jensen, E. (2011). Towards a contextual turn in visitor studies: Evaluating visitor segmentation and identity-related motivations. Visitor Studies, 14 (2), 127–140.

DeWitt, J., & Hohenstein, J. (2010a). Supporting student learning: A comparison of student discussion in museums and classrooms. Visitor Studies, 13 (1), 41–66.

DeWitt, J., & Hohenstein, J. (2010b). An investigation into teacher–student talk in two settings. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (4), 454–473.

DeWitt, J., & Osborne, J. (2007). Supporting teachers on science-focused school trips: Towards an integrated framework of theory and practice. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (6), 685–710.

DeWitt, J., & Storksdierk, M. (2008). A short review of school field trips: Key findings from the past and implications for the future. Visitor Studies, 11 (2), 181–197.

Dhingra, K. (2012). Science stories on television. In K. Tobin , B. J. Fraser , & C. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (Vol. 2, pp. 1135–1146). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Dickinson, J. L., & Bonney, R. (Eds.). (2012). Citizen science: Public participation in environmental research. New York: Cornell University Press.

Dierking, L. D., Falk, J. H., Rennie, L., Anderson, D., & Ellenbogen, K. (2003). Policy statement of the "Informal Science Education" Ad Hoc Committee. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40 (2), 108–111.

Dockett, S., Main, S., & Kelly, L. (2011). Consulting young children: Experiences from a museum. Visitor Studies, 14 (1), 13–33. Dohn, N. B. (2013). Upper secondary students' situational interest: A case study of the role of a zoo visit in a biology class. International Journal of Science Education, 35 (16), 2732–2751.

Driscoll, E. A., & Lownds, N. K. (2007). The garden wonder wall: Fostering wonder and curiosity on multi-day garden field trips. Applied Environmental Education and Communication, 6, 105–112.

Dudo, A., Brossard, D., Shanahan, J., Scheufele, D. A., Morgan, M., & Signorielli, N. (2011). Science on television in the 21st century: Recent trends in portrayals and their contributions to public attitudes toward science. Communication Research, 38 (6), 754–777.

Eberbach, C. , & Crowley, K. (2009). From everyday to scientific observation: How children learn to observe the biologist's world. Review of Educational Research, 79 (1), 39–68.

Falk, J. H. (Ed.). (2001). Free-choice science education: How we learn science outside of schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Falk, J. H. (2006). An identity-centered approach to understanding museum learning. Curator: The Museum Journal, 49 (2), 151–166.

Falk, J. H. (2009). Identity and the museum visitor experience. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Falk, J. H. (2011). Contextualizing Falk's identity-related visitor motivation model. Visitor Studies, 14 (2), 141–157.

Falk, J. H., & Dierking, L. D. (1995). Public institutions for personal learning: Establishing a research agenda. Washington, DC: American Association of Museums.

Falk, J. H., & Dierking, L. D. (2000). Learning from museums: Visitor experiences and the making of meaning. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Falk, J. H. , Dierking, L. D. , & Foutz, S. (Eds.). (2007). In principle, in practice: Museums as learning institutions. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Falk, J. H., Heimlich, J. E., & Bronnenkant, K. (2008). Using identity-related visit motivations as a tool for understanding adult zoo and aquarium visitor's meaning making. Curator: The Museum Journal, 51 (1), 55–80.

Falk, J. H., Heimlich, J. E., Vernon, C. L., & Bronnenkant, K. (2010). Critique of a critique: Do zoos and aquariums promote attitude change in visitors? Society and Animals, 18, 415–419.

Falk, J. H., & Needham, M. D. (2011). Measuring the impact of a science center on its community. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (1), 1–12.

Falk, J. H., Osborne, J., Dierking, L., Dawson, E., Wenger, M., & Wong, B. (2012). Analysing the UK science education community: The contribution of informal providers. London: Wellcome Trust.

Falk, J. H., Reinhard, E. M., Vernon, C. L., Bronnenkant, K., Heimlich, J. E., & Deans, N. L. (2007). Why zoos and aquariums matter: Assessing the impact of a visit to a zoo or aquarium. Silver Spring, MD: Association of Zoos and Aquariums.

Falk, J. H., & Storksdieck, M. (2005). Using the contextual model of learning to understand visitor learning from a science center exhibition. Science Education, 89, 744–778.

Faria, C., & Chagas, I. (2012). Investigating school-guided visits to an aquarium: What roles for science teachers? International Journal of Science Education, Part B: Communication and Public Engagement, 3 (2), 159–174.

Fender, J. G., & Crowley, K. (2007). How parent explanation changes what children learn from everyday scientific thinking. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 28, 189–210.

Fenichel, M., & Schweingruber, H. A. (2010). Surrounded by science: Learning science in informal environments. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Flagg, B. (2012). Summative evaluation of "PlanetMania" mobile app in Maryland Science Center's "Life Beyond Earth" exhibit. [Multimedia Research]. Maryland Science Center (Research Report No. 13–001). Retrieved from http://informalscience.org/evaluation/ic-000-000-003-

551/_Summative_Evaluation_of_PlanetMania_Mobile_App_in_Maryland_Science_Center_s_Life_Beyond_Earth_Exhibit_ Friedman, A. (Ed.). (2008). Framework for evaluating impacts of informal science education projects. Retrieved from http://informalscience.org/documents/Eval_Framework.pdf

Friedman, A. J. (2010). The evolution of the science museum. Physics Today, 63 (10). Retrieved from

http://scitation.aip.org/content/aip/magazine/physicstoday/article/63/10/10.1063/1.3502548

Frontier Economics . (2009). Assessing the impact of science centres in England: A report prepared for the BIS. London: Author. Retrieved from sciencecentres.org.uk/govreport/docs/impact_of_science_centres.pdf

Gee, J. P. (2007). What video games have to teach us about learning and literacy (2nd ed.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan. Goulding, C. , Saren, M. , & Lindridge, A. (2013). Reading the body at von Hagen's "Body Worlds." Annals of Tourism Research, 40, 306–330.

Griffin, J. (2012). Exploring and scaffolding learning interactions between teachers, students and museum educators. In E. Davidsson & A. Jakobsson (Eds.), Understanding interactions at science centers and museums (pp. 115–128). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Gupta, P., & Adams, J. D. (2012). Museum–university partnerships for preservice science education. In K. Tobin , B. J. Fraser , & C. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (Vol. 2, pp. 1147–1162). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer. Gutwill, J. P. , & Allen, S. (2010). Facilitating family group inquiry at science museum exhibits. Science Education, 94 (4), 710–742.

Gutwill, J. P. , & Allen, S. (2012). Deepening students' scientific inquiry skills during a science museum field trip. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 21 (1), 130–181.

Hall, M. K., Foutz, S., & Mayhew, M. A. (2012). Design and impacts of a youth-directed café scientifique program. International Journal of Science Education, Part B: Communication and Public Engagement, 3 (2), 175–198.

Heath, C., vom Lehn, D., & Osborne, J. (2005). Interaction and interactives: Collaboration and participation with computer-based exhibits. Public Understanding of Science, 14 (1), 91–101.

Hein, G. E. (1998). Learning in the museum. London: Routledge.

Hillman, T., Weilenmann, A., & Jungselius, B. (2012). Creating live experiences with real and stuffed animals: The use of mobile technologies in museums. Paper presented at the Dream Conference, Denmark. Retrieved from www.dreamconference.dk/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/Hillman.pdf

Hodder, P. (2011). Science as theatre: A New Zealand history of performances and exhibitions. Journal of Science Communication, 10 (2), A01. Retrieved from http://jcom.sissa.it

Hohenstein, J., & Tran, L. U. (2007). Use of questions in exhibit labels to generate explanatory conversation among science museum visitors. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (12), 1557–1580.

Hooper-Greenhill, E. (2007). Museums and education: Purpose, pedagogy, performance. New York: Routledge.

Hsi, S. (2007). Conceptualizing learning from the everyday activities of digital kids. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (12), 1509–1529.

Jagger, S. L., Dubek, M. M., & Pedretti, E. (2012). "It's a personal thing": Visitors' responses to Body Worlds. Museum Management and Curatorship, 27 (4), 357–374.

Jarman, R., McClune, B., Pyle, E., & Braband, G. (2012). The critical reading of the images associated with science-related news reports: Establishing a knowledge, skills and attitudes framework. International Journal of Science Education, Part B: Communication and Public Engagement, 2 (2), 103–129.

Jensen, E., Dawson, E., & Falk, J. H. (2011). Dialog and synthesis: Developing consensus in visitor research methodology. Visitor Studies, 14 (2), 158–161.

Kisiel, J. (2003). Teachers, museums and worksheets: A closer look at the learning experience. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 14 (1), 3–21.

Kisiel, J. (2010). Exploring a school–aquarium collaboration: An intersection of communities of practice. Science Education, 94 (1), 95–121.

Kisiel, J., Rowe, S., Vartabedian, M. A., & Kopczak, C. (2012). Evidence for family engagement in scientific reasoning at interactive animal exhibits. Science Education, 96 (6), 1047–1070.

Kollmann, E. K. (2007). The effect of broken exhibits on the experiences of visitors at a science museum. Visitor Studies, 10 (2), 178–191. Laherto, A. (2012). Informing the development of science exhibitions through educational research. International Journal of Science Education, Part B: Communication and Public Engagement, 3 (2), 121–143.

Layton, D., Jenkins, E., Macgill, S., & Davey, A. (1993). Inarticulate science? Perspectives on the public understanding of science and some implications for science education. Nafferton, UK: Studies in Education Ltd.

Leinhardt, G. , & Knutson, K. (2006). Grandparents speak: Museum conversations across generations. Curator: The Museum Journal, 49 (2), 235–252.

Lelliott, A., & Rollnick, M. (2010). Big ideas: A review of astronomy education research 1974–2008. International Journal of Science Education, 32 (13), 1771–1799.

Lelliott, A. D. (2008). Learning about astronomy: A case study exploring how grade 7 and 8 students experience sites of informal learning in South Africa. Retrieved from http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/handle/10539/4480

Lindemann-Matthies, P., & Kamer, T. (2006). The influence of an interactive educational approach on visitors' learning in a Swiss zoo. Science Education, 90 (2), 296–315.

Lloyd, R., Neilson, R., King, S., & Dyball, M. (2012). Review of informal science learning. London: Wellcome Trust.

Long, M., Steinke, J., Applegate, B., Lapinski, M. K., Johnson, M. J., & Ghosh, S. (2010). Portrayals of male and female scientists in television programs popular among middle school-age children. Science Communication, 32 (3), 356–382.

Louw, M., & Crowley, K. (2013). New ways of looking and learning in natural history museums: The use of gigapixel imaging to bring science and publics together. Curator: The Museum Journal, 56 (1), 87–104.

Luke, J. J. , & McCreedy, D. (2012). Breaking down barriers: Museum as broker of home/school collaboration. Visitor Studies, 15 (1), 98–113.

Marino, L., Lilienfeld, S. O., Malamud, R., Nobis, N., & Broglio, R. (2010). Do zoos and aquariums promote attitude change in visitors? A critical evaluation of the American zoo and aquarium study. Society and Animals, 18, 126–138.

Martin, L. (2007). An emerging research framework for studying free-choice learning and schools. In J. H. Falk , L. D. Dierking , & S. Foutz (Eds.), In principle, in practice: Museums as learning institutions (pp. 247–259). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Matterson, C., & Holman, J. (2012). Informal science learning review: Reflections from the Wellcome Trust. London: Wellcome Trust. McClafferty, T. P., & Rennie, L. J. (2012). Look and learn: Young children's behaviour at an interactive exhibit. In E. Davidsson & A. Jakobsson (Eds.), Understanding interactions at science centers and museum (pp. 129–145). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

McClune, B., & Jarman, R. (2010). Critical reading of science-based news reports: Establishing a knowledge, skills and attitudes framework. International Journal of Science Education, 32 (6), 727–752.

McCreedy, D., & Dierking, L. D. (2013). Cascading influences: Long-term impacts of informal STEM experiences for girls. Philadelphia: Franklin Institute.

McGinnis, J. R., Hestness, E., Riedinger, K., Katz, P., Marbach-Ad, G., & Dai, A. (2012). Informal science education in formal science teacher preparation. In K. Tobin, B. J. Fraser, & C. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (Vol. 2, pp. 1097–1108). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

McManus, P. M. (1992). Topics in museums and science education. Studies in Science Education, 20, 157–182.

Meisner, R., vom Lehn, D., Heath, C., Burch, A., Gammon, B., & Reisman, M. (2007). Exhibiting performance: Co-participation in science centres and museums. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (12), 1531–1555.

Melber, L. M. (2008). Informal learning and field trips: Engaging students in standards-based experiences across the K–5 curriculum. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Moje, E. B., Collazo, T., Carillo, R., & Marx, R. W. (2001). "Maestro, what is quality?" Language, literacy and discourse in project-based science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38, 469–495.

Morag, O., & Tal, T. (2012). Assessing learning in the outdoors with the Field Trip in Natural Environments (FiNE) framework. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (5), 745–777.

Mortensen, M. F. (2010). Museographic transposition: The development of a museum exhibit on animal adaptations to darkness. Éducation & Didactique, 4 (1), 119–137.

Mortensen, M. F. (2011). Analysis of the educational potential of a science museum learning environment: Visitors' experience with and understanding of an immersion exhibit. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (4), 517–545.

Mortensen, M. F., & Smart, K. (2007). Free-choice worksheets increase students' exposure to curriculum during museum visits. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (9), 1389–1414.

Moussouri, T., & Roussos, G. (2013). Examining the effect of visitor motivation on observed visit strategies using mobile computer technologies. Visitor Studies, 16 (1), 21–38.

Myers, O. E., Jr., Saunders, C. D., & Birjulin, A. A. (2004). Emotional dimensions of watching zoo animals: An experience sampling study building on insights from psychology. Curator: The Museum Journal, 47 (3), 299–321.

National Science Board . (2013). The science and engineering indicators 2012. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation. Retrieved from www.nsf.gov/statistics/seind12/pdf/c07.pdf

OECD . (2012, July). Are students more engaged when schools offer extracurricular activities? PISA in Focus, 2012/7, 4.I. Retrieved from www.oecd.org/edu/pisa%20in%20focus%20n18%20(eng)-v05.pdf

Orthia, L. A., Dobos, A. R., Guy, T., Kan, S. Z., Keys, S. E., Nekvapil, S., & Ngu, D. H. (2012). How do people think about the science they encounter in fiction? Undergraduates investigate responses to science in The Simpsons. International Journal of Science Education, Part B: Communication and Public Engagement, 2 (2), 149–174.

Oxarart, A. L., Monroe, M. C., & Plate, R. R. (2013). From play areas to natural areas: The role of zoos in getting families outdoors. Visitor Studies, 16 (1), 82–94.

Palmquist, S., & Crowley, K. (2007). From teachers to testers: How parents talk to novice and expert children in a natural history museum. Science Education, 91 (5), 783–804.

Pedretti, E. (2012). The medium is the message: Unravelling visitors' views of Body Worlds and the story of the heart. In E. Davidsson & A. Jakobsson (Eds.), Understanding interactions at science centers and museums (pp. 45–61). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Perdue, B. M., Stoinski, T. S., & Maple, T. L. (2012). Using technology to educate visitors about conservation. Visitor Studies, 15 (1), 16–27.

Phillips, M., Finkelstein, D., & Wever-Frerichs, S. (2007). School site to museum floor: How informal science institutions work with schools. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (12), 1489–1507.

Phipps, M. (2010). Research trends and findings from a decade (1997–2007) of research on informal science education and free-choice science learning. Visitor Studies, 13 (1), 3–22.

Pierroux, P., Krange, I., & Sem, I. (2011). Bridging contexts and interpretations: Mobile blogging on art museum field trips. MedieKultur Journal of Media and Communication Research, 50, 30–47.

Piqueras, J., Wickman, P.-O., & Hamza, K. M. (2012). Student teachers' moment-to-moment reasoning and the development of discursive themes. In E. Davidsson & A. Jakobsson (Eds.), Understanding interactions at science centers and museums (pp. 79–96). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

QA Research . (2008). "Out of school" trips research. Retrieved from

www.nationalforest.org/document/visitor/Industry/Out_of_school_trips_national_research_findings.pdf

Rahm, J. (2012). Activity theory as a lens to examine project-based museum partnerships in robotics: Tools, challenges and emergent learning opportunities. In E. Davidsson & A. Jakobsson (Eds.), Understanding interactions at science centers and museums (pp. 147–171). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Randler, C., Kummer, B., & Wilhelm, C. (2012). Adolescent learning in the zoo: Embedding a non-formal learning environment to teach formal aspects of vertebrate biology. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 21, 384–391.

Reiss, M. J., & Tunnicliffe, S. D. (2011). Dioramas as depictions of reality and opportunities for learning in biology. Curator: The Museum Journal, 54 (4), 447–459.

Rennie, L. J. (2007a). Learning science outside of school. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 125–167). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rennie, L. J. (2007b). Values in science portrayed in out-of-school contexts. In D. Corrigan , D. Gunstone , & J. Dillon (Eds.), The reemergence of values in science education (pp. 197–212). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publications.

Rennie, L. J. (2011). Blurring the boundary between the classroom and the community: Challenges for teachers' professional learning. In D. Corrigan , J. Dillon , & R. Gunstone (Eds.), The professional knowledge base of science teaching (pp. 13–29). Dordrecht, the

Netherlands: Springer.

Rennie, L. J. (2013). The practice of science and technology communication in science museums. In J. K. Gilbert & S. Stocklmayer (Eds.), Communication and engagement in the informal sector: Issues and dilemmas (pp. 197–211). London: Routledge.

Rennie, L. J., & Johnston, D. J. (2007). Research on learning from museums. In J. H. Falk , L. D. Dierking , & S. Foutz (Eds.), In principle, in practice: Museums as learning institutions (pp. 57–73). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Rennie, L. J., & Williams, G. F. (2006a). Communication about science in a traditional museum: Visitors' and staff's perceptions. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 1, 791–820. Retrieved from www.springerlink.com/content/b4k4082561696118/

Rennie, L. J., & Williams, G. F. (2006b). Adults' learning about science in free-choice settings. International Journal of Science Education, 28, 871–893.

Riedinger, K. (2012). Family connections: Family conversations in informal learning environments. Childhood Education, 88 (2), 125–127. Rowe, S., & Kisiel, J. A. (2012). Family engagement at aquarium touch tanks—exploring interactions and the potential for learning. In E. Davidsson & A. Jakobsson (Eds.), Understanding interactions at science centers and museums (pp. 63–77). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Rowe, S., & Nickels, A. (2011). Visitor motivations across three informal education institutions: An application of the identity-related visitor motivation model. Visitor Studies, 14 (2), 162–175.

Rowell, P. M. (2012). Perspectives on programs for schools in science centres and museums. Edmonton: Centre for Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, University of Alberta.

Sanders, D. L. (2007). Making public the private life of plants: The contribution of informal learning environments. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (10), 1209–1228.

Sanford, C. (2010). Evaluating family interactions to inform exhibit design: Comparing three different learning behaviors in a museum setting. Visitor Studies, 13 (1), 67–89.

Schuck, S., & Aubusson, P. (2010). Educational scenarios for digital futures. Learning, Media and Technology, 35 (3), 293–305. Semper, R. (2007). Science centers at 40: Middle-aged maturity or mid-life crisis? Curator: The Museum Journal, 50 (1), 147–150. Serrell, B. (1998). Paving attention: Visitors and museum exhibitions. Washington, DC: American Association of Museums.

Serrell, B. (2010). Paying more attention to paying attention. Retrieved from www.informalscience.org/perspectives/blog/paying-moreattention-to-paying-attention

Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. Educational Researcher, 27 (2), 4–13. Siegel, D. R., Esterly, J., Callanan, M. A., Wright, R., & Navarro, R. (2007). Conversations about science across activities in Mexicandescent families. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (12), 1447–1466.

Simonneaux, L., & Jacobi, D. (1997). Language constraints in producing prefiguration posters for a scientific exhibition. Public Understanding of Science, 6 (4), 383–408.

Smith, E. (2012). Mobile game of the week—Plague Inc. International Business Times, October 12. Retrieved from www.ibtimes.co.uk/articles/393735/20121012/mobile-game-week-plague-inc-androidios.htm

Smith, L., Weiler, B., & Ham, S. (2011). The rhetoric versus the reality: A critical examination of the zoo proposition. In W. Frost (Ed.), Zoos and tourism: Conservation, education, entertainment? (pp. 59–68). Bristol, UK: Channel View Publications.

Song, Y., Wong, L.-H., & Looi, C.-K. (2012). Fostering personalized learning in science inquiry supported by mobile technologies. Education Technology Research & Development, 60 (4), 679–701.

Stavrova, O., & Urhahne, D. (2010). Modification of a school programme in the Deutsches Museum to enhance students' attitudes and understanding. International Journal of Science Education, 32 (17), 2291–2310.

Steinke, J. (2013). Portrayals of female scientists in the mass media: End times for a media history paradigm. The International Encyclopedia of Media Studies. Retrieved from http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781444361506.wbiems070/full

StockImayer, S. M., & Gilbert, J. K. (2002). New experiences and old knowledge: Towards a model for the public awareness of science. International Journal of Science Education, 24, 835–858.

StockImayer, S. M., Rennie, L. J., & Gilbert, J. K. (2010). The roles of the formal and informal sectors in the provision of effective science education. Studies in Science Education, 46, 1–44.

Szechter, L. E., & Carey, E. J. (2009). Gravitating toward science: Parent– child interactions at a gravitational-wave observatory. Science Education, 93 (5), 846–858.

Tal, R., Bamberger, Y., & Morag, O. (2005). Guided school visits to natural history museums in Israel: Teachers' roles. Science Education, 89 (6), 920–935.

Tal, T. (2012). Imitating the family visit: Small-group exploration in an ecological garden. In E. Davidsson & A. Jakobsson (Eds.), Understanding interactions at science centers and museums (pp. 193–206). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Tal, T. , & Morag, O. (2007). School visits to natural history museums: Teaching or enriching? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (5), 747–769.

Tal, T., & Morag, O. (2009). Reflective practice as a means for preparing to teach outdoors in an ecological garden. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20 (3), 245–262.

Thomas, G. P., & Anderson, D. (2013). Parents' metacognitive knowledge: Influences on parent–child interactions in a science museum setting. Research in Science Education, 43 (3), 1245–1265.

Tlili, A., Cribb, A., & Gewirtz, S. (2006). What becomes of science in a science centre? Reconfiguring science for public consumption. The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies, 28, 203–228.

Tran, L. U. (2008). The work of science museum educators. Museum Management and Curatorship, 23 (2), 135–153.

Tran, L. U., & King, H. (2007). The professionalization of museum educators: The case of science museums. Museum Management and Curatorship, 22 (2), 131–149.

Tunnicliffe, S. D., & Scheersoi, A. (2010). Natural history dioramas: Dusty relics or essential tools for biology learning? In A. Filippoupoliti (Ed.), Science exhibitions: Communication and evaluation (pp. 186–216). Edinburgh, Scotland: MuseumsEtc.

Ucko, D. A. (2013). Science centers in a new world of learning. Curator: The Museum Journal, 56 (1), 21-30.

Van Schijndel, T. J. P., Franse, R. K., & Raijmakers, M. E. J. (2010). The Exploratory Behavior Scale: Assessing young visitors' hands-on behavior in science museums. Science Education, 94 (5), 794–809.

Van Schijndel, T. J. P., Singer, E., Van der Maas, H. L. J., & Raijmakers, M. E. J. (2010). The effects of a sciencing program on young children's exploratory play in the sandpit. European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 7 (5), 603–617.

Venville, G., Rennie, L., Hanbury, C., & Longnecker, N. (2013). Scientists reflect on why they chose to study science. Research in Science Education. doi:10.1007/s11165-013-9352-3

Vestergård, G. L. (2011). From journal to headline: The accuracy of climate science news in Danish high quality newspapers. Journal of Science Communication, 10 (2), A03. Retrieved from http://jcom.sissa.it/archive/10/02/Jcom1002(2011)A03/

Walker, G. J. (2012). Science shows: Past, present and future. The Informal Learning Review, 116, 4–7.

Wilde, M., & Urhahne, D. (2008). Museum learning: A study of motivation and learning achievement. Journal of Biological Education, 42 (2), 78–83.

Wong, L.-H. (2012). A learner-centric view of mobile seamless learning. British Journal of Educational Technology, 43 (1), E19–E23. Wong, L.-H., & Looi, C.-K. (2011). What seams do we remove in mobile-assisted seamless learning? A critical review of the literature. Computers & Education, 57 (4), 2364–2381.

World Association of Zoos and Aquariums . (2005). Building a future for wildlife—the world zoo and aquarium conservation strategy. Retrieved from

www.waza.org/files/webcontent/1.public_site/5.conservation/conservation_strategies/building_a_future_for_wildlife/wzacsen.pdf Wyles, K. J. , Pahl, S. , White, M. , Morris, S. , Cracknell, D. , & Thompson, R. C. (2013). Towards a marine mindset: Visiting an aquarium

can improve attitudes and intentions regarding marine sustainability. Visitor Studies, 16 (1), 95–110. Yalowitz, S. S., & Bronnenkant, K. (2009). Timing and tracking: Unlocking visitor behavior. Visitor Studies, 12 (1), 47–64.

Zimmerman, H. T. (2012). Participating in science at home: Recognition work and learning in biology. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (5), 597–630.

Zimmerman, H. T., & Bell, P. (2012). Where young people see science: Everyday activities connected to science. International Journal of Science Education, Part B: Communication and Public Engagement. doi:10.1080/21548455.2012.741271

Zimmerman, H. T., Reeve, S., & Bell, P. (2010). Family sense-making practices in science center conversations. Science Education, 94 (3), 478–505.

Teaching Learning Progressions

Aikenhead, G. S. (2006). Science education for everyday life: Evidence-based practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Almqvist, J., & Östman, L. (2006). Privileging and artifacts: On the use of information technology in science education. Interchange, 37 (3), 225–250.

Anderhag, P., Wickman, P.-O., & Hamza, K. M. (under review). Signs of taste for science: A methodology for studying the constitution of interest in the science classroom. Submitted to *Cultural Studies of Science Education*.

Andersson, B. (1976). Science teaching and the development of thinking. Gothenburg, Sweden: Gothenburg University.

Arvola-Orlander, A., & Wickman, P.-O. (2011). Bodily experiences in secondary school biology. Cultural Studies in Science Education, 6 (3), 569–594.

Ausubel, D. P. (1968). Educational psychology, a cognitive view. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Ausubel, D. P., Novak, J. D., & Hanesian, H. (1978). Educational psychology: A cognitive view (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Biesta, G. (2002). How general can Bildung be? Reflections on the future of a modern educational ideal. Journal of Philosophy of Education, 36, 377–390.

Blankertz, H. (1975). Theorien und Modelle der Didaktik (9 ed.). München: Juventa Verlag.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste. London: Routledge.

Brousseau, G. (1997). Theory of didactical situations in mathematics. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Bulte, A. M. W. (2007). How to connect concepts of science and technology when designing context-based science education. In C. Linder , L. Östman , & P.-O. Wickman (Eds.), Promoting scientific literacy: Science education research in transaction. Proceedings of the Linnaeus Tercentenary Symposium (pp. 140–147). Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Bulte, A. M. W., Westbroek, H. B., de Jong, O., & Pilot, A. (2006). A research approach to designing chemistry education using authentic practices as contexts. International Journal of Science Education, 28, 1063–1086.

Caillot, M. (2007). The building of a new academic field: The case of French didactiques. European Educational Research Journal, 6, 125–130.

Cherryholmes, C. H. (1988). Power and criticism. New York: Teachers College Press.

Chevallard, Y. (2007). Readjusting didactics to a changing epistemology. European Educational Research Journal, 6 (2), 131–134. Cuban, L. (1992). Curriculum stability and change. In P. Jackson (Ed.), Handbook of research on curriculum (pp. 216–247). New York: Macmillan.

Demuth, R., Gräsel, C., Parchmann, I., & Ralle, B. (2008). Chemie im Kontext—Von der Innovation zur nachhaltigen Verbreitung eines Unterrichtskonzepts. Münster: Waxmann.

Dewey, J. (1929/1958). Experience and nature (2nd ed.). New York: Dover.

Dewey, J. (1938/1997). Experience and education. New York: Touch-stone, Simon and Schuster.

Driver, R., & Easley, J. (1978). Pupils and paradigms: A review of literature related to concept development in adolescent science students. Studies in science education, 5, 61–84.

Duit, R., Gropengießer, H., Kattmann, U., Komorek, M., & Parchmann, I. (2012). The model of educational reconstruction—a framework for improving teaching and learning science. In D. Jorde & J. Dillon (Eds.), Science education research and practice in Europe (pp.13–37). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Duit, R., Komorek, M., & Wilbers, J. (1997). Studies on educational reconstruction of chaos theory. Research in Science Education, 27, 339–357.

Duncan, R. G., & Rivet, A. E. (2013). Science learning progressions. Science, 339, 396–397.

Duschl, R. (2008). Science education in 3 part harmony: Balancing conceptual, epistemic and social learning goals. Review of Research in Education, 32, 268–291.

Duschl, R. A., & Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P. (2012). Epistemic foundations for conceptual change. In S. Carver & J. Shrager (Eds.), The journey from child to scientist: Integrating cognitive development and the education sciences (pp. 245–262). Washington: American Psychological Association (APA) Press.

Erduran, S., & Jiménez-Aleixandre, M. P. (2007). Argumentation in science education: Perspectives from classroom-based research. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Eryaman, M. Y., & Riedler, M. (2010). Teacher-proof curriculum. In C. Kridel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of curriculum studies (pp. 865–866). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Fensham, P. (2003). Defining an identity: The evolution of science education as a field of research. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Fleck, L. (1979). Genesis and development of a scientific fact. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Freudenthal, H. (1991). Revisiting mathematics education. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Gilbert, J. K., Bulte, A. M. W., & Pilot, A. (2011). Concept development and transfer in context-based science education. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (6), 817–837.

Goffman, E. (1974). Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Grayling, A. C. (1996). Epistemology. In N. Bunnin & E. P. Tsui-James (Eds.), The Blackwell companion to philosophy (pp. 38–63). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Gyllenpalm, J., & Wickman, P.-O. (2011). "Experiments" and the inquiry emphasis conflation in science teacher education. Science Education, 95 (5), 908–926.

Gyllenpalm, J., Wickman, P.-O., & Holmgren, S.-O. (2010a). Secondary science teachers' selective traditions and examples of inquiryoriented approaches. Nordic Studies in Science Education, 6 (1), 44–60.

Gyllenpalm, J., Wickman, P.-O., & Holmgren, S.-O. (2010b). Teachers' language on scientific inquiry: Methods of teaching or methods of inquiry? International Journal of Science Education, 32 (9), 1151–1172.

Hamza, K. M., & Wickman, P.-O. (2008). Describing and analyzing learning in action: An empirical study of the importance of misconceptions in learning science. Science Education, 92, 141–164.

Hamza, K. M., & Wickman, P.-O. (2009). Beyond explanations: What else do students need to understand science? Science Education 93 (6), 1026–1049.

Hamza, K. M., & Wickman, P.-O. (2012). Student engagement with artefacts and scientific ideas in a laboratory and a concept mapping activity. International Journal of Science Education. doi:10.1080/09500693.2012.743696

Hamza, K. M., & Wickman, P.-O. (2013). Supporting students' progression in science: Continuity between the particular, the contingent, and the general. Science Education, 97 (1), 113–138.

Hansen, K.-H., & Olson, J. (1996). How teachers construe curriculum integration: The Science, Technology, Society (STS) movement as Bildung. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 28, 669–682.

Helldén, G. (1992). Grundskoleelvers förståelse av ekologiska processer Studia Psychologica et Pedagogica. Series Altera C. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Hubber, P., Tytler, R., & Haslam, F. (2010). Teaching and learning about force with a representational focus: Pedagogy and teacher change. Research in Science Education, 40, 5–28.

Hudson, B., & Meyer, M. A. (2011). Beyond fragmentation: Didactics, learning, and teaching in Europe. Opladen, Germany: Barbara Budrich.

Jakobson, B., & Wickman, P.-O. (2008). The roles of aesthetic experience in elementary school science. Research in Science Education 38, 45–65.

Jank, W., & Meyer, H. (2003). Didaktische Modelle (rev. ed.). Berlin: Cornelsen Scriptor.

Jenkins, E. (2002). Linking school science education with action. In W.-M. Roth & J. Désautels (Eds.), Science education as/for sociopolitical action (pp. 17–34). Oxford: Peter Lang.

Johansson, A.-M., & Wickman, P.-O. (2011). A pragmatist approach to learning progressions. In B. Hudson & M. A. Meyer (Eds.), Beyond fragmentation: Didactics, learning, and teaching in Europe (pp. 47–59). Leverkusen, Germany: Barbara Budrich Publishers.

Karplus, R., & Thier, H. D. (1967). A new look at elementary school science: Science curriculum improvement study. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Kelly, G. J., Carlsen, W. S., & Cunningham, C. M. (1993). Science education in sociocultural context: Perspectives from the sociology of science. Science Education, 77, 207–220.

Klafki, W. (1958). Didaktische Analyse als Kern der Unterrichtsvorbereitung. Die deutsche Schule, 10, 450–471.

Klafki, W. (1969). Didaktische Analyse als Kern der Unterrichtsvorbereitung. In H. Roth & A. Blumental (Eds.), Auswahl, Didaktische Analyse (10th ed.). Hannover, Germany: Schroedel.

Knecht-von Martial, I. 1985: Geschichte der Didaktik. Zur Geschichte des Begriffs und der didaktischen Paradigmen. Frankfurt am Main: R. G. Fischer.

Komorek, M., & Duit, R. (2004). The teaching experiment as a powerful method to develop and evaluate teaching and learning sequences in the domain of non-linear systems. International Journal of Science Education, 26, 619–633.

Latour, B. (1987). Science in action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press. Layton, D. , Jenkins, E. , Macgill, S. , & Davey, A. (1993). Inarticulate science? Perspectives on the public understanding of science and some implications for science education. Driffield, UK: Studies in Education.

Lederman, N. G. (2014). Research on teaching and learning of science. In N. G. Lederman (Ed.), Handbook of research on science education (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Lemke, J. L. (1990). Talking science: Language, learning and values. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Lidar, M. , Lundqvist, L. , & Östman, L. (2006). Teaching and learning in the science classroom: The interplay between teachers' epistemological moves and students' practical epistemology. Science Education, 90 (3), 148–163.

Ligozat, F. (2011). The determinants of the joint action in didactics: The text–action relationship in teaching practice. In M. A. Meyer & B. Hudson (Eds.), Beyond fragmentation: Didactics, learning and teaching in Europe (pp. 157–176). Opladen, Germany: Barbara Budrich Publishers.

Ligozat, F., & Schubauer-Leoni, M.-L. (2010). The joint action theory in didactics: Why do we need it in the case of teaching and learning mathematics? In V. Durand Guerrier, S. Maury, & F. Arzarello (Eds.), Proceedings of the Sixth Congress of the European Society for Research in Mathematics Education (pp. 1615–1624). Lyon, France: INRP.

Lijnse, P. L., & Klaassen, K. (2004). Didactical structures as an outcome of research on teaching–learning sequences? International Journal of Science Education, 26 (5), 537–554.

Linder, C. , Östman, L. , Roberts, D. A. , Wickman, P.-O. , Erickson, G. , & MacKinnon, A. (Eds.). (2011). Exploring the landscape of scientific literacy. New York: Routledge.

Lundegård, I. (2008). Self, values and the world—young people in dialogue on sustainable development. In J. Öhman (Ed.), Values and democracy in education for sustainable development—contributions from Swedish research (pp. 123–144). Stockholm: Liber.

Lundqvist, E. , Almqvist, J. , & Östman, L. (2009). Epistemological norms and companion meanings in science classroom communication. Science Education, 93 (5), 859–874.

Lundqvist, E. , Almqvist, J. , & Östman, L. (2012). Institutional traditions in teachers' manners of teaching. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 7 (1), 111–127.

May, W. T. (1993). Teaching as a work of art in the medium of the curriculum. Theory Into Practice, 32, 210-218.

Munby, H., Cunningham, M., & Lock, C. (2000). School science culture: A case study of barriers to developing professional knowledge. Science Education, 84, 193–211.

Munby, H., & Russell, T. (1992). Frames of reflection: An introduction. In T. Russell & H. Munby (Eds.), Teachers and teaching: From classroom to reflection (pp. 1–8). London: Falmer Press.

National Research Council . (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science in grades K - 8. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Novak, J. D. (1977). A theory of education. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Novak, J. D. (1990). Concept maps and vee diagrams: Two metacognitive tools for science and mathematics education. Instructional Science, 19, 29–52.

Öhman, J., & Östman, L. (2007). Continuity and change in moral meaning-making: A transactional approach. Journal of Moral Education, 36, 151–168.

Östman, L. (1994). Rethinking science teaching as a moral act. Journal of Nordic Educational Research, 14, 141–150.

Östman, L. (1995). Meaning and socialization: Science education as a political and environmental-ethical problem. English summary in L. Östsman, *Socialisation och mening: no-utbildning som politiskt och miljömoraliskt problem* (pp. 195–210). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell. Östman, L. (1996). Discourses, discursive meanings and socialization in chemistry education. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 28, 37–55. Östman, L., & Almqvist, J. (2011). What do values and norms have to do with scientific literacy? In C. Linder , L. Östman , D. A. Roberts , P.-O. Wickman , G. Erickson , & A. MacKinnon (Eds.), Exploring the landscape of scientific literacy (pp. 160–175). New York: Routledge. Parchmann, I. , Gräsel, C. , Bear, A. , Nentwig, P. , Demuth, R. , Ralle, B. , & Group, T. C. P. (2006). "Chemie im Kontext": A symbiotic implementation of a context-based teaching and learning approach. International Journal of Science Education, 28, 1041–1062.

Pedersen, S. (1992). Om elevers förståelse av naturvetenskapliga förklaringar och biologiska sammanhang (Vol. 31). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Peukert, H. (2002). Beyond the present state of affairs: *Bildung* and the search for orientation in rapidly transforming societies. Journal of Philosophy of Education, 36, 421–435.

Piqueras, J., Hamza, K. M., & Edvall, S. (2008). The practical epistemologies in the museum: A study of students' learning in encounters with dioramas. Journal of Museum Education, 33 (2), 153–164.

Prins, G. T., Bulte, A. M. W., & Pilot, A. (2011). Evaluation of a design principle for fostering students' epistemological views on models and modelling using authentic practices as contexts for learning in chemistry education. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (11), 1539–1569.

Prins, G. T., Bulte, A. M. W., Van Driel, J. H., & Pilot, A. (2008). Selection of authentic modelling practices as contexts for chemistry education. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (1), 1–24.

Riemeier, T., & Gropengieβer, H. (2008). On the roots of difficulties in learning about cell division: Process-based analysis of students' conceptual development in teaching experiments. International Journal of Science Education, 30, 923–939.

Riquarts, K., & Hopmann, S. (1995). Starting a dialogue: Issues in a beginning conversation between didaktik and the curriculum traditions. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 27, 3–12.

Roberts, D. A. (1982). Developing the concept of "curriculum emphases" in science education. Science Education, 66, 243–260.

Roberts, D. A., & Bybee, R. (2014). Science and scientific literacy. In N. G. Lederman (Ed.), Handbook of research on science education, (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Roberts, D. A., & Östman, L. (Eds.). (1998). Problems of meaning in science curriculum. New York: Teachers College Press.

Rogoff, B. (1990). Apprenticeship in thinking. Cognitive development in social context. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rorty, R. (1991). Objectivity, relativism, and truth. Philosophical papers volume I (pp. 1–17). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Roth, W.-M., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2004). Rethinking scientific literacy. New York: Routledge.

Ruthven, K., Laborde, C., Leach, J., & Tiberghien, A. (2009). Design tools in didactical research: Instrumenting the epistemological and cognitive aspects of the design of teaching sequences. Educational Researcher, 38 (5), 329–342.

Sadler, T. D. (2009). Situated learning in science education: Socioscientific issues as contexts for practice. Studies in Science Education, 45 (1), 1–42.

Sahlberg, P. (2011). Finnish lessons: What can the world learn from educational change in Finland? New York: Teachers College Press. Säljö, R., & Bergqvist, K. (1997). Seeing the light: Discourse and practice in the optics lab. In L. B. Resnick, R. Säljö, C. Pontecorvo, & B. Burge (Eds.), Discourse, tools, and reasoning: Essays on situated cognition (pp. 385–405). Berlin: Springer.

Santini, J. (2009). Characterization of the joint elaboration of conceptual understanding and of students' performances. Volcanoes and earthquakes at Grade 5. Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research, Vienna, Austria.

Schneuwly, B. (2011). Subject didactics—an academic field related to the teacher profession and teacher education. In B. Hudson & M. A. Meyer (Eds.), Beyond fragmentation: Didactics, learning and teaching in Europe (pp. 275–286). Leverkusen Opladen, Germany: Barbara Budrich.

Seel, H. (1999). Didaktik as the professional science of teachers. TNTEE Publications, 2, 85–93.

Sensevy, G. (2010). Outline of a joint action theory in didactics. In V. Durand Guerrier , S. Maury , & F. Arzarello (Eds.), Proceedings of the Sixth Congress of the European Society for Research in Mathematics Education (pp. 1645–1654). Lyon, France: INRP.

Sensevy, G. (2011). Overcoming fragmentation: Towards a joint action theory in didactics. In B. Hudson & M. A. Meyer (Eds.), Beyond fragmentation: Didactics, learning, and teaching in Europe (pp. 60–76). Leverkusen, Opladen: Barbara Budrich.

Sensevy, G. (2012). Patterns of didactic intentions, thought collective and documentation work. In G. Gueudet , B. Pepin , & L. Trouche (Eds.), From text to 'lived' resources: Mathematics curriculum materials and teacher development (pp. 43–57). New York: Springer. Sensevy, G. , Mercier, A. , & Schubauer-Leoni, M.-L. (2000). Vers un modèle de l'action didactique du professeur, à propos de la Course à 20. Recherches en Didactique des Mathématiques, 20 (3), 263–304.

Sensevy, G., Mercier, A., Schubauer-Leoni, M.-L., Ligozat, F., & Perrot, G. (2005). An attempt to model the teacher's action in mathematics. Educational Studies in Mathematics, 59 (1), 153–181.

Sensevy, G., Tiberghien, A., Santini, J., Laubé, S., & Griggs, P. (2008). An epistemological approach to modeling: Case studies and implications for science teaching. Science Education, 92 (3), 424–446.

Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the danger of choosing just one. Educational Researcher, 27 (2), 4–13.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher, 15, 4–14.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 1–22.

Sjøberg, S. (2009). Naturfag som allmenndannelse: en kritisk fagdidaktikk [In Norwegian: Science as allgemeine Bildung—a critical subject didactics] (3rd ed.). Oslo: Gyldendal.

Staberg, E.-M. (1992). Olika världar skilda värderingar—Hur flickor och pojkar möter högstadiets fysik, kemi och teknik. Umeå: Pedagogiska institutionen, Umeå universitet.

Steffe, L. P., & Thompson, P. W. (2000). Teaching experiment methodology: Underlying principles and essential elements. In R. Lesh & A. E. Kelly (Eds.), Research Design in Mathematics and Science Education (pp. 267–307). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Stolk, M. J., de Jong, O., Bulte, A. M. W., & Pilot, A. (2011). Exploring a framework for professional development in curriculum innovation: Empowering teachers for designing context-based chemistry education. Research in Science Education, 41, 369–388. Sund, P., & Wickman, P.-O. (2011). Socialisation content in schools and education for sustainable development: I. A study of teachers' selective traditions. Environmental Education Research, 17, 599–624.

Tiberghien, A. (1994). Modeling as a basis for analyzing teaching—learning situations. Learning and instruction, 4, 71–87.

Tiberghien, A. (2000). Designing teaching situations in the secondary school. In R. Millar , J. Leach , & J. Osborne (Eds.), Improving science education: The contribution of research (pp. 22–47). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Tiberghien, A. (2007). Legitimacy and references for scientific literacy. In C. Linder , L. Östman , & P.-O. Wickman (Eds.), Promoting scientific literacy: Science education research in transaction. Proceedings of the Linnaeus Tercentenary Symposium (pp. 130–133). Uppsala: Uppsala University.

Tiberghien, A., & Sensevy, G. (2012). The nature of video studies in science education: Analysis of teaching and learning processes. In D. Jorde & J. Dillon (Eds.), Science education research and practice in Europe: Retrospective and prospective (pp. 141–179). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Tiberghien, A., Vince, J., & Gaidioz, P. (2009). Design-based research: Case of a teaching sequence on mechanics. International Journal of Science Education, 31, 2275–2314.

Van Aalsvoort, J. (2004). Activity theory as a tool to address the problem of chemistry's lack of relevance in secondary school chemical education. International Journal of Science Education, 26 (13), 1635–1651.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society. The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice. Learning, meaning, and identity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Westbroek, H. B., Klaassen, K., Bulte, A. M. W., & Pilot, A. (2010). Providing students with a sense of purpose by adapting a professional practice. International Journal of Science Education, 32 (5), 603–627.

Wickman, P.-O. (2004). The practical epistemologies of the classroom: A study of laboratory work. Science Education, 88 (3), 325–344. Wickman, P.-O. (2006). Aesthetic experience in science education: Learning and meaning-making as situated talk and action. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wickman, P.-O. (2012a). Using pragmatism to develop didactics in Sweden. Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft, 15, 483–501.

Wickman, P.-O. (2012b). How can conceptual schemes change teaching? Cultural Studies of Science Education, 7, 129–136.

Wickman, P.-O. (2012c). A comparison between practical epistemology analysis and some schools in French didactics. Education & Didactique, 6 (2), 145–159.

Wickman, P.-O., Liberg, C., & Östman, L. (2012). Transcending science: Scientific literacy and *Bildung* for the 21st century. In D. Jorde & J. Dillon (Eds.), Science education research and practice in Europe (pp. 39–61). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Wickman, P.-O., & Ligozat, F. (2011). Scientific literacy as action: Consequences for content progression. In C. Linder, L. Östman, D. A. Roberts, P.-O. Wickman, G. Erickson, & A. MacKinnon (Eds.), Exploring the landscape of scientific literacy (pp. 145–159). New York: Routledge.

Wickman, P.-O., & Östman, L. (2002a). Learning as discourse change: A sociocultural mechanism. Science Education, 86 (5), 601–623. Wickman, P.-O., & Östman, L. (2002b). Induction as an empirical problem: How students generalize during practical work. International Journal of Science Education, 24 (5), 465–486.

Wittgenstein, L. (1967). Philosophical investigations (3rd ed.). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Zeidler, D. L. (1984). Moral issues and social policy in science education: Closing the literacy gap. Science Education, 68, 411–419. Zeidler, D. L., & Sadler, T. D. (2011). An inclusive view of scientific literacy: Core issues and future directions. In C. Linder, L. Östman, D. A. Roberts, P.-O. Wickman, G. Erickson, & A. MacKinnon (Eds.), Exploring the landscape of scientific literacy (pp. 176–192). New York: Routledge.

Unpacking and Critically Synthesizing the Literature on Race and Ethnicity in Science Education

Allen, N. J., & Crawley, F. E. (1998). Voices from the bridge: Worldview conflicts of Kickapoo students of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35 (2), 111–132.

Atwater, M. M. (2000). Equity for Black Americans in precollege science. Science Education, 84, 154–179.

Atwater, M. M., Lance, J., Woodard, U., & Johnson, N. H. (2013). Race and ethnicity: Powerful forecasters of science learning and performance. Theory Into Practice, 52 (1), 6–13.

Atwater, M. M., & Riley, J. P. (1993). Multicultural science education: Perspectives, definitions, and research agenda. Science Education, 77 (6), 661–668.

Bang, M., & Medin, D. (2010). Cultural processes in science education: Supporting the navigation of multiple epistemologies. Science Education, 94 (6), 1008–1026.

Banks, J. (1995). The historical reconstruction of knowledge about race: Implications for transformative teaching. Educational Researcher, 24 (2), 15–24.

Banks, J. A. (1988). Multiethnic education: Theory and practice. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Basu, J. S. (2008). How students design and enact physics lessons: Five immigrant Caribbean youth and the cultivation of student voice. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (8), 881–899.

Bell, D., Jr. (1995). *Brown v. Board of Education* and the interest convergence dilemma. In K. Crenshaw , N. Gotanda , G. Peller , & K. Thomas (Eds.), Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement (pp. 20–29). New York, NY: The New Press.

Berry, M. F. (1996). Vindicating Martin Luther King, Jr.: The road to a color-blind society. Journal of Negro History, 1 (4), 137–144. Bonham, V., Warshauer-Baker, E., & Collins, F. S. (2005). Race and ethnicity in the genome era: The complexity of the constructs. American Psychologist, 60 (1), 9–15.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (1999). The essential social fact of race. American Sociological Review, 64 (6), 899–906.

Bonnet, A. (1998). Who was White? The disappearance of non–European White identities and the formation of European racial Whiteness. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 21 (6), 1029–1055.

Boulos, S. (1965). Teaching science and world understanding. Science Education, 49 (2), 190–192.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). (Translated by R. Nice). The forms of capital. In J. E. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of theory of research for the sociology of education (pp. 241–258). New York, NY: Greenwood Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). The logic of practice. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Brand, B. R., & Glasson, G. E. (2004). Crossing cultural borders into science teaching: Early life experiences, racial and ethnic identities, and beliefs about diversity. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (2), 119–141.

Brand, B. R., Glasson, G. E., & Green, A. M. (2006). Sociocultural factors influencing students' learning in science and mathematics: An analysis of the perspectives of African American students. School Science and Mathematics, 106 (5), 228–236.

Brown, H. E. (1945). The influence of world events on science experiences in the elementary school. Science Education, 29 (5), 244–249. Butler, M. (1999). Factors associated with students' intentions to engage in science learning activities. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36 (4), 455–473.

Cho, S. (2009). Post-racialism. Iowa Law Review, 94, 1589–1649.

Cobern, W. W. (1996). Worldview theory and conceptual change in science education. Science Education, 85 (5), 579–610.

Cole, M. (1996). Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Conwell, C. , Griffin, S. , & Algozzine, B. (1993). Gender and racial differences in unstructured learning groups in science. International Journal of Science Education, 15 (1), 107–115.

Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N., Peller, G., & Thomas, K. (1994). Introduction. In K., Crenshaw, N., Gotanda, G., Peller, & K., Thomas (Eds.), Critical race theory: The key writings that informed the movement (pp. xiii–xxxii). New York, NY: The New Press.

Davis, J. (1963). Attitude changes on fallout and race associated with special instruction in biology. Science Education, 47 (2), 178–183. Ellison, R. (1994). The invisible man. New York, NY: Random House.

Epstein, J. L., & Dauber, S. L. (1991). School programs and teacher practices of parent involvement in inner-city elementary and middle schools. The Elementary School Journal, 91, 289–305.

Evans, H., & Tannenbaum, H. (1994). A, AB, B, and O? Science Education, 28 (3), 165–166.

Fenton, S. (2010). Ethnicity. (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Fine, M. (2004). Witnessing Whiteness/gathering intelligence. In M. Fine , L. Weis , L. P. Pruitt , & A. Burns (Eds.), Off-white: Readings on power, privilege, and resistance (2nd ed., pp. 245–255). New York, NY: Routledge.

Fleming, M. L., & Malone, M. R. (1983). The relationship of student characteristics and student performance in science as viewed by meta-analysis research. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 20 (5), 481–495.

Gilbert, A. , & Yerrick, R. (2001). Same school, separate worlds: A socio-cultural study of identity, resistance, and negotiation in a rural, lower track science classroom. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (5), 574–598.

Gotanda, N. (1991). A critique of "Our constitution is color-blind." Stanford Law Review, 44 (1), 1–68.

Gotanda, N. (2000). A critique of "Our constitution is color-blind." In R. Delgado & J. Stefancic (Eds.), Critical race theory: The cutting edge (2nd ed., pp. 35–38). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Gould, S. J. (1981). The mismeasure of man. New York, NY: Norton.

Greenfield, T. A. (1996). Gender, ethnicity, science achievement, and attitudes. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 33 (8), 901–933.

Greer, C. (1984). The ethnic question. Social Text, 9/10, 119–136.

Grimberg, B. I., & Gummer, E. (2013). Teaching science from cultural points of intersection. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50 (1), 12–32.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hagiwara, S., Barton, A. C., & Contento, I. (2007). Culture, food, and language: Perspectives from immigrant mothers in school science. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 2, 475–515.

Harris, C. I. (1995). Whiteness as property. Harvard Law Review, 106 (8), 1707–1791.

Hill, O. , & Pettus, O. (1990). Three studies of factors affecting the attitudes of Blacks and females toward the pursuit of science and science-related careers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 27 (4), 289–314.

Holland, D. (1998). Identity and agency in cultural worlds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Huffman, D., Lawrenz, F., & Minger, M. (1997). Within-class analysis of ninth-grade science students' perceptions of the learning environment. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34 (8), 791–804.

Jackson, J. P., Jr., & Weidman, N. M. (2006). The origins of scientific racism. The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 50, 66–79. Jacobson, M. F. (1998). Whiteness of a different color: European immigrants and the alchemy of race. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University. Johnson, C. C., Kahle, J. B., & Fargo, J. D. (2007). Effective teaching results in increased science achievement for all students. Science Education, 91, 371–383. Jones, M. G., Tretter, T., Paechter, M., Kubasko, D., Bokinsky, A., Andre, T., & Negishi, A. (2007). Differences in African-American and European-American students' engagement with nanotechnology experiences: Perceptual position or assessment artifact? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (6), 787–799.

Jones, M. L., & Rowsey, R. E. (1990). The effects of immediate achievement and retention of middle school students involved in a metric unit designed to promote the development of estimating skills. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 27 (9), 901–913.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Steinberg, S. R. (1998). Addressing the crisis of Whiteness: Reconfiguring White identity in a pedagogy of Whiteness. In J. L. Kincheloe, S. R. Steinberg, N. M. Rodriguez, & R. E. Chennault (Eds.), White reign: Deploying Whiteness in America (pp. 3–29). New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Kurth, L., Anderson, C., & Palincsar, A. (2002). The case of Carla: Dilemmas of helping all students understand science. Science Education, 86 (3), 287–313.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in U.S. schools. Educational Researcher, 35 (7), 3–12.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. Teachers College Record, 97, 47-68.

Ledbetter, C. (1993). Qualitative comparisons of students' conceptions of science. Science Education, 77 (6), 611–624.

Lee, O. (1997). Diversity and equity for Asian American students in science education. Science Education, 81 (1), 107–122.

Lee, O. (1999). Science knowledge, world views, and information sources in social and cultural context: Making sense after a natural disaster. American Educational Research Journal, 36 (2), 187–219.

Lehner, E. (2007). Describing students of the African Diaspora: Understanding micro and meso level science learning as gateways to standards based discourse. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 2, 441–473.

Lemke, J. (2001). Articulating communities: Sociocultural perspectives on science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (3), 296–316.

Lepper, R. (1967). A cross-cultural investigation of development of selected Piagetian science concepts, social status, and reading readiness. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 5, 324–337.

Lopez, I. F. H. (2006). Colorblind to the reality of race in America. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 53, 11. Downloaded from the *Academic OneFile*. Web. 25 May 2011.

Lopez, I. F. H. (2007). "A nation of minorities": Race, ethnicity, and reactionary colorblindness. Stanford Law Review, 59 (4), 985–1063. Lynch, S., Kuipers, J., Pyke, C., & Szesze, M. (2005). Examining the effects of a highly rated science curriculum unit on diverse students: Results from a planning grant. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42 (8), 912–946.

Manning, K. (1993). Race, science, and identity. In G. Early (Ed.), Lure and loathing: Essays on race, identity, and the ambivalence of assimilation (pp. 317–351). New York, NY: Allen Lane/Penguin Press.

Matthews, C. E., & Smith, W. S. (1994). Native American related materials in elementary instruction. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 31 (4), 363–380.

McEwan, B. (1951). Society changes the biology teacher. Science Education, 35 (5), 289-291.

McNamee, S. J., & Miller, R. K. (2009). The meritocracy myth. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Mertens, D. (2010). Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Muller, P. A., Stage, F. K., & Kinzie, J. (2001). Science achievement growth trajectories: Understanding factors related to gender and racial-ethnic differences in precollege science achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 38, 981–1012.

Mutegi, J. (2011). The inadequacies of "Science for All" and the necessity and nature of a socially transformative curriculum approach for African American science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 248 (3), 301–316.

Mutegi, J. (2013). "Life's first need is for us to be realistic" and other reasons for examining the sociocultural construction of race in the science performance of African American students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50 (1), 82–103.

Nagel, J. (1994). Ethnicity: Creating and recreating ethnic identity and culture. Social Problems, 41 (1), 152–176.

National Science Board . (2012). Science and engineering indicators 2012. Arlington VA: National Science Foundation (NSB 12-01).

Nieto, S. (1987). Parent involvement in bilingual education: Whose responsibility is it? NABE Journal, 11, 189-201.

Noblit, G. (2013). Culture bound: Science, teaching, and research. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50 (2), 238–249.

Oakes, J. (1985). Keeping track: How schools structure inequality (2nd ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1994). Racial formation in the United States: From the 1960s to 1990s (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Parsons, E. C. (1997). Black high school females' images of the scientist: Expressions of culture. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34 (7), 745–768.

Parsons, E. C. (2008). Positionality of African Americans and a theoretical accommodation of it: Rethinking science education research. Science Education, 92, 1127–1144.

Parsons, E. C., & Bayne, G. U. (2012). Conceptualizations of context in science education research: Implications for equity. In J. Bianchini , V. Akerson , A. C. Barton , O. Lee , & A. Rodriguez (Eds.), Moving the equity agenda forward: Equity research, practice, and policy in science education (pp. 153–172). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Parsons, E. C., Cooper, J., & Simpson, J. (2011). The neglect and significance of race and culture in science education research involving Blacks in the United States: A critical review of the literature from 1997–2007. In B. Fraser, K. Tobin, & C. McRobbie (Eds.), International handbook on science education (pp. 569–581). New York, NY: Springer.

Parsons, E. C., Rhodes, B., & Brown, C. (2011). Unpacking CRT in Negotiating White science. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6, 951–960.

Parsons, E. C., Simpson, J., & Cooper, J. (2009). Low status and positionality of African Americans: A critique of science education reform and research. In K. Tobin & W.-M. Roth (Eds.), The world of science education: Handbook of research in North America, vol 1 (pp. 331–351). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Parsons, E. C., Tran, L. U., & Gomillion, C. T. (2008). An investigation of student roles within small, racially mixed science groups: A racial perspective. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (11), 1469–1489.

Parsons, E. C., & Wall, S. (2011). Unpacking the critical in culturally relevant pedagogy: An illustration involving African Americans and Asian Americans. In L. Scherff & K. Spector (Eds.), Culturally relevant pedagogy: Clashes and confrontations (pp. 15–34). New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Petersen, R., & Lowery, L. (1972). The use of motor activity as an index of curiosity in children. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 9 (3), 193–200.

Prentice, D. A., & Miller, D. T. (2007). Psychological essentialism of human categories. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 16 (4), 202–206.

Ryu, M. (2012). "But at school ... I became a bit shy": Korean immigrant adolescents' discursive participation in science. Cultural Studies of Science Education. doi:10.1007/s11422–012–9406–2

Schibeci, R. A., & Riley, J. P., III . (1986). Influence of students' background and perceptions on science attitudes and achievement. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 23 (3), 177–187.

Schindelman, B. (1946). Changing concepts in education. Science Education, 30 (1), 35–36.

Secada, W. (1989). Enlightened self-interest and equity in mathematics education. Peabody Journal of Education, 66 (2), 22–56.

Sewell, W., Jr. (1992). A theory of structure: Duality, agency, and transformation. American Journal of Sociology, 98, 1–29.

Sheridan, C. (2003). "Another White race": Mexican Americans and the paradox of whiteness in jury selection. Law and History Review, 21 (1), 109–144.

Simpson, R., & Troost, K. (1982). Influences on commitment to and learning of science among adolescents. Science Education, 66 (5), 763–781.

Smedley, A. (2001). Social origins of the idea of race. In C. Stokes , T. Melendez , & G. Rhodes-Reed (Eds.), Race in 21st century America (pp. 1–24). East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.

Smedley, A., & Smedley, B. (2005). Race as biology is fiction, racism as a social problem is real: Anthropological and historical perspectives on the social construction of race. American Psychologist, 60 (1), 16–26.

Smith, E. M., & Hausafus, C. (1998). Relationship of family support and ethnic minority students' achievement in science and mathematics. Science Education, 82 (1), 111–125.

Solomon, M. D., & Braunschneider, G. E. (1950). Relation of biological science to the social attitudes. Science Education, 34 (2), 80–84. Stanley, W. B., & Brickhouse, N. W. (1994). Multiculturalism, universalism, and science education. Science Education, 78 (4), 387–398. Ullucci, K., & Battey, D. (2011). Exposing colorblindness/grounding color consciousness: Challenges for teacher education. Urban Education, 46 (6), 1195–1225.

U.S. Census Bureau . (2012). Statistical abstract of the United States, 2012. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Retrieved from www.census.gov/compendia/statab/cats/education.html

Von Secker, C. E., & Lissitz, R. W. (1999). Estimating the impact of instructional practices on student achievement in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36 (10), 1110–1126.

Wallace, T., & Brand, B. R. (2012). Using critical race theory to analyze science teachers' culturally responsive practices. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 7, 341–374.

Washburn, S. L. (1944). Thinking about race. Science Education, 28 (2), 65–76.

Watkins, W. (2001). Chapter 2: Scientific racism. In W. Watkins, The White architects of Black education: Ideology and power in America: 1865–1954 (pp. 24–40). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Webb, L. D. (2006). The history of American education: A great American experiment. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson-Merrill Prentice Hall.

Welch, W. W., Walberg, H. J., & Fraser, B. (1986). Predicting elementary science learning using national assessment data. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 23 (8), 699–706.

Wells, A., & Frankenberg, E. (2007). The public schools and the challenge of the Supreme Court's integration decision. The Phi Delta Kappan, 89 (3), 178–188.

Wilson, C. D., Taylor, J. A., Kowalski, S. M., & Carlson, J. (2010). The relative effects and equity of inquiry-based and commonplace science teaching on students' knowledge, reasoning, and argumentation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (3), 276–301. Yerrick, R., & Johnson, J. (2011). Negotiating White science in rural Black America: A case for navigating the landscape of teacher knowledge domains. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6, 915–939.

Yinger, J. M. (1985). Ethnicity. Annual Review of Sociology, 11, 151–180.

Zuniga, K., Olson, J. K., & Winter, M. (2005). Science education for rural Latino/a students: Course placement and success in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42 (4), 376–402.

Gender Matters

Achieve . (2013). Next generation science standards. Retrieved June 1, 2013, from www.achieve.org/next-generation-science-standards Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs and bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. Gender & Society, 4, 139–158.

Alaimo, S., & Hekman, S. (2009). Introduction: Emerging models of materiality in feminist theory. In S. Alaimo & S. Hekman (Eds.), Material feminisms (pp. 1–22). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Alexander, J., Johnson, J., & Kelley, J. (2012). Longitudinal analysis of the relations between opportunities to learn about science and the development of interests related to science. Science Education, 96, 763–786.

Andersson, K., & Gullberg, A. (2012). What is science in preschool and what do teachers have to know to empower children? Cultural Studies of Science Education. doi:10.1007/s11422-012-9439-6

Andersson, K. , Hussenius, A. , & Gustafsson, C. (2009). Gender theory as a tool for analyzing science teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 25, 336–343.

Archer, L., Dewitt, J., Osborne, J., Dillion, J., Willis, B., & Wong, B. (2012). "Balancing acts": Elementary school girls' negotiations of femininity, achievement, and science. Science Education, 96, 967–989.

Babcock, L., & Laschever, S. (2007). Women don't ask. New York: Bantam.

Banilower, E. R., Smith, P. S., Weiss, I. R., Malzahn, K. A., Campbell, K. M., & Weis, A. M. (2013). Report of the 2012 National Survey of Science and Mathematics Education. Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research, Inc.

Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. Signs, 28, 801–831.

Barad, K. (2007). Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Baram-Tsabari, A., Sethi, R. J., Bry, L., & Yarden, A. (2009). Asking scientists: A decade of questions analyzed by age, gender, and country. Science Education, 93, 131–160.

Bayne, G., & Scantlebury, K. (2013). Cogenerative dialogues as pedagogy research in science education. In K. Irby, G. Brown, & R. Lara-Aleci (Eds.), The handbook of educational theories (pp. 237–247). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing Inc.

Bazzul, J., & Sykes, H. (2011). The secret identity of a biology textbook: Straight and naturally sexed. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6, 265–286.

Brandt, C. B. (2007). Discursive geographies in science: Space, identity, and scientific discourse among indigenous women in higher education. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3, 703–730.

Broadway, F. S. (2011). Queer (v.) queer (v.): Biology as curriculum, pedagogy, and being albeit queer (v.). Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6, 293–304.

Broadway, F. S., & Leafgren, S. (2012). Unmasking: On violence, masculinity, and superheroes in science education. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 7, 719–733.

Brotman, J. S., & Moore, F. M. (2008). Girls and science: A review of four themes in the science education literature. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45, 971–1002.

Brown, S. , & Ronau, R. (2012). Students' perceptions of single-gender science and mathematics classroom experiences. School Science and Mathematics, 112, 1–22.

Buck, G. A., & Quigley, C. (2013). Allowing our research on urban, low-SES, African American girls and science education to actively and continually rewrite itself. In J. Bianchini, V. Akerson, A. C. Barton, O. Lee, & A. Rodriguez (Eds.), Moving the equity agenda forward: Equity research, practice, and policy in science education (pp. 173–189). New York: Springer.

Calabrese Barton, A. (2008). Feminisms and a world not yet: Science with and for social justice. In W. M. Roth & K. Tobin (Eds.), World of science education: North America (pp. 409–426). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Calabrese Barton, A., & Brickhouse, N. (2006). Engaging girls in science. In C. Skelton, B. Francis, & L. Smulyan (Eds.), The Sage handbook of gender and education (pp. 221–235). London: Sage.

Calabrese Barton, A., Tan, E., & Rivet, A. (2008). Creating hybrid spaces for engaging school science among urban middle school girls. American Educational Research Journal, 45, 68–103.

Carlone, H. B., & Johnson, A. (2007). Understanding the science experiences of successful women of color: Science identity as an analytic lens. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44, 1187–1218.

Chang, S. , Yau-Yuen, A. , Yeung, A. , & Cheng, M. (2009). Ninth graders' learning interests, life experiences and attitudes towards science and technology. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 18, 447–457.

Cheung, D. (2009). Students' attitudes toward chemistry lessons: The interaction effect between grade level and gender. Research in Science Education, 9, 75–91.

Clark Blickenstaff, J. (2005). Women and science careers: Leaky pipeline or gender filter? Gender and Education, 17, 369–386.

Collins, P. H. (1991). Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment. New York: Routledge. Connell, R. W. (1995). Masculinities. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersections of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics. University of Chicago Legal Forum, 140, 139–167.

Danielsson, A. (2012). In the physics class: Intersections of social class and gender in university physics students' identity constitutions. Culture Studies of Science Education. doi:10.1007/s11422–012–9421–3.

Davis, K. (2011). Intersectionality as a buzzword. In H. Lutz , M. T. H. Vivar , & L. Supik (Eds.), Framing intersectionality: Debates on a multi-faceted concept in gender studies (pp. 43–54). Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Dillabough, J., McLeod, J., & Millsx. M. (Eds.). (2009). Troubling gender in education. New York: Routledge.

Due, K. (2012). Who is the competent physics student? A study of students' positions and social interaction in small-group discussions. Cultural Studies of Science Education. doi:10.1007/s11422-012-9441-z

Dyer, D. (2011). Block building in primary classrooms as a gender equalizer in math and science. In T. Jacobson (Ed.), Perspectives on gender in early childhood (pp. 179–190). St. Paul, MN: Redleaf Press.

England, P. (2010). The gender revolution: Uneven and stalled. Gender & Society, 24, 149–166.

Farland-Smith, D. (2012). Personal and social interactions between young girls and scientists: Examining critical aspects for identity formation. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23, 1–18.

Fifield, S., & Letts, W. (2014). (Re)considering queer theories and science education. Cultural Studies of Science Education.

Francis, B., & Skelton, B. (2009). "The self-made self": Analysing the applicability of current key ideas for theories of gender and education. In J. Dillabough , J. McLeod , & M. Mills (Eds.), Troubling gender in education (pp. 11–23). New York: Routledge.

Francis, B., & Skelton, B. (2011). A feminist analysis of gender and educational achievement. In K. Van den Branden , P. Van Avermaet , & M. Van Houtte (Eds.), Equity and excellence in education: Towards maximal learning opportunities for all students (pp. 96–118). New York: Routledge.

Gonsalves, A. (2011). Gender and doctoral physics education: Are we asking the right questions? In L. McAlpine & C. Amundsen (Eds.), Doctoral education: Research-based strategies for doctoral students, supervisors and administrators (pp. 117–123). New York: Springer. Gonsalves, A. (2012). Physics and the girly girl—there is a contradiction somewhere: Doctoral students' positioning around discourses of gender and competence in physics. Cultural Studies of Science Education. doi:10.1007/s11422–012–9447–6

Gonzales, P., Williams, T., Jocelyn, L., Roey, S., Kastberg, D., & Brenwald, S. (2008). Highlights from TIMSS 2007: Mathematics and science achievement of U.S. fourth- and eighth-grade students in an international context (NCES 2009-001). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Götschel, H. (Ed.). (2013). Transforming substance: Gender in material sciences—an anthology. Uppsala, Sweden: University Printers, Centre For Gender Research.

de Groot Kim, S. (2011). Lessons learned early: Girls wait. In T. Jacobson (Ed.), Perspectives on gender in early childhood (pp. 231–246). St. Paul, MN: Redleaf Press.

Hanson, S. (2009). Swimming against the tide: African American girls and science education. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. Harding, S. (1986). The science question in feminism. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hazari, Z., Sadler, P., & Tai, R. (2008). Gender differences in the high school and affective experiences of introductory college physics students. The Physics Teacher, 46, 423–427.

Hazari, Z., Sonnert, G., Sadler, P. M., & Shanahan, M. C. (2010). Connecting high school physics experiences, outcome expectations, physics identity, and physics career choice: A gender study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 978–1003.

Hazari, Z., Tai, R., & Sadler, P. (2007). Gender differences in introductory university physics performance. Science Education, 91, 847–876.

Hekman, S. (2010). Material of knowledge: Feminist disclosures. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hill, C. , Corbett, C. , & St. Rose, A. (2010). Why so few? Women in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. Washington, DC: AAUW.

Huang, S., & Fraser, B. (2009). Science teachers' perceptions of the school environment: Gender differences. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46, 404–420.

Hussénius, A., & Scantlebury, K. (2011). Witches, alchemists, poisoners, and scientists: The changing image of chemistry. In P. Gilmer, M. H. Chiu, & D. F. Treagust (Eds.), Celebrating 100th anniversary of Marie Curie's Nobel award in chemistry in 2011 (pp. 125–137). New York: Sense Publishers.

Hussénius, A., Scantlebury, K., Andersson, K., & Gullberg, A. (2013). Ignoring half the sky: A feminist critique of science education's knowledge society. In N. Mansour & R. Wegerif (Eds.), Science education for diversity in knowledge society. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-4563-614. New York: Springer.

Hyde, J. S., & Linn, M. C. (2006). Gender similarities in mathematics and science. Science, 314, 599–600.

Johnson, A. (2007). Unintended consequences: How science professors discourage women of color. Science Education, 91, 805–821. Joslin, P., Stiles, K. S., Marshall, J. S., Anderson, O. R., Gallagher, J. J., Kahle, J. B., (2007). NARST: A lived history. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3, 157–207.

Jovanovic, J., & Bhanot, R. (2008). Gender differences in science. In W. M. Roth & K. Tobin (Eds.), World of science education: North America (pp. 427–450). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Kahle, J. B. (2004). Will girls be left behind? Gender differences and accountability. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41, 961–969.

Kahle, J. B. (2011). Professor Lesley Parker: A science educator writ large. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6, 775–781.

Kahle, J. B., & Lakes, M. (1983). The myth of equality in science classrooms. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 20, 131-140.

Kahle, J. B., & Meece, J. (1994). Research on gender issues in the classroom. In D. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research in science teaching and learning (pp. 542–576). Washington, DC: National Science Teachers Association.

Kelly, A. (1978). Girls and science: An international study of sex differences in school science achievement. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Kelly, A. (Ed.). (1981). The missing half: Girls and science education. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Kelly, A. (1985). The construction of masculine science. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 6, 133–153.

Kenway, J., Willis, S., Blackmore, J., & Rennie, L. (1998). Answering back: Girls, boys and feminism in schools. New York: Routledge. Kiran, D., & Sungur, S. (2012). Middle school students' science self-efficacy and its sources: Examination of gender difference. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 21, 619–630.

Kreitz-Sandberg, S. (2013). Gender inclusion and horizontal gender segregation: Stakeholders: Strategies and dilemmas in Swedish teachers' education. Gender and Education, 25, 444–465.

Le, L. (2009). Investigating gender differential item functioning across countries and test languages for PISA science items. International Journal of Testing, 9, 122–133.

Lemke, J. (2011). The secret identity of science education: Masculine and politically conservative? Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6, 287–292.

Lorber Newsome, J. (2013). The chemistry PhD: The impact on women's retention. London: Royal Society of Chemistry.

Louis, R. , & Mistele, J. (2011). The differences in scores and self-efficacy by student gender in mathematics and science. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 10, 1163–1190.

Lundin, M. (2014). Inviting queer ideas into the science classroom: Studying sexual education from a queer perspective. Cultural Studies of Science Education.

Lykke, N. (2010). Feminist studies: A guide to intersectional theory, methodology and writing. London: Routledge.

Mantzicopoulos, P., Patrick, H., & Samarapungavan, A. (2008). Young children's motivational beliefs about learning science. Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 23, 378–394.

Martin, S., Wassell, B., & Scantlebury, K. (2013). Examining the intersections of race, ethnicity, class and gender: An analysis of research on English language learners in K–12 science education. In J. Bianchini, V. Akerson, A. C. Barton, O. Lee, & A. Rodriguez (Eds.), Moving the equity agenda forward: Equity research, practice, and policy in science education (pp. 81–98). New York: Springer.

Matsuda, M. (1991). Beside my sister, facing the enemy: Legal theory out of coalition. Stanford Law Review, 43, 1183–1192.

McKinley, E. (2008). From object to subject: Hybrid identities of indigenous women in science. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3, 959–975.

McRobbie, A. (2007). Top girls? Young women and the post-feminist sexual contract. Cultural Studies, 21, 718–737.

McRobbie, A. (2009). The aftermath of feminism: Gender, culture and social change. London: Sage Publications.

Mendick, H., & Moreau, M. P. (2013). New media, old images: Constructing online representations of women and men in science, engineering and technology. Gender and Education, 25, 325–339.

Murphy, P., & Whitelegg, E. (2006). Girls and physics: Continuing barriers to "belonging." The Curriculum Journal, 17, 281–305. Nyström, E. (2009). Teacher talk: Producing, resisting and challenging discourses about the science classroom. Gender and Education, 21, 735–751.

Ong, M., Wright, C., Espinosa, L., & Orfield, G. (2011). Inside the double bind: A synthesis of empirical research on undergraduate and graduate women of color in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. Harvard Educational Review, 81, 172–207.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) . (2009). Equally prepared for life? How 15-year-old boys and girls perform in school. Retrieved June 30, 2012, from www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/PIF-2014-gender-international-version.pdf Orlander, A. A. (2012). What if we were in a test tube? Students meaning making during a biology lesson about the human genitals. Cultural Studies of Science Education. doi:10.1007/s11422-012-9430-2

Owens, T. (2009). Going to school with Madame Curie and Mr. Einstein: Gender roles in children's science biographies. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 4, 929–943.

Parker, C. (2014). Multiple influences: Latinas, middle-level science, and school. Cultural Studies of Science Education. Parsons, E. C. (2007). Mary Monroe Atwater: A transformative force in science education. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3, 209–216.

Patrick, H., Mantzicopoulos, P., & Samarapungavan, A. (2009). Motivation for learning science in kindergarten: Is there a gender gap and does integrated inquiry and literacy instruction make a difference? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46, 166–191.

Perry, B., Link, T., Boelter, C., & Leukefeld, C. (2012). Blinded to science: Gender differences in the effects of race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status on academic and science attitudes among sixth graders. Gender and Education, 24, 725–743.

Pettersson, H. (2011). Making masculinity in plasma physics: Machines, labour and experiments. Science Studies, 24, 47–65. Quigley, C. F. (2011). With their help: How community members construct a congruent third space in an urban kindergarten classroom. International Journal of Science Education, 35 (5), 837–863.

Rahm, I. (2008). Urban youths' hybrid positioning in science practices at the margin: A look inside a school–museum–scientist partnership project and an after-school science program. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3, 97–121.

Riegle-Crumb, C., & King, B. (2010). Questioning a White male advantage in STEM: Examining disparities in college major. Educational Researcher, 39, 656–664.

Riegle-Crumb, C., King, B., Grodsky, E., & Muller, C. (2012). The more things change, the more they stay the same? Prior achievement fails to explain gender inequality in entry into STEM college majors over time. American Educational Research Journal, 49, 1048–1073. Riegle-Crumb, C., Moore, C., & Ramos-Wada, A. (2011). Who wants to have a career in science or math? Exploring adolescents' future aspirations by gender and race/ethnicity. Science Education, 95, 458–476.

Risman, B., & Davis, G. (2013). From sex roles to gender structure. Current Sociology. doi:10.1177/0011392113479315

Rosser, S. V. (2012). Breaking into the lab. Engineering progress for women in science. New York: New York University Press.

Rossiter, M. (2012). Women scientists in America: Forging a new world since 1972. New York: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Scantlebury, K. (2007). Outsiders within: Urban African American girls' identity and science. In W.-M. Roth & K. Tobin (Eds.), Science, learning, and identity: Sociocultural and cultural-historical perspectives (pp. 121–134). New York: Sense Publishers.

Scantlebury, K. (2014). Jane Butler Kahle: Passion, determination and vision. Cultural Studies of Science Education.

Scantlebury, K., & Baker, D. (2007). Gender issues in science education research: Remembering where the difference lies. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 257–286). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Scantlebury, K., Baker, D., Sugi, A., Yoshida, A., & Uysal, S. (2007). Avoiding the issue of gender in Japanese science education. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 5, 415–438.

Scantlebury, K. , Kahle, J. B. , & Martin, S. (Eds.). (2010). Re-visioning science education from feminist perspectives: Challenges, choices and careers. New York: Sense Publishers.

Scantlebury, K., & LaVan, S. K. (2006). Re-visioning cogenerative dialogues as feminist pedagogy|research. FQS: Forum Qualitative Social Research, 7 (2), 1–10.

Scantlebury, K., & Martin, S. (2010). How does she know? Re-visioning conceptual change from feminist perspectives. In W. M. Roth, Re/structuring science education: Reuniting sociological and psychological perspectives (pp. 173–186). New York: Springer Publishers. Scantlebury, K., Tai, T., & Rahm, J. (2007). "That don't look like me." Stereotypic images of science: Where do they come from and what can we do with them? Cultural Studies of Science Education, 1, 545–558.

Sikora, J., & Pokropek, A. (2012). Gender segregation of adolescent science career plans in 50 countries. Science Education, 96, 234–264.

Sinnes, A., & Løken, M. (2012). Gendered education in a gendered world: Looking beyond cosmetic solutions to the gender gap in science. Culture Studies of Science Education. doi:10.1007/s11422-012-9433-z

Skelton, C., & Francis, B. (2009). Feminism and "the schooling scandal." London: Routledge.

Spender, D. (1982). Invisible women: The schooling scandal. London: Writers and Readers Publishing Cooperative.

Tan, E., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2008a). From peripheral to central, the story of Melanie's metamorphosis in an urban middle school science class. Science Education, 92, 567–590.

Tan, E., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2008b). Unpacking science for all through the lens of identities-in-practice: The stories of Amelia and Ginny. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3, 43–71.

Tyler-Wood, T., Ellison, A., Lim, O., & Periathiruvadi, S. (2012). Bringing up girls in science (BUGS): The effectiveness of an afterschool environmental science program for increasing female students' interest in science careers. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 21, 46–55.

Valian, V. (1998). Why so slow? The advancement of women. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Venville, G. (2008). Ocean to outback: Léonie Rennie's contribution to science education in Australia. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 4, 323–334.

Whitelegg, E., Murphy, P., & Hart, C. (2007). Girls and physics: Dilemmas and tensions. In R. Pintó & D. Couso (Eds.), Contributions from science education research (pp. 27–36). New York: Springer Publishers.

Wiseman, K., & Weinburgh, M. H. (Eds.). (2009). Becoming and being: Women's experience in leadership in K–16 science education communities. New York: Springer Publishers.

World Bank . (2011). The EdStats Newsletter, V (1), Retrieved December 10, 2012, from

http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTEDSTATS/Resources/3232763-1197312825215/EdStatsNewsletter22.pdf

Zapata, M., & Gallard, A. (2007). Female science teacher beliefs and attitudes: Implications in relation to gender and pedagogical practice. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3, 43–71.

English Learners in Science Education

Achieve, Inc. (2013). Next generation science standards. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from www.nextgenscience.org/next-generation-science-standards

Aikenhead, G. S. (2001). Students' ease in crossing cultural borders into school science. Science Education, 85 (2), 180–188.

American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) . (1990). Science for all Americans. New York: Oxford University Press. August, D. , Branum-Martin, L. , Hagan, E. , & Francis, D. (2009). The impact of an instructional intervention on the science and language learning of middle grade English language learners. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 2, 345–376.

Baker, D. P., & Stevenson, D. L. (1986). Mothers' strategies for children's achievement: Managing the transition to high school. Sociology of Education, 59, 156–166.

Ball, D. L., & Cohen, D. K. (1996). Reform by the book: What is—or might be—the role of curriculum materials in teacher learning and instructional reform? Educational Researcher, 25, 6–8.

Banilower, E. R., Smith, P. S., Weiss, I. R., Malzahn, K. A., Campbell, K. M., & Weis, A. M. (2013). Report of the 2012 national survey of science and mathematics education. Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research, Inc.

Bloome, D., Katz, L., Solsken, J., Willett, J., & Wilson-Keenan, J. (2000). Interpellations of family/community and classroom literacy practices. Journal of Educational Research, 93 (3), 155–163.

Brown, B. A. (2006). "It isn't slang that can be said about this stuff": Language, identity, and appropriating science discourse. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43 (1), 96–126.

Brown, B. A., Reveles, J. M., & Kelly, G. J. (2005). Scientific literacy and discursive identity: A theoretical framework for understanding science learning. Science Education, 89, 779–802.

Brown, B. A. , & Spang, E. (2008). Double talk: Synthesizing everyday and science language in the classroom. Science Education, 92, 708–732.

Bruna, K. R., & Gomez, K. (Eds.). (2008). Talking science, writing science: The work of language in multicultural classrooms. Mahwah, NJ: Taylor and Francis.

Buck, G. A., Mast, C., Ehlers, N., & Franklin, E. (2005). Preparing teachers to create a mainstream science classroom conducive to the needs of English language learners: A feminist action research project. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42 (9), 1013–1031. Buxton, C. (2010). Social problem solving through science: An approach to critical place-based science teaching and learning. Equity and Excellence in Education, 43 (1), 120–135.

Buxton, C., Allexsaht-Snider, M., & Rivera, C. (2012). Science, language and families: Constructing a model of language-rich science inquiry. In J. Bianchini, V. Atkerson, A. Calabrese Barton, O. Lee, & A. Rodriguez (Eds.), Moving the equity agenda forward: Equity research, practice and policy in science education (pp. 241–259). New York: Springer.

Buxton, C., Allexsaht-Snider, M., Suriel, R., Kayumova, S., Choi, Y., Bouton, B., & Land, M. (2012). Using educative assessments to support science teaching for middle school English language learners. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24 (2), 347–366. Buxton, C., Kayumova, S., & Allexsaht-Snider, M. (2013). Teacher, researcher and accountability discourses shaping democratic

practices for science teaching in middle schools. Democracy & Education, 21 (2).

Buxton, C., & Lee, O. (2010). Fostering scientific reasoning as a strategy to support science learning for ELLs. In D. Senal, C. Senal, & E. Wright (Eds.), Teaching Science with Hispanic ELLs in K–16 Classrooms (pp. 11–36). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing. Buxton, C., Lee, O., & Santau, A. (2008). Promoting science among English language learners: Professional development for today's culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 19(5), 495–511.

Buxton, C., Salinas, A., Mahotiere, M., Lee, O., & Secada, W. G. (2013). Leveraging cultural resources through teacher reasoning: Teachers analyze second language learners' problem solving in science. Teaching and Teacher Education, 32, 31–42.

Calabrese Barton, A., Tan, E., & O'Neill, T. (2013). Science education in urban contexts: New conceptual tools and stories of possibilities. In N. G. Lederman & S. K. Abell (Eds.), Handbook of research in science education (2nd ed., pp. 246–265). New York: Routledge.

Calderón, M., Slavin, R., & Sanchéz, M. (2011). Effective instruction for English learners. Future Child, 21 (1), 103–127.

Callahan, R., Wilkinson, L., & Muller, C. (2010). Academic achievement and course taking among language minority youth in U.S. schools: Effects of ESL placement. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 32 (1), 84–117.

Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1996). The Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA): A model for linguistically diverse classrooms. The Elementary School Journal, 96 (3), 259–273.

Chinn, P. W. (2007). Decolonizing methodologies and indigenous knowledge: The role of culture, place and personal experience in professional development. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (9), 1247–1268.

Cone, N., Buxton, C., Mahotiere, M., & Lee, O. (2013). Negotiating a sense of identity in a foreign land: Navigating public school structures and practices that often conflict with Haitian culture and values. Urban Education. doi:10.1177/0042085913478619 Davis, E., & Krajcik, J. (2005). Designing educative curriculum materials to promote teacher learning. Educational Researcher, 34 (3), 3–14.

Epstein, J. (1987). Parent involvement: What research says to administrators. Education and Urban Society, 19, 119–136. Fathman, A. K., & Crowther, D. T. (Eds.). (2006). Science for English language learners: K–12 classroom strategies. Arlington, VA: National Science Teachers Association.

Fradd, S. H., Lee, O., Sutman, F. X., & Saxton, M. K. (2002). Materials development promoting science inquiry with English language learners: A case study. Bilingual Research Journal, 25 (4), 479–501.

Garcia, E., Arias, M. B., Harris Murri, N., & Serna, C. (2010). Developing responsive teachers: A challenge for a demographic reality. Journal of Teacher Education, 61 (1–2), 132–142.

Garza, D. (2011). Alaska native science: A curriculum guide. Fairbanks, AK: Alaska Native Knowledge Network.

Gere, A. R., Buehler, J., Dallavis, C., & Haviland, V. S. (2009). A visibility project: Learning to see how preservice teachers take up culturally responsive pedagogy. American Educational Research Journal, 46, 816–852.

Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners: What the research does—and does not—say. American Educator, 32 (2), 42–44.

González, N. , Moll, L. C. , & Amanti, C. (2005). Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gruenewald, D. (2003). The best of both worlds: A critical pedagogy of place. Educational Researcher, 32 (4), 3–12.

Hampton, E., & Rodriguez, R. (2001). Inquiry science in bilingual classrooms. Bilingual Research Journal, 25 (4), 461–478.

Hart, J. , & Lee, O. (2003). Teacher professional development to improve science and literacy achievement of English language learners. Bilingual Research Journal, 27 (3), 475–501.

Hill, N. E., & Tyson, D. F. (2009). Parental involvement in middle school: A meta-analytic assessment of the strategies that promote achievement. Developmental Psychology, 45 (3), 740–763.

Hong, S., & Ho, H.-Z. (2005). Direct and indirect longitudinal effects of parental involvement on student achievement: Second-order latent growth modeling across ethnic groups. Journal of Educational Psychology, 97 (1), 32–42.

Horn, J. L., & Carroll, C. D. (1998). Confronting the odds: Students at risk and the pipeline to higher education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Hudicourt-Barnes, J. (2003). The use of argumentation in Haitian Creole science classrooms. Harvard Educational Review, 73 (10), 73–93.

Jorgenson, O. (2000). The need for more ethnic teachers: Addressing the critical shortage in American public schools. Teachers College Record. Date Published: September 13. Retrieved from www.tcrecord.org/Content.asp?ContentId=10551

Kesidou, S., & Roseman, J. E. (2002). How well do middle school science programs measure up? Findings from Project 2061's curriculum review. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (6), 522–549.

Kieffer, M. J., Lesaux, N. K., Rivera, M., & Francis, D. (2009). Accommodations for English language learners on large-scale assessments: A meta-analysis on effectiveness and validity. Review of Educational Research, 79 (3), 1168–1201.

Kopriva, R. J. (2008). Improving testing for English language learners: A comprehensive approach to designing, building, implementing, and interpreting better academic assessments. New York: Routledge.

Kopriva, R. J., & Sexton, U. (2011). Using appropriate assessment processes in the classroom: How to get accurate information about the academic knowledge and skills of English language learners. In M. del Rosario-Basterra, E. Trumbull, & G. Solano-Flores (Eds.), Cultural validity in assessment: Addressing linguistic and cultural diversity. New York: Routledge Publishers.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. American Educational Research Journal, 32 (3), 465–491. Lawrenz, F., Huffman, D., & Welch, W. (2001). The science achievement of various subgroups of alternative assessment formats. Science Education, 85 (3), 279–290.

Lee, J. S., & Bowen K. N. (2006). Parent involvement, cultural capital, and the achievement gap among elementary school children. American Educational Research Journal, 43 (2), 193–218.

Lee, O. (2004). Teacher change in beliefs and practices in science and literacy instruction with English language learners. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (1), 65–93.

Lee, O. , & Buxton, C. A. (2008). Science curriculum and student diversity: Culture, language, and socioeconomic status. The Elementary School Journal, 109 (2), 123–137.

Lee, O., & Buxton, C. A. (2012). Integrating science and English proficiency for English language learners. Theory into Practice, 52 (1), 31–42.

Lee, O., Deaktor, R., Enders, C., & Lambert, J. (2008). Impact of a multi-year professional development intervention on science

achievement of culturally and linguistically diverse elementary students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (6), 726–747. Lee, O., & Fradd, S. H. (1998). Science for all, including students from non–English language backgrounds. Educational Researcher, 27 (3), 12–21.

Lee, O. , Hart, J. , Cuevas, P. , & Enders, C. (2004). Professional development in inquiry-based science for elementary teachers of diverse students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (10), 1021–1043.

Lee, O., Lewis, S., Adamson, K., Maerten-Rivera, J., & Secada, W. G. (2008). Urban elementary school teachers' knowledge and practices in teaching science to English language learners. Science Education, 92 (4), 733–758.

Lee, O. , & Luykx, A. (2005). Dilemmas in scaling up educational innovations with nonmainstream students in elementary school science. American Educational Research Journal, 43, 411–438.

Lee, O. , Luykx, A. , Buxton, C. A. , & Shaver, A. (2007). The challenge of altering elementary school teachers' beliefs and practices regarding linguistic and cultural diversity in science instruction. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (9), 1269–1291.

Lee, O. , & Maerten-Rivera, J. (2012). Teacher change in elementary science instruction with English language learners: Results of a multi-year professional development intervention across multiple grades. Teachers College Record, 114 (8), 1–44.

Lee, O. , Mahotiere, M. , Salinas, A. , Penfield, R. D. , & Maerten-Rivera, J. (2009). Science writing achievement among English language learners: Results of three-year intervention in urban elementary schools. Bilingual Research Journal, 32 (2), 153–167.

Lee, O. , Quinn, H. , & Valdés, G. (2013). Science and language for English language learners: Language demands and opportunities in relation to Next Generation Science Standards. Educational Researcher, 42 (4), 223–233.

Luykx, A., Lee, O., & Edwards, U. (2008). Lost in translation: Negotiating meaning in a beginning ESOL science classroom. Educational Policy, 22 (5), 640–674.

Lynch, S., Kuipers, J., Pyke, C., & Szesze, M. (2005). Examining the effects of a highly rated science curriculum unit on diverse populations: Results from a planning grant. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42 (8), 912–946.

Moje, E., Collazo, T., Carillo, R., & Marx, R. W. (2001). "Maestro, what is quality?": Examining competing discourses in project-based science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (4), 469–495.

National Center for Education Statistics . (2011). The condition of education 2011 (NCES 2011–033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics . (2012a). Science 2011: National assessment of educational progress at Grade 8 (NCES 2012–465). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics . (2012b). Trends in high school dropout and completion rates in the United States: 1972 – 2009. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition . (2007). The growing numbers of limited English proficient students: 1996–2006. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition.

National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition . (2012). The growing number of English learner students: 1995–2010. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education Office of English Language Acquisition.

National Commission on Excellence in Education . (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Research Council . (1996). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science in Grades K–8. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2011). A framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting themes, and core ideas. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Science Foundation . (1998). Infusing equity in systemic reform: An implementation scheme. Washington, DC: Author. No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act . (2002). Public Law No. 107–110, 115 Stat. 1425.

Pandya, C. , Batalova, J. , & McHugh, M. (2011). Limited English proficient individuals in the United States: Number, share, growth, and linguistic diversity. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Pew Research Center . (2012). The rise of Asian Americans. Washington, DC: Pew Social and Demographic Trends. Race To The Top (RT 3 Act of 2011, Senate Bill 844 (2011)).

Riggs, E. M. (2005). Field-based education and indigenous knowledge: Essential components of geoscience education for Native American communities. Science Education, 89, 296–313.

Rodriguez, A., & Berryman, C. (2002). Using sociotransformative constructivism to teach for understanding in diverse classrooms: A beginning teacher's journey. American Educational Research Journal, 39 (4), 1017–1045.

Rodriguez, A., Collins-Parker, T., & Garza, J. (2013). Interpreting research on parent involvement and connecting it to the science classroom. Theory Into Practice, 52 (1), 51–58.

Rodriguez, A., Zozakiewicz, C., & Yerrick, R. (2008). Students acting as change agents in culturally diverse schools. In A. J. Rodriguez (Ed.), The multiple faces of agency: Innovative strategies for effecting change in urban school contexts (pp. 47–72). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishing.

Rosebery, A. S., Ogonowski, M., DiSchino, M., & Warren, B. (2010). "The coat traps all your body heat": Heterogeneity as fundamental to learning. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 19 (3), 322–357.

Rosebery, A. S., & Warren, B. (Eds.). (2008). Teaching science to English language learners: Building on students' strengths. Arlington, VA: National Science Teachers Association.

Rudolph, J. (2002). Scientists in the classroom: The Cold War reconstruction of American science education. New York: Palgrave. Sable, J., & Plotts, C. (2010). Public elementary and secondary school student enrollment and staff counts from the Common Core of Data: School year 2008 – 09. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education National Center for Education Statistics.

Schmidt, W. H. , McKnight, C. C. , & Raizen, S. A. (1997). A splintered vision: An investigation of U.S. science and mathematics education. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Shavelson, R. J., & Towne, L. (Eds.). (2002). Scientific research in education. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Shaw, J. M. (1997). Threats to the validity of science performance assessments for English language learners. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34 (7), 721–743.

Shaw, J. M. (2009). Science performance assessment and English learners: An exploratory study. Electronic Journal of Literacy Through Science, 8 (3). Retrieved from http://ejlts.ucdavis.edu/article/2009/8/3/science-performance-assessment-and-english-learners-exploratory-study

Shaw, J. M., Bunch, G., & Geaney, E. (2010). Analyzing the language demands facing English learners on science performance assessments: The SALD framework. Journal of Research on Science Teaching, 47 (8), 909–928.

Sheldon, S. B., & Epstein L. J. (2005). Involvement counts: Family and community partnerships and mathematics achievement. Journal of Educational Research, 98 (4), 196–206.

Siegel, M. A. (2007). Striving for equitable classroom assessments for linguistic minorities: Strategies for and effects of revising life science items. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44, 864–881.

Solano-Flores, G. (2008). Who is given tests in what language by whom, when, and where? The need for probabilistic views of language in the testing of English language learners. Educational Researcher, 37 (4), 189–199.

Solano-Flores, G., & Li, M. (2008). Examining the dependability of academic achievement measures for English-language learners. Assessment for Effective Intervention, 33 (3), 135–144.

Solano-Flores, G., & Trumbull, E. (2003). Examining language in context: The need for new research and practice paradigms in the testing of English-language learners. Educational Researcher, 32 (2), 3–13.

Stoddart, T., Pinal, A., Latzke, M., & Canaday, D. (2002). Integrating inquiry science and language development for English language learners. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (8), 664–687.

Stoddart, T., Solis, J., Tolbert, S., & Bravo, M. (2010). A framework for the effective science teaching of English language learners in elementary schools. In D. Sunal, C. Sunal, & E. Wright (Eds.), Teaching science with Hispanic ELLs in K–16 classrooms. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages . (2006). PreK–12 English language proficiency standards. Alexandra, VA: Author. Tharp, R. G. (1997). From at-risk to excellence: Research, theory, and principles for practice. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence. Retrieved from www.cal.org/crede/pubs/researchreports.html

Tong, F., Irby, B., Lara-Alecio, R., Yoon, M., & Mathes, P. (2010). Hispanic English learners' responses to longitudinal English instructional intervention and the effect of gender: A multilevel analysis. The Elementary School Journal, 110 (4), 542–566. Trumbull, E., & Koelsch, N. (2011). Language-arts: Designing and using a reading assessment for learners transitioning to English-only

instruction. In M. Rosario Basterra , E. Trumbull , & G. Solano-Flores (Eds.), Cultural validity in assessment: Addressing linguistic and cultural diversity (pp. 195–217). New York: Routledge.

U.S. Census Bureau . (2012). Statistical abstract of the United States, 2012. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. U.S. Department of Education . (2007). Participation in education: Elementary and secondary education. Washington, DC: Author.

Vijver, F., & Tanzer, N. (2004). Bias and equivalence in cross-cultural assessment: An overview. European Review of Applied Psychology, 54 (2), 119–135.

Villegas, A. M. (2007). Dispositions in teacher education: A look at social justice. Journal of Teacher Education, 58 (5), 370–380. Warren, B., Ballenger, C., Ogonowski, M., Rosebery, A., & Hudicourt-Barnes, J. (2001). Rethinking diversity in learning science: The logic of everyday language. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (5), 529–552.

Warren, B., & Rosebery, A. (2011). Navigating interculturality: African American male students in the science classroom. Journal of African American Males in Education, 2 (1), 98–115.

Wayne, A. J., Yoon, K. S., Zhu, P., Cronen, S., & Garet, M. S. (2008). Experimenting with teacher professional development: Motives and methods. Educational Researcher, 37 (8), 469–479.

Wong-Fillmore, L., & Snow, C. (2002). What teachers need to know about language. Washington DC: Center for Applied Linguistics. Yore, L., Bisanz, G., & Hand, B. (2003). Examining the literacy component of science literacy: 25 years of language arts and science research. International Journal of Science Education, 25 (6), 689–725.
Special Needs and Talents in Science Learning

Achieve, Inc. (2013a). Diversity and equity in the Next Generation Science Standards (NGGS): "All standards, all students." Retrieved from www.nextgenscience.org/sites/ngss/files/Appendix%20D%20Diversity%20and%20Equity%20-%204.9.13.pdf

Achieve, Inc. (2013b). The Next Generation Science Standards. Retrieved from www.nextgenscience.org/

Adamo-Villani, N., & Wilbur, R. (2009). Two novel technologies for accessible math and science education. IEEE Multimedia, 15 (4), 38–46.

Algozzine, B. (2005). Restrictiveness and race in special education: Facts that remain difficult to ignore anymore. Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal, 3, 64–69.

Americans With Disabilities Act . (1990). Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division.

Arthaud, T. J., Aram, R. J., Breck, S. E., Doelling, J. E., & Bushrow, K. M. (2007). Developing collaboration skills in pre-service teachers: A partnership between general and special education. Teacher Education and Special Education, 30 (1), 1–12.

Baker, E., Wang, M., & Walberg, H. (1994). The effects of inclusion on learning. Educational Leadership, 52 (4), 33–35.

Baker, J. M. , & Zigmond, N. (1990). Are regular education classes equipped to accommodate students with learning disabilities? Exceptional Children, 56, 515–526.

Bass, G. M., & Ries, R. R. (1995, April). Scientific understanding in high-ability school students: Concepts and process skills. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Bauwens, J. (1991, March). Blueprint for cooperation teaching. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Special Education Conference, Cedar Rapids, IA.

Bauwens, J., & Hourcade, J. (1997, April). Cooperative teaching; Portraits of possibilities. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children, Salt Lake City, UT.

Bay, M., Staver, J. R., Bryan, T., & Hale, J. B. (1992). Science instruction for the mildly handicapped: Direct instruction versus discovery teaching. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29 (6), 555–570.

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (Eds.). (1998). From them to us: An international study of inclusion in education. London: Routledge.

Bouck, E. C. (2010). Technology and students with disabilities: Does it solve all the problems? In F. E. Obiakor , J. P. Bakken , & A. F. Rotatori (Ed.), Current issues and trends in special education: Research, technology, and teacher preparation (Advances in SPECIAL EDUCATION, Volume 20; pp. 91–104). Bingley, United Kingdom: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Boyce, L. N., VanTassel-Baska, J., Burruss, J. D., Sher, B. T., & Johnson, D. T. (1997). A problem-based curriculum: Parallel learning opportunities for students and teachers. Journal for the education of the gifted, 20, 363–379.

Boyd-Kimball, D. (2012). Adaptive instructional aids for teaching a blind student in a nonmajors college chemistry course. Journal of Chemical Education, 89, 1395–1399.

Brandwein, P. (1955). The gifted student as future scientist: The high school student and his commitment to science. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., Cocking, R. R., Donovan, M. S., & Pellegrino, J. W. (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Burgstahler, S. (2003). The role of technology in preparing youth with disabilities for postsecondary education and employment. Journal of Special Education Technology, 18 (4), 7–19.

Burgstahler, S., Moore, E., & Crawford, L. (2011). 2011 Report of the Access STEM/Access Computing/DO-IT Longitudinal Transition Study (ALTS). Retrieved from www.washington.edu/doit/Stem/tracking4.html

Caleon, I. S., & Subramaniam, R. (2008). Attitudes towards science of intellectually gifted and mainstream upper primary students in Singapore. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (8), 940–954.

Cawley, J., Hayden, S., Cade, E., & Baker-Kroczynski, S. (2002). Including students with disabilities into the general education science classroom. Exceptional Children, 68 (4), 423–435.

Cawley, J., & Parmar, R. (2001). Literacy proficiency and science for students with learning disabilities. Reading and Writing Quarterly, 17, 105–125.

Cawley, J. F. (1994). Science for students with disabilities. Remedial and Special Education, 15, 67-71.

Cawley, J. F., Kahn, H., & Tedesco, A. (1989). Vocational education and students with learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 22, 630–634.

Civil Rights Act . (1964). Civil right act of 1964. Retrieved from www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=97

Coles, G. (2004). Danger in the classroom: "Brain glitch" research and learning to read. Phi Delta Kappan, 85, 344–351.

Collins, A. (1998). National education standards: A political document. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35, 711–727.

Costello, C. (1991). A comparison of student cognitive and social achievement for handicapped and regular education students who are educated in integrated versus a substantially separate classroom. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

Courtade, G. R., Browder, D. M., Spooner, F., & DiBiase, W. (2010). training teachers to use an inquiry-based task analysis to teach science to students with moderate and severe disabilities. Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities, 2010, 45 (3), 378–399.

Cross, T. L., & Coleman, L. J. (1992). Gifted high school students' advice to science teachers. Gifted Child Today, 15 (5), 25–26. Darling-Hammond, L. (1999). Teaching for high standard, what policymakers need to know and be able to do. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.

DeBoer, G. E. (1991). A history of ideas in science education: Implications for practice. New York: Teachers College Press. Dexter, D. D., Park, Y. J., & Hughes, C. A. (2011). A meta-analytic review of graphic organizers and science instruction for adolescents with learning disabilities: Implications for the intermediate and secondary science classroom. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 26 (4), 204–213.

Donald, M. (2001). A mind so rare: The evolution of human consciousness. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, Pub. L. No. 94–142. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. (1975).

Eisner, E. W. (2001). What does it mean to say a school is doing well? Phi Delta Kappan, 82, 367–372.

Enersen, D. L. (1994). Where are the scientists? Talent development in summer programs. Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 5 (2), 23–26.

Epps, S. , & Tindall, G. (1987). The effectiveness of differential programming in serving students with mild handicaps: Placement options and instructional programming. In M. C. Wang , M. C. Reynolds , & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), Handbook of special education: Research and practice: Vol. 1. Learner characteristics and adaptive education (pp. 231–248). New York: Pergamon Press.

Fehn, B. (1997, March). Historical thinking ability among talented math and science students: An exploratory study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Fensham, P. J. (1985). Science for all. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 17, 415–435.

Ferguson, D. L. (1995). The real challenge of inclusion: Confessions of a "rabid inclusionist." Phi Delta Kappan, 77, 281–287.

Ferguson, P., & Asch, A. (1989). Lessons from life: Personal and parental perspectives on school, childhood, and disability. In D. Bicklen, A. Ford, & D. Ferguson (Eds.), Disability and society (pp. 108–140). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Finson, K. D., Ormsbee, C. K., & Jensen, M. M. (2011). Differentiating science instruction and assessment for learners with special needs, K–8. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Friend, M. , & Bursuck, W. D. (1999). Including students with special needs: A practical guide for classroom teachers. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (1994). Inclusive school movement and radicalization of special education reform. Exceptional Children, 60, 294–309.

Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hamlett, C. L., Phillips, N., & Karns, K. (1995). General educator's specialized adaptations for students with learning disabilities. Exceptional Children, 61, 440–459.

Gallagher, J. J. (1997). Issues in the education of gifted students. In N. Clangelo & A. D. Davis (Eds.), Handbook of gifted education (2nd ed.; pp. 27–42). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Gallagher, J. J. (2002). Society's role in educating gifted students: The role of public policy [Monograph]. Storrs, CT: National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 476370)

Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D. K. (1987). Beyond special education: Toward a quality system for all students. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 367–395.

Gilbert, J. K., & Newberry, M. (2007). The characteristics of the gifted and exceptionally able in science. In K. S. Taber (Ed.), Science education for gifted learners (pp. 15–31). New York: Routledge.

Golomb, K., & Hammeken, P. (1996). Grappling with inclusion confusion? Learning, 24 (4), 48-51.

Grant, P. A. (2005). Restrictiveness and race in special education: Educating all learners. Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal, 3 (1), 70–74.

Gray, D. E., & Denicolo, P. (1998). Research in special needs education: Objective or ideology? British Journal of Special Education, 25, 140–145.

Hacker, R. G., & Rowe, M. J. (1993). A study of the effects of an organizational change from streamed to mixed-ability classes upon science classroom instruction. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 30, 223–231.

Hardman, M. L., & Dawson, S. (2008). The impact of federal public policy on curriculum and instruction for students with disabilities in the general classroom. Preventing School Failure, 52 (2), 5–11.

Hardman, M. L., Drew, C. J., & Egan, M. W. (2002). Human exceptionality: Society, school, and family. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Heward, W. L. (2000). Exceptional children: An introduction to special education (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Hitchcock, C., Meyer, A., Rose, D., & Jackson, R. (2002). Providing new access to the general curriculum: Universal design for learning. Teaching Exceptional Children, 35, 8–17.

Hollowood, T., Salisbury, C., Rainforth, B., & Palombaro, M. (1995). Use of instructional time in classrooms serving students with and without severe disabilities. Exceptional Children, 61, 242–253.

Individuals With Disabilities Education Act of 1990. 20 U.S.C. 1400–1485.

Individuals With Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997, PL 105–17, 20 U.S.C. 1400-et seq., 105th Congress, 1st session. Individuals With Disabilities Education Improvement Act. (2004). P.L. 108–446, 118 Stat. 2647.

Jarwan, F. E., & Feldhusen, J. (1993). Residential schools of mathematics and science for academically talented youth: An analysis of admission programs. Collaborative Research Study (CRSS, 93304). Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut, National Research Center on Gifted and Talented.

Jeffs, T. L. (2010). Virtual reality and special needs. Themes in Science and Technology Education, 2 (1–2), 253–268.

Johnson, L. J., & Pugach, M. C. (1990). Classroom teacher's views of intervention strategies for learning and behavior problems: Which are reasonable and how frequently are they used? Journal of Special Education, 24 (1), 69–84.

Jones, L. S. (1997). Opening doors with informal science: Exposure and access for underserved students. Science Education, 81, 663–677.

Jordan, K. R., Bain, S. K., McCallum, R. S., & Bell, S. M. (2012). Comparing gifted and non-gifted African American and Euro-American students on cognitive and academic variables using local norms. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 35, 241–258.

Kahn, S., Feldman, A., & Cooke, M. L. (2013). Signs of autonomy: Facilitating independence and inquiry in deaf science classrooms. Journal of Science Education for Students with Disabilities, 17 (1), 13–35.

Kahn, S., & Lewis, A. R. (2013, January). Survey on teaching science to K–12 students with disabilities: Teacher preparedness and attitudes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Science Teacher Education, Charleston, SC.

Katsiyannis, A., Zhang, D., Ryan, J. B., & Jones, J. (2007). High-stakes testing and students with disabilities: Challenges and promises. Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 18, 160–167.

Kaufman, A. K., & Blewett, E. (2012). When good enough is no longer good enough: How the high stakes nature of the No Child Left Behind Act supplanted the Rowley definition of a free appropriate public education. Journal of Law & Education, 41 (1), 5–23. Kohn, A. (2001). A practical guide to rescuing our schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 82, 358–362.

Kurtts, S. A., Matthews, C. E., & Smallwood, T. (2009). (Dis)solving the differences: A physical science lesson using universal design. Intervention in school and clinic, 44, 151–159.

Lang, H. G. (1994). Silence of the spheres: The deaf experience in the history of science. Westport, CT: Bergan and Garvey.

Lazarus, S. S. , Thurlow, M. L. , Lail, K. E. , & Christensen, L. (2009). A longitudinal analysis of state accommodations policies twelve years of Change, 1993–2005. Journal of Special Education, 43 (2), 67–80.

Levy, S. T. , & Lahav, O. (2012). Enabling people who are blind to experience science inquiry learning through sound-based mediation. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 28, 499–513.

Lipsky, D. K., & Gartner, A. (1998). Taking inclusion into the future. Educational Leadership, 56 (2), 78–82.

Lunsford, S. K., & Bargerhuff, M. E. (2006). A project to make the laboratory more accessible to students with disabilities. Journal of Chemical Education, 83, 407–409.

Lynch, S. (1990). Credit and placement issues for the academically talented following summer studies in science and mathematics. Gifted Child Quarterly, 34, 27–30.

Lynch, S. (1992). Fast-paced high school science for the academically talented: A six-year perspective. Gifted Child Quarterly, 36, 147–154.

Lynch, S., Taymans, J., Watson, W. A., Ochsendorf, R. J., Pyke, C., & Szesze, M. J. (2007). Effectiveness of a highly rated science curriculum unit for students with disabilities in general education classrooms. Exceptional Children, 73 (2), 202–223.

Maker, C. J. (1993). Creativity, intelligence, and problem solving: A definition and design for cross-cultural research and measurement related to giftedness. Gifted Education International, 9 (2), 68–77.

Mastropieri, M. A., Scruggs, T. E., & Butcher, K. (1997). How effective is inquiry learning for students with mild disabilities? Journal of Special Education, 31 (2), 199–211.

Mastropieri, M. A., Scruggs, T. E., & Magnusen, M. (1999). Activities-oriented science instruction for students with disabilities. Learning Disability Quarterly, 22 (4), 240–249.

Mastropieri, M., Scruggs, T. E., Mantziopoulos, P., Sturgeon, A., Goodwin, L., & Chung, S. (1998). "A place where living things affect and depend on each other": Qualitative and quantitative outcomes associated with inclusive science teaching. Science Education, 82, 163–179.

Mastropieri, M. A., Scruggs, T. E., Norland, J. J., Berkeley, S., McDuffie, K., Tornquist, E. H., & Connors, N. (2006). Differentiated curriculum enhancement in inclusive middle school science: Effects on classroom and high-stakes tests. Journal of Special Education, 40 (3), 130–137.

McCann, W. S. (1998). Science classrooms for students with special needs. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED433185)

McCarthy, C. B. (2005). Effect of thematic-based, hands-on science teaching versus a textbook approach for students with disabilities. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42 (3), 245–263.

McGinnis, J. R. (2000). Teaching science as inquiry for students with disabilities. In J. Minstrell & E. H. VanZee (Eds.), Inquiring into inquiry/learning and teaching in science (pp. 425–433). Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science. McGinnis, J. R. (2003). The morality of inclusive verses exclusive settings: Preparing teachers to teach students with mental disabilities in science. In D. Zeidler (Ed.), The role of moral reasoning on socioscientific issues and discourse in science education (pp. 196–215).

science. In D. Zeidler (Ed.), The role of moral reasoning on socioscientific issues and discourse in science education (pp. 196–215). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

McGinnis, J. R. (2013). Teaching science to learners with special needs. Special issue, diversity and equity in science education (O. Lee & C. Buxton , Eds.), Theory into Practice, 52 (1), 43–50.

McGinnis, J. R., & Nolet, V. W. (1995). Diversity, the science classroom, and inclusion: A collaborative model between the science teacher and the special educator. Journal of Science for Persons with Disabilities, 3, 31–35.

McGuire, J. M., Scott, S. S., & Shaw, S. F. (2006). Universal design and its applications in educational environments. Remedial and special education, 27 (3), 166–175.

McLeskey, J., Landers, E., Williamson, P., & Hoppey, D. (2012). Are we moving toward educating students with disabilities in less restrictive settings? Journal of Special Education, 46 (3), 131–140.

McLeskey, J., & Waldron, J. L. (1996). Responses to questions teachers and administrators frequently ask about inclusive school programs. Phi Delta Kappan, 78, 150–156.

McLeskey, J., Waldron, N. L., & Redd, L. (2012). A case study of a highly effective, inclusive elementary school. Journal of Special Education. Retrieved from http://sed.sagepub.com/content/early/2012/03/23/0022466912440455

McNulty, B. A., Connolly, T. R., Wilson, P. G., & Brewer, R. D. (1996). LRE policy: The leadership challenge. Remedial and Special Education, 17, 158–167.

Mehan, H. (1993). Beneath the skin and between the ears: A case study in the politics of representation. In S. Chaiklin & J. Lave (Eds.), Understanding practices: Perspectives on activity and content (pp. 241–268). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mercer, C. D., Lane, H. B., Jordan, L., Allsopp, D. H., & Eisele, M. R. (1996). Empowering teachers and students with instructional choices in inclusive settings. Remedial and Special Education, 17, 226–236.

Miedijensky, S., & Tal, T. (2009). Embedded assessment in project-based science courses for the gifted: Insights to inform teaching all students. International Journal of Science Education, 31 (18), 2411–2435.

Moin, L. J., Magiera, K., & Zigmond, N. (2009). Instructional activities and group work in the US inclusive high school co-taught science class. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 7, 677–697.

Moriarty, M. A. (2007). Inclusive pedagogy: Teaching methodologies to reach diverse learners in science instruction. Equity & Excellence in Education, 40 (3), 252–265.

National Association for Gifted Children . (2011). Redefining gifted for a new century: Shifting the paradigm [Position Paper]. Retrieved from www.nagc.org/index2.aspx?id=6404

National Center for Educational Statistics . (2012). Table 48. Children 3 to 21 years old served under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B, by type of disability: Selected years, 1976–77 through 2010–11. Retrieved from

http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/tables/dt12_048.asp

National Council on Disability . (1989, September). The education of students with disabilities: Where do we stand? A report to the President and Congress of the United States. Washington, DC: Author.

National Council on Disability . (2011, September). A letter to Secretary Duncan regarding forthcoming NCLB waivers. Retrieved from www.ncd.gov/publications/2011/September192011

National Research Council . (1996). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2002). National Research Council on Minority Students in Special Education and Gifted Education. Washington, DC: National Adacemies Press.

National Research Council . (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science in Grades K–8. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Science Board . (2010). Preparing the next generation of STEM innovators: Identifying and developing our nation's human capital. Retrieved from www.nsf.gov/nsb/publications/2010/nsb1033.pdf

National Science Foundation . (2011). Broadening participation in America's STEM workforce. Committee on Equal Opportunities in Science and Engineering Biennial Report to Congress 2009–2010. Retrieved from www.nsf.gov/od/oia/activities/ceose/reports/2009-2010_CEOSEBiennialReportToCongress.pdf

Neely, M. B. (2007). Using technology and other assistive strategies to aid students with disabilities in performing chemistry lab tasks. Journal of Chemical Education, 84 (10), 1697.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107–110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002).

Nolet, V. , & McLaughlin, M. J. (2000). Accessing the general curriculum: Including students with disabilities in standards-based reform. Thousand Oaks, CA. Corwin Press.

Norman, K. , Caseau, D. , & Stefanich, G. (1998). Teaching students with disabilities in inclusive science classrooms: Survey results. Science Education, 82, 127–146.

Park, S., & Oliver, J. S. (2009). The translation of teachers' understanding of gifted students into instructional strategies for teaching science. Journal Science Teacher Education, 20, 333–351.

Patton, J. R. (1995). Teaching science to students with special needs. Teaching Exceptional Children, 27 (4), 4-6.

Piirto, J. (1999). Talented children and adults (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Reeve, P. T., & Hallahan, D. P. (1994). Practical questions about collaboration between general and special educators. Focus on Exceptional Children, 26 (7), 1–11.

Renzulli, J. S., Baum, S. M., Hebert, T., & McCluskey, K. W. (1999). Reversing underachievement through enrichment. Reclaiming children and youth. Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Problems, 7, 217–223.

Rogoff, B. (1990). Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context. New York: Oxford University Press. Rojewski, J. W., & Pollard, R. R. (1993). A multivariate analysis of perceptions held by secondary academic teachers toward students with special needs. Teacher Education and Special Education, 16, 330–341.

Roth, W.-M. (2002, April). Constructing dis/ability in science. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, New Orleans, LA.

Rule, A. C., Stefanich, G. P., Boody, R. M., & Peiffer, B. (2011). Impact of adaptive materials on teachers and their students with visual impairments in secondary science and mathematics classes. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (6), 865–887.

Salisbury, C. , Mangino, M. , Petrigala, M. , Rainforth, B. , Syryca, S. , & Palombaro, M. (1994). Promoting the instructional inclusion of young children with disabilities in the primary grades. Journal of Early Intervention, 18, 311–322.

Sapon-Shevin, M. (1996). Full inclusion as a disclosing tablet: Revealing the flaws in our present system. Theory Into Practice, 35 (1), 35–41.

Schaff, J., Jerome, M., Behrmann, M., & Sprague, D. (2005). Science in special education: Emerging technologies. In D. Edyburn, K. Higgins, & R. Boone, (Eds.), Handbook of special education technology and practice (pp. 643–660). Whitefish Bay, WI: Knowledge by Design.

Scott, B. J., Vitale, M. R., & Masten, W. G. (1998). Implementing instructional adaptations for students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms. Remedial and Special Education, 19 (2), 106–119.

Scott, P., Mortimer, E., & Aguiar, O. (2006). The tension between authoritative and dialogic discourse: A fundamental characteristic of meaning making interactions in high school science lessons. Science Education, 90 (4), 605–631.

Scruggs, T. E., & Mastropieri, M. A. (1993). Successful mainstreaming in elementary science classes: A qualitative study of three reputational cases. American Research Journal, 31, 785–811.

Scruggs, T. E., & Mastropieri, M. A. (1994). Current approaches to science education: Implications for mainstream instruction of students with disabilities. Remedial and Special Education, 14 (1), 15–24.

Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., Bakken, J. P., & Brigham, F. J. (1993). Reading vs. doing: The relative effects of textbook-based and inquiry-oriented approaches to science education in special education classrooms. Journal of Special Education, 27, 1–15.

Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., Berkely, S., & Graetz, J. E. (2009). Do special education interventions improve learning of secondary content? A meta-analysis. Remedial and Special Education, 31, 437–449.

Seifert, K., & Espin, C. (2012). Improving reading of science text for secondary students with learning disabilities: Effects of text reading, vocabulary learning, and combined instruction. Learning Disabilities Quarterly, 35 (4), 236–247.

Sena, J. D. W., Lowe, P. A., & Lee, S. W. (2007). Significant predictors of test anxiety among students with and without learning disabilities. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 40 (4), 360–376.

Shaywitz, S. E. (2003). Overcoming dyslexia: A new and complete science-based program for reading problems at any level. New York: Knopf.

Shippen, M. E., Curtis, R., & Miller, A. (2009). A qualitative analysis of teachers' and counselors' perceptions of overrepresentation of African Americans in special education: A preliminary study. Teacher Education & Special Education, 32 (3), 226–238.

Simos, P. G., Fletcher, J. M., Bergman, J. I., Breier, B. R., Foorman, E. M., & Castillo, R. N. (2002). Dyslexia-specific brain activation profile becomes normal following successful remedial training. Neurology, 58, 1203–1213.

Simpson, M., & Ure, J. (1994). Studies of differentiation practices in primary and secondary schools. Interchange No. 30. Scotland, UK: Scottish Office Education Department, Edinburgh, Research and Intelligence Unit.

Smith, T. E., Polloway, E., Patton, J. R., & Dowdy, C. A. (1998). Teaching students with special needs in inclusive settings (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Smith, T. E. C. (2005). IDEA 2004: Another round in the reauthorization process. Remedial and Special Education, 26 (6), 314–319. Soukup, J. H., Wehmeyer, M. L., Bashinski, S. M., & Bovaird, J. (2007). Classroom variables and access to the general education curriculum of students with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Exceptional Children, 74, 101–120.

Spooner, F., Knight, V., Browder, D., Jimenez, B., & DiBiase, W. (2011). Evaluating evidence-based practice in teaching science content to students with severe developmental disabilities. Research & Practice for Persons With Severe Disabilities, 36 (1–2), 62–75.

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1990). Understanding and conducting qualitative research. Dubuque, IA: Council for Exceptional Children. Stainback, W., Stainback, S., & Bunch, G. (1989). Introduction and historical background. In S. Stainback, W. Stainback, & M. Forest (Eds.), Educating all students in the mainstream of regular education (pp. 3–14). Baltimore, MD: Brookes.

Stainback, W., Stainback, S., & Stefanich, G. (1996). Learning together in inclusive classrooms: What about curriculum? Teaching Exceptional Children, 28 (3), 14–19.

Steele, M. M. (2005, April 30). Teaching students with learning disabilities: Constructivism or behaviorism? Current Issues in Education [On-line], 8 (10). Retrieved from http://cie.ed.asu.edu/volume8/number10/

Stefanich, G. (1983). The relationship of effective schools research to school evaluation. North Central Association Quarterly, 53, 343–349. Stefanich, G. (1994). Science educators as active collaborators in meeting the educational needs of students with disabilities. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 5 (2), 56–65.

Stefanich, G., & Hadzegeorgiou, Y. (2001). Nature of the learner: Implications for teachers from the constructivist perspective. Science teaching in inclusive classrooms: Theory & foundations (pp. 23–43). National Science Foundation (Grant Numbers HRD-953325 and HRD 9988729).

Stephens, K. R. (2011). Federal and state response to the gifted and talented. Journal of Applied School Psychology, 27 (4), 306–318. Sternberg, R. J. (2001). Giftedness as developing expertise: A theory of the interface between high abilities and achieved excellence. High Ability Students, 12 (2), 159–179.

Sternberg, R. J. (2007). Cultural concepts of giftedness. Roeper Review, 29 (3), 160–165.

Sumida, M. (2010). Identifying twice-exceptional children and three gifted styles in the Japanese primary science classroom. International Journal of Science Education, 32 (15), 2097–2111.

Taber, K. (Ed.). (2007). Science education for gifted learners. New York: Routledge.

Tannenbaum, A. J. (1997). The meaning and making of giftedness. In N. Colangelo & A. D. Davis (Eds.), Handbook of gifted education (2nd ed.; pp. 27–42). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Temple, E., Deutsch, G. K., Poldrack, R. A., Miller, S. L., Tallal, P., & M. M. Merzenich (2003). Neural deficits in children with dyslexia ameliorated by behavioral remediation: Evidence from functional MRI. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, USA, 110, 2860–2865.

Thompson, S. (2001). The authentic standards movement and its evil twin. Phi Delta Kappan, 82, 358–362.

Thurlow, M. L., Ysseldyke, J. E., & Silverstein, B. (1995). Testing accommodations for students with disabilities. Remedial and Special Education, 16 (5), 260–270.

Trundle, K. G. (2008). Inquiry-based science instruction for students with disabilities. In Science as inquiry in the secondary setting (pp. 79–85). Arlington, VA: NSTA Press.

Tucker, B. P., & Goldstein, B. A. (1992). Legal rights of persons with disabilities, an analysis of federal law. Horsham, PA: LRP Publications.

Udvari-Solner, A. (1996). Examining teacher thinking: Constructing a process to design curricular adaptations. Remedial and Special Education, 17, 245–254.

U.S. Department of Education . (1993). National excellence: A case for developing America's talent. Washington, DC: Office of Education Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education . (2011). 30th annual report to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2008. Washington, DC: Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education.

Vannest, K. J., Mason, B. A., Brown, L., Dyer, N., Maney, S., & Adiguzel, T. (2009). Instructional settings in science for students with disabilities: Implications for teacher education. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20 (4), 353–363.

VanTassel-Baska, J. (2003). Implementing innovative curricular and instructional practices in classrooms and schools. In J. VanTassel-Baska & C. Little (Eds.), Content-based curriculum for high-ability learners (pp. 355–375). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.

VanTassel-Baska, J., Bass, G., Ries, R., Poland, D., & Avery, L. D. (1998). A national study of science curriculum effectiveness with high ability students. Gifted Child Quarterly, 42 (4), 200–211.

Walter-Thomas, C., Bryant, M., & Land, S. (1996). Planning for effective co-teaching: The key to successful inclusion. Remedial and Special Education, 17, 255–264.

Wang, M. C., & Reynolds, M. (1996). Progressive inclusion: Meeting new challenges in special education: Bringing inclusion into the future. Theory Into Practice, 35 (1), 20–25.

Wei, X., Yu, J. W., Shattuck, P., McCracken, M., & Blackorby, J. (2012). Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) participation among college students with an autism spectrum disorder. Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 1–8. doi:10.1007/s10803–012–1700-z

Welner, K. (2006). Legal rights: The overrepresentation of culturally and linguistically diverse students in special education. Teaching Exceptional Children, 38, 60–62.

Wertsch, J., & Kanner, B. (1992). A sociocultural approach to intellectual development. In R. Sternberg & C. Berg (Eds.), Intellectual development (pp. 328–349). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Whitmore, J. R., & Maker, C. J. (1985). Intellectual giftedness in the disabled persons. Rockville, MD: Aspen.

Will, M. C. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 52 (5), 411–415.

Willard-Holt, C. (1998). Academic and personality characteristics of gifted students with cerebral palsy: A multiple case study. Exceptional Children, 65, 37–50.

Winter, S. (1997). "SMART" planning for inclusion. Childhood Education, 73, 212–218.

Wood, K. (1990). Meaningful approaches to vocabulary development. Middle School Journal, 21 (4), 22-24.

Ysseldyke, J. E., Thurlow, M., Wotruba, J., & Nania, P. (1990). Instructional arrangements: Perceptions for general education. Teaching Exceptional Children, 22 (4), 4–7.

Zembylas, M., & Isenbarger, L. (2002). Teaching science to students with learning disabilities: Subverting the myths of labeling through teachers' caring and enthusiasm. Research in Science Education, 32 (1), 55–79.

Science Education in Urban Contexts

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). Discourse in the novel. In M. Holquist (Ed.), The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin (C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans., pp. 259–428). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bang, M. , & Medina, D. (2010). Cultural processes in science education: Supporting the navigation of multiple epistemologies. Science Education, 94 (6), 1008–1026.

Basu, S. J., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2007). Urban students' sustained interest in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (3), 466–489.

Bell, P. , Lewenstein, B. , Shouse, A. W. , & Feder, M. A. (Eds.). (2009). Learning science in informal environments: People, places, and pursuits. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Bouillion, L., & Gomez, L. (2001). Connecting school and community with science learning: Real world problems and school-community partnerships as contextual scaffolds. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38, 878–898.

Brickhouse, N., Lowery, P., & Schultz, K. (2000). What kind of a girl does science? The construction of a school science identity. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37, 441–458.

Brickhouse, N., & Potter, J. (2001). Young women's scientific identity formation in an urban context. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38, 965–980.

Buck, P. , & Skilton-Sylvester, P. (2005). Preservice teachers enter urban communities: Coupling funds of knowledge research and critical pedagogy in teacher education In N. González , L. C. Moll , & C. Amanti (Eds.), Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities and classrooms (pp. 213–232). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Buxton, C. (2010). Social problem solving through science: An approach to critical place-based science teaching and learning. Equity and Excellence in Education, 43, 120–135.

Calabrese Barton, A., Kang, H., Tan, E., O'Neill, T., Bautista-Guerra, C., & Brecklin, C. (2013). Crafting a future in science: Tracing middle school girls' identity work over time and space. American Education Research Journal, 50 (1), 37–75.

Calabrese Barton, A., & Tan, E. (2009). Funds of knowledge, discourses and hybrid space. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46, 50–73.

Calabrese Barton, A., & Tan, E. (2010). We be burnin': Agency, identity and learning in a green energy program. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 19 (2), 187–229.

Calabrese Barton, A., Tan, E., & Rivet, A. (2008). Creating hybrid spaces for engaging school science among urban middle school girls. American Education Research Journal, 45, 68–103.

Carlone, H. B., Haun-Frank, J., & Webb, A. (2011). Assessing equity beyond knowledge- and skills-based outcomes: A comparative ethnography of two fourth-grade reform-based science classrooms. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48, 459 – 485.

Chapa, J., & De La Rosa, B. (2006). The problematic pipeline: Demographic trends and Latino participation in graduate science, technology, engineering, and mathematics programs. Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 5 (3), 203–221.

Chavous, T., Bernat, D., Schmeelk-Cone, K., Caldwell, C., Kohn-Wood, L., & Zimmerman, M. (2003). Racial identity and academic attainment among African American adolescents. Child Development, 74, 1076–1090.

Clotfelter, C., Ladd, H., & Vigdor, J. (2005). Who teaches whom? Race and the distribution of novice teachers. Economics of Education Review, 24, 377–392.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. (2005). Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education. Washington, DC: American Education Research Association.

Council of Great City Schools . (2011). Pieces of the puzzle: Full Report. Washington, DC: Council of Great City Schools.

Emdin, C. (2010). Affiliation and alienation: Hip-hop, rap, and urban science education. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 42 (1), 1–25.

Endreny, A. H. (2010). Urban 5th graders' conceptions during a place-based inquiry unit on watersheds. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 501–517. doi:10.1002/tea.20348

Fordham, S. (1993). Those loud Black girls: (Black) women, silence, and gender "passing" in the academy. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 24 (1), 3–32.

Fryer, R. (2006). Acting White: The social price paid by the best and brightest minority students. Education Next, 6 (1). Retrieved from http://educationnext.org/actingwhite/

Fusco, D. (2001). Creating relevant science through urban planning and gardening. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (8), 860–877.

Gandara, P. (2006). Strengthening the academic pipeline leading to careers in math, science, and technology for Latino students. Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 5 (3), 222–237.

García, S. B., & Guerra, P. L. (2004). Deconstructing deficit thinking: Working with educators to create more equitable learning environments. Education and Urban Society, 36 (2), 150–168.

Gee, J. P. (1990). Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses. London: Falmer.

Gee, J. P. (2004). Situated language and learning. London: Routledge.

Gresalfi, M. S., Martin, T., Hand, V., & Greeno, J. G. (2008). Constructing competence: An analysis of student participation in the activity systems of mathematics classrooms. Educational Studies in Mathematics, 70, 49–70.

Griner, A. (2012). Addressing the achievement gap and disproportionality through the use of culturally responsive teaching practices urban education. doi:10.1177/0042085912456847

Gruenewald, D. A., & Smith, G. A. (Eds.). (2008). Place-based education in the global age: Local diversity. New York: Erlbaum. Gutiérrez, K., & Orellana, M. (2006). The problem of English learners: Constructing genres of difference. Research in the Teaching of

English, 40, 502–507. Hogg, L. (2011). Funds of knowledge: An investigation of coherence within the literature. Teaching and Teacher Education, 27, 666–677.

Holgg, L. (2011). Funds of knowledge: An investigation of conference within the interature. Teaching and Teaching Education, 27, 666–677. Holland, D. , Lachicotte, W. J. , Skinner, D. , & Cain, C. (2001). Identity and agency in cultural worlds. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2004). Do teacher induction and mentoring matter? NASSP Bulletin, 88, 28–40.

Kaba, A. J. (2013). Black Americans, gains in science and engineering degrees, and gender. Sociology Mind, 3 (1) 67–82. Retrieved from http://works.bepress.com/amadu_kaba/50

Kanahele, G. (1986). Kû Kanaka, stand tall: A search for Hawaiian values. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lim, M. (2010). Historical consideration of place. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 5, 899–909.

Lim, M. , & Calabrese Barton, A. (2006). Science learning and a sense of place in an urban middle school. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 1, 107–142.

Lim, M., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2010). Exploring insideness in urban children's sense of place. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 30, 328–337.

Luke, A. (2008). Urban education dystopia: 2050. In W. Pink & G. Noblit (Eds.), International handbook of urban education (pp. 1177–1186). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Meyer, R., Carl, B., & Cheng, H. (2010). Accountability and performance in secondary education in Milwaukee public schools. Volume II of the Senior Urban Education Research Fellowship Series. Washington DC: Great Council of City Schools.

Milner, H. R. (2012). But what is urban education? Urban Education, 47, 556.

Moje, E., Collazo, T., Carillo, R., & Marx, R. W. (2001). "Maestro, what is 'quality?": Language, literacy, and discourse in project-based science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (4), 469–498.

Moje, E. B., Ciechanowski, K. M., Kramer, K., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and discourse. Reading Research Quarterly, 39 (1), 38–70.

Moll, L. C. , Amanti, C. , Neff, D. , & González, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. Theory Into Practice, 31 (2), 132–141.

Mutegi, J. (2013). Life's first need is for us to be realistic and other reasons for examining the sociocultural construction of race in the science performance of African American students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50, 82–103.

Nasir, N. S., Rosebery, A., Warren, B., & Lee, C. D. (2006). Learning as a cultural process: Achieving equity through diversity. In K. Sawyer (Ed.), Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 489–504). New York: Cambridge University Press.

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) . (2009). The nation's report card: 2009.

National Center for Education Statistics . (2011). Nation's Report Card. Retrieved from

nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/stt2011/2012467HI8.pdf-2012-04-27; nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/main2011/2012459.pdf-2011-10-31. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Science Board . (2012). Science and engineering indicators 2012. Arlington, VA: Author.

Oakes, J. (1990). Multiplying inequalities: The effects of race, social class, and tracking on opportunities to learn mathematics and science. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Oakes, J., Lipton M., Anderson L., & Stillman J. (2012). Teaching to change the world (4th ed.). Columbus, OH: McGraw Hill.

O'Neill, T. (2010). Fostering spaces of student ownership in middle school science. Equity & Excellence in Education, 43 (1), 6–20. Pink, W. , & Noblit, G. (2008). International handbook of urban education. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Rahm, J. , Martel-Reny, M. P. , & Moore, J. C. (2005). The role of after-school and community science programs in the lives of urban youth. School Science and Mathematics, 105 (6), 283–291.

Rahm, J., Martel-Reny, M. P., & Moore, J. C. (2010). The role of after-school and community science programs in the lives of urban youth. School Science and Mathematics, 105 (6), 283–291.

Ramnarain, U. (2011). Equity in science at South African schools: A pious platitude or an achievable goal? International Journal of Science Education, 33 (10), 1353–1371.

Relph, E. (1976). Place and placelessness. London: Pion Limited.

Rios-Aguilar, C., Kiyama, J. M., Gravitt, M., & Moll, L. C. (2011). Funds of knowledge for the poor and forms of capital for the rich? A capital approach to examining funds of knowledge. Theory and Research in Education, 9 (2), 163–184.

Rose, S., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2012). Should Great Lakes City build a new power plant? How youth navigate complex socioscientific issues. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (5), 541–567.

Rosebery, A., Ogonowski, M., DiSchino, M., & Warren, B. (2010). "The coat traps all your body heat": Heterogeneity as fundamental to learning. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 19 (3), 322–357.

Rosebery, A. S., & Warren, B. (Eds.). (2008). Teaching science to English language learners. Arlington, VA: NSTA Press.

Sadker, D., Sadker, M., & Zittleman, K. (2009). Still failing at fairness: How gender bias cheats girls and boys in school and what we can do about it. New York: Scribner.

Semli, L. , & Mehta, K. (2012). Science education in Tanzania: Challenges and policy responses. International Journal of Educational Research, 53, 225–239.

Tan, E., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2007). From peripheral to central, the story of Melanie's metamorphosis in an urban middle school science class. Science Education, 92 (4), 567–590.

Tan, E., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2008). Unpacking science for all through the lens of identities-in-practice. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3, 43–71.

Tan, E., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2010). Transforming science learning and student participation in 6th grade science: A case study of an urban minority classroom. Equity & Excellence in Education, 43 (1), 38–55.

Tan, E., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2012). Empowering math and science education in urban contexts. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tzou, C., Scalone, G., & Bell, P. (2010). The role of environmental narratives and social positioning in how place gets constructed for and by youth. Equity and Excellence in Education, 43 (1), 105–119.

Upadhyay, B. (2006). Using students' lived experiences in an urban science classroom: An elementary school teacher's thinking. Science Education, 90, 94–110.

Upadhyay, B. R. (2005). Practicing reform-based science curriculum in an urban classroom: A Hispanic elementary school teacher's thinking and decisions. School Science and Mathematics, 105 (7), 343–351.

Upadhyay, B. R. (2010). Teaching science for empowerment in an urban classroom: A case study of a Hmong teacher. Equity and Excellence in Education, 42 (2), 217–232.

U.S. Census Bureau . (2010). 2010 census: Urban and rural classification. Retrieved from www.census.gov/geo/www/ua/urbanruralclass.html

Varelas, M., Kane, J. M., & Wylie, C. D. (2011). Young African American children's representations of self, science, and school: Making sense of difference. Science Education, 95 (5), 824–851.

Varelas, M., & Pappas, C. C. (2006). Intertextuality in read-alouds of integrated science-literacy units in primary classrooms: Opportunities for the development of thought and language. Cognition & Instruction, 24, 211–259.

Varelas, M., Pappas, C. C., Tucker-Raymond, E., Kane, J., Hankes, J., Ortiz, I., (2010). Drama activities as ideational resources for primary-grade children in urban science classrooms. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 302–325.

Warren, B., & Ogonowski, M. (2005). "Everyday" and "scientific": Rethinking dichotomies in modes of thinking and science learning. In R. Nemirovsky, A. S. Rosebery, J. Solomon, & B. Warren (Eds.), Everyday matters in science and mathematics (pp. 119–148). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zhang, T. (2007). Urban development patterns in China: New, renewed, and ignored urban spaces. In Y. Song (Ed.), Urbanization in China: Critical issues in an era of rapid growth. Cambridge, Lincoln *Institute of Land Use Policy*, 3–27.

Zimmerman, H. (2012). Participating in science at home: Recognition work and learning in biology. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 597–630.

Rural Science Education

Arnold, M. L. (2005). Jump the shark: A rejoinder to Howley, Theobald, and Howley. Journal of Research in Rural Education, 20 (20), 1–2. Arnold, M. L., Newman, J. H., Gaddy, B. B., & Dean, C. B. (2005). A look at the condition of rural education research: Setting a difference for future research. Journal of Research in Rural Education, 20 (6). Retrieved from http://jrre.psu.edu/articles/20-6.pdf Asia Society . (2010). Meeting the challenge: Preparing Chinese language teachers for American schools. New York: Author.

Avery, L. M. (2013). Rural science education: Valuing local knowledge. Theory Into Practice, 52 (1), 28–35.

Avery, L. M. , & Kassam, K.-A. (2011). *Phronesis:* Children's local rural knowledge of science and engineering. Journal of Research in Rural Education, 26 (2), 1–18. Retrieved from http://jrre.psu.edu/articles/26-2.pdf

Barbour, M. , & Mulcahy, D. (2006). An inquiry into retention and achievement differences in campus based and web based AP courses. Rural Educator, 27, 8–12.

Boe, E. , Cook, L. , & Sunderland, R. (2008). Teacher turnover: Examining exit attrition, teaching area transfer, and school migration. Exceptional Children, 75 (1), 7–31.

Borman, G., & Dowling, M. (2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. Review of Educational Research, 78, 367–409.

Boyd, W. L. (1978). The changing politics of American curriculum policy making. Review of Educational Research, 48 (4), 577–628. Brown, D. L., & Schafft, K. A. (2011). Rural people and communities in the 21st century: Resilience and transformation. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Byun, S. Y., Irvin, M. J., & Meece, J. L. (2012). Predictors of bachelor's degree completion among rural students at four-year institutions. Review of Higher Education, 35 (3), 463–484.

Carlone, H. B., Kimmel, S., & Tschida, C. (2010). A rural math, science, and technology elementary school tangled up in global networks of practice. Cultural Studies in Science Education, 5, 447–476.

Coladarci, T. (2007, May 24). Improving the yield of rural education research: An editor's swan song. Journal of Research in Rural Education, 22 (3). Retrieved from http://jrre.psu.edu/articles/22-3.pdf

Collins, T. (1999). *Attracting and retaining teachers in rural areas* (ED438152). Charleston, WV: Eric Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No.ED438152).

Comstock, A. B. (1939). Handbook of nature study. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Cook, T. D. (2001). Sciencephobia: Why education researchers reject randomized experiments. Education Next, 1, 62–68.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Keeping good teachers: Why it matters, what leaders can do? Educational Leadership, 60 (8), 6–13. Dobbie, W. (2011, July). Teacher characteristics and student achievement: Evidence from Teach for America. Harvard University. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/teacherbeat/teachercharacteristicsjuly2011.pdf

Domina, T. (2006). What clean break? Education and nonmetropolitan migration patterns, 1984–2004. Rural Sociology, 71 (3), 373–398. Feuer, M. J., Towne, L., & Shavelson, R. J. (2002). Scientific culture and educational research. Educational Researcher, 31 (8), 4–14. Friedman, T. L. (2005). The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century. New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux.

GAO (U.S. Government Accountability Office) . (2004, September). No Child Left Behind Act: Additional assistance and research on effective strategies would help small rural districts. GAO-04–909. Retrieved from www.gao.gov/assets/250/244228.pdf

Gilmer, P. J. (2010). Vertical teaming: K–12 teachers engaged in scientific research in rural settings. Rural Educator, 31 (3), 1–6. Goodpaster, K. P. S., Adedokun, O. A., & Weaver, G. C. (2012). Teachers' perceptions of rural STEM teaching: Implications for rural teacher retention. Rural Educator, 33 (3), 9–22.

Guarino, C. M., Santibanez, L., & Daley, G. A. (2006). Teacher recruitment and retention: A review of the recent empirical literature. Review of Educational Research, 76, 173–208.

Hamos, J., Bergin, K., Maki, D., Perez, L., Prival, J., Rainey, D., Rowell, G., & Vander Putten, E. (2009). Opening the classroom door: Professional learning communities in the math and science partnership program. Science Educator, 18 (2), 14–25.

Henderson, S. A., & Royster, W. C. (2000, March 14). The Appalachian rural systemic initiative: Improving science and mathematics student achievement in economically disadvantaged rural counties in central Appalachia through a school-based teacher partner approach. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 8 (17). Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/408/531

Henke, R., Zahn, L., & Carroll, C. (2001). Attrition of new teachers among recent college graduates: Comparing occupational stability among 1992–1993 college graduates who taught and those who worked in other occupations. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Hodges, G. W. (2010). The intersection of science teacher retention, attrition, and migration with accountability reform in rural Georgia. Dissertation from the University of Georgia.

Hodges, G. W., Oliver, J. S., & Tippins, D. (2013). A study of highly qualified science teachers' career trajectory in the deep, rural South: Examining a link between deprofessionalization and teacher dissatisfaction. School Science and Mathematics, 113 (6), 263–274. Hoggart, K. (1990). Let's do away with rural. Journal of Rural Studies, 6 (3), 245–257.

Horng, E. (2009). Teacher tradeoffs: Disentangling teachers' preferences for working conditions and student demographics. American Educational Research Journal, 46 (3), 690–717.

Howley, C. (2009). Critique and fiction: Doing science right in rural education research. Journal of Research in Rural Education, 24 (15). Retrieved from http://jrre.psu.edu/articles/24-15.pdf

Howley, C. B., Theobald, P., & Howley, A. (2005). What rural education research is of most worth? A reply to Arnold, Newman, Gaddy, and Dean. Journal of Research in Rural Education, 20 (18), 1–6.

Ingersoll, R., & Perda, D. (2010). Is the supply of mathematics and science teachers sufficient? American Education Research Journal, 47 (3), 563–594.

Ingersoll, R. M., & Perda, D. (2009, March). The mathematics and science teacher shortage: Fact and myth. CPRE Research Report #RR-62. Retrieved from www.cpre.org/images/stories/cpre_pdfs/math%20science%20shortage%20paper%20march%202009%20final.pdf Irvin, M., Hannum, W., Farmer, T., de la Varre, C., & Keane, J. (2009). Supporting online learning for advanced placement students in small rural schools: Conceptual foundations and intervention components of the facilitator preparation program. The Rural Educator, 31 (1), 29–36.

Jahnukainen, M. (2011). Different strategies, different outcome? The history and trends of the inclusive and special education in Alberta (Canada) and in Finland. Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 55 (5), 489–502.

Keppel, A. M. (1962). The myth of agrarianism in rural educational reform, 1890–1914. History of Education Quarterly, 2 (2), 100–112. Labaree, D. F. (2005). Progressivism, schools and schools of education: An American romance . Paedagogica Historica, 41 (1 & 2), 275–288.

Lee, O. , & Buxton, C. A. (2013). This issue. Theory Into Practice, 52 (1), 1–5.

Legrain, P. (2002). [Book review] Open world, the truth about globalization. Economist, 365, 79.

Levy, F., & Murnane, R. J. (2004). The new division of labor: How computers are creating the next job market. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Liu, L. (2009). Effective management of quality distance training: Case study of the summer training project held by China Ministry of Education. China Educational Technology, 268 (5), 55–58.

Lloyd, E. M. (2010). Eliciting and utilizing rural students' funds of knowledge in the service of science learning: An action research study. Unpublished dissertation, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY.

Lyons, T., Cooksey, R., Panizzon, D., Parnell, A., & Pegg, J. (2006). Science, ICT and mathematics education in rural and regional Australia: The SiMERR National Survey. Canberra: Department of Education, Science and Training. Retrieved from www.une.edu.au/simerr/pages/resources publications.php

Madrigal, A. (2013, March). Look smarter. The Atlantic. Retrieved from www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2013/03/look-smarter/309234/

Maltzan, T. L. (2006). Rurality and higher education: Implications for identity and persistence. Doctoral dissertation, the Ohio State University.

McGaw, B. (2010). President's report: Transforming school education. Dialogue, 29(1). Retrieved from Academy of Social Sciences in Australia at www.assa.edu.au/publications/dialogue/2010_Vol29_No1.pdf

McQuaide, S. (2009). Making education equitable in rural China through distance learning. International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 10 (1). Retrieved from www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/590/1177

Mensah, F. M. (2009). A portrait of Black teachers in science classrooms. The Negro Educational Review, 60 (1-4), 39-51.

Mensah, F. M. (2013). Theoretically and practically speaking, what is needed in diversity and equity in science teaching and learning? Theory Into Practice, 72, 66–72.

MetLife Foundation Issue Brief . (2008). What keeps teachers in the classroom? Understanding and reducing teacher turnover. Retrieved from http://all4ed.org/reports-factsheets/what-keeps-good-teachers-in-the-classroom-understanding-and-reducing-teacher-turnover/ Monk, D. (2007). Recruiting and retaining high-guality teachers in rural areas. The Rural Educator, 17 (1), 155–174.

Moss, P. A., Phillips, D. C., Erickson, F. D., Floden, R. E., Lather, P. A., & Schneider, B. L. (2009). Learning from our differences: A dialogue across perspectives on quality in educational research. Educational Researcher, 38 (7), 501–517.

Nespor, J. (1997). Tangled up in schools: Politics, space, bodies, and signs in the educational process. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. Obama, B. (2009, March 10). President Obama's remarks to the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. Retrieved from www.nytimes.com/2009/03/10/us/politics/10text-obama.html

Okebukola, P. A., Owolabi, O., & Okebukola, F. O. (2013). Mother tongue as default language of instruction in lower primary science classes: Tension between policy prescription and practice in Nigeria. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50 (1), 62–81. Oliver, J. S. (2007a). Rural science education. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook on Research on Science Education (pp.

345–369). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. Oliver, J. S. (2007b). Rural science education research and the frameworks that give it form. The Rural Educator, 28 (3), 1–3. Paine, L., & Zeichner, K. (2012). The local and the global in reforming teaching and teacher education. Comparative Education Review, 56 (4), 569–585.

Petrosino, A., Boruch, R. F., Rounding, C., McDonald, S., & Chalmers, I. (2000). The Campbell Collaboration Social, Psychological, Educational and Criminological Trials Register (C2-SPECTR) to facilitate the preparation and maintenance of systematic reviews of social and educational interventions. Evaluation and Research in Education, 14, 206–219.

Picciano, A. G., & Seaman, J. (2009). K–12 online learning: A 2008 follow-up of the survey of U.S. School District Administrators. Newburyport, MA: Sloan Consortium.

Plunkett, M., & Dyson, M. (2011). Becoming a teacher and staying one: Examining the complex ecologies associated with educating and retaining new teachers in Rural Australia. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (1), 31–47.

Provasnik, S., Kewal Ramani, A., Coleman, M. M., Gilbertson, L., Herring, W., & Xie, Q. (2007). *Status of education in rural America* (NCES 2007–040). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Reininger, M. (2012). Hometown disadvantage? It depends on where you're from: Teachers' location preferences and the implications for staffing schools. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 34 (2), 127–145.

Robinson, D. H. (2012). The strange case of the changing graph: Much ado about nothing? Educational Researcher, 41 (5), 171–173. Rudolph, J. (2002). Scientists in the classroom: The Cold War reconstruction of American science education. New York: MacMillan. Sahlberg, P. (2010, April). Key drivers of educational performance in *Finland*. Presentation at the International Perspectives on U.S. Education Policy and Practice symposium, Washington, DC. Retrieved from Asia Society at http://asiasociety.org/education/learning-world/what-accounts-finlands-high-student-achievement-rate

Schafft, K. A., Alter, T. R., & Bridger, J. C. (2006). Bringing the community along: A case study of a school district's information technology rural development initiative. Journal of Research in Rural Education, 21 (8). Retrieved from http://jrre.psu.edu/articles/21-8.pdf Shortall, S., & Warner, M. E. (2012). Rural transformations: Conceptual and policy issues. In M. Shucksmith , D. L. Brown , S. Shortall , J. Vergunst , & M. E. Warner (Eds.), Rural transformations and rural policies in the US and UK. Retrieved from site.ebrary.com/lib/ugalib/docDetail.action?docID=10

Skidmore, S. T., & Thompson, B. (2012). Propagation of misinformation about frequencies of RFTs/RCTs in education: A cautionary tale. Educational Researcher, 41 (5), 163–170.

Slacks, J. R. (1938). The rural teacher's work. Boston: Ginn and Company.

Snyder, T. D., & Dillow, S. A. (2010). Digest of education statistics 2009. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Stewart, V. (2012). A world-class education: Learning from international models of excellence and innovation. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Strunk, K., & Robinson, P. (2006). Oh won't you stay. A multi-level analysis of the difficulties in retaining highly qualified teachers. Peabody Journal of Education, 81 (4), 65–94.

Tytler, R., Symington, D., Darby, L., Malcolm, C., & Kirkwood, V. (2011). Discourse communities: A framework from which to consider professional development for rural teachers of science and mathematics. Teaching and Teacher Education, 27 (5), 871–879.

Underhill, O. E. (1941). The origins and development of elementary school science. Chicago: Scott Foresman. UNESCO . (2010). Education for All global monitoring report: Reaching the marginalized. Paris: UNESCO; and Oxford, UK: Oxford

University Press. UNESCO Institute for Statistics . (2006). Teachers and educational quality: Monitoring global needs for 2015 (Vol. 253). Montreal, Quebec, Canada: UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

Wang, D., & Gao, M. (2013). Educational equality or social mobility: The value conflict between preservice teachers and the free teacher education program in China. Teaching and Teacher Education, 32, 66–74.

Yan, W. (2002). Postsecondary enrolment and persistence of students from rural Pennsylvania. Harrisburg, PA: Centre for Rural Pennsylvania.

Yang, R. (2008). Transnational higher education in China: Contexts, characteristics and concerns. Australian Journal of Education, 52 (3), 272–286.

Culturally Responsive Science Education for Indigenous and Ethnic Minority Students

Abrams, E., Taylor, C. T., & Guo, C. J. (2013). Editorial: Contextualizing culturally relevant science and mathematics teaching for indigenous students. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 11, 1–21.

Adams, J. , Luitel, B. C. , Afonso, E. , & Taylor, P. C. (2008). A cogenerative inquiry using postcolonial theory to envisage culturally inclusive science education. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3, 999–1019.

Aikenhead, G. S. (1996). Science education: Border crossing into the subculture of science. Studies in Science Education, 27, 1–52.

Aikenhead, G. S. (1997). Toward a First Nations cross-cultural science and technology curriculum. Science Education, 81, 217–238.

Aikenhead, G. S. (2006). Science education for everyday life: Evidence-based practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Aikenhead, G. S. (2011). Towards a cultural view on quality science teaching. In D. Corrigan , J. Dillon , & R. Gunstone (Eds.), The professional knowledge base of science teaching (pp. 107–127). New York: Springer.

Aikenhead, G. S., & Elliott, D. (2010). An emerging decolonizing science education in Canada. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 10, 321–338.

Aikenhead, G. S., & Jegede, O. J. (1999). Cross-cultural science education: A cognitive explanation of a cultural phenomenon. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36, 269–287.

Aikenhead, G. S., & Michell, H. (2011). Bridging cultures: Indigenous and scientific ways of knowing nature. Toronto: Pearson Education Canada.

Ainscow, M., Dyson, A., Goldrick, S., & West, M. (2012). Developing equitable education systems. London: Routledge.

Atwater, M. M. (1994). Research on cultural diversity in the classroom. In D. L. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 558–576). New York: Macmillan.

Atwater, M. M., Freeman, T. B., Butler, M. B., & Draper-Morris, J. (2010). A case study of science teacher candidates' understandings and actions related to the culturally responsive teaching of "other" students. International Journal of Environmental & Science Education, 5 (3), 287–318.

Bang, M., Medin, D., Washinawatok, K., & Chapman, S. (2010). Innovations in culturally-based science education through partnerships and community. In M. Khine & I. Saleh (Eds.), New science of learning: cognition, computers and collaboration in education (pp. 569–592). New York: Springer.

Belczewski, A. (2009). Decolonizing science education and the science teacher: A White teacher's perspective. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 9 (3), 191–202.

Bhabha, H. K. (2004). The location of culture. London: Routledge.

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Powell, A., & Teddy, L. (2007). *Te Kotahitanga: Improving the educational achievement of Māori students in mainstream education Phase 2: Towards a whole school approach* (Report to the Ministry of Education). Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education.

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Tiakiwai, S., & Richardson, C. (2003). Te Kotahitanga: The experiences of Year 9 and 10 Māori students in mainstream classrooms. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education.

Boutte, G. , Kelly-Jackson, C. , & Johnson, G. L. (2010). Culturally relevant teaching in science classrooms: Addressing academic achievement, cultural competence, and critical consciousness. International Journal of Multicultural Education, 12 (2), 1–20.

Branden, K., Avermaet, P., & Houtte, M. (2011). Equity and excellence in education: Towards maximal learning opportunities for all students. New York: Routledge.

Brayboy, B. M. J., & Castagno, A. E. (2008). How might Native science inform "informal science learning"? Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3 (3), 731–750.

Brown, B. A. (2011). Isn't that just good teaching? Disaggregate instruction and the language identity dilemma. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 22 (8), 679–704.

Brown, B. A. (2013). The language-identity dilemma: An examination of language, cognition, identity, and their associated implications for learning. In J. A. Bianchini , V. L. Akerson , A. Calabrese Barton, O. Lee , & A. J. Rodriguez (Eds.), Moving the equity agenda forward: Equity research, practice, and policy in science education (pp. 223–239). New York: Springer.

Buxton, C. (2005). Creating a culture of academic success in an urban science and math magnet high school. Science Education, 89 (3), 392–417.

Cajete, G. (1994). Look to the mountain: An ecology of indigenous education. Durango, CO: Kivaki Press.

Calabrese Barton, A., & Tan, E. (2009). Funds of knowledge and discourses and hybrid space. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46, 50–73.

Calabrese Barton, A., Tan, E., & Rivet, A. (2008). Creating hybrid spaces for engaging school science among urban middle school girls. American Education Research Journal, 45, 68–103.

Carlone, H. B., & Johnson, A. (2007). Understanding the science experiences of successful women of color: Science identity as an analytic lens. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44, 1187–1218.

Carlone, H. B., & Johnson, A. (2012). Unpacking "culture" in cultural studies of science education: Cultural difference versus cultural production. Ethnography and Education, 7 (2), 151–173.

Carter, L. (2007). Sociocultural influences on science education: Innovation for contemporary times. Science Education, 92 (1), 165–181. Chappell, S. V., & Cahnmann-Taylor, M. (2013). No child left with crayons: The imperative of arts-based education and research with language "minority" and other minoritized communities. Review of Educational Research, 37 (1), 255–280.

Cheesman, E., & De Pry, R. (2010). A critical review of culturally responsive literacy instruction. Journal of Praxis in Multicultural Education, 5 (1), 83–99.

Chigeza, P. (2011). Cultural resources of minority and marginalised students should be included in the school science curriculum. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6 (2), 401–412.

Chinn, P. (2012). Developing teachers' place-based and culture-based pedagogical content knowledge and agency. In B. Fraser, C. McRobbie, & K. Tobin (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 323–334). New York and London: Springer. Clinton, J., & Hattie, J. (2013). New Zealand students' perceptions of parental involvement in learning and schooling. Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 33 (3), 324–337.

Cobern, W. W., & Aikenhead, G. S. (1998). Cultural aspects of learning science. In B. J. Fraser & K. G. Tobin (Eds.), International handbook of science education (pp. 39–52). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Cupane, A. F. (2011). Towards an understanding of the role of language in the science classroom and its association with cultural identity development in the context of Mozambique. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6 (2), 435–440.

DeWitt, J., Archer, L., Osborn, J., Dillon, J., Willis, B., & Wong, B. (2011). High aspirations but low progression: The science aspirations-careers paradox amongst minority ethnic students. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 9, 243–271. Deyhle, D., & Comeau, K. G. (2009). Connecting the Circle in American Indian Education. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), The Routledge international companion to multicultural education (pp. 265–275). New York: Routledge.

Eisenhart, M. (2001). Changing conceptions of culture and ethnographic methodology: Recent thematic shifts and their implications for research on teaching. In V. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 209–225). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Ezeife, A. N. (2003). Using the environment in mathematics and science teaching: An African and Aboriginal perspective. International Review of Education, 49, 319–342.

Fraser, N. (2010). Scales of justice. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gay, G. (2000). Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. Journal of Teacher Education, 53, 106–116.

Gay, G. (2009). Preparing culturally responsive teachers. In B. Greer , S. Mukhopadhyay , S. Nelson-Barber , & A. B. Powell (Eds.), Culturally responsive mathematics education (pp. 65–84). New York: Routledge.

Gilbert, A., & Yerrick, R. (2001). Same school, separate worlds: A socio-cultural study of identity, resistance, and negotiation in a rural, lower track science classroom. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38, 574–598.

Giroux, H. A. (1992). Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education. New York: Routledge.

Glasson, G. E., Mhango, N., Phiri, A., & Lanier, M. (2010). Sustainability science education in Africa: Negotiating indigenous ways of living with nature in the third space. International Journal of Science Education, 32 (1), 125–141.

Gonzalez, N. , & Moll, L. C. (2002). Cruzando el puente: Building bridges to funds of knowledge. Educational Policy, 16 (4), 623–641. Gonzalez, N. , Moll, L. C. , & Amanti, C. (2005). Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Greenfield, P. M., Keller, H., Fuligni, A., & Maynard, A. (2003). Cultural pathways through universal development. Annual Review of Psychology, 54, 461–490.

Greenfield, P. M., Quiroz, B., & Raeff, C. (2000). Cross-cultural conflict and harmony in the social construction of the child. In S. Harkness, C. Raeff, & C. M. Super (Eds.), Variability in the social construction of the child (pp. 93–108). New Directions in Child Development, No. 87. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gutierrez, K. D., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. Educational Researcher, 32 (5), 19–25.

Harris, P., & Mercier, O. (2006). Te Ara Putaiao. In M. Mulholland (Ed.), State of the Māori Nation. Auckland, NZ: Reed Publishing.

Hawkins, J., & Pea, R. D. (1987). Tools for bridging the cultures of everyday and scientific thinking. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 24 (4), 291–307.

Herbert, S. (2008). Collateral learning in science: Students' responses to a cross-cultural unit of work. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (7), 979–993.

Heymann, J., & Cassola, A. (Eds.). (2012). Lessons in educational equality. New York: Oxford University Press.

Higgins, M. (2009). Shared horizons: A dialogue between Indigenous and Western science. Unpublished thesis proposal, Lakehead University, Thunder Bay, ON.

Hynds, A., Sleeter, C., Hindle, D., Savage, C., Penetito, W., & Meyer, L. (2011). Te Kotahitanga: A case study of a repositioning approach to teacher professional development for culturally responsive pedagogies. Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 39 (4), 339–351.

Jegede, O. (1995). Collateral learning and the eco-cultural paradigm in science and mathematics education in Africa. Studies in Science Education, 25, 97–137.

Johnson, C. (2011). The road to culturally relevant science: Exploring how teachers navigate change in pedagogy. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (2), 170–198.

Johnson, C. C. , & Marx, S. (2009). Transformative professional development: A model for urban science education reform. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20 (2), 113–134.

Jordan, W. J. (2010). Defining equity: Multiple perspectives to analyzing the performance of diverse learners. Review of Research in Education, 34, 142–178.

Kawagley, A. (2006). A Yupiaq worldview: A pathway to ecology and spirit. Long Grove, IL. Waveland Press.

Kawagley, A., & Barnhardt, R. (2007). Education indigenous to place: Western science meets native reality. Retrieved May 31, 2013, from www.ankn.uaf.edu/curriculum/Articles/BarnhardtKawagley/EIP.html

Kincheloe, J., & Steinberg, S. (2008). Indigenous knowledges in education: Complexities, dangers, and profound benefits. In N. K. Denzin , Y. S. Lincoln , & L. T. Smith (Eds.), Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies (pp. 135–156). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Kirkness, V. J. , & Barnhardt, R. (1991). First Nations and higher education: The four R's—respect, relevance, reciprocity, responsibility. Journal of American Indian Education, 30 (3), 1–15.

Klump, J., & McNeir, G. (2005). Culturally responsive practices for student success: A regional sampler. Retrieved April 16, 2013, from www.ode.state.or.us/opportunities/grants/saelp/culturallynwrel.pdf

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. Theory Into Practice, 34, 159–165. Lee, O. (2002). Science inquiry for elementary students from diverse backgrounds. In W. G. Secada (Ed.), Review of research in education (pp. 23–69). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Lee, O. (2004). Teacher change in beliefs and practices in science and literacy instruction with English language learners. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41, 65–93.

Lee, O. (2005). Science education with English language learners: Synthesis and research agenda. Review of Educational Research, 75, 491–530.

Lee, O., Deaktor, R., Enders, C., & Lambert, J. (2008). Impact of a multiyear professional development intervention on science achievement of culturally and linguistically diverse elementary students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (6), 726–747.

Lee, O. , & Fradd, S. H. (1998). Science for all, including students from non-English-language backgrounds. Educational Researcher, 27, 12–21.

Lee, O. , & Luykx, A. (2006). Science education and student diversity: Synthesis and research agenda. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lemke, J. (1990). Talking science: Language, learning, and values. Nor-wood, NJ: Ablex.

Lewthwaite, B., McMillan, B., Renaud, R., Hainnu, R., & MacDonald, C. (2010). Combining the views of "both worlds": Science education in Nunavut Pigusiit Tamainik katisugit. Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, 98, 1–71.

Lewthwaite, G., & McMillan, B. (2007). Combing the views of both worlds: Perceived constraints and contributors to achieving aspirations for science education in Qikigtani. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 7, 355–376.

Lim, M., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2006). Science learning and a sense of place in an urban middle school. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 1, 107–142.

Luke, A., Green, J., & Kelly, G. J. (2010). Introduction: What counts as evidence? Review of Research in Education, 34, vii–xvi. May, S. (2001). Language and minority rights. Essex, UK: Pearson Education Limited.

McCarty, T. L. (2009). The impact of high-stakes accountability policies on Native American learners: Evidence from research. Teaching Education, 20 (1), 7–29.

McIntosh, T., & Mulholland, M. (Eds.). (2011). Māori and social issues. Wellington, NZ: Huia Publishers.

McKinley, E. (1996). Towards an indigenous science curriculum. Research in Science Education, 26 (2), 155–167.

McKinley, E. (2001). Cultural diversity: Masking power with innocence. Science Education, 85 (1), 74–76.

McKinley, E. (2005). Brown bodies, white coats: Postcolonialism, Māori women and science. Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 26 (4), 481–496.

McKinley, E. (2007). Postcolonialism, indigenous students and science education. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), International handbook of research in science education (pp. 199–226). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

McKinley, E., & Keegan, P. J. (2008). Curriculum and language in Aotearoa New Zealand: From science to pūtaiao. L1—Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 8 (1), 135–147.

McKinley, E., & Stewart, G. M. (2009). Falling into place: Indigenous science education research in the Pacific. In S. Ritchie (Ed.), World of science education, Vol. 2. Handbook of research in Australasia (pp. 49–65). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

McKinley, E., & Stewart, G. M. (2012). Out of place: Indigenous knowledge (IK) in the science curriculum. In B. Fraser, C. McRobbie, & K. Tobin (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 541–554). New York and London: Springer.

McLaughlin, D. S., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2012). Preservice teachers' uptake and understanding of funds of knowledge in elementary science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24 (1), 13–36.

Mead, H. M. (2003). Tikanga Māori. Wellington, NZ: Huia Publishers.

Meyer, X., & Crawford, B. A. (2011). Teaching science as a cultural way of knowing: Merging authentic inquiry, nature of science, and multicultural strategies. Cultural Studies in Science Education, 6 (3), 525–547.

Ministry of Education . (2008). Ka Hikitia—Managing for success: The Māori education strategy 2008–2012. Wellington, NZ: Author. Ministry of Education . (2010). Ngā Haeata Mātauranga. Retrieved July 16, 2013, from

www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/series/5851/75954/organisational-success

Moje, E., Collazo, T., Carillo, R., & Marx, R. W. (2001). "Maestro, what is 'quality?": Language, literacy, and discourse in project-based science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (4), 469–498.

Moje, E., McIntosh Ciechanowski, K., Kramer, K., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and discourse. Reading Research Quarterly, 39 (1), 38–70.

Moll, L. C. , Amanti, C. , Neff, D. , & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. Theory Into Practice, 31 (2), 132–141.

Morrison, K. A., Robbins, H. A., & Rose, D. G. (2008). Operationalizing culturally relevant pedagogy: A synthesis of classroom-based research. Equity and Excellence in Education, 41 (4), 433–452.

Nam, Y., Roehrig, G., Kern, A., & Reynolds, B. (2013). Perceptions and practices of culturally relevant science teaching in American Indian classrooms. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 11, 143–167.

Oakes, J. (2005). Keeping track: How schools structure inequality (2nd ed.). New Haven, CT, & London: Yale University Books.

Ogawa, M. (1995). Science education in a multi-science perspective. Science Education, 79, 583-593.

Pang, V. , Han, P. , & Pang, J. (2011). Asian American and Pacific Islander students equity and the achievement gap. Educational Researcher, 40 (8), 378–389.

Reveles, J., & Brown, B. (2008). Discursive identity and science teaching: Teachers emphasizing student identity in science instruction. Science Education, 92 (5), 1015–1041.

Richards, J., & Scott, M. (2009). Aboriginal education: Strengthening the foundations. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Policy Research Networks. Rogers, C. A., & Jaime, A. M. (2010). Listening to the community: Guidance from Native community members for emerging culturally responsive educators. Equity and Excellence in Education, 43 (2), 188–201.

Roth, W.-M. (Ed.). (2009). Science education from people for people: Taking a stand(point). New York: Routledge.

Roth, W.-M., & Tobin, K. (Eds.). (2007). Science, learning, identity: Sociocultural and cultural historical perspectives. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Schech, S., & Haggis, J. (2000). Culture and development: A critical introduction. Oxford: Blackwell Publications.

Seiler, G. (2013). New metaphors about culture: Implications for research in science teacher preparation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50 (1), 104–121.

Sleeter, C. E. (2012). Confronting the marginalization of culturally responsive pedagogy. Urban Education, 47 (3), 562–584.

Smith, G. A. (2007). Place-based education: Breaking through the constraining regularities of public school. Environmental Education Research, 13 (2), 189–207.

Solano-Flores, G., & Nelson-Barber, S. (2001). On the cultural validity of science assessments. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (5), 553–573.

Stanley, W. B., & Brickhouse, N. W. (1994). Multiculturalism, universalism, and science education. Science Education, 78 (4), 387–398.

Stewart, G. M. (2010). Good science? The growing gap between power and education. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Stewart, G. M. (2012). Achievements, orthodoxies and science in Kaupapa Māori schooling. New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 47 (2), 51–63.

Sutherland, D., & Henning, D. (2009). Ininiwi-Kiskānıtamowin: A framework for long-term science education. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 9 (3), 173–190.

Taylor, P. E. (2006a). Toward culturally inclusive science classrooms. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 1, 189–195.

Taylor, P. E. (2006b). Cultural hybridity and third space science classrooms. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 1, 201–208.

Tobin, K. G. (2008). Contributing to the conversation in science education. Cultural Studies in Science Education, 3, 535–540.

Van Eijick, M., & Roth, W. M. (2007). Keeping the local local: Recalibrating the status of science and traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) in science education. Science Education, 6, 926–947.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach. Albany: SUNY Press.

Wallace, C. S. (2004). Framing new research in science literacy and language use: Authenticity, multiple discourses, and the "third space." Science Education, 88, 901–914.

Wallace, T. , & Brand, B. R. (2012). Using critical race theory to analyze science teachers' culturally responsive practices. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 7 (2), 341–374.

Warren, B., Ballenger, C., Ogonowski, M., Rosebery, A., & Hudicourt-Barnes, J. (2001). Rethinking diversity in learning science: The logic of everyday sense-making. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38, 1–24.

Webber, M., McKinley, E., & Hattie, J. (2013). The importance of race and ethnicity: An exploration of New Zealand Pākehā, Māori, Samoan and Chinese adolescent identity. New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 42 (1), 43–54.

Wolcott, H. F. (1991). Propriospect and the acquisition of culture. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 22, 251–273.

Woods, A., Dooley, K., Luke, A., & Exley, B. (2014). School leadership, literacy and social justice: The place of local school curriculum planning and reform. In I. Bogotch & C. Shields (Eds.), International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Social (In)Justice (pp. 509–520). New York: Springer.

Young, E. (2010). Challenges to conceptualizing and actualizing culturally relevant pedagogy: How viable is the theory in classroom practice? Journal of Teacher Education, 61 (3), 248–260.

Zembylas, M., & Avraamidou, L. (2008). Postcolonial foldings of space and identity in science education: Limits, transformations, prospects. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3, 977–998.

General Instructional Methods and Strategies

Adams, C. (2012). PowerPoint and the pedagogy of digital media technologies. In M. Orey , S. A. Jones , & R. M. Branch (Eds.), Educational media and technology yearbook: Volume 36, 2011 (pp. 139–154). New York: Springer.

Aikenhead, G. S. (2006). Science education for everyday life: Evidence-based practice. New York: Teachers College Press. Ai-Lim Lee, E., Wong, K. W., & Fung, C. C. (2010). How does desktop virtual reality enhance learning outcomes? A structural equation modeling approach. Computers & Education, 55 (4), 1424–1442.

Ainsworth, S. (1999). The functions of multiple representations. Computers & Education, 33 (2/3), 131–152.

Ainsworth, S. (2006). DeFT: A conceptual framework for considering learning with multiple representations. Learning and Instruction, 15 (3), 183–198.

Ainsworth, S., & Lowe, R. (2012). Representational learning. In N. M. Seel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of the sciences of learning (pp. 2832–2835). Boston: Springer US.

Almeida, P., & de Souza, F. N. (2010). Questioning profiles in secondary science classrooms. International Journal of Learning and Change, 4 (3), 237–251.

Alvermann, D. E., & Wilson, A. A. (2011). Comprehension strategy instruction for multimodal texts in science. Theory Into Practice, 50 (2), 116–124.

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1999). Science for all Americans: A project 2061 report on literacy goals in science, mathematics, and technology. Retrieved from www.project2061.org/publications/sfaa/online/intro.htm

Angeli, C., & Valanides, N. (2008). Examining the effects of electronic mentoring prompts on learners' scientific reasoning skills in a textbased online conference for a science education course. Science Education International, 19 (4), 357–369.

Atchison, C. L., Stredney, D., Irving, K. E., Toomey, R. S., Price, A., Kerwin, T., ... Reed, P. J. (2012). Overcoming physical barriers to provide cave and karst field experiences through the multiple representation of virtual reality. Abstracts with Programs—Geological Society of America, 44 (7), 513–513.

Ates, S. (2005). The effectiveness of the learning-cycle method on teaching DC circuits to prospective female and male science teachers. Research in Science & Technological Education, 23 (2), 213–227.

Atkin, J. M., & Karplus, R. (1962). Discovery or invention? The Science Teacher, 29, 45-51.

Aubusson, P. J., Harrison, A. G., & Ritchie, S. M. (Eds.). (2006). Metaphor and analogy in science education. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Basta, T. B., & Barman, C. R. (2008). An application of the learning cycle in health education: HIV/AIDS prevention. American Journal of Health Education, 39 (4), 245–247.

Bednar, A. K., & Coperland, N. L. (2012). Enlisting the collaboration of the educational technology professional community to develop a knowledge management system of the field: edu-techKNOWiki. In M. Orey, S. A. Jones, & R. M. Branch (Eds.), Educational media and technology yearbook: Volume 36, 2011 (pp. 81–89). New York: Springer.

Bell, C. V., & Odom, A. L. (2012). Reflections on discourse practices during professional development on the learning cycle. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23 (6), 601–620.

Berland, L. K., & McNeill, K. L. (2012). For whom is argument and explanation a necessary distinction? A response to Osborne and Patterson. Science Education, 96 (5), 808–813.

Besson, U. (2010). Calculating and understanding: Formal models and causal explanations in science, common reasoning and physics teaching. Science & Education, 19 (3), 225–257.

Bodzin, A. M., & Beerer, K. M. (2003). Promoting inquiry-based science instruction: The validation of the science teacher inquiry rubric (STIR). Journal of Elementary Science Education, 15 (2), 39–49.

Bonello, C., & Scaife, J. (2009). PEOR—engaging students in demonstrations. Journal of Science and Mathematics Education in Southeast Asia, 32 (1), 62–84.

BouJaoude, S., & Tamim, R. (2008). Middle school students' perceptions of the instructional value of analogies, summaries and answering questions in life science. Science Educator, 17 (1), 72–78.

Braaten, M., & Windschitl, M. (2011). Working toward a stronger conceptualization of scientific explanation for science education. Science Education, 95 (4), 639–669.

Brown, A., & Green, T. (2011). Issues and trends in instructional technology: Lean times, shifts in online learning, and increased attention to mobile devices. In M. Orey, S. A. Jones, & R. M. Branch (Eds.), Educational media and technology yearbook: Volume 36 (pp. 67–80). New York: Springer.

Bryan, A. J., & Fennell, D. B. (2009). Wave modelling: A lesson illustrating the integration of mathematics, science and technology through multiple representations. Physics Education, 44 (4), 403–410.

Bucciarelli, M., & Cutica, I. (2012). Mental models in improving learning. In N. M. Seel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of the sciences of learning (pp. 2213–2216). Boston: Springer US.

Buckley, B. C. (2012a). Model-based learning. In N. M. Seel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of the sciences of learning (pp. 2300–2303). Boston: Springer US.

Buckley, B. C. (2012b). Model-based teaching. In N. M. Seel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of the sciences of learning (pp. 2312–2315). Boston: Springer US.

Buckley, B. C. , & Quellmatz, E. S. (2013). Supporting and assessing complex biology learning with computer-based simulations and representations. In D. F. Treagust & C.-Y. Tsui (Eds.), Multiple representations in biological education (pp. 247–267). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Buckley, C. B. (2000). Interactive multimedia and model-based learning in biology. International Journal of Science Education, 22 (9), 895–935.

Bybee, R. W. (2009). The BSCS 5E instructional model and 21st century skills. Paper prepared for the Workshop on Exploring the Intersection of Science Education and the Development of 21st Century Skills. Retrieved from http://sites.nationalacademies.org/DBASSE/BOSE/DBASSE 080127

Carlsen, B., & Marek, E. A. (2010). Why do athletes drink sports drinks? A learning cycle to explore the concept of osmosis. Science Teacher, 77 (9), 48–52.

Chandrasegaran, L. A., Treagust, D. F., & Mocerino, M. (2009). Emphasizing multiple levels of representation to enhance students' understandings of the changes occurring during chemical reactions. Journal of Chemical Education, 86 (12), 1433–1436.

Chandrasegaran, L. A., Treagust, D. F., & Mocerino, M. (2011). Facilitating high school students' use of multiple representations to describe and explain simple chemical reactions. Teaching Science, 57 (4), 13–20.

Chang, K. , Chen, Y. , Lin, H. , & Sung, Y. (2008). Effects of learning support in simulation-based physics learning. Computers & Education, 51 (4), 1486–1498.

Chin, C. (2006). Classroom interaction in science: Teacher questioning and feedback to students' responses. International Journal of Science Education, 28 (11), 1315–1346.

Chin, C. (2007). Teacher questioning in science classrooms: Approaches that stimulate productive thinking. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (6), 815–843.

Chin, C., & Osborne, J. (2008). Students' questions: A potential resource for teaching and learning science. Studies in Science Education, 44 (1), 1–39.

Chin, C., & Osborne, J. (2010a). Students' questions and discursive interaction: Their impact on argumentation during collaborative group discussions in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (7), 883–908.

Chin, C. , & Osborne, J. (2010b). Supporting argumentation through students' questions: Case studies in science classrooms. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 19 (2), 230–284.

Chittleborough, G. D., Mocerino, M., & Treagust, D. F. (2007). Achieving greater feedback and flexibility using online pre-laboratory exercises with non-major chemistry students. Journal of Chemical Education, 84 (5), 884–884.

Chiu, M.-H., & Duit, R. (2011). Globalization: Science education from an international perspective. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (6), 553–566.

Clement, J. J. , & Rae-Mamirez, M. A. (Eds.). (2008). Model based learning and instruction in science. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer Science + Business Media B. V.

Coll, R. K., & Lajium, D. (2011). Modeling and the future of science learning. In M. S. Khine & I. M. Saleh (Eds.), Models and modeling: Cognitive tools for scientific enquiry (pp. 4–21). Dordrecht; New York: Springer.

Concord Consortium . (2001, October). BioLogica. Retrieved from http://biologica.concord.org

Cook, M., Wiebe, E., & Carter, G. (2008). The influence of prior knowledge on viewing and interpreting graphics with macroscopic and molecular representations. Science Education, 92 (5), 848.

Costu, B. , Ayas, A. , & Niaz, M. (2010). Promoting conceptual change in first year students' understanding of evaporation. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 11 (1), 5–16.

Crouch, C. H., Fagen, A. P., Callan, J. P., & Mazur, E. (2004). Classroom demonstrations: Learning tools or entertainment? American Journal of Physics, 72, 835–838.

Dagher, Z. R. (1994). Does the use of analogies contribute to conceptual change? Science Education, 78 (6), 601–614.

Dawes, L. (2004). Talk and learning in classroom science. International Journal of Science Education, 26, 677–695.

de Jong, T., Ainsworth, S., Dobson, M., Van der Hulst, A., Levonen, J., Reimann, P., ... Swaak, J. (1998). Acquiring knowledge in science and mathematics: The use of multiple representations in technology based learning environments. In M. W. V. Someren, P. Reimann, H. P. A. Boshuizen, & T. D. Jong (Eds.), Learning with multiple representations (pp. 9–40). London: Elsevier.

Dogru-Atay, P., & Tekkaya, C. (2008). Promoting students' learning in genetics with the learning cycle. Journal of Experimental Education, 76 (3), 259–280.

Driver, R., Leach, J., Millar, R., & Scott, P. (1996). Young people's images of science. Buckingham/Philadelphia: Open University Press. Dufresne, R. J., Gerace, W. J., & Leonard, W. J. (1997). Solving physics problems with multiple representations. The Physics Teacher, 35, 270–275.

Duit, R. (1991). On the role of analogies and metaphors in learning science. Science Education, 75 (6), 649-672.

Duschl, R., & Hamilton, R. (2010). Learning science. In R. E. Mayer & P. A. Alexander (Eds.), Handbook of research on learning and instruction (pp. 78–107). New York: Routledge.

Eilam, B. (2013). Possible constraints of visualization in biology: Challenges in learning with multiple representations. In D. F. Treagust & C.-Y. Tsui (Eds.), Multiple representations in biological education (pp. 55–73). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Fensham, P. J. (1990). Practical work and the laboratory in science for all. In E. Hegarty-Hazel (Ed.), The student laboratory and the science curriculum (pp. 291–311). London; New York: Routledge.

Fensham, P. J. (2001). Science content as problematic issues for research. In H. Behrendt , H. Dahncke , R. Duit , W. M. Komorek , A. Kross , & P. Reiska (Eds.), Research in science education—past, present and future (pp. 27–41). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer. Fensham, P. J. (2009). Real world contexts in PISA science: Implications for context-based science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (8), 884–896.

Fensham, P. J., Gunstone, R. F., & White, R. T. (Eds.). (1994). The content of science: A constructivist approach to its teaching and learning. London; Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Furberg, A., & Ludvigsen, S. (2008). Students' meaning-making of socio-scientific issues in computer mediated settings: Exploring learning through interaction trajectories. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (13), 1775–1799.

Geelan, D. (2012). Teacher explanations. In B. J. Fraser , K. Tobin , & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 987–999). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Gilbert, J. (2008). Visualization: An emerging field of practice and enquiry in science education. In J. K. Gilbert , M. Reiner , & M. Nakhleh (Eds.), Visualization: Theory and practice in science education (pp. 3–24). London: Springer.

Gilbert, J., Boulter, C. J., & Elmer, R. (2000). Positioning models in science education and in design and technology education. In J.

Gilbert & C. J. Boutler (Eds.), Developing models in science education (pp. 3–17). Dordrecht: the Netherlands: Kluwer. Gilbert, J. K. (2004). Models and modelling: Routes to more authentic science education. International Journal of Science and

Mathematics Education, 2 (2), 115–130.

Gilbert, J. K. (2010). Preface. In L. M. Phillips , S. P. Norris , & J. S. Macnab (Eds.), Visualization in Mathematics, Reading, and Science Education (pp. v–vii). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Gilbert, J. K. , & Boulter, C. J. (1998). Learning science through models and modelling. In B. J. Fraser (Ed.), International handbook of science education (pp. 53–66). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Gilbert, J. K., Reiner, M., & Nakhleh, M. (Eds.). (2008). Visualization: Theory and practice in science education. New York: London: Springer.

Gilbert, J. K., & Treagust, D. F. (Eds.). (2009). Multiple representations in chemical education. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Gillen, J., Littleton, K., Twiner, A., Staarman, J. K., & Mercer, N. (2008). Using the interactive whiteboard to resource continuity and support multimodal teaching in a primary science classroom. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 24 (4), 348–358.

Gluckman, P. (2011). Looking ahead: Science education for the twenty-first century. Wellington, New Zealand: Office of the Prime Minister Office's Science Advisory Committee. Retrieved from www.pmcsa.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/Looking-ahead-Science-education-forthe-twenty-first-century.pdf

Glynn, S. M. (1991). Explaining science concepts: A teaching-with-analogies model. In M. Shawn , S. M. Glynn , R. H. Yeany , & B. K. Britton (Eds.), The psychology of learning science (pp. 219–240). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gonzalez-Spada, W. J., Birriel, J., & Birriel, I. (2010). Discrepant events: A challenge to students' intuition. Physics Teacher, 48 (8), 508–511.

Guelman, C. B., De Leone, C., & Price, E. (2009, July). The influence of tablet PCs on students' use of multiple representations in lab reports. Paper presented at the Physics Education Research Conference 2009. Ann Arbor, MI.

Gunstone, R. (1995). Constructive learning and the teaching of science. In B. Hand & V. Prain (Eds.), Teaching and learning in science: The constructivist classroom (pp. 3–20). Sydney: Harcourt Brace.

Hackling, M. (2006). Primary connections: A new approach to primary science and to teacher professional learning. Retrieved from http://research.acer.edu.au/research_conference_2006/14

Haglund, J. , Jeppsson, F. , & Andersson, J. (2012). Young children's analogical reasoning in science domains. Science Education, 96 (4), 725–756.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Martin, J. R. (1993). Writing science: Literacy and discursive power. London: Falmer.

Halverson, K. L., & Friedrichsen, P. (2013). Learning tree thinking: Developing a new framework of representational competence. In D. F. Treagust & C.-Y. Tsui (Eds.), Multiple representations in biological education (pp. 185–201). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer. Hamza, K. M., & Wickman, P.-O. (2009). Beyond explanations: What else do students need to understand science? Science Education, 93 (6), 1026–1049.

Harlen, W. (Ed.). (2010). Principle and big ideas of science education. Hatfield, UK: Association for Science Education. Retrieved from http://cmaste.ualberta.ca/en/Outreach/media/cmaste/Documents/Outreach/IANASInterAmericasInquiry/PrinciplesBigIdeasInSciEd.pdf Harris, D., & Williams, J. (2007). Questioning "open questioning" in early years science discourse from a social semiotic perspective. International Journal of Educational Research, 46 (1), 15–15.

Harrison, A. G., & Treagust, D. F. (1994). Science analogies. Science Teacher, 61 (4), 40-43.

Harrison, A. G., & Treagust, D. F. (2000a). Learning about atoms, molecules, and chemical bonds: A case study of multiple-model use in grade 11 chemistry. Science Education, 84, 352–381.

Harrison, A. G., & Treagust, D. F. (2000b). A typology of school science models. International Journal of Science Education, 22 (9), 1011–1026.

Hennessey, M. G. (2003). Metacognitive aspects of students' reflective discourse: Implications for intentional conceptual change teaching and learning. In G. M. Sinatra & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), Intentional conceptual change (pp. 103–132). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Herrington, D., & Scott, P. (2011). Get in the game with team density. Science Teacher, 78 (4), 58-61.

Hilton, M. (2010). Exploring the intersection of science education and 21st century skills: A workshop summary. Retrieved from www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12771#toc

Hodson, D., & Hodson, J. (1998). From constructivism to social constructivism: A Vygotskian perspective on teaching and learning science. School Science Review, 79 (289), 33–41.

Hofstein, A., & Lunetta, V. N. (2004). The laboratory in science education: Foundations for the twenty-first century. Science Education, 88 (1), 28–54.

Holyoak, K. J., & Thagard, P. (1995). Mental leaps: Analogy in creative thought. Cambridge, London: MIT Press.

Horwitz, P. (2013). Evolution is a model: Why not teach it that way? In D. F. Treagust & C.-Y. Tsui (Eds.), Multiple representations in biological education (pp. 129–145). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Horwitz, P., & Christie, M. A. (2000). Computer-based manipulatives for teaching scientific reasoning: An example. In M. J. Jacobson & R. B. Kozma (Eds.), Innovations in science and mathematics education: Advanced design for technologies of learning (pp. 163–191). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Horwood, R. H. (1988). Explaining and description in science teaching. Science Education, 72 (1), 41-49.

Howe, A. C. (1996). Development of science concepts within a Vygotskian framework. Science Education, 80 (1), 35–51.

Jaipal, K. (2010). Meaning making through multiple modalities in a biology classroom: A multimodal semiotics discourse analysis. Science Education, 94 (1), 48–72.

Johnson, L. H., Trout, L. B., Brekke, J. C., & Luedecke, O. L. (2004). Hands-on, demonstration, and videotape laboratories for nonscience majors in a food science course: Achievement, attitude, and efficiency. Journal of Food Science Education, 3 (1), 2–7. Johnson-Laird, P. N. (1983). Mental models: Towards a cognitive science of language, inferences, and consciousness. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnstone, A. H. (1991). Why is science difficult to learn? Things are seldom what they seem. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 7, 75–83.

Johnstone, A. H. (2009). Book review: Multiple representations in chemical education. International Journal of Science Education, 31 (16), 2271–2273. doi:10.1080/09500690903211393

Jones, M. G., Rua, M. J., & Carter, G. (1998). Science teachers' conceptual growth within Vygotsky's zone of proximal development. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35 (9), 967–985.

Karplus, R. (1977). Science teaching and the development of reasoning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 14 (2), 169–175. Kearney, M., Treagust, D. F., Yeo, S., & Zadnik, M. G. (2001). Student and teacher perceptions of the use of multimedia supported predict-observe-explain tasks to probe understanding. Research in Science Education, 31 (4), 589–615.

Keeratichamroen, W., Dechsri, P., Panijpan, B., & Ruenwongsa, P. (2010). The tapioca bomb: A demonstration to enhance learning about combustion and chemical safety. Teaching Science, 56 (1), 39–41.

Kelley, R. L. (2010). Worms in the college classroom: More than just a composting demonstration. Journal of College Science Teaching, 39 (3), 52–55.

Kozma, R., & Russell, J. (2005). Students becoming chemists: Developing representational competence. In J. K. Gilbert (Ed.), Visualization in science education (pp. 121–146). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Kozma, R. B., & Russell, J. (1997). Multimedia and understanding: Expert and novice responses to different representations of chemical phenomenon. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34 (9), 949–968.

Larkin, J. H., & Simon, H. A. (1987). Why a diagram is (sometimes) worth ten thousand words. Cognitive Science, 11, 65–99. Lavoie, D. R. (1999). Effects of emphasizing hypothetico-predictive reasoning within the science learning cycle on high school student's process skills and conceptual understandings in biology. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36(10), 1127–1147. doi:10.1002/(sici)1098–2736(199912)36:10<1127::aid-tea5>3.0.co;2–4

Lawson, A., Oehrtman, M., & Jensen, J. (2008). Connecting science and mathematics: The nature of scientific and statistical hypothesis testing. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 6 (2), 405–416. doi:10.1007/s10763–007–9108–5 Lawson, A. E. (2000). The generality of hypothetico-deductive reasoning: Making scientific thinking explicit. American Biology Teacher, 62

(7), 482–495. Lawson, A. E. (2010). Basic inferences of scientific reasoning, argumentation, and discovery. Science Education, 94 (2), 336–364. Lazarowitz, R., & Tamir, P. (1994). Research on using laboratory instruction. In L. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 94–128). New York: Praeger Publishers.

Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2006). Cultivating model-based reasoning in science education. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 371–387). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lemke, J. L. (1990). Talking science: Language, learning, and values. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Levy Nahum, T., Ben-Chaim, D., Azaiza, I., Herskovitz, O., & Zoller, U. (2010). Does STES-oriented science education promote 10thgrade students' decision-making capability? International Journal of Science Education, 32 (10), 1315–1336.

Liew, C. W., & Treagust, D. F. (1995). A predict-observe-explain teaching sequence for learning about students' understanding of heat and expansion of liquids. Australian Science Teachers Journal, 4 (1), 68–71.

Linenberger, K. J., & Bretz, S. L. (2012). Generating cognitive dissonance in student interviews through multiple representations. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 13 (3), 172–178.

Liu, T.-C. , Peng, H. , Wu, W.-H. , & Lin, M.-S. (2009). The effects of mobile natural-science learning based on the 5E learning cycle: A case study. Educational Technology & Society, 12 (4), 344–358.

Liu, Y., Tsui, C.-Y., & Treagust, D. F. (2013). Roles of computer-based simulations in conceptual change learning of school science. In C. B. Lee & D. Jonassen (Eds.), Fostering conceptual change with technology: Asian perspectives (pp. 261–286). Singapore: Cengage Learning Asia Pte Ltd.

Luft, J. A. (1999). Rubrics: Design and use in science teacher education. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 10 (2), 107–121. Lyons, T. (2006). Different countries, same science classes: Students' experiences of school science in their own words. International Journal of Science Education, 28 (6), 591–613.

Madden, S. P. , Jones, L. L. , & Rahm, J. (2011). The role of multiple representations in the understanding of ideal gas problems. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 12 (3), 283–293.

Mancuso, V. J. (2010). Using discrepant events in science demonstrations to promote student engagement in scientific investigations: An action research study. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Rochester, New York. Retrieved from http://search.proguest.com/docview/881456335?accountid=10382Ericdatabase

Marbach-Ad, G., & Stavy, R. (2000). Students' cellular and molecular explanations of genetic phenomena. Journal of Biological Education, 34 (4), 200–205.

Marek, E. A. , Laubach, T. A. , & Pedersen, J. (2003). Preservice elementary school teachers' understandings of theory based science education. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 14 (3), 147–159.

Marquez, C., Izquierdo, M., & Espinet, M. (2006). Multimodal science teachers' discourse in modeling the water cycle. Science Education, 90 (2), 202–226.

Martins, I., & Ogborn, J. (1997). Metaphorical reasoning about genetics. International Journal of Educational Research, 19 (6), 48–63. Mayer, R. E., & Wittrock, M. C. (2012). Problem solving. In P. A. Alexander & P. H. Winne (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology (2nd ed., pp. 287–303). Hoboken, NJ: Taylor & Francis.

McCarthy, D. (2005). Newton's first law: A learning cycle approach. Science Scope, 28 (5), 46-49.

McKinsey & Company . (2012). Education to employment: Designing a system that works. Retrieved from

http://mckinseyonsociety.com/downloads/reports/Education/Education-to-Employment_FINAL.pdf

McNeal, K. S., Miller, H. R., & Herbert, B. E. (2008). The effect of using inquiry and multiple representations on introductory geology students' conceptual model development of coastal eutrophication. Journal of Geoscience Education, 56 (3), 201–211.

Mercer, N. , & Littleton, K. (2007). Dialogue and the development of children's thinking: A sociocultural approach. London; New York: Routledge.

Millar, R. (2006). "Twenty first century science": Insights from the design and implementation of a scientific literacy approach in school science. International Journal of Science Education, 28 (13), 1499–1521.

Millar, R. (2011). Reviewing the national curriculum for science: Opportunities and challenges. Curriculum Journal, 22 (2), 167–185. Milne, C., & Otieno, T. (2007). Understanding engagement: Science demonstrations and emotional energy. Science Education, 91 (4), 523–553.

Moore, C. J., & Rubbo, L. J. (2012). Scientific reasoning abilities of non-science majors in physics-based courses. Physical Review Special Topics—Physics Education Research, 8 (1), 010106–010101.

Mortimer, E., & Scott, P. (2000). Analysing discourse in the science classroom. In R. Millar, J. Leach, & J. Osborne (Eds.), Improving science education: The contribution of research (pp. 125–142). Buckingham UK; Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Musheno, B. V., & Lawson, A. E. (1999). Effects of learning cycle and traditional text on comprehension of science concepts by students at differing reasoning levels. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36 (1), 23–37.

National Research Council . (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science kindergarten to eighth grade. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from www.nap.edu

Neibert, K., Riemeier, T., & Gropengiesser, H. (2013). The hidden hand that shapes conceptual understanding: Choosing effective representations for teaching cell division and climate change. In D. F. Treagust & C.-Y. Tsui (Eds.), Multiple representations in biological education (pp. 293–310). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Nguyen, D.-H., & Rebello, S. N. (2011). Students' difficulties with multiple representations in introductory mechanics. US–China Education Review, 8 (5), 559–569.

Ogborn, J. , Kress, G. , Martin, I. , & McGillicuddy, K. (1996). Explaining science in the classroom. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Oliva, J. M. , Azcarate, P. , & Navarrete, A. (2007). Teaching models in the use of analogies as a resource in the science classroom. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (1), 45–66.

Orpwood, G., Schmidt, B., & Hu, J. (2012). Competing in the 21st century skills race. Canadian Council of Chief Executives. Retrieved from www.ceocouncil.ca/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/Competing-in-the-21st-Century-Skills-Race-Orpwood-Schmidt-Hu-July-2012-FINAL.pdf

Osborne, J., Collins, S., Ratcliffe, M., Millar, R., & Duschl, R. (2003). What "ideas-about-science" should be taught in school science? A Delphi study of the expert community. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40 (7), 692–720.

Osborne, J., & Patterson, A. (2012). Authors' response to "For whom is argument and explanation a necessary distinction? A response to Osborne and Patterson" by Berland and McNeill. Science Education, 96 (5), 814–817.

Osborne, J. F., & Patterson, A. (2011). Scientific argument and explanation: A necessary distinction? Science Education, 95 (4), 627–638. Paivio, A. (1986). Mental representation and dual coding approach. New York: Oxford University Press.

Panofsky, C. P., John-Steiner, V., & Blackwell, P. J. (1990). The development of scientific concepts and discourse. In L. C. Moll (Ed.), Vygotsky and education: Instructional implications and applications of sociohistorical psychology (pp. 252–267). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pedrosa-de-Jesus, H., da Silva Lopes, B., Moreira, A., & Watts, M. (2012). Contexts for questioning: Two zones of teaching and learning in undergraduate science. Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning, 64 (4), 557–571. Phillips, L. M., Norris, S. P., & Macnab, J. S. (Eds.). (2010). Visualization in mathematics, reading, and science education. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Ratcliffe, M., & Millar, R. (2009). Teaching for understanding of science in context: Evidence from the pilot trials of the "Twenty First Century Science" courses. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (8), 945–959.

Riopel, M., Potvin, P., & Vázquez-Abad, J. (2009). *Utilisation des technologies pour la recherche en éducation scientifique* [Utilisation of technologies for research in science education]. Québec, Canada: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Robottom, I. (2012). Socio-scientific issues in education: Innovative practices and contending epistemologies. Research in Science Education, 42 (1), 95–107.

Roth, W.-M., McRobbie, C. J., Lucas, K. B., & Boutonné, S. (1997). Why may students fail to learn from demonstrations? A social practice perspective on learning in physics. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34, 509–533.

Ruiz-Primo, M. A., Li, M., Tsai, S.-P., & Schneider, J. (2010). Testing one premise of scientific inquiry in science classrooms: Examining students' scientific explanations and student learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (5), 583–608.

Rundgren, C.-J., Hirsch, R., & Tibell, L. A. (2009). Death of metaphors in life science? A study of upper secondary and tertiary students' use of metaphors in their meaning-making of scientific content. Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching, 10 (1), 21–21.

Russ, R. S., Coffey, J. E., Hammer, D., & Hutchison, P. (2009). Making classroom assessment more accountable to scientific reasoning: A case for attending to mechanistic thinking. Science Education, 93 (5), 875–891. doi:10.1002/sce.20320

Schmidt, S. J., Bohn, D. M., Rasmussen, A. J., & Sutherland, E. A. (2012). Using food science demonstrations to engage students of all ages in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). Journal of Food Science Education, 11 (2), 16–22.

Schunn, C. (2009). Are 21st century skills found in science standards? Paper presented at the Workshop on Exploring the Intersection of Science Education and the Development of 21st Century Skills, New York. Retrieved from www7.nationalacademies.org/bose/Schunn.pdf Schwartz, R., & Brown, M. (2013). Understanding photosynthesis and cellular respiration: Encouraging a view of biological nested

systems. In D. F. Treagust & C.-Y. Tsui (Eds.), Multiple representations in biological education (pp. 203–223). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Scott, P. (1998). Teacher talk and meaning making in science classrooms: A Vygotskian analysis and review. Studies in Education, 32, 45–80.

Seker, H., & Komur, S. (2008). The relationship between critical thinking skills and in-class questioning behaviours of English language teaching students. European Journal of Teacher Education, 31 (4), 389–402.

Selwyn, N. (2011). Schools and schooling in the digital age: A critical analysis. New York: Routledge.

Sfard, A. (1998). On two metaphors for learning and the danger of just choosing one. Educational Researcher, 27 (2), 4–13.

Shapiro, J. (2012). China's environmental challenges. Malden, MA: Polity.

Shinohara, F. (2006). Innovative methods in science education in Japan— strategic methods on smooth transition from upper secondary school to the university. Journal of Science and Mathematics Education in Southeast Asia, 29 (1), 98–117.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher, 15 (2), 4–14.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundation of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57 (1), 1–22.

Simon, S., Erduran, S., & Osborne, J. (2006). Learning to teach argumentation: Research and development in the science classroom. International Journal of Science Education, 28 (2), 235–260.

Simonneaux, L., & Simonneaux, J. (2009). Students' socio-scientific reasoning on controversies from the viewpoint of education for sustainable development. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 4 (3), 657–687.

Sjøberg, S. , & Schreiner, C. (2010). The ROSE project: An overview and key findings. Retrieved from http://folk.uio.no/sveinsj/ROSE-overview_Sjoberg_Schreiner_2010.pdf

Slavin, R. E. (2009). Educational psychology: Theory into practice (9th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Sternberg, R. J., & Williams, W. M. (2002). Educational psychology. Boston: Allen & Bacon.

Stierer, B., & Maybin, J. (1993). Language, literacy and learning in educational practice: A reader. Clevedon, UK: Open University. Sweller, J. (1994). Cognitive load theory, learning difficulty, and instructional design. Learning and Instruction, 4, 295–312.

Thomas, G. (2012). Metacognition in science education: Past, present and future considerations. In B. J. Fraser , K. Tobin , & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 131–144). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Tobin, K. (1987). The role of wait time in higher cognitive level learning. Review of Educational Research, 57 (1), 69–95.

Treagust, D. F. (2007). General instructional methods and strategies. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 373–391). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Treagust, D. F., Chittleborough, G. D., & Mamiala, T. L. (2003). The role of sub-microscopic and symbolic representations in chemical explanations. International Journal of Science Education, 25 (11), 1353–1369.

Treagust, D. F., & Harrison, A. G. (2000). In search of explanatory frameworks: An analysis of Richard Feynman's lecture "Atoms in Motion." International Journal of Science Education, 22 (11), 1157–1170.

Treagust, D. F., Harrison, A. G., & Venville, G. J. (1998). Teaching science effectively with analogies: An approach for preservice and inservice teacher education. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 9 (2), 85–101.

Treagust, D. F., & Tsui, C.-Y. (Eds.). (2013). Multiple representations in biological education. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer. Tsui, C.-Y., & Treagust, D. F. (2003). Genetics reasoning with multiple external representations. Research in Science Education, 33 (1), 111–135.

Tsui, C.-Y., & Treagust, D. F. (2007). Understanding genetics: Analysis of secondary students' conceptual status. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (2), 205–235.

Tsui, C.-Y., & Treagust, D. F. (2013). Secondary students' understanding of genetics using BioLogica: Two case studies. In D. F. Treagust & C.-Y. Tsui (Eds.), Multiple representations in biological education (pp. 269–292). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Tural, G. , Akdeniz, A. R. , & Alev, N. (2010). Effect of 5E teaching model on student teachers' understanding of weightlessness. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 19 (5), 470–488.

Turkmen, H. (2006). What technology plays supporting role in learning cycle approach for science education. Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology—TOJET, 5 (2), 7–7.

Tytler, R. (2007). *Re-imagining science education: Engaging students in science for Australia's future* (Australian Education Review 51). Camberwell, Victoria: Australian Council of Educational Research.

Tytler, R., Prain, V., Hubber, P., & Waldrip, B. (Eds.). (2013). Constructing representations to learn in science. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Tytler, R., Symington, D., Darby, L., Malcolm, C., & Kirkwood, V. (2011). Discourse communities: A framework from which to consider professional development for rural teachers of science and mathematics. Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies, 27 (5), 871–879.

Underwood, J. (1997). If a picture is worth a thousand words, what is the value of two? Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education, 6 (1), 3–8.

van Someren, M. W., Reimann, P., Boshuizen, H. P. A., & de Jong, T. (Eds.). (1998). Learning with multiple representations. London: Pergamon.

Venville, G. J., & Dawson, V. (2010). The impact of an argumentation intervention on Grade 10 students' conceptual understanding of genetics. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (8), 952–977.

Venville, G. J., & Treagust, D. F. (1996). The role of analogies in promoting conceptual change in biology. Instructional Science, 24, 295–320.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Waldrip, B., & Prain, V. (2012). Learning from and through representations in science. In B. J. Fraser, K. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (Vol. 40, pp. 145–154). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Waldrip, B., Prain, V., & Carolan, J. (2010). Using multi-modal representations to improve learning in junior secondary science. Research in Science Education, 40 (1), 65–80.

Wertsch, J. V. (1991). Voices of the mind: A sociocultural approach to mediated action. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

White, R. T. (1996). The link between the laboratory and learning. International Journal of Science Education, 18 (7), 761–774.

White, R. W., & Gunstone, R. (1992). Probing understanding. London: Palmer Press.

Yarden, H., & Yarden, A. (2013). Learning and teaching biotechnological methods using animations. In D. F. Treagust & C.-Y. Tsui (Eds.), Multiple representations in biological education (pp. 93–108). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Young, M. (2008). From constructivism to realism in the sociology of the curriculum. In G. J. Kelly , A. Luke , & J. Green (Eds.), Review of research in education: What counts as knowledge in educational settings, disciplinary knowledge, assessment, and curriculum (Vol. 32, pp. 1–28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zacharia, Z. C. (2005). The impact of interactive computer simulations on the nature and quality of postgraduate science teachers' explanations in physics. International Journal of Science Education, 27 (14), 1741–1767.

Zheng, Z. R., Yang, W., Garcia, D., & McCadden, P. E. (2008). Effects of multimedia and schema induced analogical reasoning on science learning. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 24 (6), 474–482.

Zohar, A., & Dori, Y. J. (Eds.). (2012). Metacognition in science education: Trends in current research. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Zoller, U., & Levy Nahum, T. (2012). From teaching to KNOW to learning to THINK in science education. In B. J. Fraser, K. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 209–229). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Discourse Practices in Science Learning and Teaching

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2012). Examining the sources for our understandings about science: Enduring conflations and critical issues in research on nature of science in science education. International Journal of Science Education, 34, 353–374.

Airey, J., & Linder, C. (2009). A disciplinary discourse perspective on university science learning: Achieving fluency in a critical constellation of modes. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46, 27–49.

Albe, V. (2008). When scientific knowledge, daily life experience, epistemological and social considerations intersect: Students' argumentation in group discussions on a socio-scientific issue. Research in Science Education, 38, 67–90.

Allchin, D. (2011). Evaluating knowledge of the nature of (whole) science. Science Education, 95, 518-542.

Alozie, N. M., Moje, E. B., & Krajcik, J. S. (2010). An analysis of the supports and constraints for scientific discussion in high school project-based science. Science Education, 94, 395–427.

Ash, D. (2008). Thematic continuities? Talking and thinking about adaptation in a socially complex classroom. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45, 1–30.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). The dialogic imagination (C. Emerson & M. Holquist , Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Barton, A. C., & Tan, E. (2009). Funds of knowledge and discourses and hybrid space. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46, 50–73.

Barton, A. C., & Tan, E. (2010). We be burnin'! Agency, identity, and science learning. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 19, 187–229. Barton, A. C., Tan, E., & Rivet, A. (2008). Creating hybrid spaces for engaging school science among urban middle school girls. American Educational Research Journal, 45, 68–103.

Bazerman, C. (1988). Shaping written knowledge: The genre and activity of the experimental article in science. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Bellocchi, A., & Ritchie, S. M. (2011). Investigating and theorizing discourse during analogy writing in chemistry. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48, 771–792.

Bennett, J., Hogarth, S., Lubben, F., Campbell, B., & Robinson, A. (2010). Talking science: The research evidence on the use of small group discussions in science teaching. International Journal of Science Education, 32, 69–95.

Berland, L. K., & Hammer, D. (2012). Framing for scientific argumentation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 68–94.

Berland, L. K., & McNeill, K. L. (2010). A learning progression for scientific argumentation: Understanding student work and designing supportive instructional contexts. Science Education, 94, 765–793.

Berland, L. K., & McNeill, K. L. (2012). For whom is argument and explanation a necessary distinction? A response to Osborne and Patterson. Science Education, 96, 808–813.

Berland, L. K., & Reiser, B. J. (2009). Making sense of argumentation and explanation. Science Education, 93, 26–55.

Berland, L. K. , & Reiser, B. J. (2011). Classroom communities' adaptations of the practice of scientific argumentation. Science Education, 95, 191–216.

Böttcher, F., & Meisert, A. (2011). Argumentation in science education: A model-based framework. Science & Education, 20, 103–140. Bricker, L. A., & Bell, P. (2008). Conceptualizations of argumentation from science studies and the learning sciences and their implications for the practices of science education. Science Education, 92, 473–498.

Brown, B. A. (2006). "It isn't no slang that can be said about this stuff": Language, identity, and appropriating science discourse. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43, 96–126.

Brown, B. A., Reveles, J. M., & Kelly, G. J. (2005). Scientific literacy and discursive identity: A theoretical framework for understanding science learning. Science Education, 89, 779–802.

Brown, B. A. , & Spang, E. (2008). Double talk: Synthesizing everyday and science language in the classroom. Science Education, 92, 708–732.

Cameron, D. (2001). Working with spoken discourse. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Carlsen, W. S. (1991). Questioning in classrooms: A sociolinguistic perspective. Review of Educational Research, 61, 157–178.

Cavagnetto, A. R. (2010). Argument to foster scientific literacy: A review of argument interventions in K–12 science contexts. Review of Educational Research, 80, 336–371.

Chin, C. (2007). Teacher questioning in science classrooms? Approaches that stimulate productive thinking. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44, 815–843.

Chin, C., & Osborne, J. (2010a). Journal of the learning supporting argumentation through students' questions: Case studies in science classrooms. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 19, 230–284.

Chin, C., & Osborne, J. (2010b). Students' questions and discursive interaction: Their impact on argumentation during collaborative group discussions in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 883–908.

Choi, A., Notebaert, A., Diaz, J., & Hand, B. (2010). Examining arguments generated by year 5, 7, and 10 students in science classrooms. Research in Science Education, 40, 149–169.

Clark, D. B., & Sampson, V. D. (2007). Personally-seeded discussions to scaffold online argumentation. International Journal of Science Education, 29, 253–277.

Clark, D. B., & Sampson, V. (2008). Assessing dialogic argumentation in online environments to relate structure, grounds, and conceptual quality. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45, 293–321.

Crawford, T. (2005). What counts as knowing: Constructing a communicative repertoire for student demonstration of knowledge in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42, 139–165.

Danish, J. A., & Phelps, D. (2011). Representational practices by the numbers: How kindergarten and first-grade students create,

evaluate, and modify their science representations. International Journal of Science Education, 33, 2069–2094.

DeWitt, J., & Hohenstein, J. (2010). School trips and classroom lessons: An investigation into teacher-student talk in two settings. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 454–473.

Duran, R. A. (2008). Assessing English-language learners' achievement. Review of Research in Education, 32, 292–327.

Duschl, R. A. (2008). Science education in 3 part harmony: Balancing conceptual, epistemic and social learning goals. Review of Research in Education, 32, 1–25.

Erduran, S., & Jimenez-Aleixandre, M. P. (Eds.). (2008). Argumentation in science education: Recent developments and future directions. New York: Springer.

Evagorou, M., Jimenez-Aleixandre, M.-P., & Osborne, J. (2012). "Should we kill the grey squirrels?" A study exploring students' justifications and decision-making. International Journal of Science Education, 34, 401–428.

Eylon, B., Berger, H., & Bagno, E. (2008). An evidence-based continuous professional development programme on knowledge integration in physics: A study of teachers' collective discourse. International Journal of Science Education, 30, 619–641. Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and social change. Boston: Blackwell Publishing.

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language. London: Longman.

Ford, M. J., & Wargo, B. M. (2012). Dialogic framing of scientific content for conceptual and epistemic understanding. Science Education, 96, 369–391.

Gee, J. P. (2001). Literacy, discourse, and linguistics: Introduction and what is literacy? In E. Cushman , E. R. Kintgen , B. M. Kroll , & M. Rose (Eds.), Literacy: A critical sourcebook (pp. 525–544). Boston: Bedford St. Martin's.

Gee, J. P., & Green, J. L. (1998). Discourse analysis, learning, and social practice: A methodological study. Review of Research in Education, 23, 119–169.

Givry, D., & Roth, W. (2006). Toward a new conception of conceptions? Interplay of talk, gestures, and structures in the setting. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43, 1086–1109.

Gomes, M. D. C., Mortimer, E. F., & Kelly, G. J. (2011). Contrasting stories of inclusion/exclusion in the chemistry classroom. International Journal of Science Education, 33, 747–772.

Gumperz, J. (2001). Interactional sociolingustics: A personal perspective. In D. Schiffrin , D. Tannen , & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), The handbook of discourse analysis (pp. 215–228). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Gyllenpalm, J., & Wickman, P. (2011). The uses of the term hypothesis and the inquiry emphasis conflation in science teacher education. Journal of Science Education, 33, 1993–2015.

Gyllenpalm, J., Wickman, P.-O., & Holmgren, S.-O. (2010). Teachers' language on scientific inquiry: Methods of teaching or methods of inquiry? International Journal of Science Education, 32, 1151–1172.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Martin, J. R. (1993). Writing science: Literacy and discursive power. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press. Hamza, K. M., & Wickman, P.-O. (2008). Describing and analyzing learning in action? An empirical study of the importance of misconceptions in learning science. Science Education, 92, 141–164.

Hanrahan, M. U. (2006). Highlighting hybridity: A critical discourse analysis of teacher talk in science classrooms. Science Education, 90, 8–43.

Ideland, M., Malmberg, C., & Winberg, M. (2011). Culturally equipped for socio-scientific issues? A comparative study on how teachers and students in mono- and multiethnic schools handle work with complex issues. International Journal of Science Education, 33, 1835–1859.

Irzik, G., & Nola, R. (2011). A family resemblance approach to the nature of science for science education. Science & Education, 20, 591–607.

Jaipal, K. (2010). Meaning making through multiple modalities in a biology classroom: A multimodal semiotics discourse analysis. Science Education, 94, 48–72.

Jakobsson, A., Mäkitalo, A., & Säljö, R. (2009). Conceptions of knowledge in research on students' understanding of the greenhouse effect: Methodological positions and their consequences for representations and knowing. Science Education, 93, 978–995.

Jaworski, A. , & Coupland, N. (Eds.). (1999). The discourse reader. New York: Routledge.

Kamberelis, G., & Wehunt, M. D. (2012). Hybrid discourse practice and science learning. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 7, 505–534.

Kelly, G., Regev, J., & Prothero, W. A. (2008). Analysis of lines of reasoning in written argumentation. In S. Erduran & M. P. Jiménez-Aleixandre (Eds.), Argumentation in science education: Recent developments and future directions (pp. 137–157). New York: Springer. Kelly, G. J. (in press). Inquiry teaching and learning: Philosophical considerations. In M. Matthews (Ed.), International Handbook of Research in History, Philosophy and Science Teaching. Springer.

Kelly, G. J. (2007). Discourse in science classrooms. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 443–469). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kelly, G. J. (2008). Inquiry, activity, and epistemic practice. In R. A. Duschl & R. E. Grandy (Eds.), Teaching scientific inquiry:

Recommendations for research and implementation (pp. 99–117; 288–291). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Kelly, G. J. (2011). Scientific literacy, discourse, and epistemic practices. In C. Linder, L. Östman, D. A. Roberts, P. Wickman, G.

Erikson , & A. McKinnon (Eds.), Exploring the landscape of scientific literacy (pp. 61–73). New York: Routledge. Kelly, G. J. (2012). Developing critical conversations about identity research in science education. In M. Varelas (Ed.), Identity construction and science education research: Learning, teaching, and being in multiple contexts (pp. 185–192). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer. Kelly, G. J. (2014). Analysing classroom activities: Theoretical and methodological considerations. In C. Bruguière , A. Tiberghien , & P. Clément (Eds.),. Topics and Trends in Current Science Education: 9 th ESERA Conference Selected Contributions (pp. 353–368). Dordrecht: Springer.

Kelly, G. J., Carlsen, W. S., & Cunningham, C. M. (1993). Science education in sociocultural context: Perspectives from the sociology of science. Science Education, 77, 207–220.

Kelly, G. J., McDonald, S. P., & Wickman, P.-O. (2012). Science learning and epistemology. In B. J. Fraser, K. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 281–291). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Khine, M. S. (Ed.). (2012). Perspectives on scientific argumentation: Theory, practice and research. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer. Knorr-Cetina, K. (1999). Epistemic cultures: How the sciences make knowledge. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kolstø, S. D. (2006). Patterns in students' argumentation confronted with a risk-focused socio-scientific issue. International Journal of Science Education, 28, 1689–1716.

Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1986). An anthropologist visits the laboratory. In B. Latour & S. Woolgard (Eds.), Laboratory life: The construction of scientific facts (pp. 43–90). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lemke, J. L. (1990). Talking science: Language, learning and values. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Lemke, J. L., Kelly, G. J., & Roth, W.-M. (2006). Forum: Toward a phenomenology of interviews. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 1, 83–106.

Lidar, M. , Almqvist, J. , & Östman, L. (2010). A pragmatist approach to meaning making in children's discussions about gravity and the shape of the earth. Science Education, 94, 689–709.

Loxley, P. M. (2009). Evaluation of three primary teachers' approaches to teaching scientific concepts in persuasive ways. International Journal of Science Education, 31, 1607–1629.

Maeng, S., & Kim, C.-J. (2011). Variations in science teaching modalities and students' pedagogic subject positioning through the discourse register and language code. Science Education, 95, 431–457.

Manz, E. (2012). Understanding the codevelopment of modeling practice and ecological knowledge. Science Education, 96, 1071–1105. McDonald, S., & Kelly, G. J. (2012). Beyond argumentation: Sense making discourse in the science classroom. In M. S. Khine (Ed.), Perspectives on scientific argumentation: Theory, practice and research (pp. 265–281). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Mehan, H. (1979). Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mercer, N. , Dawes, L. , & Staarman, J. K. (2009). Dialogic teaching in the primary science classroom. Language and Education, 23, 353–369.

Mikeska, J. N. , Anderson, C. W. , & Schwarz, C. V. (2009). Principled reasoning about problems of practice. Science Education, 93, 678–686.

Mishler, E. G. (1986). Research interviewing: Context and narrative. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mortimer, E. F., & Scott, P. H. (2003). Meaning making in secondary science classrooms. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

National Research Council (NRC) . (1996). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. National Research Council (NRC) . (2011). A framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Nielsen, J. A. (2012). Science in discussions: An analysis of the use of science content in socioscientific discussions. Science Education, 96, 428–456.

Olitsky, S., Flohr, L. L., Gardner, J., & Billups, M. (2010). Coherence, contradiction, and the development of school science identities. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 1209–1228.

Oliveira, A. W. (2010). Improving teacher questioning in science inquiry discussions through professional development. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 422–453.

Oliveira, A. W., Akerson, V. L., Colak, H., Pongsanon, K., & Genel, A. (2012). The implicit communication of nature of science and epistemology during inquiry discussion. Science Education, 96, 652–684.

Osborne, J. F., & Patterson, A. (2011). Scientific argument and explanation: A necessary distinction? Science Education, 95, 627–638. Parsons, E., Tran, L. U., & Gomillion, C. T. (2008). An investigation of student roles within small, racially mixed science groups: A racial perspective. International Journal of Science Education, 30, 1469–1489.

Reveles, J. M., & Brown, B. A. (2008). Contextual shifting: Teachers emphasizing students' academic identity to promote scientific literacy. Science Education, 92, 1015–1041.

Russ, R. S., Lee, V. R., & Sherin, B. L. (2012). Framing in cognitive clinical interviews about intuitive science knowledge: Dynamic student understandings of the discourse interaction. Science Education, 96, 573–599.

Sadler, T. D. (2006). Promoting discourse and argumentation in science teacher education. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 17, 323–346.

Sampson, V., & Clark, D. B. (2008). Assessment of the ways students generate arguments in science education: Current perspectives and recommendations for future directions. Science Education, 92, 447–472.

Schwab, J. (1960). The teaching of science as enquiry. In J. Schwab & P. Brandwein (Eds.), The teaching of science (pp. 3–103). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shaw, J. M., Bunch, G. C., & Geaney, E. R. (2010). Analyzing language demands facing English learners on science performance assessments: The SALD framework. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 909–928.

Siry, C. , Ziegler, G. , & Max, C. (2012). "Doing science" through discourse-in-interaction: Young children's science investigations at the early childhood level. Science Education, 96, 311–326.

Tang, X., Coffey, J. E., Elby, A., & Levin, D. M. (2010). The scientific method and scientific inquiry: Tensions in teaching and learning. Science Education, 94, 29–47.

Varelas, M. (Ed.). (2012). Identity construction and science education research: Learning, teaching, and being in multiple contexts. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Varelas, M. , Kane, J. M. , & Wylie, C. D. (2012). Young Black children and science: Chronotopes of narratives around their science journals. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 568–596.

Varelas, M., Pappas, C. C., Kane, J. M., Arsenault, A., Hankes, J., & Cowan, B. M. (2008). Urban primary-grade children think and talk science: Curricular and instructional practices that nurture participation and argumentation. Science Education, 92, 65–95.

von Aufschnaiter, C., Erduran, S., Osborne, J., Simon, S., Education, P., & Giessen, J. (2008). Arguing to learn and learning to argue: Case studies of how students' argumentation relates to their scientific knowledge. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45, 101–131. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walker, K. A., & Zeidler, D. L. (2007). Promoting discourse about socio-scientific issues through scaffolded inquiry. International Journal of Science Education, 29, 1387–1410.

Wickman, P. O., & Östman, L. (2002). Learning as discourse change: A sociocultural mechanism. Science Education, 86, 601–623.

Windschitl, M., Thompson, J., & Braaten, M. (2008). How novice science teachers appropriate epistemic discourses around model-based inquiry for use in classrooms. Cognition & Instruction, 26, 310–376.

Zembal-Saul, C. (2009). Learning to teach elementary school science as argument. Science Education, 93, 687–719.

Zimmerman, H. T., Reeve, S., & Bell, P. (2010). Family sense-making practices in science center conversations. Science Education, 94, 478–505.

Promises and Challenges of Using Learning Technologies to Promote Student Learning of Science

Adams, D., & Shrum, J. W. (1990). The effects of microcomputer-based laboratory exercises on the acquisition of line graph construction and interpretation skills by high school biology students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 27(8), 777–787.

Ainsworth, S. (1999). The functions of multiple representations. Computers & Education, 33(2/3), 131–152.

Ainsworth, S. (2008). The educational value of multiple-representations when learning complex scientific concepts. In J. K. Gilbert , M. Reiner , & M. Nakhleh (Eds.), Visualization: Theory and practice in science education (pp. 191–208). London: Springer.

Barab, S. A., Hay, K. E., Barnett, M., & Keating, T. (2000). Virtual solar system project: Building understanding through model building. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37(7), 719–756.

Barab, S. A., Squire, K., & Barnett, M. (1999, May). From teachers' fixed curricular objectives toward students' emergent practices. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Barnett, M., Barab, S. A., & Hay, K. E. (2001). The virtual solar system project: Student modeling of the solar system. Journal of College Science Teaching, 30(5), 300–305.

Bell, P. (2004). Promoting students' argument construction and collaborative debate in the science classroom. In M. C. Linn , E. A. Davis , & P. Bell (Eds.), Internet environments for science education (pp. 115–144). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Blumenfeld, P., Fishman, B., Krajcik, J. S., Marx, R. W., & Soloway, E. (2000). Creating useable innovations in systemic reform: Scaling-up technology-embedded project-based science in urban schools. Educational Psychologist, 35(3), 149–164.

Blumenfeld, P., Soloway, E., Marx, R., Krajcik, J. S., Guzdial, M., & Palincsar, A. (1991). Motivating project-based learning. Educational Psychologist, 26(3 & 4), 369–398.

Bransford, J. , Brown, A. L. , & Cocking, R. (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Brasell, H. (1987). The effect of real-time laboratory graphing on learning graphic representations of distance and velocity. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 24(4), 385–395.

Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. Educational Researcher, 18(1), 32–42. Bybee, R. W. (2011). Scientific and engineering practices in K–12 classrooms: Understanding a framework for K–12 science education. Science Teacher, 78(9), 34–40.

Calabrese Barton, A., & Tan, E. (2010). We be burnin: Agency, identity and learning in a green energy program. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 19(2), 187–229.

Calabrese Barton, A., Tan, E., & Rivet, A. (2008). Creating hybrid spaces for engaging school science among urban middle school girls. American Education Research Journal, 45(1), 68–103.

Chang, H., Quintana, C., & Krajcik, J. S. (2010). The impact of designing and evaluating molecular animations on how well middle school students understand the particulate nature of matter. Science Education, 94(1), 73–94.

Choi, J., & Shin, N. (2009). Digital textbook design principles: Adapting the universal design for learning. Journal of Educational Technology, 25(1), 29–59.

Collins, A., Brown, J. S., & Newman, S. E. (1989). Cognitive apprenticeship: Teaching the crafts of reading, writing, and mathematics. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), Knowing, learning, and instruction: Essays in honor of Robert Glaser (pp. 453–494). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Damelin, D., & Koile, K. (2011). Technology-enabled formative assessment in the science classroom. In P. E. Noyce & D. T. Hickey (Eds.), New frontiers in formative assessment (pp. 175–190). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Publishing Group.

Damelin, D., Stevens, S. Y., Choi, S., Russell, R., & Krajcik, J. S. (2013, April). Supporting student understanding of submicroscopic interactions using technology infused materials: A curriculum design study. Paper session presented at the 86th annual international meeting of National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Rio Grande, Puerto Rico.

Dede, C. , Salzman, M. , Loftin, B. , & Sprague, D. (1999). Multisensory immersion as a modeling environment for learning complex scientific concepts. In W. Feurzeig & N. Roberts (Eds.), Computer modeling and simulation in science and mathematics education (pp. 282–319). New York: Springer Verlag.

de Jong, T. (2006). Computer simulations: Technological advance in inquiry learning. Science, 312, 532–533.

de Jong, T., & van Joolingen, W. (1998). Scientific discovery learning with computer simulations of conceptual domains. Review of Educational Research, 68(2), 179–202.

Dunleavy, M., & Dede, C. (2014). Augmented reality teaching and learning. In M. J. Bishop & J. Elen (Eds.), Handbook of research on educational communications and technology, 4th ed., Vol. 2 (pp. 735–746). New York: Macmillan.

Edelson, D. C., & Reiser, B. (2006). Making authentic practices accessible to learners: Design challenges and strategies. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 335–354). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fortus, D., & Krajcik, J. S. (2012). Curriculum coherence and learning progressions. In B. J. Fraser, K. G. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 783–798). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Frederiksen, J. R., White, B. Y., & Gutwill, J. (1999). Dynamic mental models in learning science: The importance of constructing derivational links among models. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36(7), 806–836.

Fretz, E. B., Wu, H., Zhang, B., Davis, E. A., Krajcik, J. S., & Soloway, E. (2002). An investigation of software scaffolds supporting modeling practices. Research in Science Education, 32(4), 567–589.

Gilbert, J. K. (2004). Models and modelling: Routes to more authentic science education. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 2(2), 115–130.

Grotzer, R., Tutwiler, S., Dede, C., Kamarainen, A., & Metcalf, S. (2011, April). Helping students learn more expert framing of complex causal dynamics in ecosystems using EcoMUVE. Paper presented at the National Association of Research in Science Teaching (NARST) Conference, Orlando, Florida.

Halloun, I. A. (2006). Modeling theory in science education. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Hansen, J. A., Barnett, M., Makinster, J. G., & Keating, T. (2004). The impact of three dimensional computational modeling on students' understanding of astronomy concepts: A qualitative analysis. International Journal of Science Education, 26(11), 65–78.

Jaipal, K. (2009). Meaning making through multiple modalities in a biology classroom: A multimodal semiotics discourse analysis. Science Education, 94(1), 48–72.

Jonassen, D. H. (1995). Computers as cognitive tools: Learning with technology, not from technology. Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 6(2), 40–73.

Kali, Y., Fortus, D., & Ronen-Fuhrmann, T. (2008). Designing learning environments to support students constructing coherent understandings. In Y. Kali, M. C. Linn, & J. E. Roseman (Eds.), Designing coherent science education (pp. 185–200). New York: Teachers College Press.

Kamarainen, A. M., Metcalf, S., Grotzer, T., Browne, A., Mazzuca, D. M. Tutwiler, S., & Dede, C. (2013). EcoMOBILE: Integrating augmented reality and probeware with environmental education field trips. Computer & Education, 68, 545–556.

Kang, M., Kim H. S., & Lee, J. (2011). The effects of flow and cognitive presence on learning outcomes in a middle school science class using Web-based simulation. Journal of Educational Information and Media, 17(1), 39–61.

Kesidou, S., & Roseman, J. E. (2002). How well do middle school science programs measure up? Findings from Project 2061's curriculum review. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39(6), 522–549.

Klopfer, E. (2008). Augmented learning: Research and design of mobile educational games. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Klopfer, E., & Squire, K. D. (2008). Environmental detectives—the development of an augmented reality platform for environmental simulations. Education Technology Research and Development, 56, 203–228.

Koponen, I. (2007). Models and modeling in physics education: A critical re-analysis of philosophical underpinnings and suggestions for revisions. Science and Education, 16(7–8), 751–773.

Kozma, R., & Russell, J. (1997). Multimedia and understanding: Expert and novice responses to different representations of chemical phenomena. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34(9), 949–968.

Kozma, R., & Russell, J. (2005). Students becoming chemists: Developing representational competence. In J. K. Gilbert (Ed.), Visualization in science education (pp. 121–146). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Krajcik, J. S. (1991). Developing students' understandings of chemical concepts. In S. H. Glynn , R. H. Yeany , & B. K. Britton (Eds.), The psychology of learning science (pp. 117–148). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Krajcik, J. S. (2013). The next generation science standards: A focus on physical science. The Science Teacher, 80(3), 13–24. Krajcik, J., Blumenfeld, B., Marx, R., & Soloway. E. (2000). Instructional, curricular, and technological supports for inquiry in science classrooms. In J. Minstell & E. Van Zee (Eds.), Inquiry into inquiry: Science learning and teaching (pp. 283–315). Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science Press.

Krajcik, J. S., & Czerniak, C. (2013). Teaching science in elementary and middle school classrooms: A project-based approach (4th ed.). London: Taylor and Francis.

Krajcik, J. S., & Layman, J. W. (1992). Research matters to the science teacher: Microcomputer–based laboratories in the science classroom. Reston, VA: NARST. Retrieved from www.narst.org/publications/research/microcomputer.cfm

Krajcik, J. S., McNeill, K. L., & Reiser, B. J. (2008). Learning-goals– driven design model: Developing curriculum materials that align with national standards and incorporate project-based pedagogy. Science Education, 92(1), 1–32.

Krajcik, J., Reiser, B., Sutherland, L., & Fortus, D. (2012). IQWST: Investigating and questioning our world through science and technology (middle school science curriculum materials). Sangari Global Education/Active Science.

Krajcik, J. S., & Shin, N. (2014). Project-based learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (2nd ed.). New York: Cambridge.

Krajcik, J. S., Slotta, J., McNeill, K. L., & Reiser, B. (2008). Designing learning environments to support students constructing coherent understandings. In Y. Kali, M. C. Linn, & J. E. Roseman (Eds.), Designing coherent science education (pp. 39–64). New York: Teachers College Press.

Krajcik, J., & Starr, M. (2001). Learning science content in a project-based environment. In R. Tinker & J. S. Krajcik (Eds.), Portable technologies: Science learning in context (pp. 103–119). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Kuhn, A., McNally, B., Schmoll, S., Cahill, C., Lo, W., Quintana, C., & Delen, I. (2012). How students find, evaluate, and utilize peercollected annotated multimedia data in science inquiry with Zydeco. Human Factors in Computing Systems: CHI 2012 Conference Proceedings, Austin, Texas.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. New York: Cambridge University Press. Lee, J., McGee, S., Duck, J., Choi, S., & Krajcik, J. (2013, April). Using interactive materials to develop high school students' understandings of how objects interact. Paper session presented at the 86th annual international meeting of National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Rio Grande, Puerto Rico.

Linn, M. C. (1998). The impact of technology on science instruction: Historical trends and current opportunities. In B. Fraser & K. Tobin (Eds.), International handbook of science education, part two (pp. 265–294). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers. Linn, M. C. , Davis, E. A. , & Bell, P. (Eds.). (2004). Internet environments for science education. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Linn, M. C., & Eylon, B. S. (2006). Science education: Integrating views of learning and instruction. In P. A. Alexander & P. H. Winne (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology (2nd ed., pp. 511–544). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Linn, M. C., & Eylon, B. S. (2011). Science learning and instruction: Taking advantage of technology to promote knowledge integration. New York and London: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.

Linn, M. C. , & Hsi, S. (2000). Computers, teachers, peers: Science learning partners. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Linn, M. C. , Layman, J. W. , & Nachmias, R. (1987). Cognitive consequences of microcomputer-based laboratories: Graphing skills development. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 12(3), 244–253.

Linn, M. C. , Lee, H. S. , Tinker, R. , Husic, F. , & Chiu, J. L. (2006). Teaching and assessing knowledge integration in science. Science, 313(5790), 1049–1050.

Louca, L. T., & Zacharia, Z. C. (2012). Modeling-based learning in science education: Cognitive, metacognitive, social, material and epistemological contributions. Educational Review, 64(4), 471–492.

McNeill, K. L., & Krajcik, J. S. (2011a, March). Claim, evidence and reasoning: Supporting middle school students in evidence-based scientific explanations. Workshop presented at the annual national meeting of National Science Teachers Association. San Francisco, CA. McNeill, K. L., & Krajcik, J. S. (2011b). Supporting Grade 5–8 students in constructing explanations in science: The claim, evidence and reasoning framework for talk and writing. New York: Pearson.

McNeill, K. L., Lizotte, D. J., Krajcik, J., & Marx, R. W. (2006). Supporting students' construction of scientific explanations by fading scaffolds in instructional materials. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 15(2), 153–191.

Merrill, P. F., Hammons, K., Vincent, B. R., Reynolds, P. L., & Tolman, M. N. (1996). Computers in education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon. Merritt, J., & Krajcik, J. S. (2013). Supporting students in building a particle model of matter. In G. Tsaparlis & H. Sevian (Eds.), Concepts of matter in science education (pp. 11–46). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Merritt, J., Shwartz, Y., Sutherland, L. M., Van de Kerkhof, M. H., & Krajcik, J. S. (2012). Introduction to chemistry. In J. Krajcik, B. Reiser, L. Sutherland, & D. Fortus (Eds.), *IQWST: Investigating and questioning our world through science and technology* (middle school science curriculum materials). Greenwich, CT: Sangari Global Education/Active Science.

Metcalf, S. J., Dede, C. J., Grotzer, T. A., & Kamarainen, A. (2010, May). EcoMUVE: Design of virtual environments to address science learning goals. Paper session presented at American Educational Research Association (AERA) Conference, Denver, CO.

Metcalf, S. J., & Tinker, F. T. (2004). Probeware and handhelds in elementary and middle school science. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 13(1), 43–49.

Metcalf-Jackson, S., Krajcik, J. S., & Soloway, E. (2000). Model-it: A design retrospective. In M. Jacobson & R. B. Kozma (Eds.), Innovations in science and mathematics education: Advanced designs for technologies and learning (pp. 77–116). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Mokros, J., & Tinker, R. F. (1987). The impact of microcomputer-based labs on children's ability to interpret graphs. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 24(4), 369–383.

National Research Council, Duschl, R. A., Schweingruber, H. A. & Shouse, A. W. (Eds.). (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science in grades K–8. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11625 National Research Council, Committee on Science Learning: Computer Games, Simulations, and Education, Honey, M., & Hilton M. (Eds.). (2011). Learning science through computer games and simulations. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from

www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13078

National Research Council . (2012). A framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

NGSS Lead States . 2013. Next Generation Science Standards: For States, By States. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Nicaise, M., Gibney, T., & Crane, M. (2000). Toward an understanding of authentic learning: Student perceptions of an authentic classroom. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 9(1), 79–94.

Njoo, M., & de Jong, T. (1993). Exploratory learning with a computer simulation for control theory: Learning processes and instructional support. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 30(8), 821–844.

Noh, T., Cha, J., & Kim, C. (1999). The effect of computer-assisted instruction using molecular-level animation and worksheet in high school chemistry class. Journal of the Korean Association for Research in Science Education, 19(1), 128–136.

Novak, A. M., & Gleason, C. (2001). Incorporating portable technology to enhance an inquiry: Project-based middle school science classroom. In R. Tinker & J. S. Krajcik (Eds.), Portable technologies: Science learning in context (pp. 29–26). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Publishers.

Novak, A. M., Gleason, C., Mahoney, J., & Krajcik, J. S. (2002). Inquiry through portable technology. Science Scope, 26(3), 18–21. Novak, A. M., & Krajcik, J. S. (2004). Using technology to support inquiry in middle school science. Science & Technology Education Library, 25, 75–101.

Novak, A. M., & Krajcik, J. S. (2005). Using learning technologies to support inquiry in middle school science. In L. Flick & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Scientific inquiry and nature of science: Implications for teaching, learning and teacher education (pp. 75–102). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Publishers.

Novak, M., & Wilensky, U. (2007). NetLogo connected chemistry solid combustion model. Retrieved from

http://ccl.northwestern.edu/netlogo/models/ConnectedChemistrySolidCombustion. Evanston, IL: Center for Connected Learning and Computer-Based Modeling, Northwestern Institute on Complex Systems, Northwestern University.

Oliver, M. (2000). An introduction to the evaluation of learning technology. Educational Technology & Society, 3(4), 20–30.

Palincsar, S. A. (1998). Social constructivist perspectives on teaching and learning. Annual Review of Psychology, 49(1), 345–375. Pallant, A., & Tinker, R. (2004). Reasoning with atomic-scale molecular dynamic models. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 13(1), 51–66.

Pluta, J. W., Chinn, A. C., & Duncan, R. G. (2011). Learners' epistemic criteria for good scientific models. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48(5), 486–511.

Quintana, C. (2012). Pervasive science: Using mobile devices and the cloud to support science education anytime, anyplace. Interactions, 19(4), 76–80.

Quintana, C., Reiser, B. J., Davis, E. A., Krajcik, J. S., Fretz, E., Duncan, R. D., Kyza, E., Edelson, D., & Soloway, E. (2004). A scaffolding design framework for software to support science inquiry. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 13(3), 337–386.

Reid-Griffin, A., & Carter, G. (2008). Uncovering the potential: The role of technologies on science learning of middle school students. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 6(2), 329–350.

Rivet, A. E., & Krajcik, J. S. (2008). Contextualizing instruction: Leveraging students' prior knowledge and experiences to foster understanding of middle school science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45(1), 79–100.

Rogoff, R. (1990). Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Rose, D. H., & Meyer, A. (2002). Teaching every student in the digital age: Universal design for learning. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Rose, D. H., Meyer, A., & Hitchcock, C. (2005). The universally designed classroom: Accessible curriculum and digital technologies. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Rouse, W. B., & Morris, N. M. (1986). On looking into the black box: Prospects and limits in the search for mental models. Psychological Bulletin, 100(3), 349–363.

Sabelli, N. (1994). On using technology for understandings science. Interactive Learning Environments, 4(3), 195–198.

Salomon, G., Perkins, D. N., & Globerson, T. (1991). Partners in cognition: Extending human intelligence with intelligent technologies. Educational Researcher, 20(3), 2–9.

Sawyer, R. K. (2006). The new science of learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 1–18). New York: Cambridge.

Sherin, B., Reiser, B., & Edelson, D. (2004). Scaffolding analysis: Extending the scaffolding metaphor to learning artifacts. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 13(3), 387–421.

Shin, N., Sutherland, L. M., & McCall, K. (April, 2011). Design research of features in inquiry-based science materials. Paper session presented at annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Slotta, J. D., & Linn, M. C. (2009). WISE science: Web-based inquiry in the classroom. Technology, education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Smith, C. L., Wiser, M., Anderson, C. W., & Krajcik, J. S. (2006). Implications of research on children's learning for standards and assessment: A proposed learning progression for matter and the atomic molecular theory. Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives, 4(1&2), 1–98.

Spitulnik, M., Stratford, S., Krajcik, J. S., & Soloway, E. (1997). Using technology to support students' artifact construction in science. In B. Fraser & K. Tobin (Eds.), International handbook of science education, part two (pp. 363–382). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Squire, K. D., & Klopfer, E. (2007). Augmented reality simulations on handheld computers. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 16(3), 371–413.

Stevens, S., Sutherland, L., & Krajcik, J. S. (2009). The big ideas of nanoscale science and engineering. Arlington, VA: National Science Teachers Association Press.

Stieff, M. (2011), Improving representational competence using molecular simulations embedded in inquiry activities. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48(10), 1137–1158.

Stratford, S. J., Krajcik, J., & Soloway, E. (1998). Secondary students' dynamic modeling processes: Analyzing, reasoning about, synthesizing, and testing models of stream ecosystems. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 7(3), 215–234. Sutherland, L., & Krajcik, J. S. (2007). Collaborative research: Universal design of inquiry–based middle and high school science curriculum (NSF; DRL–0730348; 2007–2011); UM: LeeAnn Sutherland (PI) & Joe Krajcik (CoPI); CAST: David Rose (PI) & Boris Gold-owsky (CoPI); EDC: Jackie Miller (PI) & June Foster (CoPI). Thornton, R. K., & Sokoloff, D. (1990). Learning motion concepts using real-time microcomputer-based laboratory tools. American Journal of Physics, 58(9), 858–866.

Van Berkum, J. J. A., & de Jong, T. (1991). Instructional environments for simulations. Education & Computing, 6(3/4), 305–358. Van Joolingen, W. R., & de Jong, T. (2003). SimQuest, authoring educational simulations. In T. Murray, S. Blessing, & S. Ainsworth (Eds.), Authoring tools for advanced technology learning environments: Toward cost-effective adaptive, interactive, and intelligent educational software (pp. 1–31). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of the higher psychological processes (A. Kozulin , Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wilensky, U. (1999). NetLogo. http://ccl.northwestern.edu/netlogo/. Evanston, IL: Center for Connected Learning and Computer-Based Modeling, Northwestern Institute on Complex Systems, Northwestern University.

Williams, M. (2008). Moving technology to the center of instruction: How one experienced teacher incorporates a Web-based environment over time. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 17, 316–333.

Williams, M., & Linn, M. C. (2002). WISE inquiry in fifth grade biology. Research in Science Education, 32(4), 415–436.

Williams, M., Montgomery, B. L., & Mangrove, V. (2012). From phenotype to genotype: Exploring middle school students' understanding of genetic inheritance in a web-based environment. The American Biology Teacher, 74(1), 35–40.

Wilson, M. R., & Berenthal, M. W. (2006). Systems for state science assessment. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Windschitl, M., & Andre, T. (1998). Using computer simulations to enhance conceptual change: The roles of constructivist instruction and student epistemological beliefs. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35(2), 145–160.

Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem-solving. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17(2), 89–100.

Xie, Q., & Tinker, R. (2006). Molecular dynamics simulations of chemical reactions for use in education. Journal of Chemical Education, 83, 77.

Zhang, B. H. (2012). Students' computer-based modeling practices and their changes: Classroom-based research with middle school science students. Saarbrücken, Germany: LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing.

Zhang, Z. H., & Linn, M. C. (2011). Can generating representations enhance learning with dynamic visualizations? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48(10), 1177–1198.

Elementary Science Teaching

Abd-El-Khalick, F., BouJaoude, S., Duschl, R., Lederman, N. G., Mamlok-Naaman, R., Hofstein, A., Niaz, M., Treagust, D., & Tuan, H.-L. (2004). Inquiry in science education: International perspectives. Science Education, 88, 397–419.

Abell, S. K., Anderson, G., & Chezem, J. (2000). Science as argument and explanation: Exploring concepts of sound in third grade. In J. Minstrell & E. Van Zee (Eds.), Inquiring into inquiry learning and teaching in science (pp. 65–79). Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Teaching.

Abrahams, I., & Reiss, M. J. (2012). Practical work: Effectiveness in primary and secondary schools in England. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (8), 1035–1055.

Akerson, V. L., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2003). Teaching elements of nature of science: A yearlong case study of a fourth grade teacher. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40, 1025–1049.

Akerson, V. L., Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Lederman, N. G. (2000). Influence of a reflective explicit activity-based approach on elementary teachers' conceptions of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 32, 295–317.

Akerson, V. L., Buzzelli, C. A., & Donnelly, L. A. (2010). On the nature of teaching nature of science: Preservice early childhood teachers' instruction in preschool and elementary settings. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (2), 213–233.

Akerson, V. L., & Hanuscin, D. L. (2007). Teaching nature of science through inquiry: Results of a 3-year professional development program. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (5), 653–680.

Akerson, V. L., & Volrich, M. L. (2006). Teaching nature of science explicitly in a first-grade internship setting. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43 (4), 377–394.

Appleton, K. (2003). How do beginning primary school teachers cope with science? Toward an understanding of science teaching practice. Research in Science Education, 33, 1–25.

Appleton, K. (2007). Elementary science teaching. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 493–535). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Aschbacher, P. R., & Roth, E. J. (2002). What's happening in the elementary inquiry science classroom and why? Examining patterns of practice and district factors affecting science reforms. Paper presented in a Symposium: Policy Levers for Urban Systemic Mathematics and Science Reform: Impact Studies From Four Sites at the Annual Meeting of the AERA, New Orleans, LA.

Avraamidou, L., & Zembal-Saul, C. (2010). In search of well-started beginning science teachers: Insights from two first-year elementary teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (6), 661–686.

Baek, H., Schwarz, C., Chen, J., Hokayem, H., & Zhan, L. (2011). Engaging elementary students in scientific modeling: The MoDeLS fifth-grade approach and findings. In M. S. Khine & I. M. Saleh (Eds.), Models and modeling in science education (pp. 195–218). New York, NY: Springer.

Ball, D. L. , Sleep, L. , Boerst, T. A. , & Bass, H. (2009). Combining the development of practice and the practice of development in teacher education. The Elementary School Journal, 109 (5), 458–474.

Bamberger, Y. M., & Davis, E. (2013). Middle-school science students' scientific modeling performances across content areas and within a learning progression. International Journal of Science Education, 35 (2), 213–238.

Banilower, E. R., Heck, D. J., & Weiss, I. R. (2007). Can professional development make the vision of the standards a reality? The impact of the National Science Foundations' local systemic change through teacher enhancement initiative. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44, 375–395.

Banilower, E. R., Smith, P. S., Pasley, J. D., & Weiss, I. R. (2006). The state of K12 science teaching in the United States: Results from a national observation survey. In D. Sunal & E. Wright (Eds.), The impact of state and national standards on K–12 teaching. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Banilower, E. R., Smith, P. S., Weiss, I. R., Malzahn, K. A., Campbell K. M., & Weis, A. M. (2013). Report of the 2012 National Survey of Science and Mathematics Education. Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research, Inc.

Barnes, B., Bloor, D., & Henry, J. (1996). Scientific knowledge: A sociological analysis. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. Barton, A., Gunckel, K., Covitt, B., & McLaughlin, D. (2007, July). Considering students' strengths: Helping elementary preservice teachers take account of students' resources in planning and teaching science lessons. Poster presented at the Center for Curriculum Materials in Science Knowledge Sharing Institute, Washington, DC.

Barton, A. C., & Tan, E. (2009). Funds of knowledge and discourses and hybrid space. Journal of research in science teaching, 46 (1), 50–73.

Beeth, M. E., & Hewson, P. W. (1999). Learning goals in an exemplary science teacher's practice: Cognitive and social factors in teaching for conceptual change. Science Education, 83 (6), 738–760.

Berland, L. K., & Reiser, B. J. (2009). Making sense of argumentation and explanation. Science Education, 93 (1), 26–55.

Beyer, C., & Davis, E. A. (2008). Fostering second-graders' scientific explanations: A beginning elementary teacher's knowledge, beliefs, and practice . Journal of the Learning Sciences, 17 (3), 381–414.

Borman, G., Gamoran, A., & Bowdon, J. (2008). A randomized trial of teacher development in elementary science: First-year achievement effects. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 1, 237–264.

Borman, K., Boydston, T., Lee, R., Lanehart, R., & Cotner, B. (2009, March). Improving elementary science instruction and student achievement: The impact of a professional development program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness, Washington, D.C.

Bransford, J., Darling-Hammond, L., & LePage, P. (2005). Introduction. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do (pp. 1–39). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bricker, L. A., & Bell, P. (2008). Conceptualizations of argumentation from science studies and the learning sciences and their implications for the practices of science education. Science Education, 92, 473–498.

Bruozas, M., Finn, L. E., Tzou, C., Hug, B., Kuhn, L., & Reiser, B. J. (2004). Struggle in natural environments: What will survive? In J. Krajcik & B. J. Reiser (Eds.), IQWST: Investigating and questioning our world through science and technology. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University.

Bybee, R. W., & Landes, N. M. (1988). What research says about the new science curriculum (BSCS). Science and Children, 25, 35–39. Bybee, R. W., Taylor, J. A., Gardner, A., Van Scotter, P., Powell, J. C., Westbrook, A., (2006). The BSCS 5E instructional model: Origins and effectiveness. Colorado Springs, CO: BSCS.

Carey, S., Evans, R., Honda, M., Jay, E., & Unger, C. (1989). "An experiment is when you try it and see if it works:" A study of junior high school students' understanding of the construction of scientific knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 11, 514–529. Carlone, H. B., Haun-Frank, J., & Kimmel, S. C. (2010). Tempered radicals: Elementary teachers' narratives of teaching science within and against prevailing meanings of schooling. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 5, 941–965.

Carlone, H. B., Haun-Frank, J., & Webb, A. (2011). Assessing equity beyond knowledge- and skills-based outcomes: A comparative ethnography of two fourth-grade reform-based science classrooms. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (5), 459–485. Catley, K., Lehrer, R., & Reiser, B. (2005). Tracing a proposed learning progression for developing understanding of evolution. Paper commissioned for the Committee on Test Design for K–12 Science Achievement. Center for Education, National Research Council. Washington, DC.

Cavagnetto, A. R. (2008). Factors influencing the implementation of the science writing heuristic in two elementary science classrooms. In B. Hand (Ed.), Science inquiry, argument, and language: A case for the science writing heuristic (pp. 37–52). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.

Cavagnetto, A. R. (2010). Argument to foster scientific literacy: A review of argument interventions in K–12 science contexts. Review of Educational Research, 80, 336–371.

Cavagnetto, A. R., Hand, B. M., & Norton-Meier, L. (2010). The nature of elementary science discourse in the context of the science writing heuristic approach. International Journal of Science Education, 32 (4), 427–449.

Cazden, C. B. (2001). Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Cervetti, G. N., & Barber, J. (2008). Text in hands-on science. In E. H. Hiebert & M. Sailors (Eds.), Finding the right texts: What works for beginning and struggling readers (pp. 89–108). New York, NY: Guilford.

Cervetti, G. N., Barber, J., Dorph, R., Pearson, P. D., & Goldschmidt, P. G. (2012). The impact of an integrated approach to science and literacy in elementary school classrooms. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (5), 631–658.

Chapin, S. H., O'Connor, C., & Anderson, N. C. (2009). Classroom discussions: Using math talk to help students learn. Sausalito, CA: Scholastic Math Solutions.

Chinn, C. A., & Malhotra, B. A. (2002). Children's responses to anomalous scientific data: How is conceptual change impeded? Journal of Educational Psychology, 94, 327–343.

Cobb, P. , Gresalfi, M. , & Hodge, L. L. (2009). An interpretive scheme for analyzing the identities that students develop in mathematics classrooms. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 40, 40–68.

Cornelius, L. L., & Herrenkohl, L. R. (2004). Power in the classroom: How the classroom environment shapes students' relationships with each other and with concepts. Cognition and Instruction, 22 (4), 389–392.

Cortina, A. (Ed.). (2008). The education system of the Federal Republic of Germany. Reinbek, Germany: Rowohlt Verlag.

Czerniak, C. M., Beltyukova, S., Struble, J., Haney, J. J., & Lumpe, A. T. (2006). Do you see what I see? The relationship between a professional development model and student achievement. In R. E. Yager (Ed.), Exemplary science in Grades 5–8: Standards-based success stories (pp. 13–43). Arlington, VA: NSTA Press.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hammerness, K., Grossman, P., Rust, F., & Shulman, L. (2005). The design of teacher education programs. In L. Darling-Hammond & J. Bransford (Eds.), Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do (pp. 390–441). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Davis, E., & Smithey, J. (2009). Beginning teachers moving toward effective elementary science teaching. Science Education, 93 (4), 745–770.

Delpit, L. D. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. Harvard Educational Review, 28 (3), 280–299.

Delpit, L. D. (2006). Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Donovan, S., & Bransford, J. D. (2005). How students learn: Science in the classroom. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Dorph, R., Shields, P., Tiffany-Morales, J., Hartry, A., & McCaffrey, T. (2011). High hopes—few opportunities: The status of elementary science education in California. Sacramento, CA: Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning at WestEd.

Driver, R., Leach, J., Millar, R., & Scott, P. (1996). Young people's images of science. Buckingham, England: Open University Press. Duncan, R., Rogat, A. D., & Yarden, A. (2009). A learning progression for deepening students' understandings of modern genetics across the 5th– 10th grades. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (6), 655–674.

Duschl, R., Schweingruber, H., & Shouse, A. (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science in grades K–8. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Fang, Z., & Wei, Y. (2010). Improving middle school students' science literacy through reading infusion. Journal of Educational Research, 103, 262–273.

Fogleman, J., McNeill, K. L., & Krajcik, J. (2011). Examining the effect of teachers' adaptations of a middle school science inquiryoriented curriculum unit on student learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (2), 149–169.

Franke, M., Grossman, P., Hatch, T., Richert, A., & Schultz, K. (2006, April). Using representations of practice in teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Fulp, S. L. (2002). 2000 national survey of science and mathematics education: Status of elementary school science teaching. Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research.

Furtak, E. M., & Alonzo, A. C. (2010). The role of content in inquiry-based elementary science lessons: An analysis of teacher beliefs and enactment. Research in Science Education, 40 (3), 425–449.

Gabel, D. L. (1994). Handbook of research on science teaching and learning. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Gardner, A., Stuhlsatz, M., & Roth, K. J. (2013, April). Video analysis of science teaching: Developing a shared "words-to-images" analytical tool. Paper presented at the annual international meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Goodrum, D., Hackling, M., & Rennie, L. (2001). The status and quality of teaching and learning of science in Australian schools. Department of Education, Training, and Youth Affairs, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra, Australia.

Granger, E. M., Bevis, T. H., Saka, Y., & Southerland, S. A. (2010, March). Large scale, randomized cluster design study of the relative effectiveness of reform-based and traditional/verification curricula in supporting student science learning. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Philadelphia, PA.

Gresalfi, M. S., & Cobb, P. (2006). Cultivating discipline-specific dispositions as a critical goal for pedagogy and equity. Pedagogies, 1, 49–57.

Grimberg, B. I., & Gummer, E. (2013). Teaching science from cultural points of intersection. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50 (1), 12–32.

Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E., & Williamson, P. (2009). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. Teachers College Record, 111 (9), 2055–2100.

Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 15 (2), 273–289.

Gunckel, K. L. (2011). Mediators of a preservice teacher's use of the inquiry-application instructional model. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 22 (1), 79–100.

Gunckel, K. L., Mohan, L., Covitt, B. A., & Anderson, C. W. (2012). Addressing challenges in developing learning progressions for environmental science literacy. In A. C. Alonzo & A. W. Gotwals (Eds.), Learning progressions in science: Current challenges and future directions (pp. 39–76). Boston, MA: Sense Publishers.

Guthrie, J. T., Anderson, E., Alao, S., & Rinehart, J. (1999). Influences of concept-oriented reading instruction on strategy use and conceptual learning from text. Elementary School Journal, 99, 343–366.

Guthrie, J. T., & Cox, K. E. (2001). Classroom conditions for motivation and engagement in reading. Educational Psychology Review, 13, 283–302.

Guthrie, J. T., McRae, A., Coddington, C. S., Klauda, S. L., Wigfield, A., & Barbosa, P. (2009). Impacts of comprehensive reading instruction on diverse outcomes of low- and high-achieving readers. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 42, 195–214.

Guthrie, J. T., McRae, A., & Klauda, S. (2007). Contributions of concept-oriented reading instruction to knowledge about interventions for motivation in reading. Educational Psychologist, 43, 237–250.

Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., Barbosa, P., Perencevich, K. C., Taboada, A., Davis, M. H., (2004). Increasing reading comprehension and engagement through concept-oriented reading instruction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 96, 403–423.

Hammer, D., Goldberg, F., & Fargason, S. (2012). Responsive teaching and the beginnings of energy in a third grade classroom. Review of Science, Mathematics and ICT Education, 6 (1), 51–72.

Hammer, D., Russ, R., Mikeska, J., & Scherr, R. (2008). Identifying inquiry and conceptualizing students' abilities. In R. Duschl & R. Grandy (Eds.), Teaching scientific inquiry: Recommendations for research and implementation (pp. 138–156). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Hand, B. (2008). Science inquiry, argument, and language: A case for the science writing heuristic. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense. Hardy, I., Kloetzer, B., Moeler, K., & Sodian, B. (2010). The analysis of classroom discourse: Elementary school science curricula advancing reasoning with evidence. Educational Assessment, 15, 197–221.

Harlen, W. (1997). Primary teachers' understanding in science and its impact in the classroom. Research in Science Education, 27, 323–337.

Harris, C. J., Phillips, R. S., & Penuel, W. R. (2012). Examining teachers' instructional moves aimed at developing students' ideas and questions in learner-centered science classrooms. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23, 769–788.

Harris, D., & Williams, J. (2012). The association of classroom interactions, year group and social class. British Educational Research Journal, 38 (3), 373–397.

Heller, J. I., Daehler, K. R., Wong, N., Shinohara, M., & Miratrix, L. W. (2012). Differential effects of three professional development models on teacher knowledge and student achievement in elementary science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (3), 333–362.

Hennessey, M. G. (2003). Probing the dimensions of metacognition: Implications for conceptual change teaching-learning. In G. M. Sinatra & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), Intentional conceptual change (pp. 105–132). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Herrenkohl, L. R., & Guerra, M. R. (1998). Participant structures, scientific discourse, and student engagement in fourth grade. Cognition and Instruction, 16 (4), 433–475.

Hokayem, H., & Schwarz, C. (2013). Engaging fifth graders in scientific modeling to learn about evaporation and condensation.

International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education. Published online first, January 16, 2013.

Howes, E. V., Lim, M., & Campos, J. (2009). Journeys into inquiry-based elementary science: Literacy practices, questioning, and empirical study. Science Education 93(2), 189–217.

Hudicourt-Barnes, J. (2003). The use of argumentation in Haitian Creole science classrooms. Harvard Educational Review, 73 (1), 73–93. Johnson, C. C. (2011). The road to culturally relevant science: Exploring how teachers navigate change in pedagogy. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (2), 170–198.

Johnson, C. C., Kahle, J. B., & Fargo, J. D. (2007). A study of the effect of sustained, whole-school professional development on student achievement in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (6), 775–786.

Kazemi, E., Lampert, M., & Ghousseini, H. (2007). Conceptualizing and using routines of practice in mathematics teaching to advance professional education. Report to the Spencer Foundation. Chicago, IL: Spencer Foundation.

Kennedy, C. A. , & Wilson, M. (2007). Using progress variables to interpret student achievement and progress. BEAR Report Series, 2006 – 12–101. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Kesidou, S., & Roseman, J. E. (2002). How well do middle school science programs measure up? Findings from Project 2061's curriculum review. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (6), 522–549.

Khishfe, R., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2002). Influence of explicit and reflective versus implicit inquiry-oriented instruction on sixth graders' view of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39, 551–578.

Kidman, G. (2012). Australia at the crossroads—A review of school science practical work. EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 8 (1), 35–47.

Kim, M., Tan, A. L., & Talaue, F. T. (2013). New vision and challenges in inquiry-based curriculum change in Singapore. International Journal of Science Education, 35 (2), 289–311.

Klug, B., & Whitfield, P. (2003). Widening the circle: Culturally relevant pedagogy for American Indian children. New York, NY: Routledge. Kuhn, D., & Franklin, S. (2006). The second decade: What develops (and how) In W. Damon, R. M. Lerner, D. Kuhn, & R. S. Siegler (Eds.), Handbook of child psychology, volume 2, cognition, perception, and language (6th ed., pp. 954–994). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Krajcik, J. S., McNeill, K. L., & Reiser, B. L. (2008). Learning-goals-driven design model: Developing curriculum materials that align with national standards and incorporate project-based pedagogy. Science Education, 92 (1), 1–32.

Kurth, L. A., Anderson, C. W., & Palincsar, A. S. (2002). The case of Carla: Dilemmas of helping all students to understand science. Science Education, 86 (3), 287–313.

Lakshmanan, A., Heath, B. P., Perlmutter, A., & Elder, M. (2011). The impact of science content and professional learning communities on science teaching efficacy and standards-based instruction. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (5), 534–555.

Lampert, M., Beasley, H., Ghousseini, H., Kazemi, E., & Franke, M. (2010). Using designed instructional activities to enable novices to manage ambitious mathematics teaching. In M. K. Stein & L. Kucan (Eds.), Instructional explanations in the disciplines (pp. 129–144). New York, NY: Springer Science+Business Media.

Lampert, M., Boerst, T., & Graziani, F. (2011). Organization resources in the service of school-wide ambitious teaching practice. Teachers College Record, 113 (7), 1361–1400.

Lampert, M., & Graziani, F. (2009). Instructional activities as a tool for teachers' and teacher educators' learning. Elementary School Journal, 109 (5), 491–509.

Lara-Alecio, R., Tong, F., Irby, B. J., Guerrero, C., Huerta, M., & Fan, Y. (2012). The effect of an instructional intervention on middle school English learners' science and English reading achievement. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (8), 987–1011. LaVan, S.-K. (2006, April). Culturally-adaptive practices. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, San Francisco, CA.

Lee, O. (2003). Equity for linguistically and culturally diverse students in science education: A research agenda. Teachers College Record, 105 (3), 465–489.

Lee, O. (2005). Science education with English language learners: Synthesis and research agenda. Review of Educational Research, 75 (4), 491–530.

Lee, O., Buxton, C., Lewis, S., & LeRoy, K. (2006). Science inquiry and student diversity: Enhanced abilities and continuing difficulties after an instructional intervention. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43, 607–636.

Lee, O., Deaktor, R., Enders, C., & Lambert, J. (2008). Impact of a multiyear professional development intervention on science achievement of culturally and linguistically diverse elementary students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (6), 726–747. Lee, O., Luykx, A., Buxton, C., & Shaver, A. (2007). The challenge of altering elementary school teachers' beliefs and practices regarding linguistic and cultural diversity in science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (9), 1269–1291.

Lee, O., Maerten-Rivera, J., Buxton, C., Penfield, R., & Secada, W. G. (2009). Urban elementary teachers' perspectives on teaching science to English language learners. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20 (3), 263–286.

Lee, O. , Penfield, R. , & Maerten-Rivera, J. (2009). Effects of fidelity of implementation on science achievement gains among English language learners. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (7), 836–859.

Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2000). Model-based reasoning in mathematics and science. In R. Glaser (Ed.), Advances in instructional psychology, Vol. 5 (pp. 101–159). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (Eds.). (2002). Investigating real data in the classroom: Expanding children's understanding of math and science. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2004). Modeling natural variation through distribution. American Educational Research Journal, 41 (3), 635–680.

Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2005). Developing modeling and argument in elementary grades. In T. Romberg, T. Carpenter, & F. Dremock (Eds.), Understanding mathematics and science matters (pp. 29–53). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2006). Cultivating model-based reasoning in science education. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), Handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 371–387). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2012). Seeding evolutionary thinking by engaging children in modeling its foundations. Science Education, 96 (94), 701–724.

Lehrer, R. , Schauble, L. , Strom, D. , & Pligge, M. (2001). Similarity of form and substance: Modeling material kind. In D. Klahr and S. Carver (Eds.), Cognition and instruction: 25 years of progress (pp. 39–74). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lindfors, J. W. (1999). Children's inquiry: Using language to make sense of the world. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Liu, X., & Lesniak, K. (2006). Progression in children's understanding of the matter concept from elementary to high school. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43 (3), 320–347.

Loucas, T. L., Zacharia, Z. C., & Constantinou, C. P. (2011). In quest of productive modeling-based learning discourse in elementary school science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (8), 919–951.

Lumpe, A., Czerniak, C., Haney, J., & Beltyukova, S. (2012). Beliefs about teaching science: The relationship between elementary teachers' participation in professional development and student achievement. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (2), 153–166. McNeill, K. L. (2011). Elementary students' views of explanation, argumentation, and evidence, and their abilities to construct arguments over the school year. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (7), 793–823.

McNeill, K. L., & Krajcik, J. (2007). Middle school students' use of appropriate and inappropriate evidence in writing scientific explanations. In M. Lovett & P. Shah (Eds.), Thinking with data (pp. 233–265). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

McNeill, K. L., & Krajcik, J. (2008). Scientific explanations: Characterizing and evaluating the effects of teachers' instructional practices on student learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (1), 53–78.

McNeill, K. L., Lizotte, D. J., Krajcik, J., & Marx, R. W. (2006). Supporting students' construction of scientific explanations by fading scaffolds in instructional materials. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 15 (2), 153–191.

Mercer, N., Dawes, L., Wegerif, R., & Sams, C. (2004). Reasoning as a scientist: Ways of helping children to use language to learn science. British Education Research Journal, 30, 359–377.

Mercer, N., Wegerif, R., & Dawes, L. (1999). Children's talk and the development of reasoning in the classroom. British Educational Research Journal, 25 (1), 95–111.

Metz, K. E. (2002a). Children doing science: Investigation of animal behavior. Unpublished science curriculum module for grades 1–3. University of California, Berkeley.

Metz, K. E. (2002b). Children doing science: Investigation of plants. Unpublished science curriculum module for grades 1–3. University of California, Berkeley.

Metz, K. E. (2004). Children's understanding of scientific inquiry: Their conceptualization of uncertainty in investigations of their own design. Cognition and Instruction, 22 (2), 219–290.

Metz, K. E. (2011). Disentangling robust developmental constraints from the instructionally mutable: Young children's reasoning about a study of their own design. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 20, 50–110.

Michaels, S., & O'Connor, C. (2012). Talk science primer. Cambridge, MA: TERC.

Michaels, S., O'Connor, C., Hall, M., with Resnick, L. B. (2002). Accountable Talk: Classroom conversation that works. (CD-ROM set). Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh.

Michaels, S., O'Connor, C., & Resnick, L. (2008). Reasoned participation: Accountable Talk® in the classroom and in civic life. Studies in Philosophy and Education, 27 (4), 283–297.

Michaels, S., Shouse, A. W., & Schweingruber, H. A. (2008). Ready, set, science! Putting research to work in K–8 science classrooms. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Michaels, S., Sohmer, R. E., & O'Connor, M. C. (2004). Classroom discourse. In H. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. Mattheier, & P. Trudgill (Eds.), Sociolinguistics: An international handbook of the science of language and society (2nd ed., pp. 2351–2366). New York, NY: Walter de Gruyter.

Ministry of Education . (1999). Curriculum outline for "nature science and living technology". Taipei, Taiwan: Ministry of Education. (In Taiwanese).

Mohan, L., Chen, J., & Anderson, C. W. (2009). Developing a multi-year learning progression for carbon cycling in socio-ecological systems. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (6), 675–689.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching. Theory Into Practice, 31, 132–141.

Moore, F. M. (2008). Agency, identity and social justice education: Preservice teachers' thoughts on becoming agents of change in urban elementary science classrooms. Research in Science Education, 38 (5), 589–610.

Morrison, K. A., Robbins, H. H., & Rose, D. G. (2008). Operationalizing culturally relevant pedagogy: A synthesis of classroom-based research. Equity and Excellence in Education, 41 (4), 433–452.

National Center for Educational Research and Development . (1997). Public educational curricula and goals. Beirut, Lebanon: Author. (In Lebanese.)

National Curriculum Board . (2009). Shape of the Australian Curriculum: Science. Retrieved from

www.acara.edu.au/verve/_resources/Australian_Curriculum_-_Science.pdf

National Research Council . (2012). A framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Science Teachers Association . (2000). NSTA position statement: The nature of science. Retrieved from

http://www.nsta.org/about/positions/natureofscience.aspx

Neumann, K., Viering, T., Boone, W. J., & Fischer, H. J. E. (2013). Towards a learning progression of energy. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50 (2), 162–188.

Newton, P. , Driver, R. , & Osborne, J. (1999). The place of argumentation in the pedagogy of school science. International Journal of Science Education, 21 (5), 553–576.

Next Generation Science Standards. (2013). www.nextgenscience.org/

Osborne, J., & Dillon, J. (2008). Science education in Europe: Critical reflections. A report to the Nuffield Foundation. London, England: Kings College.

Palincsar, A. S., & Magnusson, S. J. (2001). The interplay of first-hand and second-hand (text-based) investigations to model and support the development of scientific knowledge and reasoning. In S. M. Carver & D. Klahr (Eds.), Cognition and instruction: Twenty-five years of progress (pp. 151–187). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pappas, C. C. , Keifer, B. Z. , & Levstik, L. S. (2006). An integrated language perspective in the elementary school: An action approach. Boston, MA: Pearson Education. Pine, J., Aschbacher, P., Roth, E., Jones, M., McPhee, C., Martin, C., Phelps, S., Kyle, T., & Foley, B. (2006). Fifth graders' science inquiry abilities: A comparative study of students in hands-on and textbook curricula. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43 (5), 467–484.

Plummer, J. D. (2009). Early elementary students' development of astronomy concepts in the planetarium. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (2), 192–209.

Plummer, J. D., & Krajcik, J. (2010). Building a learning progression for celestial motion: Elementary levels from an earth-based perspective. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (7), 768–787.

Pottenger, F., & Young, D. (1992). FAST 1: The local environment. Manoa, HI: Curriculum Research and Development Group, University of Hawaii.

Radinsky, J., Oliva, S., & Alamar, K. (2010). Camila, the earth, and the sun: Constructing an idea as shared intellectual property. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (6), 619–642.

Raghavan, K., Sartoris, M., & Glaser, R. (1998). Why does it go up? The impact of the MARS curriculum as revealed through changes in student explanations of a helium balloon. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35 (5), 547–567.

Reinsvold, L. A., & Cochran, K. R. (2012). Power dynamics and questioning in elementary science classrooms. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23, 745–768.

Reveles, J. M., Cordova, R., & Kelly, G. J. (2004). Science literacy and academic identity formulation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (10), 1111–1144.

Romance, N., & Vitale, M. (1992). A curriculum strategy that expands time for in-depth elementary science instruction by using sciencebased reading strategies: Effects of a year-long study in Grade four . Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29 (6), 545–554.

Romance, N., & Vitale, M. (2001). Implementing an in-depth expanded science model in elementary schools: Multi-year findings, research issues, and policy implications. International Journal of Science Education, 23, 272–304.

Romance, N., & Vitale, M. (2011, March). An interdisciplinary model for accelerating student achievement in science and reading comprehension across grades 3–8: Implications for research and practice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Research in Educational Effectiveness, Washington, DC.

Romance, N. R., & Vitale, M. R. (2012). Expanding the role of K–5 science instruction in educational reform: Implications of an interdisciplinary model for integrating science and reading. School Science and Mathematics, 112 (8), 506–515.

Rosebery, A. S., Ogonowski, M., DiSchino, M., & Warren, B. (2010). "The coat traps all your body heat": Heterogeneity as fundamental to learning. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 19 (3), 322–357.

Roth, K. (1984). Using classroom observations to improve science teaching and curriculum materials. In C. W. Anderson (Ed.), Observing science classrooms: Perspective from research and practice (pp. 77–102). Columbus, OH: ERIC.

Roth, K. J. (2002). Talking to understand science. In J. Brophy (Ed.), Social constructivist teaching: Affordances and constraints. Advances in research on teaching (vol. 9, pp. 197–262). New York, NY: JAI Press.

Roth, K. J., Druker, S. D., Garnier, H. E., Lemmens, M., Chen, C., Kawanaka, T., Rasmussen, D., Trubacova, S., Warvi, D., Okamoto, Y., Gonzales, P., Stigler, J., & Gallimore, R. (2006). Teaching science in five countries: Results from the TIMSS 1999 video study (NCES 2006–011). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/timss

Roth, K. J., & Garnier, H. (2007). How five countries teach science. Educational Leadership, 64 (4), 16–23.

Roth, K. J., Garnier, H., Chen, C., Lemmens, M., Schwille, K., & Wickler, N. I. Z. (2011). Videobased lesson analysis: Effective science PD for teacher and student learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (2), 117–148.

Roth, K. J., Peasley, K., & Hazelwood, C. (1992). Integration from the student perspective: Constructing meaning in science. Elementary subjects series No. 63. East Lansing, MI: Center for Learning and Teaching for Elementary Subjects.

Roth, K. J., Taylor, J., Wilson, C., & Landes, N. M. (2013, April). Scale-up study of a videocase-based lesson analysis PD program: Teacher and student science content learning. Proceedings CD of the annual conference of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Rio Grande, Puerto Rico.

Ruiz-Primo, M. A., & Furtak, E. M. (2007). Exploring teachers' informal formative assessment practices and students' understanding in the context of scientific inquiry. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (1), 57–84.

Santau, A. O., Secada, W., Maerten-Rivera, J., Cone, N., & Lee, O. (2010). US urban elementary teachers' knowledge and practices in teaching science to English language learners: Results from the first year of a professional development intervention. International Journal of Science Education, 32 (15), 2007–2032.

Schroeder, C. M., Scott, T. P., Tolson, H., Huang, T.-Y., & Lee, Y.-H. (2007). A meta-analysis of national research: Effects of teaching strategies on student achievement in science in the United States . Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (10), 1436–1460. Schwarz, C. (2009). Developing preservice elementary teachers' knowledge and practices through modeling centered scientific inquiry. Science Education, 93 (4), 720–744.

Schwarz, C. V., Reiser, B. J., Acher, A., Kenyon, L., & Fortus, D. (2012). MoDeLS: Challenges in defining a learning progression for scientific modeling. In A. Alonzo & A. W. Gotwals (Eds.), Learning progressions in science: Current challenges and future directions (pp. 101–138). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Schwarz, C. V., Reiser, B. J., Davis, E. A., Kenyon, L., Acher, A., Fortus, D., Shwartz, Y. H., Hug, B., & Krajcik, J. (2009). Developing a learning progression for scientific modeling: Making scientific modeling accessible and meaningful for learners. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (2), 141–165.

Shepardsom, D. P., & Britsch, S. J. (2006). Zones of interaction: Differential access to elementary science discourse. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43 (5), 443–466.

Shymansky, J. A., Yore, L. D., & Anderson, J. O. (2004). Impact of a school district's science reform effort on the achievement and attitudes of third- and fourth-grade students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (8), 771–790.

Simosi, M. (2003). Using Toulmin's *Framework* for the analysis of everyday argumentation: Some methodological considerations. Argumentation, 17, 185–202.

Sismondo, S. (2004). An introduction to science and technology studies. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Sleep, L., Boerst, T., & Ball, D. (2007). Learning to do the work of teaching in a practice-based methods course. Atlanta, GA: NCTM Research Pre-Session.

Smith, C., Maclin, D., Houghton, C., & Hennessey, M. G. (2000). Sixth-grade students' epistemologies of science: The impact of school science experiences on epistemological development. Cognition and Instruction, 18 (3), 349–422.

Smith, C. L., Wiser, M., Anderson, C. W., & Krajcik, J. (2006). Implications of research on children's learning for standards and assessment: A proposed learning progression for matter and the atomic molecular theory. Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives, 14 (1&2), 1–98.

Smith, C. L., Wiser, M., & Carraher, D. W. (2010). Using a comparative, longitudinal study with upper elementary school students to test some assumptions of a learning progression for matter. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Philadelphia, PA.

Smith, D., & Neale, D. C. (1989). The construction of subject matter knowledge in primary science teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 5, 1–20.

Smith, D., & Neale, D. C. (1991). The construction of subject matter knowledge in primary science teaching. Advances in Research on Teaching, 2, 187–243.

Smith, D. C. (1999). Changing our teaching: The role of pedagogical content knowledge in elementary science. In N. Lederman & J. Guess-Newsome (Eds.), Examining pedagogical content knowledge (pp. 163–198). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Smith, L. K., & Southerland, S. A. (2007). Reforming practice or modifying reforms? Elementary teachers' response to the tools of reform. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (3), 396–423.

Songer, N. B., & Gotwals, A. W. (2012). Guiding explanation construction by children at the entry points of learning progressions. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (2), 141–165.

Songer, N. B., Kelcey, B., & Gotwals, A. W. (2009). How and when does complex reasoning occur? Empirically driven development of a learning progression focused on complex reasoning about biodiversity. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (6), 610–631.

Songer, N. B. , Shah, A. M. , & Fick, S. (2013). Characterizing teachers' verbal scaffolds to guide elementary students' creation of scientific explanations. School Science and Mathematics, 113 (7), 321–332.

Stern, L., & Roseman, J. E. (2004). Can middle-school science textbooks help students learn important ideas? Findings from Project 2061's curriculum evaluation study: Life science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (6), 538–568.

Stevens, S. Y., Delgado, C., & Krajcik, J. S. (2009). Developing a hypothetical multi-dimensional learning progression for the nature of matter. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (6), 687–715.

Stoddart, T., Connell, M., Stofflett, R., & Peck, D. (1993). Reconstructing elementary teacher candidates' understanding of mathematics and science content. Teaching and Teacher Education, 9, 229–241.

Stoddart, T., Pinal, A., Latzke, M., & Canaday, D. (2002). Integrating inquiry science and language development for English language learners. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (8), 664–687.

Tan, E., & Barton, A. C. (2008a). From peripheral to central, the story of Melanie's metamorphosis in an urban middle school science class . Science Education, 92 (4), 567–590.

Tan, E., & Barton, A. C. (2008b). Unpacking science for all through the lens of identities-in-practice: The stories of Amelia and Ginny. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3, 43–71.

Tao, Y., Oliver, M., & Venville, G. (2013). A comparison of approaches to the teaching and learning of science in Chinese and Australian elementary classrooms: Cultural and socioeconomic complexities. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50 (1), 33–61.

Thompson, J. , Windschitl, M. , & Braaten, M. (2013). Developing a theory of ambitious early-career teacher practice. American

Educational Research Journal, 50 (3), 574–615.

Toulmin, S. (1958). The uses of argument. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Tsurusaki, B. K., Barton, A. C., Tan, E., Koch, P., & Contento, I. (2013). Using transformative boundary objects to create critical engagement in science: A case study. Science Education, 97 (1), 1–31.

Upadhyay, B. R. (2006). Using students' lived experiences in an urban science classroom: An elementary school teacher's thinking. Science Education, 90, 94–110.

U.S. Department of Education . (2011). Science 2009: National assessment of educational progress at grades 4, 8, and 12. Washington, DC: Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics.

van Es, E. A., & Sherin, M. G. (2002). Learning to notice: Scaffolding new teachers' interpretations of classroom interactions. Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 10 (4), 571–596.

Varelas, M., Kane, J. M., & Wylie, C. D. (2012). Young black children and science: Chronotopes of narratives around their science journals. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (5), 568–596.

Varelas, M., & Pappas, C. C. (2006). Intertextuality in read-alouds of integrated science-literacy units in primary classrooms: Opportunities for the development of thought and language. Cognition and Instruction, 24, 211–259.

Varelas, M., Pappas, C. C., Kane, J. M., Arsenault, A., Hankes, J., & Cowan, B. M. (2008). Urban primary-grade children think and talk science: Curricular and instructional practices that nurture participation and argumentation. Science Education, 92 (1), 65–95.

Varelas, M., Pappas, C. C., & Rife, A. (2006). Exploring the role of intertextuality in concept construction: Urban second-graders make sense of evaporation, boiling, and condensation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43, 637–666.

Varelas, M., Pappas, C. C., Tucker-Raymond, E., Kane, J., Hankes, J., Ortiz, I., Keblawe-Shamah, N. (2010). Drama activities as ideational resources for primary-grade children in urban science classrooms. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (3), 302–325. Warren, B., Ballenger, C., Ogonowski, M., Rosebery, A. S., & Hudicourt-Barnes, J. (2001). Rethinking diversity in learning science: The logic of everyday sense-making. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (5), 529–552.

Weiss, I. R. , Pasley, J. D. , Smith, P. S. , Banilower, E. R. , & Heck, D. J. (2003). Looking inside the classroom: A study of K–12 mathematics and science education in the United States. Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research, Inc.

White, B. (1993). Thinkertools: Causal models, conceptual change, and science instruction. Cognition and Instruction, 10, 1–100. Windschitl, M., & Calabrese Barton, A. (in press). Rigor and equity by design: Locating a set of core practices for the science education community. Handbook of research on teaching. American Educational Research Association.

Windschitl, M., Thompson, J., & Braaten, M. (2008). Beyond the scientific method: Model-based inquiry as a new paradigm of preference for school science investigations. Science Education, 92(5), 941–967.

Windschitl, M., Thompson, J., & Braaten, M. (2011). Ambitious pedagogy by novice teachers? Who benefits from tool-supported collaborative inquiry into practice and why. Teachers College Record, 113 (7), 1311–1318.

Windschitl, M., Thompson, J., Braaten, M., & Stroupe, D. (2012). Proposing a core set of instructional practices and tools for teachers of science. Science Education, 96, 878–903.

Wiser, M., Smith, C., & Doubler, S. (2012). Learning progressions as tool for curriculum development: Lessons from the Inquiry Project. In A. Alonzo & A. Gotwals (Eds.), Learning progressions in science: Current challenges and future directions (pp. 359–404). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Yacoubian, H. A., & BouJaoude, S. (2010). The effect of reflective discussions following inquiry-based laboratory activities on students' views of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (10), 1229–1252.

Yore, L., Bisanz, G. L., & Hand, B. (2003). Examining the literacy component of science literacy: 25 years of language arts and science research. International Journal of Science Education, 25 (6), 689–725.

Zembal-Saul, C. (2009). Learning to teach elementary school science as argument. Science Education, 93 (4), 687–719.

Interdisciplinary Science Teaching

Achieve . (2013). College and career readiness. Retrieved from www.achieve.org/college-and-career-readiness AIMS Educational Foundation . (1986). Activities integrating math and science. Fresno, CA: Author.

AIMS Educational Foundation . (1987). Math + science: A solution. Fresno, CA: Author.

Akerson, V. L. (2001). Teaching science when your principal says, "Teach language arts". Science and Children, 38 (7), 42–47.

Applebee, A. N. , Adler, M. , & Flihan, S. (2007). Interdisciplinary curricula in middle and high school classrooms: Case studies of approaches to curriculum and instruction. American Educational Research Journal, 44 (4), 1002–1039.

Arredondo, D. E., & Rucinski, T. T. (1996). Integrated curriculum: Its use, initiation and support in Midwestern schools. Mid-Western Educational Researcher, 9 (2), 37–44.

Barab, S. A., & Landa, A. (1997). Designing effective interdisciplinary anchors. Educational Leadership, 54 (6), 52–58.

Basham, J. D., Koehler, C. M., & Israel, M. (2011). Creating a "STEM for All" environment. In C. C. Johnson (Ed.), Secondary STEM educational reform (pp. 1–24). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

Basista, B., & Mathews, S. (2002). Integrated science and mathematics professional development programs. School Science and Mathematics, 102 (7), 360–370.

Basista, B. , Tomlin, J. , Pennington, K. , & Pugh, D. (2001). Inquiry-based integrated science and mathematics professional development program. Education, 121 (3), 615–624.

Beane, J. (1995). Curriculum integration and the disciplines of knowledge. Phi Delta Kappan, 76, 616–622.

Beane, J. (1996). On the shoulders of giants! The case for curriculum integration. Middle School Journal, 28, 6–11.

Beane, J. A. (1993). A middle school curriculum: From rhetoric to reality. Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

Beane, J. A. (1997). Curriculum integration: Designing the core of democratic education. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Berger, C. F. (1994). Breaking what barriers between science and mathematics? Six myths from a technological perspective. In D. F. Berlin (Ed.), NSF/SSMA Wingspread conference: A network for integrated science and mathematics teaching and learning (pp. 23–27). Bowling Green, OH: School Science and Mathematics Association.

Berlin, D. (1994). The integration of science and mathematics education: Highlights from the NSF/SSMA Wingspread conference plenary papers. School Science and Mathematics, 94 (1), 32–35.

Berlin, D., & White, A. (1992). Report from the NSF/SSMA Wing-spread conference: A network for integrated science and mathematics teaching and learning. School Science and Mathematics, 92 (6), 340–342.

Berlin, D. , & White, A. (1994). The Berlin-White integrated science and mathematics model (BWISM). School Science and Mathematics, 94 (1), 2–4.

Berlin, D., & White, A. (2012). A longitudinal look at attitudes and perceptions related to the integration of mathematics, science, and technology education. School Science and Mathematics, 112 (1), 20–30.

Berlin, D. F., & Hillen, J. A. (1994). Making connections in math and science: Identifying student outcomes. School Science and Mathematics, 94 (6), 283–290.

Bragow, D., Gragow, K. A., & Smith, E. (1995). Back to the future: Toward curriculum integration. Middle School Journal, 27, 39–46. Brazee, E. N., & Capelluti, J. (1995). Dissolving boundaries: Toward an integrative curriculum. Columbus, OH: National Middle School Association.

Brears, L., Tutor, S., & MacIntyre, B. (2011). Preparing teachers for the 21st century using PBL as an integrating strategy in science and technology education. Design and Technology Education, 16 (1), 36–46.

Breiner, J., Harkness, M., Johnson, C. C., & Koehler, C. (2012). What Is STEM? A discussion about conceptions of STEM in education and partnerships. School Science and Mathematics, 112, 3–11.

Briscoe, C., & Stout, D. (1996). Integrating math and science through problem centered learning in methods courses: Effects on prospective teachers' understanding of problem solving. Journal of Elementary Science Education, 8 (2), 66–87.

Brooks, J. G., & Brooks, M. G. (1993). In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

BSCS . (1994). Innovations in science education survey instrument. Colorado, Springs, CO: Author.

Canady, R. (1995). Block scheduling: A catalyst for change in high schools. Princeton, NJ: Eye on Education.

Canady, R., & Rettig, M. (1996). Teaching in the block: Strategies for engaging active learners. Princeton, NJ: Eye on Education.

Capraro, R. M., & Slough, S. W. (2008). Project-based learning: An integrated science, technology, engineering, and technology (STEM) approach. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.

Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, Task Force on Education of Young Adolescents . (1989). Turning points: Preparing American youth for the 21st century: The report of the task force on education of young adolescents. Washington, DC: Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development.

Carnegie Foundation . (2009). The opportunity equation: Transforming mathematics and science education for citizenship and the global economy. New York, NY: Institute for Advanced Study.

Christensen, C. M., Horn, M. B., & Johnson, C. W. (2011). Disrupting class: How disruptive innovation will change the way the world learns (Vol. 98). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Cleland, J. V., Wetzel, K. A., Zambo, R., Buss, R. R., & Rillero, P. (1999). Science integrated with mathematics using language arts and technology: A model for collaborative professional development. Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching, 18 (2), 157–172.

Cohen, P. (1995). Understanding the brain: Educators seek to apply brain research. ASCD Education Update, 37 (7), 1, 4–5. Committee on Prospering in the Global Economy of the 21st Century . (2007). Rising above the gathering storm. Retrieved from www.nap.edu/catalog/11463.html

Common Core State Standards Initiative . (2012). Standards for mathematical practice. Retrieved from www.corestandards.org/Math Copple, C. , & Bradekamp, S. 2009. Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Crane, S. (1991). Integrated science in a restructured high school. Educational Leadership, 49 (2), 39-41.

Cremin, L. (1964). The transformation of the school. New York, NY: Vintage Press.

Czerniak, C. M. , Lumpe, A. T. , & Haney, J. J. (1999). Teachers' beliefs about thematic units in science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 10 (2), 123–145.

Czerniak, C. M. , Weber, W. , Sandmann, A. , & Ahern, J. (1999). A literature review of science and mathematics integration. School Science and Mathematics, 99 (8), 421–430.

Davison, D. M., Miller, K. W., & Metheny, D. L. (1995). What does integration of science and mathematics really mean? School Science and Mathematics, 95 (5), 226–230.

Deeds, D. G., Allen, C. S., Callen, B. W., & Wood, M. W. (2000). A new paradigm in integrated math and science courses: Finding common ground across disciplines. Journal of College Science Teaching, 30 (3), 178–183.

Dickinson, V. L., & Young, T. A. (1998). Elementary science and language arts: Should we blur the boundaries? School Science and Mathematics, 98 (6), 334–339.

Drake, S. M. (1998). Creating integrated curriculum: Proven ways to increase student learning. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Drake, S. M., & Burns, R. C. (2004). Meeting standards through integrated curriculum. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Erb, T. O. (2001). This we believe ... And now we must act. Westerville, OH: National Middle School Association.

Fogarty, R. (1991). Ten ways to integrate curriculum. Educational Leadership, 49 (2), 61-65.

Francis, R., & Underhill, R. G. (1996). A procedure for integrating math and science units. School Science and Mathematics, 96 (3), 114–119.

Francis, R. W. (1996). Connecting the curriculum through the national mathematics and science standards. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 7 (1), 75–81.

Friend, H. (1985). The effect of science and mathematics integration on selected seventh grade students' attitudes toward and achievement in science. School Science and Mathematics, 85 (6), 453–461.

Frykholm, J. , & Glasson, G. (2005). Connecting science and mathematics instruction: Pedagogical content knowledge for teachers. School Science and Mathematics, 105 (3), 127–141.

Gardner, H., & Boix-Mansilla, V. (1994). Teaching for understanding within and across the disciplines. Educational Leadership, 51, 14–18. Geier, R., Blumenfeld, P. C., Marx, R. W., Krajcik, J. S., Fishman, B., Soloway, E., & Clay-Chambers, J. (2008). Standardized test outcomes for students engaged in inquiry-based science curricula in the context of urban reform. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (8), 922–939.

George, P. S. (1996). The integrated curriculum: A reality check. Middle School Journal, 28, 12–19.

Goldberg, H., & Wagreich, P. (1989). Focus on integrating science and math. Science and Children, 26 (5), 22–24.

Greene, L. C. (1991). Science-centered curriculum in elementary school. Educational Leadership, 49, 42–51.

Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., & VonSecker, C. (2000). Effects of integrated instruction on motivation and strategy use in reading. Journal of Educational Psychology, 92 (2), 331–341.

Haigh, W. , & Rehfeld, D. (1995). Integration of secondary mathematics and science methods courses: A model. School Science and Mathematics, 95 (5), 240–247.

Hargreaves, A., Earl, L., Moore, S., & Manning, S. (2001). Learning to change: Teaching beyond subjects and standards. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Harrison, M. (2011). Supporting the T and the E in STEM: 2004–2010. Design and Technology Education, 16 (1), 17–25.

Hart, L. C. (2002). Preservice teachers' beliefs and practice after participating in an integrated content/methods course. School Science and Mathematics, 102, 4–14.

Heitin, L. (2013). In Common Core, teachers see interdisciplinary opportunities. Retrieved from:

www.edweek.org/tm/articles/2013/03/13/ccio_interdisciplinary_units.html

Huntley, M. A. (1998). Design and implementation of a framework for defining integrated mathematics and science education. School Science and Mathematics, 98 (6), 320–327.

Hurley, M. M. (1999). Interdisciplinary mathematics and science: Characteristics, forms, and related effect sizes for student achievement and affective outcomes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University at Albany, State University of New York.

Hurley, M. M. (2001). Reviewing integrated science and mathematics: The search for evidence and definitions from new perspectives. School Science and Mathematics, 101 (5), 259–268.

Hurley, M. M. (2003). The presence, value, and reasoning behind integrated science and mathematics methods courses. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Philadelphia, PA.

Institute for Mathematics and Science Education . (1995). Teaching integrated mathematics and science (TIMS). Chicago, IL: Author. Jacobs, H. H. (1989). Interdisciplinary curriculum: Design and implementation. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Jimoyiannis, A. (2010). Designing and implementing an integrated technological pedagogical science knowledge framework for science teachers' professional development. Computers & Education, 55 (3), 1259–1269. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2010.05.022

Johnson, C. (2003). Bioterrorism is real-world science: Inquiry-based simulation mirrors real life. Science Scope, 27 (3), 19–23.

Johnson, C.C. (2013a). Conceptualizing integrated STEM education – Editorial. School Science and Mathematics Journal, 113(8). Johnson, C. C. , & Fargo, J. D. (in press). A study of the impact of transformative professional development (TPD) on Hispanic student performance on state-mandated assessments of science. Science Education.

Johnson, C. C. , & Saylor, L. (2013). Bring your own laptop (BYOL): The journey of a large middle school into the 21st century. Journal for Computing Teachers, 9 (1), 1–7.

Keys, P. (2003). Teachers bending the science curriculum. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Philadelphia, PA.

Koirala, H. P., & Bowman, J. K. (2003). Preparing middle level preservice teachers to integrate mathematics and science: Problems and possibilities. School Science and Mathematics, 103 (3), 145–154.

Kotar, M. , Guenter, C. E. , Metzger, D. , & Overholt, J. L. (1998). Curriculum integration: A teacher education model. Science and Children, 35 (5), 40–43.

Krajcik, J., & Czerniak, C. M. (2014). Teaching science to children: A project-based science approach. New York, NY: Routledge. Labov, J. B., Reid, A. H., & Yamamoto, K. R. (2010). Integrated biology and undergraduate science education: A new biology education for the twenty-first century? CBE Life Science Education, 9, 10–16.

Lawrence Hall of Science . (1984). Great explorations in math and science (GEMS). Berkeley, CA: Author.

Lebeaume, J. (2011). Integration of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics: Is this curricular revolution really possible in France? Design and Technology Education, 16 (1), 47–52.

Lederman, N. G., & Niess, M. L. (1997). Integrated, interdisciplinary, or thematic instruction? Is this a question or is it questionable semantics? School Science and Mathematics, 97 (2), 57–58.

Lee, M. M., Chauvot, J., Plankis, B., Vowell, J., & Culpepper, S. (2011). Integrating to learn and learning to integrate: A case study of an online master's program on science-mathematics integration for middle school teachers. Internet and Higher Education, 14, 191–200. Lehman, J. R. (1994). Integrating science and mathematics: Perceptions of preservice and practicing elementary teachers. School Science and Mathematics, 94 (2), 58–64.

Lehman, J. R., & McDonald, J. L. (1988). Teachers' perceptions of the integration of mathematics and science. School Science and Mathematics, 88 (8), 642–649.

Lonning, R. A., & DeFranco, T. C. (1994). Development and implementation of an integrated mathematics/science preservice elementary methods course. School Science and Mathematics, 94 (1), 18–25.

Lonning, R. A., & DeFranco, T. C. (1997). Integration of science and mathematics: A theoretical model. School Science and Mathematics, 97 (4), 212–215.

Lonning, R. A., DeFranco, T. C., & Weinland, T. P. (1998). Development of theme-based, interdisciplinary, integrated curriculum: A theoretical model. School Science and Mathematics, 98 (6), 312–319.

Marbach-Ad, G., & McGinnis, J. R. (2008). To what extent do reform prepared upper elementary and middle school science teachers maintain their beliefs and intended instructional actions as they are inducted into schools? Journal of Science Teacher Education, 19, 157–182.

Marx, R. W., Blumenfeld, P. C., Krajcik, J. S., Fishman, B., Soloway, E., Geier, R., & Tal, R. T. (2004). Inquiry-based science in the middle grades: Assessment of learning in urban systemic reform. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (10), 1063–1080. Mason, T. C. (1996). Integrated curricula: Potential and problems. Journal of Teacher Education, 47 (4), 263–270.

McBride, J. W., & Silverman, F. L. (1991). Integrating elementary/middle school science and mathematics. School Science and Mathematics, 91 (7), 285–292.

McComas, W. F. (1993). STS education and the affective domain. In R. E. Yager (Ed.), What research says to the science teacher, 7: The science, technology, and society movement (pp. 161–168). Washington, DC: National Science Teachers Association.

McComas, W. F., & Wang, H. A. (1998). Blended science: The rewards and challenges of integrating the science disciplines for instruction. School Science and Mathematics, 98 (6), 340–348.

McDonald, J., & Czerniak, C. M. (1998). Scaling sharks. School Science and Mathematics, 98 (7), 397-399.

McGehee, J. J. (2001). Developing interdisciplinary units: A strategy based on problem solving. School Science and Mathematics, 101 (7), 380–389.

Meier, S. L., Nicol, M., & Cobbs, G. (1998). Potential benefits and barriers to integration. School Science and Mathematics, 98 (8), 438–447.

Merrill, C. (2001). Integrating technology, mathematics, and science education: A quasi-experiment. Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 38 (3), 45–61.

Minnesota Mathematics and Science Project . (1970). Minneapolis: Minnesota School Mathematics and Science Center.

Moore, E. H. (1967). On the foundations of mathematics. Mathematics Teacher, 60, 360–374. A reprint of his 1902 retiring presidential address to the American Mathematical Society, originally published in *Science* (1903), 402–424.

Morrison, J., & McDuffie, A. R. (2009). Connecting science and mathematics: Using inquiry investigations to learn about data collection, analysis, and display. School Science and Mathematics, 109 (1), 31–44.

Nargund-Joshi, V., & Liu, X. (2013). Understanding meanings of interdisciplinary science inquiry in an era of Next Generation Science Standards. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Rio Grande, Puerto Rico.

National Association for the Education of Young Children . (1987). Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs serving children from birth through age 8. Washington, DC: Author.

National Council for the Social Studies . (2010). National curriculum and standards for social studies. Washington, DC: Author. National Council of Teachers of English and the International Reading Association . (1996). Standards for the English language arts. Urbana, IL: Author.

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics . (2000). Principles and standards for school mathematics. Reston, VA: Author. National Middle School Association . (2010). This we believe. Columbus, OH: Author.

National Research Council . (1996). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2012). A framework for K-12 science education. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Science Teachers Association . (1992). The content core. Washington, DC: Author.

National Science Teachers Association . (1996). NSTA board endorses new position statement on interdisciplinary learning, PreK–grade 4. NSTA Reports!, 6, 8.

Nesin, G., & Lounsbury, J. (1999). Curriculum integration: Twenty questions—with answers. Atlanta: Georgia National Middle School Association.

Next Generation Science Standards . (2013). Retrieved from www.nextgenscience.org/next-generation-science-standards Nuffield Foundation Science Teaching Project. (1967). London, England: Longmans.

Pang, J. S., & Good, R. (2000). A review of the integration of science and mathematics: Implications for further research. School Science and Mathematics, 100 (2), 73–82.

Partnership for 21st Century Skills. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://p21.org/

Perkins, D. (1991). Educating for insight. Educational Leadership, 49, 4-8.

Peters, T., Schubeck, K., & Hopkins, K. (1995). A thematic approach: Theory and practice at the Aleknagik school. Phi Delta Kappan, 76, 633–636.

Petrie, H. G. (1992). Interdisciplinary education: Are we faced with insurmountable opportunities? Review of Research in Education, 18, 299–333.

Rakow, S. J., & Vasquez, J. (1998). Integrated instruction: A trio of strategies. Science and Children, 35 (6), 18–22.

Rennie, L., Venville, G., & Wallace, J. (2012a). Integrating science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. New York, NY: Routledge.

Rennie, L., Venville, G., & Wallace, J. (2012b). Knowledge that counts in a global community: Exploring the contribution of integrated curriculum. New York, NY: Routledge.

Rivet, A. E., & Krajcik, J. S. (2004). Achieving standards in urban systemic reform: An example of a sixth grade project-based science curriculum. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (7), 669–692.

Roebuck, K. I., & Warden, M. A. (1998). Searching for the center on the mathematics-science continuum. School Science and Mathematics, 98 (6), 328–333.

Romance, N. R., & Vitale, M. R. (2012). Expanding the role of K–5 science instruction in educational reform: Implications of an interdisciplinary model for integrating science and reading. School Science and Mathematics, 112 (8), 506–515.

Ronis, D. L. (2007). Problem-based learning for math and science: Integrating inquiry and the internet. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin. Ross, J. A., & Hogaboam-Gray, A. (1998). Integrated mathematics, science, and technology: Effects on students. International Journal of Science Education, 20 (9), 1119–1135.

Roth, K. J. (1994). Second thoughts about interdisciplinary studies. American Educator, 18 (1), 44-48.

Roth, W. M. (1993). Problem-centered learning for the integration of mathematics and science in a constructivist laboratory: A case study. School Science and Mathematics, 93 (3), 113–122.

Rutherford, J., & Ahlgren. (1990). Science for all Americans. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Sanders, M. (2009). STEM, STEM education, STEM mania. Technology Teacher, 68 (4), 20–26.

Sandmann, A. , Weber, W. , Czerniak, C. , & Ahern, J. (1999). Coming full circuit: An integrated unit plan for intermediate and middle grade students. Science Activities, 36 (3), 13–20.

Schneider, R. M., Krajcik, J., Marx, R. W., & Soloway, E. (2002). Performance of students in project-based science classrooms on a national measure of science achievement. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (5), 410–422.

Shann, M. H. (1977). Evaluation of an interdisciplinary, problem-solving curriculum in elementary science and mathematics. Science Education, 61 (4), 491–502.

Smith, C. (2001). Addressing standards through curriculum integration. Middle School Journal, 33 (2), 5–6.

Sondergeld, T. A., Milner, A. R., Coleman, L. J., & Southern, T. (2011). Lessons from the field: Examining the challenges and successes of a mathematics and science program using acceleration and enrichment for gifted urban middle school students. In C. C. Johnson (Ed.), Secondary STEM educational reform (pp. 193–195). New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.

St. Clair, B., & Hough, D. L. (1992). Interdisciplinary teaching: A review of the literature. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 373 056).

Stevenson, C., & Carr, J. (1993). Integrated studies: Dancing through walls. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. Stinson, K., Harkness, S. S., Meyer, H., & Stallworth, J. (2009). Mathematics and science integration: Models and characterizations. School Science and Mathematics, 109 (3), 153–161.

Stuessy, C. L. (1993). Concept to application: Development of an integrated mathematics/science methods course for preservice elementary teachers. School Science and Mathematics, 93 (2), 55–62.

Stuessy, C. L., & Naizer, G. L. (1996). Reflection and problem solving: Integrating methods of teaching mathematics and science. School Science and Mathematics, 96 (4), 170–177.

Teaching Institute for Excellence in STEM . (2010). What is STEM Education? Retrieved from www.tiesteach.org/stem-education.aspx Underhill, R. (1995). Editorial. School Science and Mathematics, 95 (5), 225.

Unified Science and Mathematics for Elementary Schools Project. (1973). Newton, MA: Educational Development Center.

Vars, G. F. (1991). Integrated curriculum in historical perspective. Educational Leadership, 49, 14-15.

Venville, G., Rennie, L. J., & Wallace, J. (2004). Decision making and sources of knowledge: How students tackle integrated tasks in science, technology and mathematics. Research in Science Education, 34 (2), 115–135. doi:10.1023/B:RISE.0000033762.75329.9b Venville, G., Wallace, J., Rennie, L. J., & Malone, J. (1998). The integration of science, mathematics, and technology in a discipline-based culture. School Science and Mathematics, 98 (6), 294–302.

Venville, G. J., Wallace, J., Rennie, L. J., & Malone, J. A. (2002). Curriculum integration: Eroding the high ground of science as a school subject? Studies in Science Education, 37 (1), 43–83.

Vitale, M. R., & Romance, N. R. (2011). Adaptation of a knowledge-based instructional intervention to accelerate student learning in science and early literacy in grades one and two. Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 5 (2), 79–93.

Waldrip, B. (2001). Primary teachers' views about integrating science and literacy. Investigating: Australian Primary & Junior Science Journal, 17 (1), 38–41.

Watanabe, T., & Huntley, M. A. (1998). Connecting mathematics and science in undergraduate teacher education programs: Faculty voices from the Maryland Collaborative for Teacher Preparation. School Science and Mathematics, 98 (1), 19–25.

Wei, B. (2009). In search of meaningful integration: The experiences of developing integrated science curricula in junior secondary schools in China. International Journal of Science Education, 31 (2), 259–277.

Wieseman, K. C., & Moscovici, H. (2003). Stories from the field: Challenges of science teacher education based on interdisciplinary approaches. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 14 (2), 127–143.

Williams, P. J. (2011). STEM education: Proceed with caution. Design and Technology Education, 16 (1), 26–35.

Willis, S. (1992, November). Interdisciplinary learning: Movement to link the disciplines gains momentum. ASCD Curriculum Update, 1–8. Zwick, T. , & Miller, K. (1996). A comparison of integrated outdoor education activities and traditional science learning with American Indian students. Journal of American Indian Education, 35 (2), 1–9.
High School Biology Curricula Development

Agrest, B. (2003). How do biology teachers choose to teach certain topics in a high school biology curriculum without compulsory parts? Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel.

Aikenhead, G. S. (1980). Science in social issues: Implications for teaching. Ottawa: Science Council of Canada.

Alexander, G. (1953). General biology (6th ed.). New York: Barnes & Noble.

Anderson, S. L. (2003). Teaching today's students how to examine ethical issues and be more actively involved in the learning process. Journal of Academic Publishers, 1(2), 189–198.

Aronson, E., Stephan, C., Sikes, J., Blaney, N., & Snapp, M. (1978). The jigsaw classroom. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Baird, J. H., Lazarowitz, R., & Allman, V. (1984). Science choices and preferences of middle and secondary school students in Utah. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 21(1), 47–54.

Bethel, J. L., & Hard, M. S. (1981). The study of change: Inservice teachers in a National Science Foundation Environmental Science Education Program. Paper presented at the American Research Association Conference, Los Angeles, CA.

Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS) . (1966). Biological science: Patterns and process. New York: Rinehart & Winston.

Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS). (1968). 1. Biological science and inquiry into life (Yellow version). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World; *2. Molecules to man* (Blue version), New York: Houghton-Mifflin; *3. High school biology* (Green version). New York: Rand McNally.

Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS) . (1970). Interaction of experiments and ideas (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. Bloom, B. S. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. London: Longmans.

Bruner, J. S. (1961). The act of discovery. Harvard educational review.

Bryant, J. A. (2002, May 17). Why I believe that all biology degrees study should include a module in bioethics. Times Higher Education Supplement, 14.

Bryant, J. A., & Baggott la Velle, L. M. (2003). A bioethics course for biology and science education students. Journal of Biological Education, 37(2), 91–95.

Bybee, R. W. (1987). Science education and science-technology-society (STS) theme. Science Education, 71(5), 667-683.

Bybee, R. W., Harms, N., Ward, B., & Yager R. (1980). Science society and science education. Science Education, 64(3), 377–395.

Conner, N. L. (2000). Societal issues: Recommendations for teaching in science and technology. Pacific Asian Education, 12(1), 19–30.

DeHart Hurd, P. (1961). Biological education in American secondary schools (1890–1960). Baltimore, MD: Waverly Press.

DeHart Hurd, P. (1978). The golden age of biological education 1960–1975. In W. V. Mayer (Ed.), BSCS, Biology teacher's handbook (3rd ed., pp. 28–96). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

DeHart Hurd, P., Robinson, J. T., Connell, M. C., & Ross, N. R. (1981). The status of middle and junior high school science: Vol. 2. Technical report. Louisville, CO: Biological Sciences Curriculum Study.

Dewey, J. (1938). The theory of inquiry. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Wiston.

DiGisi, L. L., & Willett, J. B. (1995). What high school biology teachers say about their textbooks use: A descriptive study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 32(2), 123–142.

Dreyfus, A. (1995). Biological knowledge as a prerequisite for the development of values and attitudes. Journal of Biological Education, 29(3), 215–219.

Farmer, W. A., & Farrell, M. A. (1980). Systematic instruction in science for the middle and high school years. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Finely, F., Steward, J., & Yaroch, L. (1982). Teachers' perception of important and difficult science content. Science Education, 66(4), 531–538.

Fisher, M. K., Wandersee, H. J., & Moody, E. D. (2000). Mapping biology knowledge. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic. Friedler, Y., Amir, R., & Tamir, P. (1987). High school students' difficulties in understanding osmosis. International Journal of Science Education, 9(5), 541–551.

Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A development conception. American Educational Research Journal, 6(2), 207–226. Gagne, R. M. (1963). The learning requirements for inquiry. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 1, 144–153.

Gallagher, J. J. (1967). Teacher variation in concept presentation in BSCS curriculum program. BSCS Newsletter, January 8–19, pp. 1–39. German, P. J., Haskins, S., & Auls, S. (1996). Analysis of nine high school biology laboratory manuals: Promoting scientific inquiry. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 33(5), 475–499.

Gottlieb, S. F. (1976). Teaching ethical issues in biology. The American Biology Teacher, March, 148–149.

Harari, M. (1989). Report #1, internationalization of higher education: Effecting institutional change in the curriculum and campus ethos. Center for International Education, California State University, Long Beach, CA.

Harder, R., Schumacher, W., Firbas, F., & von Denffer, D. (1965). Strasburger's textbook of botany. London: Longmans.

Harms, N. C. , & Yager, R. E. (1981). What research says to the science teacher (Vol. 3). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Huppert, J., Simchoni, D., & Lazarowitz, R. (1992). Human health and science. A model for an STS high school biology course. The American Biology Teacher, 54(7), 395–400.

Johnstone, A. H., & Mahmoud, N. A. (1980). Isolating topics of high perceived difficulty in school biology. Journal of Biological Education, 14(2), 163–166.

Khalil, M. (2002a). Microorganisms, a STS learning unit. Haifa, Israel: Israel Science Teaching Center and the R&D Institute, IIT, Technion. Khalil, M. (2002b). a. Microorganisms, a STS learning unit. b. Teachers' handbook. Haifa, Israel: Israel Science Teaching Center and the R&D Institute, IIT, Technion.

Khalil, M. (2007). Teaching the microorganisms learning unit: Academic achievements and attitudes toward environment and peace of 9th grade students. Journal of Stellar Peacemaking, 2(2), 1–26.

Khalil, M., & Lazarowitz, R. (2002, April). Developing a learning unit on the science-technology-environment-peace-society mode. Students' cognitive achievements and attitudes toward peace. Annual Meeting of the National Association of Research in Science Teaching (NARST), New Orleans, LA.

Khalil, M., Lazarowitz, R., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (2009). A conceptual model, the six mirrors of the classroom and its application to teaching and learning about microorganisms. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 18, 85–100.

Klinckman, E. (1970). Biology teachers' handbook. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Koran, J. J., Jr. (1971). Concepts and concept-formation in the teaching of biology. The American Biology Teacher, October, 405–408. Koran, J. J., Jr., Koran, M. L., & Baker, S. D. (1980). Differential response to cueing and feedback in the acquisition of an inductively presented biological concept. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 17(2), 167–172.

Koran, J. J., Jr., Koran, M. L., Baker, S. D., & Moody, K. W. (1978, October). Concept formation in science instruction: What does research tell us? The Science Council, Alberta Teachers Association and the National Science Teachers Association, Banff, Alberta, Canada.

Lawson, A. E. (1988). A better way to teach biology. The American Biology Teacher, 50(5), 266–277.

Lawson, A. E., & Thompson, L. D. (1988). Formal reasoning ability and misconceptions concerning genetics and natural selection. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 25(9), 733–746.

Lawson, A. E., & Worsnop, W. A. (1992). Learning about evolution and rejecting a belief in special creation: Effects of reflective reasoning skill, prior knowledge, prior belief and religious commitment. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29(2), 143–166.

Lazarowitz, R. (1995a). Learning science in cooperative modes in junior-and senior-high school: Cognitive and affective outcomes. In E. J. Pedersen & D. A. Digby (Eds.), Cooperative learning and secondary schools: Theory, models and strategies (pp. 185–227). New York: Garland Press.

Lazarowitz, R. (1995b). Learning biology in cooperative investigative groups. In E. J. Pedersen & D. A. Digby (Eds.), Cooperative learning and secondary schools: Theory, models and strategies (pp. 341–363). New York: Garland Press.

Lazarowitz, R. (2000). Research in science, content knowledge structure and secondary school curricula. Israel Journal of Plant Sciences, 48(3), 229–238.

Lazarowitz, R., & Bloch, I. (2005). Awareness to societal issues among high school biology teachers teaching genetics. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 14(5/6), 437–457.

Lazarowitz, R., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (1979). Choices and preferences of science subjects by junior high school students in Israel. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 16(4), 317–323.

Lazarowitz, R., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (1998). Cooperative learning in the science curriculum. In B. J. Fraser & K. G. Tobin (Eds.), International handbook of science education (pp. 449–471). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Lazarowitz, R., & Penso, S. (1992). High school students' difficulties in learning biology concepts. Journal of Biological Education, 26(3), 215–223.

Lazarowitz, R., & Tamir, P. (1994). Research on using laboratory instruction in science. In D. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research in science teaching and learning (Vol. 3, pp. 94–128). New York: Macmillan.

Madaus, G. F., & Stufflebeam, D. L. (Eds.). (1989). Tyler's rationale for curriculum development. Boston: Kluwer Academic. Mechner, F. (1965). Science education and behavioral technology. In R. Glaser (Ed.), Teaching machines and programmed learning, 11: Data and directions (pp. 441–507). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Muller-Hill, B. (1998). Murderous science, elimination by scientific selection of Jews, Gypsies and others in Germany, 1933–1945. Plainview, NY: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press.

Nachshon, M. (2000). Ionizing radiation. The biological effects and uses. Haifa, Israel: Israel Science Teaching Center and the R&D Institute, IIT, Technion.

Nachshon, M., & Lazarowitz, R. (2002, April). Ionizing radiation, uses and effects. A thematic module for 11th grade students: Academic achievements and creativity. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Research in Science Teaching (NARST), New Orleans, LA.

Novak, J. D. (1965). A model for the interpretation and analysis of concept formation. Journal of Research in Science Education, 3, 72–83. Nuffield Advanced Science . (1970). Biological science: 1. Teachers' guide to the laboratory guides Volume I. a). Maintenance of the organism; b) Organisms and populations; and Volume II. a) The developing organism; b) Control and co-ordination in organisms. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books.

Nuffield Foundation . (1966). Synopsis of the Nuffield Biology Course. London: Longmans/Penguin Books, Biological Science. Otto, J. H. , & Moon, T. J. (1965). Modern biology. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Ron, S., & Lazarowitz, R. (1995, April). Learning environment and academic achievement of high school students who learned evolution in a cooperative mode. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, NARST, San Francisco, CA.

Rosenthal, D. B. (1984). Social issues in high school biology textbooks: 1963–1983. Journal of Re-search in Science Teaching, 21(8), 819–831.

Rutherford, F. J. (1964). The role of inquiry in science teaching. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 2, 80-84.

Schwab, J. J. (1963). Biology teachers' handbook. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Schwab, J. J., & Brandwein, P. F. (1962). The teaching of science as enquiry. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shemesh, M., & Lazarowitz, R. (1989). Pupils' reasoning skills and their mastery of biological concepts. Journal of Biological Education, 23(1), 59–63.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundation of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 1–22.

Stern, L., & Roseman, E. J. (2004). Can middle school science textbooks help students learn important ideas? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41(6), 538–568.

Steward, J. H. (1982). Difficulties experienced by high school students when learning basic Mendelian genetics. The American Biology Teacher, 44(2), 80–84.

Tamir, P. (1974). An inquiry-oriented laboratory examination. Journal of Educational Measurement, 11, 23-25.

Tamir, P., & Glassman, F. (1971). A laboratory test for BSCS students—a progress report. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 8, 332–341.

Tamir, P., & Jungwirth, E. (1975). Students' growth and trends developed as a result of studying BSCS biology for several years. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 12, 263–280.

Tyler, R. W. (1966). Dimensions in curriculum development. Phi Delta Kappan, 48, 25–28.

Wagner-Gershgoren, I. (2004). The development and validity of a model to set criteria for the choice and evaluation of biology textbooks. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Israel Institute of Technology, Technion, Haifa, Israel.

Watson, D. J. (2000). A passion for DNA: Genes, genomes and society. Five days in Berlin. Plainview, NY: Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press.

Welicker, M., & Lazarowitz, R. (1995, April). Performance tasks and performance assessment of high school students studying primary prevention of cardiovascular diseases. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, NARST, San Francisco, CA.

Witenoff, S., & Lazarowitz, R. (1993). Restructuring laboratory work-sheets for junior high school biology students in the heterogeneous classroom. Research in Science and Technological Education, 11(2), 225–239.

Yager, R. E. (1980). Analysis of current accomplishments and needs in science education. Columbus, OH: ERIC/SMEAC Clearinghouse for Science, Mathematical, and Environmental Education, Columbus State University.

Yager, R. E. (1982). The crisis in biology education. The American Biology Teacher, 44(6), 328–336, 368.

Yager, R. E., & Hofstein, A. (1986). Features of a quality curriculum for school science. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 18, 133–146. Yager, R. E., Hofstein, A., & Lunetta, V. N. (1981). Science education attuned to social issues: Challenge for the 80s. The Science Teacher, 48(9), 12–13.

Teaching Physics

AAAS—American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1993). Project 2061—Benchmarks for scientific literacy. New York: Oxford University Press.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. , Bell, R. L. , & Lederman, N. G. (1998). The nature of science and instructional practice: Making the unnatural natural. Science Education, 82, 417–436.

Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Lederman, N. G. (2000). Improving science teachers' conceptions of nature of science: A critical review of the literature. International Journal of Science Education, 22 (7), 665–701.

Allchin, D. (2011). Evaluating knowledge of the nature of (whole) science. Science Education, 95 (3), 518–542.

Alonzo, A. C., & Steedle, J. T. (2009). Developing and assessing a force and motion learning progression. Science Education, 93 (3), 389–421.

Anderson, R. D., & Helms, J. V. (2001). The ideal of standards and the reality of schools: Needed research. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38, 3–16.

Araujo, I. S., Veit, E. A., & Moreira, M. A. (2008). Physics students' performance using computational modelling activities to improve kinematics graphs interpretation. Computers & Education, 50 (4), 1128–1140.

Arons, A. (1984). Students' patterns of thinking and reasoning. The Physics Teacher, 22, 21–26; 89–93; 576–581.

Arons, A. (1997). Teaching introductory physics. New York: Wiley.

Baker, D. R. (1998). Equity issues in science education. In B. J. Fraser & K. G. Tobin (Eds.), International handbook of science education (pp. 869–895). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Baumert, J., & Köller, O. (2000). Unterrichtsgestaltung, verständnisvolles Lernen und multiple Zielerreichung im Mathematik- und Physikunterricht der gymnasialen Oberstufe [Instructional planning, mindful learning and the achievement of multiple goals in mathematics and physics instruction at upper secondary level]. In J. Baumert & O. Köller (Eds.), TIMSS/III. Dritte Internationale Mathematik- und Naturwissenschaftsstudie. Volume 2 (pp. 271–315). Opladen, Germany: Leske+Budrich.

Beaton, A. E., Martin, M. O., Mullis, I. V. S., Gonzalez, E. J., Smith, T. A., & Kelly, D. A. (1996). Science achievement in the middle school years. IEA's Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). Boston: Boston College—Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation, and Educational Policy.

Beichner, R. J. (1994). Testing student interpretation of kinematik graphs. American Journal of Physics, 62, 750–762.

Beichner, R. J. (1996). The impact of video motion analysis on kinematics graph interpretation skills. American Journal of Physics, 64, 1272–1278.

Bernholt, S., Neumann, K., & Nentwig, P. (Eds.). (2012). Making it tangible—learning outcomes in science education. Münster: Waxmann.

Bertram, A., & Loughran, J. (2012). Science teachers' views on CoRes and PaPeRs as a framework for articulating and developing pedagogical content knowledge. Research in Science Education, 42, 1027–1047.

Bethge, T. (1992). Vorstellungen von Schülerinnen und Schülern zu Begriffen der Atomphysik [Students' ideas about concepts of atomic physics]. In H. Fischler (Ed.), Quantenphysik in der Schule (pp. 88–113). Kiel, Germany: IPN—Leibniz Institute for Science Education. Brückmann, M., & Knierim, B. (2008). Teaching and learning processes in physics instruction—chances of videotape classroom studies. In S. Mikelskis-Seifert, U. Ringelband, & M. Brückmann (Eds.), Four decades of research in science education—from curriculum development to quality improvement (pp. 191–219). Münster: Waxmann.

Bryan, J. (2006). Technology for physics instruction. Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education, 6 (2), 230–245. Budde, M., Niedderer, H., Scott, P., & Leach, J. (2002). The quantum atomic model 'Electronium': A successful teaching tool. Physics Education, 37 (3), 204–210.

Buffler, A. , Lubben, F. , & Ibrahim, B. (2009). The relationship between students' views of the nature of science and their views of the nature of scientific measurement. International Journal of Science Education, 31 (9), 1137–1156.

Bybee, R. (1997). Achieving scientific literacy: From purposes to practices. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Publishing.

Camp, C., & Clement, J. (1994). Preconceptions in mechanics. Lessons dealing with students' conceptual difficulties. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Chevallard, Y. (2007). Readjusting didactics to changing epistemology. European Educational Research Journal, 6 (2), 131–134. Chi, M. T. H., Slotta, J. D., & de Leeuw, N. (1994). From things to processes: A theory of conceptual change for learning science concepts. Learning and Instruction, 4, 27–43.

Chinn, C. A., & Malhotra, B. A. (2002). Epistemologically authentic inquiry in schools: A theoretical framework for evaluating inquiry tasks. Science Education, 86 (2), 175–218.

Chiu, M.-H., & Duit, R. (2011). Globalization: Science education from a global perspective—Editorial. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (6), 553–566.

Christian, W., & Belloni, M. (Eds.). (2003). Physlet? Physics: Interactive illustrations, explorations, and problems for introductory physics. Prentice Hall, NJ: Addison-Wesley.

Clement, J. (1993). Using bridging analogies and anchoring intuitions to deal with students' preconceptions in physics. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 30, 1241–1257.

Clough, M. P. (2006). Learners' responses to the demands of conceptual change: Considerations for effective nature of science instruction. Science Education, 15, 463–494.

Clough, M. P. (2007). Teaching the nature of science to secondary and post-secondary students: Questions rather than tenets. The Pantaneto Forum, Issue 25, January. Retrieved from www.pantaneto.co.uk/issue25/clough.htm (December 2012).

DeBoer, G. E. (2011). The globalization of science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (6), 567–591.

Deng, F., Chen, D.-T., Tsai, C.-C., & Chai, C. S. (2011). Students' views of the nature of science: A critical review of research. Science Education, 95 (6), 961–999.

diSessa, A. A. (1988). Knowledge in pieces. In G. Forman & P. B. Pufall (Eds.), Constructivism in the computer age (pp. 49–90). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Doerr, H. M. (1997). Experiment, simulation and analysis: An integrated instructional approach to the concept of force. International Journal of Science Education, 19 (3), 265–282.

Driver, R., & Oldham, V. (1986). A constructivist approach to curriculum development in science. Studies in Science Education, 13, 105–122.

Driver, R., Squires, A., Rushworth, P., & Wood-Robinson, V. (1994). Making sense of secondary science—Research into children's ideas. London, UK: Routledge.

Duit, R. (1992). Teilchen- und Atomvorstellungen [Conceptions of particles and atoms]. In H. Fischler (Ed.), Quantenphysik in der Schule (pp. 201–204) Kiel, Germany: IPN—Leibniz Institute for Science Education.

Duit, R. (2009). Bibliography—STCSE (students' and teachers' conceptions and science education). Kiel: Leibniz Institute for Science and Mathematics Education. Retrieved from www.ipn.uni-kiel.de/aktuell/stcse/stcse.html (Dec. 2012)

Duit, R., Goldberg, F., & Niedderer, H. (1992). Research in physics learning: Theoretical issues and empirical studies. Kiel: IPN—Leibniz Institute for Science Education.

Duit R., Gropengießer H., Kattmann U., Komorek M., & Parchmann, I. (2012). The model of educational reconstruction—A framework for improving teaching and learning science. In D. Jorde & J. Dillon (Eds.), The world of science education: Science education research and practice in Europe (pp. 13–47). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Duit, R., Komorek, M., & Wilbers, J. (1997). Studies on educational reconstruction of chaos theory. Research in Science Education, 27, 339–357.

Duit, R., Treagust, D., & Widodo, A. (2013). Teaching science for conceptual change: Theory and practice. In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), International handbook of research on conceptual change (pp. 487–503). New York, London: Routledge.

Duit, R., & von Rhöneck, Ch (1998). Learning and understanding key concepts of electricity. In A. Tiberghien , E. L. Jossem , & J. Barojas (Eds.), Connecting research in physics education. Boise, Ohio: ICPE—International Commission on Physics Education, ICPE Books. Retrieved from http://web.archive.org/web/20130105145245/www.physics.ohio-state.edu/~jossem/ICPE/C2.html (Jan. 2014)

Duschl, R. (2000). Making the nature of science explicit. In R. Millar , J. Leach , & J. Osborne (Eds.), Improving science education. The contribution of research (pp. 187–206). Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Duschl, R. (2012). The second dimension—Crosscutting concepts. The Science Teacher, 79 (2), 34-38.

Duschl, R. , Maeng, S. , & Sezen, A. (2011). Learning progressions and teaching sequences: A review and analysis. Studies in Science Education, 47, 123–182.

Escalada, L. T., Rebello, S., & Zollman, D. A. (2004). Student explorations of quantum effects in LEDs and luminescent devices. The Physics Teacher, 42, 173–179.

Fensham, P. (2001). Science content as problematic—issues for research. In H. Behrendt , H. Dahncke , R. Duit , W. Gräber , M. Komorek , A. Kross , & P. Reiska (Eds.), Research in science education—past, present, and future (pp. 27–41). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Fischler, H. (1999, March). Introduction to quantum physics— development and evaluation of a new course. In D. Zollman (Ed.), Research on teaching and learning quantum mechanics (pp. 32–40). Papers presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching. Retrieved from http://web.phys.ksu.edu/papers/narst/QM_papers.pdf (Jan. 2014)

Fischler, H. (2011). Didaktik—An appropriate framework for the professional work of science teachers? In D. Corrigan , J. Dillon , & R. Gunstone (Eds.), The professional knowledge base of science teaching (pp. 31–50). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Fischler, H., & Lichtfeldt, M. (1992). Modern physics and students' conceptions. International Journal of Science Education, 14, 181–190. Galilei, G. (1832, reprint). Il Saggiatore. In Opere di Galileo Galilei, Vol. 2 (p. 13). Milano: Bettoni.

Galili, I., & Hazan, A. (2000). The influence of an historically oriented course on students' content knowledge in optics evaluated by means of facets-schemes analysis. American Journal of Physics Supplement, 68 (7), 3–14.

Gallagher, J. J. J. , & Tobin, K. (1987). Teacher management and student engagement in high school science. Science Education, 71, 535–555.

Gingras, Y. (2001). What did mathematics do to physics? History of Science, 29, 383–416.

Goldberg, F., & Bendall, S. (1995). Making the invisible visible: A teaching and learning environment that builds on a new view of the physics learner. American Journal of Physics, 63, 978–991.

Gräsel, C. , & Parchmann, I. (2004). Implementationsforschung— oder: der steinige Weg Unterricht zu verändern [Implementation research—the stony path towards changing instruction]. Unterrichtswissenschaft, 32 (3), 196–214.

Grayson, D. (1996). Improving science and mathematics learning by concept substitution. In D. Treagust , R. Duit , & B. Fraser (Eds.), Improving teaching and learning in science and mathematics (pp. 152–161). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hake, R. R. (1998). Interactive-engagement versus traditional methods: A six-thousand-student survey of mechanics test data for introductory physics courses. American Journal of Physics, 66, 64–74.

Hannover, B., & Kessels, U. (2004). Self-to-prototype matching as a strategy for making academic choices. Why high school students do not like math and science. Learning and Instruction, 14, 51–67.

Harding, J. (1996). Science as a masculine strait-jacket. In L. H. Parker , L. J. Rennie , & B. Fraser (Eds.), Gender, science and mathematics (pp. 3–16). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Harrison, A. G. , & Treagust, D. F. (1996). Secondary students' mental models of atoms and molecules: Implications for teaching chemistry. Science Education, 80, 509–534.

Härtel, H. (1982). The electric circuit as a system. A new approach. European Journal of Science Education, 4 (1), 45–55.

Häußler, P., & Hoffmann, L. (2002). An intervention study to enhance girls' interest, self-concept and achievement in physics classes . Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (9), 870–888.

Hazari, Z., Sonnert, G., Sadler, P. M., & Shanahan, M.-C. (2010). Connecting high school physics experiences, outcome expectations, physics identity, and physics career choice: A gender study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (8), 978–1003.

Heck, A. , Kedzierska, E. , & Ellermeijer, T. (2009). Design and implementation of an integrated computer working environment for doing mathematics and science. Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching, 28 (2), 147–161.

Heering, P., & Höttecke, D. (2014). Historical-investigative approaches in science teaching. In M. R. Matthews (Ed.), International handbook of research in history, philosophy and science teaching (pp. 1473–1502). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer. Heimann, P., Otto, G., & Schulz, W. (1969). Unterricht, Analyse und Planung [Instruction: Analysis and planning]. Hannover, Germany: Schroedel.

Heinicke, S., & Heering, P. (2012). Discovering randomness, recovering expertise: The different approaches to the quality in measurement of Coulomb and Gauss and of today's students. Science & Education, 22, 483–503.

Herrmann, F. (1995). A critical analysis of the language of modern physics. In C. Bernardini , C. Tarsitani , & M. Vicentini (Eds.), Thinking physics for teaching (pp. 287–294). New York: Plenum Press.

Herrmann, F., & Job, G. (2006). The Karlsruhe physics course, Vol. 3, reactions, waves, atoms, 134. Retrieved from www.physikdidaktik.uni-karlsruhe.de/kpk/english/KPK Volume 3.pdf (June 2013)

Hestenes, D., Wells, M., & Swackhamer, G. (1992). Force concept inventory. The Physics Teacher, 30, 141–158.

Hodson, D. (2009). Teaching and learning about science. Language, theories, methods, history, traditions and values. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishes.

Hofstein, A., & Kind, P. M. (2012). Learning in and from science laboratories. In B. J. Fraser, K. G. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 189–207). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Hopf, M. (2007). Problemorientierte Schülerexperimente [Problem-based practical work of students]. Berlin: Logos-Verlag.

Hopmann, S. (2007). Restrained teaching: The common core of Didaktik. European Educational Research Journal, 6 (2), 109–124. Höttecke, D. (2001). Die Vorstellungen von Schülern und Schülerinnen von der "Natur der Naturwissenschaften" [Students' beliefs on the nature of science]. Zeitschrift für Didaktik der Naturwissenschaften, 7, 7–23.

Höttecke, D., Henke, A., & Rieß, F. (2012). Implementing history and philosophy in science teaching—strategies, methods, results and experiences from the European Project HIPST. Science & Education, 21 (9), 1233–1261.

Höttecke, D., & Silva, C. C. (2011). Why implementing history and philosophy in school science education is a challenge—an analysis of obstacles. Science & Education, 20 (3–4), 293–316.

Huffman, D., & Heller, P. (1995). What does the force concept inventory actually measure? The Physics Teacher, 33, 138–143. Interactive Physics. (2014). Canton, MI: Design Simulation Technologies.

Ivie, R. , & Guo, S. (2006). Women physicists speak again. American Institute of Physics Report. Retrieved from www.aip.org/statistics/reports/women-physicists-speak-again (Jan. 2014)

Jonas-Ahrend, G. (2004). Physiklehrervorstellungen zum Experiment im Physikunterricht [Teachers' beliefs about practical work in physics teaching]. Berlin: Logos.

Jung, W. (2012). Philosophy of science and education. Science & Education. doi:10.1007/s11191-012-9497-x

Jung, W., Wiesner, H., & Engelhard, P. (1981). Vorstellungen von Schülern über Begriffe der Newtonschen Mechanik [Students' ideas about concepts of Newtonian Mechanics]. Bad Salzdetfurth, Germany: Franzbecker.

Kalkanis, G., Hadzidaki, P., & Stavrou, D. (2003). An instructional model for a radical conceptual change towards quantum mechanics concepts. Science Education, 87 (2), 257–280.

Ke, J.-L., Monk, M., & Duschl, R. (2005). Learning introductory quantum physics: Sensori-motor experiences and mental models. International Journal of Science Education, 27 (13), 1571–1594.

Keeves, J. P., & Kotte, D. (1996). Patterns of science achievement: International comparisons. In L. H. Parker, L. J. Rennie, & B. Fraser (Eds.), Gender, science and mathematics (pp. 77–94). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Kessels, U., Rau, M., & Hannover, B. (2006). What goes well with physics? Measuring and altering the image of science. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 76 (4), 761–780.

Kircher, E., Girwidz, R., & Häußler, P. (2000). Physikdidaktik [Didactics of physics]. Braunschweig/Wiesbaden, Germany: Friedrich Vieweg & Sohn.

Kirstein, J., & Nordmeier, V. (2007). Multimedia representation of experiments in physics. European Journal of Physics, 28 (3), S115–S126.

Klafki, W. (1969). Didaktische Analyse als Kern der Unterrichtsvorbereitung [Educational analysis as core issue of instructional planning]. In H. Roth & A. Blumental (Eds.), Auswahl, Didaktische Analyse (pp. 5–34). Hannover, Germany: Schroedel.

Klassen, S. (2009). The construction and analysis of a science story: A proposed methodology. Science & Education, 18, 401–423. KMK—Ständige Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (Hrsg.) . (2005). Bildungsstandards im Fach Physik für den Mittleren Bildungsabschluss. Köln: Wolters Kluwer.

Knote, H. (1975). Zur Atomvorstellung bei Dreizehn- bis Fünfzehnjährigen [Thirteen to fifteen year old students' conceptions of the atom]. Der Physikunterricht, 4, 86–96.

Köller, O., Baumert, J., & Neubrand, J. (2000). Epistemologische Überzeugungen und Fachverständnis im Mathematik- und Physikunterricht [Epistemological beliefs and content knowledge in mathematics and physics instruction]. In J. Baumert (Eds.),

TIMSS—Mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Bildung am Ende der Sekundarstufe II [TIMSS—mathematics and science literacy at the end of upper secondary school] (pp. 229–270). Opladen, Germany: Leske & Budrich.

Kremer, K., Fischer, H. E., Kauertz, A., Mayer, J., Sumfleth, E., & Walpuski, M. (2012). Assessment of standards-based learning outcomes in science education: Perspectives from the German project ESNaS. In S. Bernholt, K. Neumann, & P. Nentwig (Eds.), Making it tangible—learning outcomes in science education (pp. 201–218). Münster: Waxmann.

Kroh, L. B., & Thomsen, P. V. (2005). Studying students' attitudes towards science from a cultural perspective but with a quantitative methodology: Border crossing into the physics classroom. International Journal of Science Education, 27, 281–302.

Labudde, P., Nidegger, C., Adamina, M., & Gingings, F. (2012). The development, validation, and implementation of standards in science education: Chances and difficulties in the Swiss project HarmoS. In S. Bernholt, K. Neumann, & P. Nentwig (Eds.), Making it tangible—learning outcomes in science education (pp. 255–280). Münster: Waxmann.

Laukenmann, M., Bleicher, M., Fuß, S., Gläser-Zikuda, M., Mayring, P., & v. Rhöneck, C. (2003). An investigation of the influence of emotional factors on learning in physics instruction. International Journal of Science Education, 25, 489–507.

Laws, P. W. (1997). Promoting active learning based on physics education research in introductory physics courses (Millikan Lecture 1996). American Journal of Physics, 65, 14–21.

Lederman, N. G. (1992). Students' and teachers' conceptions of the nature of science: A review of research. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29 (4), 331–359.

Lederman, N. G., & Lederman, J. S. (2011). The development of scientific literacy. A function of interactions and distinctions among subject matter, nature of science, scientific inquiry, and knowledge about scientific inquiry. In C. Linder, L. Östman, D. A. Robert, P.-O. Wickman, G. Erickson, & A. MacKinnon (Eds.), Exploring the landscape of scientific literacy (pp. 127–144). New York, London: Routledge.

Lijnse, P. L. (1995). "Developmental research" as a way to an empirically based "didactical structure" of science. Science Education, 79 (2), 189–199.

Linn, M. C., Songer, N. B., Lewis, E. L., & Stern, J. (1993). Using technology to teach thermodynamics: Achieving integrated understanding. In D. L. Ferguson (Ed.), Advanced educational technologies for mathematics and science (pp. 5–60). Berlin: Springer. Liu, S.-Y., Lin, C.-S., & Tsai, C.-C. (2011). College students' scientific epistemological views and thinking patterns in scocioscientific decision-making. Science Education, 95 (3), 597–517.

Lunetta, V. N. (1998). The school science laboratory: Historical perspectives and contexts for contemporary teaching. In K. Tobin & B. Fraser (Eds.), International handbook of science education. Part I (pp. 249– 264). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Maloney, D. P. (1994). Research on problem solving: Physics. In D. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 327–354). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Mashhadi, A. (1995). Students' conceptions of quantum physics. In G. Welford , J. Osborne , & P. Scott (Eds.), Research in science education in Europe (pp. 254–266). London, UK: Falmer.

Matthews, M. R. (1994). Science teaching—the role of history and philosophy of science. London: Routledge.

Matthews, M. R. (2012). Changing the focus: From nature of science to features of science. In M. S. Khine (Ed.), Advances in nature of science research (pp. 3–26). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Mazur, E. (1997). Peer instruction: A user's manual. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

McCloskey, M. (1983). Intuitive physics. Scientific American, 284 (4), 114–122.

McComas, W. F. (Ed.). (1998). The nature of science in science education rationales and strategies. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Méheut, M., & Psillos, D. (2004). Teaching-learning sequences. Aims and tools for science education research. International Journal of Science Education, 26 (5), 515–535.

Meyling, H. (1997). How to change students' conceptions of the epistemology of science. Science & Education, 6, 397–416.

Mikelkis-Seifert, S., & Fischler, H. (2003). Die Bedeutung des Denkens in Modellen bei der Entwicklung von

Teilchenvorstellungen—Stand der Forschung und Entwurf einer Unterrichtskonzeption [On the role of thinking in terms of models when developing particle ideas—state of research and a draft of an instructional approach]. Zeitschrift für Didaktik der Naturwissenschaften, 9, 75–88.

Minstrell, J. (1992). Facets of students' knowledge and relevant instruction. In R. Duit , F. Goldberg , & H. Niedderer (Eds.), Research in physics learning: Theoretical issues and empirical studies (pp. 110–128). Kiel, Germany: IPN—Institute for Science Education.

Mintzes, J. J., Wandersee, J. H., & Novak, J. D. (Eds.). (1997). Teaching science for understanding—a human constructivist view. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Mulhall, P., & Gunstone, R. (2008). Views about physics held by physics teachers with differing approaches to teaching physics. Research in Science Education, 38, 435–462.

Müller, R. (2003). Quantenphysik in der Schule [Quantum physics in high school]. Berlin: Logos.

Müller, R., & Wiesner, H. (2002). Teaching quantum mechanics on an introductory level. American Journal of Physics, 70, 200–209. Neumann, K., Viering, T., Boone, W. J., & Fischer, H. E. (2012). Towards a learning progression of energy. Journal of Research in Science Teaching. doi:10.1002/tea.21061

Niedderer, H., Budde, M., Giry, D., Psillos, D., & Tiberghien, A. (2007). Learning process studies. In R. Pintó & D. Couso (Eds.), Contributions from science education research (pp. 451–463). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Niedderer, H., Buty, C., Haller, K., Hucke, L., Sander, F., Fischer, H. E., v. Aufschnaiter, S., & Tiberghien, A. (2002). Talking physics in labwork contexts—a category based analysis of videotapes. In D. Psillos & H. Niedderer (Eds.), Teaching and learning in the science laboratory (pp. 31–40). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Niedderer, H., & Deylitz, S. (1999, March). Evaluation of a new approach in quantum atomic physics in high school. In D. Zollman (Ed.), Research on teaching and learning quantum mechanics (pp. 23–27). Papers presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching (NARST). Retrieved from http://web.phys.ksu.edu/papers/narst/QM_papers.pdf) (The textbook is available from www.idn.uni-bremen.de/pubs/Niedderer/1998-QAP-Skript-engl.pdf [Jun. 2013]).

Niedderer, H., & Goldberg, F. (1995). Lernprozesse beim elektrischen Stromkreis [Learning processes in case of the electric circuit]. Zeitschrift für Didaktik der Naturwissenschaften, 1, 73–86.

NRC—National Research Council . (1996). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. NRC—National Research Council . (2012). A framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

OECD—Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development . (1999). Measuring student knowledge and skills—a new framework for assessment. Paris: OECD Publications.

OECD—Organization for Economic Coordination and Development . (2009). Equally prepared for life? How 15-year-old boys and girls perform in school. Retrieved from www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/equally-prepared-for-life_9789264064072-en (Feb. 2014).

Osborne, J. (2007). Science education for the twenty first century. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science, and Technology Education, 3 (3), 173–184.

Osborne, R. (1983). Towards modifying children's ideas about electric current. Research in Science and Technology Education, 1, 73–82. Oser, F. K., & Baeriswyl, F. J. (2001). Choreographies of teaching: Bridging instruction to learning. In V. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 1031–1065). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Pasanen, P. (2009). Subject matter didactics as a central knowledge base for teachers, or should it be called pedagogical content knowledge? Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 17 (1), 29–39.

Petri, J., & Niedderer, H. (1998). A learning pathway in high-school level quantum physics. International Journal of Science Education, 20, 1075–1088.

Pintrich, P. R., Marx, R. W., & Boyle, R. A. (1992). Beyond cold conceptual change: The role of motivational beliefs and classroom contextual factors in the process of conceptual change. Review of Educational Research, 63, 167–199.

Psillos, D., Koumaras, P., & Tiberghien, A. (1988). Voltage presented as a primary concept in an introductory teaching sequence on DC circuits. International Journal of Science Education, 10 (1), 29–43.

Redish, E. F. (2003). Teaching physics. New York: Wiley.

Redish, E. F. , Saul, J. M. , & Steinberg, R. N. (1996). On the effectiveness of active-engagement microcomputer-based laboratories. American Journal of Physics, 65, 45–54.

Reid, N., & Skryabina, E. A. (2003). Gender and physics. International Journal of Science Education, 25, 509-536.

Roach, L. E., & Wandersee, J. H. (1995). Putting people back into science: Using historical vignettes. School Science and Mathematics, 95 (7), 365–370.

Roth, K., & Garnier, H. (2006). What science teaching looks like: An international perspective. Science in the Spotlight, 64 (4), 16–23. Ryder, J. (2001). Identifying science understanding for functional scientific literacy. Studies in Science Education, 36, 1–44.

Sadaghiani, H. R. (2012). Controlled study on the effectiveness of multimedia learning modules for teaching mechanics. Physical Review Special Topics—Physics Education Research, 8. doi:10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.8.010103

Samburski, S. (1975). Physical thought. From the pre-Socratics to the quantum physicists—an anthology. New York: Pica Press.

Schecker, H. (1998). Integration of experimenting and modeling by advanced educational technology: Examples from nuclear physics. In K. Tobin & B. Fraser (Eds.), International handbook of science education. Part I (pp. 383–398). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Schecker, H., Fischer, H. E., & Wiesner, H. (2004). Physikunterricht in der gymnasialen Oberstufe [Physics instruction in upper secondary]. In H. E. Tenorth (Ed.), Kerncurriculum Oberstufe (pp. 148–234). Weinheim, Germany: Beltz.

Schecker, H., & Niedderer, H. (1996). Contrastive teaching: A strategy to promote qualitative conceptual understanding of science. In D. Treagust, R. Duit, & B. Fraser (Eds.), Improving teaching and learning in science and mathematics (pp. 141–151). New York: Teachers College Press.

Schecker, H., & Parchmann, I. (2007). Standards and competence models—the German situation. In D. Waddington, P. Nentwig, & S. Schanze (Eds.), Making it comparable—standards in science education (pp. 147–164). Münster: Waxmann.

Scott, P. H. (1992). Pathways in learning science: A case study of the development of one student's ideas relating to the structure of matter. In R. Duit , F. Goldberg , & H. Niedderer (Eds.), Research in physics learning: Theoretical issues and empirical studies (pp. 203–224). Kiel, Germany: IPN—Leibniz-Institute for Science Education.

Seidel, T., & Prenzel, M. (2006). Stability of teaching patterns in physics instruction: Findings from a video study. Learning and Instruction, 16 (3), 228–240.

Sharma, M. D., Johnston, I. D., Johnston, H., Varvell, K., Robertson, G., Hopkins, A., Stewart, C., Cooper, I., & Thornton, R. (2010). Use of interactive lecture demonstrations: A ten year study. Physical Review Special Topics—Physics Education Research, 6. doi:10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.6.020119

Shipstone, D. M., von Rhöneck, C., Jung, W., Karrqvist, C., Dupin, J. J., Joshua, S., & Licht, P. (1988). A study of secondary students' understanding of electricity in five European countries. International Journal of Science Education, 10, 303–316.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of a new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57 (1), 1–22.

Sjøberg, S., & Schreiner, C. (2010). The ROSE project. An overview and key findings. Oslo: University of Oslo. Retrieved from www.ils.uio.no/english/rose/publications/english-pub.html (Dec. 2010)

Smith, C., Wiser, M., Anderson, C., Krajcik, J., & Coppola, B. (2004). Implications of research on children's learning for assessment: Matter and atomic molecular theory. Paper commissioned by the Committee on Test Design for K–12 Science Achievement. Washington, DC: Center for Education. National Research Council.

Smith, C. L., Wiser, M., Anderson, C. W., & Krajcik, J. (2006). Implications of research on children's learning for standards and assessment: A proposed learning progression for matter and the atomic molecular theory. Measurement: Interdisciplinary Research and Perspectives, 4 (1–2), 1–98.

Sokoloff, D. R., Thornton, R. K., & Laws, P. W. (2012). RealTime physics. Active learning laboratories. Module 1 Mechanics. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Solomon, J., Scott, L., & Duveen, J. (1996). Large-scale exploration of pupils' understanding of the nature of science. Science Education, 80 (5), 493–508.

Stadler, H., Benke, G., & Duit, R. (2000). Do boys and girls understand physics differently? Physics Education, 35 (6), 417–422. Stavrou, D., Duit, R., & Komorek, M. (2008). A teaching and learning sequence about the interplay of chance and determinism in nonlinear systems. Physics Education, 43, 417–422.

Stevens, S. Y., Delgado, C., & Krajcik, J. (2009). Developing a hypothetical multi-dimensional progression for the nature of matter. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (6), 687–715.

Stewart, J., Griffin, H., & Stewart, G. (2007). Context sensitivity in the force concept inventory. Physical Review Special Topics—Physics Education Research, 3. doi:10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.3.010102

Taber, K. S. (2001). When the analogy breaks down: Modeling the atom on the solar system. Physics Education, 36, 222–226.

Tesch, M., & Duit, R. (2004). Experimentieren im Physikunterricht— Ergebnisse einer Videostudie [Experiments in physics education—results of a video-study]. Zeitschrift für Didaktik der Naturwissenschaften, 10, 51–69.

Thornton, R. K. (1992). Enhancing and evaluating students' learning of motion concepts. In A. Tiberghien & H. Mandl (Eds.), Physics and learning environments (pp. 265–283). Berlin, Germany: Springer.

Thornton, R. K., & Sokoloff, D. R. (1998). Assessing student learning of Newton's laws: The force and motion conceptual evaluation and the evaluation of active learning laboratory and lecture curricula. American Journal of Physics, 66 (4), 338–351.

Tiberghien, A. (1984). Critical review on the research aimed at elucidating the sense that notions of temperature and heat have for the students aged 10 to 16. Twenty years of research on physics education. Proceedings of the first international workshop. La Londe les Maures.

Tiberghien, A., Veillard, L., Le Maréchal, J.-F., Buty, C., & Millar, R. (2001). An analysis of labwork tasks used in science teaching at upper secondary school and university levels in several European countries. Science Education, 85 (5), 483–508.

Tiberghien, A. , Vince, J. , & Gaidioz, P. (2009). Design-based research: Case of a teaching sequence on mechanics. International Journal of Science Education, 31 (17), 2275–2314.

Tinker, R. (Ed.). (1996). Microcomputer based labs: Educational research and standards. New York: Springer.

Treagust, D., Chittleborough, G., & Mamiala, T. L. (2002). Students' understanding of the role of scientific models in learning science. International Journal of Science Education, 24, 357–368.

Treagust, D., & Duit, R. (2012). Conceptual change learning and teaching. In G. Venville & V. Dawson (Eds.), The art of teaching science (pp. 41–59). Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Tsai, C. C. (2003). Using a conflict map as an instructional tool to change student alternative conceptions in simple series electric circuits. International Journal of Science Education, 25 (3), 307–327.

Tsaparlis, G., & Papaphotis, G. (2009). High-school students' conceptual difficulties and attempts at conceptual change: The case of basic quantum chemical concepts. International Journal of Science Education, 31 (7), 895–930.

Urhahne, D., Prenzel, M., Davier, M. V., Senkbeil, M., & Bleschke, M. (2000). Computereinsatz im naturwissenschaftlichen Unterricht—Ein Überblick über die pädagogisch-psychologischen Grundlagen und ihre Anwendung [Computers in science education—an overview of pedagogical and psychological foundations and their applications]. Zeitschrift für Didaktik der Naturwissenschaften, 6, 157–186.

van Borkulo, S. P., van Joolingen, W. R., Savelsbergh, E. R., & de Jong, T. (2012). What can be learned from computer modeling? Comparing expository and modeling approaches to teaching dynamic systems behavior. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 21, 267–275.

Viennot, L. (1979). Spontaneous reasoning in elementary dynamics. European Journal of Science Education, 1, 205–221.

Viennot, L. (2001). Reasoning in physics. The part of common sense. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Viennot, L. (2003). Teaching physics. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Vosniadou, S. (2002). On the nature of naïve physics. In M. Limon & L. Mason (Eds.), Reconsidering conceptual change: Issues in theory and practice (pp. 61–76). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Vosniadou, S. (2012). Reframing the classical approach to conceptual change: Preconceptions, misconceptions and synthetic models. In B. Fraser , K. Tobin , & C. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 119–130). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Vosniadou, S., & Ioannides, C. (1998). From conceptual change to science education: A psychological point of view. International Journal of Science Education, 20, 1213–1230.

Waddington, D., Nentwig, P., & Schanze, S. (Eds.). (2007). Making it comparable—standards in science education. Münster: Waxmann. Wandersee, J. H., Mintzes, J. J., & Novak, J. D. (1994). Research on alternative conceptions in science. In D. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 177–210). New York: Macmillan.

Warren, J. W. (1979). Understanding force. London, UK: Murray.

Westbury, I. (2000). Teaching as reflective practice: What might Didaktik teach Curriculum? In I. Westbury, S. Hopmann, & K. Riquarts (Eds.), Teaching as reflective practice: The German Didaktik tradition (pp. 15–39). New York, London: Routledge.

Westbury, I., Hopmann, S., & Riquarts, K. (Eds.). (2000). Teaching as reflective practice: The German Didaktik tradition. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

White, B. Y., & Frederiksen, J. (1998). Inquiry, modeling, and meta-cognition: Making science accessible to all students. Cognition and Instruction, 16 (1), 3–118.

Widodo, A. (2004). Constructivist oriented lessons. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Wilhelm, T., Tobias, V., Waltner, C., Hopf, M., & Wiesner, H. (2012). Einfluss der Sachstruktur auf das Lernen Newtonscher Mechanik [The influence of content structure on learning Newtonian mechanics]. In H. Bayrhuber (Eds.), Formate Fachdidaktischer Forschung (pp. 237–258). Münster: Waxmann.

Zacharia, Z. C. (2007). Comparing and combining real and virtual experimentation—an effort to enhance students' conceptual understanding of electric circuits. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 23 (2), 120–132.

Zhu, G., & Singh, C. (2012). Improving students' understanding of quantum measurement. ii. Development of research-based learning tools. Physical Review Special Topics—Physics Education Research, 8. doi:10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.8.010118

Zohar, A. (2005). Physics teachers' knowledge and beliefs regarding girls' low participation rates in advanced physics classes. International Journal of Science Education, 27 (1), 61–77.

Zollman, D. A., Rebello, N. S., & Hogg, K. (2002). Quantum mechanics for everyone: Hands-on activities integrated with technology. American Journal of Physics, 70, 252–259.

The Many Faces of High School Chemistry

ACARA . (2012). Chemistry. Sydney: Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority.

Adbo, K. , & Taber, K. S. (2009). Learners' mental models of the particle nature of matter: A study of 16-year-old Swedish science students. International Journal of Science Education, 31, 757–786.

Ahtee, M., & Varjola, I. (1998). Students' understanding of chemical reaction. International Journal of Science Education, 20, 305–316. Allen, D., Donham, R., & Tanner, K. (2004). Approaches to biology teaching and learning: Lesson study—building communities of learning among educators. Cell Biology Education, 3, 1–7.

Alonzo, A. C., & Gotwals, A. W. (Eds.). (2012). Learning progressions in science: Current challenges and future directions. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Ambrogi, P., Caselli, M., Montalti, M., & Venturi, M. (2008). Make sense of nanochemistry and nanotechnology. Chemistry Education Research & Practice, 9, 5–10.

Andersson, B. (1990). Pupils' conceptions of matter and its transformations (age 12–16). Studies in Science Education, 18, 53–85.

Bachelard, G. (1940/1968). The philosophy of no: A philosophy of the scientific mind. New York: Orion Press.

Baddeley, A. (2003). Working memory: Looking back and looking forward. Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 4, 829-839.

Barker, V. , & Millar, R. (1999). Students' reasoning about chemical reactions: What changes occur during a context-based post-16 chemistry course? International Journal of Science Education, 21, 645–665.

Barker, V., & Millar, R. (2000). Students' reasoning about basic chemical thermodynamics and chemical bonding: What changes occur during a context-based post-16 chemistry course? International Journal of Science Education, 22, 1171–1200.

Bennett, J., Gräsel, C., Parchmann, I., & Waddington, D. (2005). Context-based and conventional approaches to teaching chemistry: Comparing teachers' views. International Journal of Science Education, 27, 1521–1547.

Bennett, J., & Holman, J. (2002). Context-based approaches to the teaching of chemistry: What are they and what are their effects? In J. K. Gilbert, O. De Jong, R. Justi, D. F. Treagust, & J. H. Van Driel (Eds.), Chemical education: Towards research-based practice (pp. 165–184). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Bennett, J., Lubben, F., & Hogarth, S. (2007). Bringing science to life: A synthesis of the research evidence on the effects of contextbased and STS approaches to science teaching. Science Education, 91, 347–370.

Blonder, R., & Sakhnini, S. (2012). Teaching two basic nanotechnology concepts in secondary schools by using a variety of teaching methods. Chemistry Education Research & Practice, 13, 500–516.

Brown, J. R. (1991). Laboratory of the mind: Though experiments in the natural sciences. London: Routledge.

Bulte, A. , Westbroek, H. , De Jong, O. , & Pilot, A. (2006). A research approach to designing chemistry education using authentic practices as contexts. International Journal of Science Education, 28, 1063–1086.

Campbell, B. , Lazonby, J. , Millar, R. , Nicolson, P. , Ramsden, J. , & Waddington, D. (1994). Science: The Salters' approach—a case study of the process of large scale curriculum development. Science Education, 78, 415–447.

Cavallo, A. M. L., McNeely, J. C., & Marek, E. A. (2003). Eliciting students' understanding of chemical reactions using two forms of essay questions during a learning cycle. International Journal of Science Education, 25, 583–603.

Chandrasegaran, A. L., Treagust, D. F., & Mocerino, M. (2007). The development of a two-tier multiple-choice diagnostic instrument for evaluating secondary school students' ability to describe and explain chemical reactions using multiple levels of representation. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 8, 293–307.

Cheng, M., & Gilbert, J. K. (2009). Towards a better utilization of diagrams in research into the use of representative levels in chemical education. In J. Gilbert & D. Treagust (Eds.), Multiple representations in chemical education (pp. 55–73). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Chiu, M.-H., & Wu, H.-K. (2009). The roles of multimedia in the teaching and learning of the triplet relationship in chemistry. In J. K. Gilbert & D. Treagust (Eds.), Multiple representations in chemical education (pp. 251–283). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Clement, J. (2008). The role of explanatory models in teaching for conceptual change. In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), International handbook of research on conceptual change (pp. 417–452). New York: Routledge.

Coll, R. K. , & Treagust, D. F. (2003). Investigation of secondary school, undergraduate, and graduate learners' mental models of ionic bonding. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40, 464–486.

Dagher, Z., & Cossman, G. (1992). Verbal explanations given by science teachers: Their nature and implications. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29, 361–374.

De Jong, O., Acampo, J., & Verdonk, A. H. (1995). Problems in teaching the topic of redox reactions: Actions and conceptions of chemistry teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 32, 1097–1110.

De Jong, O. , Ahtee, M. , Goodwin, A. , Hatzinikita, V. , & Koulaidis, V. (1999). An international study of prospective teachers' initial teaching conceptions and concerns: The case of teaching "combustion". European Journal of Teacher Education, 22, 45–59.

De Jong, O., & Treagust, D. F. (2002). The teaching and learning of electrochemistry. In J. K. Gilbert, O. De Jong, R. Justi, D. F. Treagust, & J. H. Van Driel (Eds.), Chemical education: Towards research-based practice (pp. 317–337). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

De Jong, O., & Van Driel, J. (2004). Exploring the development of student teachers' PCK of multiple meanings of chemistry topics. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 2, 477–491.

De Vos, W., & Verdonk, A. H. (1985). A new road to reactions, part 1. Journal of Chemical Education, 62, 238–240.

Develaki, M. (2007). The model-based view of scientific theories and the structuring of school science programmes. Science & Education, 16, 725–749.

diSessa, A. A. (2008). A bird's-eye view of the "pieces" vs. "coherence" controversy (from the "pieces" side of the fence). In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), International handbook of research on conceptual change (pp. 35–60). New York: Routledge.

Drechsler, M., & Schmidt, H.-J. (2005). Upper secondary school students' understanding of models used in chemistry to define acids and bases. Science Education International, 16, 39–53.

Driessen, H. P. W., & Meinema, H. A. (2003). Chemistry between context and concept: Designing for renewal. Enschede, the Netherlands: SLO.

Driver, R., & Erickson, G. (1983). Theories-in-action: Some theoretical and empirical issues in the study of students' conceptual frameworks in science. Studies in Science Education, 10, 37–60.

Duit, R. (2009). Bibliography—students' and teachers' conceptions and science education. Kiel, Germany: Leibnitz Institute for Science and Mathematics Education. Retrieved from www.ipn.uni-kiel.de/aktuell/stcse/stcse.html

Feierabend, T., Jokmin, S., & Eilks, I. (2011). Chemistry teachers' views on teaching "climate change"—An interview case study from research-oriented learning in teacher education. Chemistry Education: Research & Practice, 11, 85–91.

Fensham, P. J. (1975). Concept formation. In D. J. Daniels (Ed.), New movements in the study and teaching of chemistry (pp. 199–217). London: Temple Smith.

Gabel, D. (1999). Improving teaching and learning through chemistry education research: A look to the future, Journal of Chemical Education, 76, 548–554.

Garcia Franco, A., & Taber, K. (2009). Secondary students' thinking about familiar phenomena: Learners' explanations from a curriculum context where "particles" is a key idea for organizing teaching and learning. International Journal of Science Education, 31, 1917–1952. George, J., & Lubben, F. (2002). Facilitating teachers' professional growth through their involvement in creating context-based materials in science. International Journal of Educational Development, 22, 659–672.

Gilbert, J. K. (2007). Visualization: A metacognitive skill in science and science education. In J. K. Gilbert (Ed.), Visualization in science education (pp. 9–27). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Gilbert, J. K., De Jong, O., Justi, R., Treagust, D. F., & Van Driel, J. H. (Eds.). (2002). Chemical education: Research-based practice. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Gilbert, J. K., Justi, R., Van Driel, J. H., De Jong, O., & Treagust, D. F. (2004). Securing a future for chemical education. Chemistry Education: Research & Practice, 5, 5–14.

Gilbert, J. K., Osborne, R. J., & Fensham, P. J. (1982). Children's science and its consequences for teaching. Science Education, 66, 623–633.

Gräsel, D., Nentwig, P., & Parchmann, I. (2005). Chemie im Kontext: Curriculum development and evaluation strategies. In J. Bennett , J. Holman , R. Millar , & D. Waddington (Eds.), Evaluation as a tool for improving science education (pp. 53–66). Münster, Germany: Waxmann.

Haglund, J., & Jeppsson, F. (2012). Using self-generated analogies in teaching of thermodynamics. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 898–921.

Hammer, D. (1996). Misconceptions or p-prims: How may alternative perspectives of cognitive structure influence instructional perceptions and intentions? Journal of the Learning Sciences, 5, 97–127.

Harrison, A. G. (2001). How do teachers and textbook writers model scientific ideas for students? Research in Science Education, 31, 401–435.

Harrison, A. G., & Coll, R. K. (Eds.). (2008). Using analogies in middle and secondary science classrooms. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Harrison, A. G., & Treagust, D. F. (2000a). Learning about atoms, molecules, and chemical bonds: A case study of multiple-model use in grade 11 chemistry. Science Education, 84, 352–381.

Harrison, A. G., & Treagust, D. F. (2000b). A typology of school science models. International Journal of Science Education, 22, 1011–1026.

Hesse, J. J., & Anderson, C. W. (1992). Students' conceptions of chemical change. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29, 277–299.

Jaber, L., & BouJaoude, S. (2012). A macro-micro-symbolic teaching to promote relational understanding of chemical reactions. International Journal of Science Education, 34, 973–998.

Jensen, W. B. (1995). Logic, history and the teaching of chemistry. Keynote lecture, given at the 57th Annual Summer Conference of the New England Association of Chemistry Teachers. Monograph. Sacred Heart University, Fairfield, CT.

Johnson, P. M. (2000). Children's understanding of substances, part 1: Recognizing chemical change. International Journal of Science Education, 22, 719–737.

Johnson, P. M. (2002). Children's understanding of substances, part 2: Explaining chemical change. International Journal of Science Education, 24, 1037–1054.

Johnson, P. M. (2012). Introducing particle theory. In K. S. Taber (Ed.), Teaching secondary chemistry (2nd ed., pp. 49–73). London: Association for Science Education/Hodder Education.

Johnson, P., & Papageorgiou, G. (2010). Rethinking the introduction of particle theory: A substance-based framework. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 130–150.

Johnstone, A. H. (1989). Some messages for teachers and examiners: An information processing model. In Assessment Subject Group Trust (Ed.). Assessment of chemistry in schools (Vol. Research in Assessment VII, pp. 23–39). London: Royal Society of Chemistry Education Division.

Johnstone, A. H. (1991). Why is science difficult to learn? Things are seldom what they seem. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 7, 75–83.

Johnstone, A. H. (1993). The development of chemistry teaching. Journal of Chemical Education, 70, 701–705.

Justi, R., & Gilbert, J. K. (2000). History and philosophy of science through models: Some challenges in the case of "the atom". International Journal of Science Education, 22, 993–1009.

Karpudewan, M., Ismael, Z., & Roth, W.-M. (2012). The efficacy of a green chemistry laboratory-based pedagogy: Changes in environmental values of Malaysia pre-service teachers. International Journal of Science and Mathematics, 10, 497–529.

Kern, A. L., Wood, N. B., Roehrig, G. H., & Nyachwaya, J. (2010). A qualitative report of the ways high school chemistry students attempt to represent a chemical reaction at the atomic/molecular level. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 11, 165–172. Keys, P. M. (2005). Are teachers walking the walk or just talking the talk in science education? Teachers and Teaching, 11, 499–516.

Kortland, K., & Klaassen, K. (Eds.). (2010). Designing theory-based teaching-learning sequences for science education Utrecht, The Netherlands: CDBeta Press.

Krnel, D. , Watson, R. , & Glazar, S. A. (1998). Survey of research related to the development of the concept of "matter". International Journal of Science Education, 20, 257–289.

Laverty, D. T., & McGarvey, J. E. B. (1991). A "constructivist" approach to learning. Education in Chemistry, 28, 99-102.

Leach, J., & Scott, P. (2002). Designing and evaluating science teaching sequences: An approach drawing upon the concept of learning demand and a social constructivist perspective on learning. Studies in Science Education, 38, 115–142.

Levy Nahum, T., Mamlok-Naaman, R., Hofstein, A., & Krajcik, J. (2007). Developing a new teaching approach for the chemical bonding concept aligned with current scientific and pedagogical knowledge. Science Education, 91, 579–603.

Levy Nahum, T. , Mamlok-Naaman, R. , Hofstein, A. , & Taber, K. S. (2010). Teaching and learning the concept of chemical bonding. Studies in Science Education, 46, 179–207.

Lőfgren, L., & Helldén, G. (2009). A longitudinal study showing how students use a molecule concept when explaining everyday situations. International Journal of Science Education, 31, 1631–1655.

Marks, R., Bertram, S., & Eilks, I. (2008). Learning chemistry and beyond with a lesson plan on potato crisps, which follows a sociocritical and problem-oriented approach to chemistry lessons—a case study. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 9, 267–276. Meijer, M. (2011). Macro-meso-micro thinking with structure-property relations for chemistry education—an explorative design-based study. Utrecht, Netherlands: Utrecht University (Ph.D. thesis). Retrieved from igitur-archive.library.uu.nl/dissertations/2011-0627-200510/Uindex.html

Meijer, M., Bulte, A., & Pilot, A. (2009). Structure-property relations between macro and micro representations: Relevant meso-levels in authentic tasks. In J. Gilbert & D. Treagust (Eds.), Multiple representations in chemical education (pp. 195–213). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Meijer, M., Bulte, A., & Pilot, A. (2013). Macro-micro thinking with structure-property relations: Integrating "meso-levels" in secondary education. In G. Tsaparlis & H. Sevian (Eds.), Concepts of matter in science education (pp. 419–436). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Millar, R. (1990). Making sense: What use are particles to children? In P. Lijnse , P. Licht , W. de Vos , & A. Waarlo (Eds.), Relating macroscopic phenomena to microscopic particles (pp. 283–293). Utrecht, the Netherlands: CDß Press.

Millar, R. (2006). Twenty-first-century science: Insights from the design and implementation of a scientific literacy approach in school science. International Journal of Science Education, 28, 1499–1521.

Mozzer, N. B., & Justi, R. (2011). Students' pre- and post-teaching analogical reasoning when they draw their analogies. International Journal of Science Education, 34, 429–458.

Nelson, P. (2002). Teaching chemistry progressively: From substances, to atoms and molecules, to electrons and nuclei. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 3, 215–228.

Nieswandt, M. (2001). Problems and possibilities for learning in an introductory chemistry course from a conceptual change perspective. Science Education, 85, 158–179.

NRC (National Research Council Committee on Conceptual Framework for the New K–12 Science Education Standards) . (2012). A framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Özmen, H. (2004). Some student misconceptions in chemistry: A literature review of chemical bonding. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 13, 147–159.

Parchmann, I., Gräsel, D., Baer, A., Nentwig, P., Demuth, R., Ralle, B., & The ChiK Project Group . (2006). "Chemie im Kontext": A symbiotic implementation of a context-based teaching and learning approach. International Journal of Science Education, 28, 1041–1062. Park, E. J., & Light, G. (2008). Identifying atomic structure as a threshold concept: Student mental models and troublesomeness. International Journal of Science Education, 31, 233–258.

Pauling, L. (1960). The nature of the chemical bond and the structure of molecules and crystals: An introduction to modern structural chemistry (3rd ed.). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Petri, J. , & Niedderer, H. (1998). A learning pathway in high school-level quantum atomic physics. International Journal of Science Education, 20, 1075–1088.

Prins, G., Bulte, A., & Pilot, A. (2011). Evaluation of a design principle for fostering students' epistemological views on models and modeling using authentic practices as contexts for learning in chemistry education. International Journal of Science Education, 33, 1539–1569.

QCA . (2007). Science: Programme of study for key stage 3 and attainment targets. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. Ramsden, J. M. (1997). How does a context-based approach influence understanding of key chemical ideas at 16+? International Journal of Science Education, 19, 697–710.

Rosenblueth, A., & Wiener, N. (1945). The role of models in science. Philosophy of Science, 12, 316–321.

Sadownik, J. W., & Ulijn, R. V. (2010). Dynamic covalent chemistry in aid of peptide self-assembly. Current Opinion in Biotechnology, 21, 401–411.

Sánchez Gómez, P. J., & Martín, F. (2003). Quantum versus "classical" chemistry in university chemistry education: A case study of the role of history in thinking the curriculum. Chemistry Education: Research & Practice, 4, 131–148.

Scerri, E. R. (2000). Have orbitals really been observed? Journal of Chemical Education, 77, 1492–1494.

Smith, J. P., diSessa, A. A., & Roschelle, J. (1993). Misconceptions reconceived: A constructivist analysis of knowledge in transition. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 3, 115–163.

Solomonidou, C., & Stavridou, H. (2000). From inert object to chemical substance: Students' initial conceptions and conceptual development during an introductory experimental chemistry sequence. Science Education, 84, 382–400.

Solsona, N. , Izquierdo, M. , & De Jong, O. (2003). Exploring the development of students' conceptual profiles of chemical change. International Journal of Science Education, 25, 3–12.

Stavridou, H., & Solomonidou, C. (1998). Conceptual reorganization and the construction of the chemical reaction concept during secondary education. International Journal of Science Education, 20, 205–221.

Stoddart, J. F. (2012). Editorial: From supramolecular to systems chemistry: Complexity emerging out of simplicity. Angewandte Chemie International Edition, 51, 12902–12903.

Stolk, M. , Bulte, A. , De Jong, O. , & Pilot, A. (2012). Evaluating a professional development framework to empower chemistry teachers to design context-based education. International Journal of Science Education, 34, 1487–1508.

Stolk, M. , De Jong, O. , Bulte, A. , & Pilot, A. (2011). Exploring a framework for professional development in curriculum innovation: Empowering teachers for designing context-based chemistry education. Research in Science Education, 41, 369–388.

Taber, K. S. (1994). Can Kelly's triads be used to elicit aspects of chemistry students' conceptual frameworks? Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Oxford. Retrieved from www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001482.htm Taber, K. S. (1998a). An alternative conceptual framework from chemistry education. International Journal of Science Education, 20, 597–608.

Taber, K. S. (1998b). The sharing-out of nuclear attraction: Or I can't think about physics in chemistry. International Journal of Science Education, 20, 1001–1014.

Taber, K. S. (2000). The CERG lecture 2000: Molar and molecular conceptions of research into learning chemistry: Towards a synthesis. Paper presented at the Variety in Chemistry Teaching 2000. Retrieved from www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001551.htm

Taber, K. S. (2001a). Building the structural concepts of chemistry: Some considerations from educational research. Chemistry Education: Research and Practice in Europe, 2, 123–158.

Taber, K. S. (2001b). When the analogy breaks down: Modelling the atom on the solar system. Physics Education, 36, 222–226. Taber, K. S. (2003). The atom in the chemistry curriculum: Fundamental concept, teaching model or epistemological obstacle?

Foundations of Chemistry, 5, 43–84. Taber, K. S. (2005). Learning quanta: Barriers to stimulating transitions in student understanding of orbital ideas. Science Education, 89, 94–116.

Taber, K. S. (2009a). College students' conceptions of chemical stability: The widespread adoption of a heuristic rule out of context and beyond its range of application. International Journal of Science Education, 31, 1333–1358.

Taber, K. S. (2009b). Learning at the symbolic level. In J. K. Gilbert & D. F. Treagust (Eds.), Multiple representations in chemical education (pp. 75–108). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Taber, K. S. (2009c). Progressing Science Education: Constructing the scientific research programme into the contingent nature of learning science. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Taber, K. S. (2012a). Developing models of chemical bonding. In K. S. Taber (Ed.), Teaching secondary chemistry (2nd ed., pp. 103–136). London: Association for Science Education/Hodder Education.

Taber, K. S. (2012b). Key concepts in chemistry. In K. S. Taber (Ed.), Teaching secondary chemistry (2nd ed., pp. 1–47). London: Association for Science Education/Hodder Education.

Taber, K. S., & Tan, K. C. D. (2007). Exploring learners' conceptual resources: Singapore A level students' explanations in the topic of ionization energy. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 5, 375–392.

Taber, K. S., & Tan, K. C. D. (2011). The insidious nature of "hard core" alternative conceptions: Implications for the constructivist research programme of patterns in high school students' and pre-service teachers' thinking about ionization energy. International Journal of Science Education, 33, 259–297.

Taber, K. S., & Watts, M. (1996). The secret life of the chemical bond: Students' anthropomorphic and animistic references to bonding. International Journal of Science Education, 18, 557–568.

Talanquer, V. (2007). Explanations and teleology in chemistry education. International Journal of Science Education, 29, 853–870. Talanquer, V. (2011). Macro, submicro, and symbolic: The many faces of the chemistry "triplet". International Journal of Science Education, 33, 179–195.

Tortosa, M. (2012). The use of microcomputer based laboratories in chemistry secondary education: Present state of the art and ideas for research-based practice. Chemistry Education: Research & Practice, 13, 161–171.

Tsaparlis, G. (1994). Blocking mechanisms in problem solving from the Pascual-Leone's M-space perspective. In H.-J. Schmidt (Ed.), Problem solving and misconceptions in chemistry and physics (pp. 211–226). Dortmund, Germany: International Council of Associations for Science Education.

Tsaparlis, G., Kolioulis, D., & Pappa, E. (2010). Lower-secondary introductory chemistry course: A novel approach based on scienceeducation theories, with emphasis on the macroscopic approach, and the delayed meaningful teaching of the concepts of molecule and atom. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 11, 107–117.

Ünal, S., Çalık, M., Ayas, A., & Coll, R. K. (2006). A review of chemical bonding studies: Needs, aims, methods of exploring students' conceptions, general knowledge claims and students' alternative conceptions. Research in Science & Technological Education, 24, 141–172.

Vaino, K., Holbrook, J., & Rannikmäe, M. (2012). Stimulating students' intrinsic motivation for learning chemistry through the use of context-based learning modules. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 13, 410–419.

Van Aalsvoort, J. (2004). Activity theory as a tool to address the problem of chemistry's lack of relevance in secondary school chemical education. International Journal of Science Education, 26, 1635–1651.

Van Driel, J. H., & Graeber, W. (2002). The teaching and learning of chemical equilibrium. In J. K. Gilbert, O. De Jong, R. Justi, D. F. Treagust, & J. H. Van Driel (Eds.), Chemical education: Towards research-based practice (pp. 271–292). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Watson, R., Prieto, T., & Dillon, J. S. (1997). Consistency of students' explanations about combustion. Science Education, 81, 425-443.

Earth System Science Education

Achieve, Inc. on behalf of the twenty-six states and partners that collaborated on the NGSS . (2013). The next generation science standards. Retrieved June 15, 2013, from www.nextgenscience.org

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (2012). Facilitating interdisciplinary research and education: A practical guide. Retrieved June 15, 2013, from www.aaas.org/report/facilitating-interdisciplinary-research-and-education-practical-guide

Andre. J. C., & Frochot, C. (2013). Problems arising in evaluation of interdisciplinary scientific research for innovation. International Journal of Innovation Science, 5 (2), 103–112.

Atchison, C., & Martinez-Frias, J. (2012). Inclusive geoscience instruction. Nature Geoscience, 5 (6), 366–366.

Ault, C. R. (1994). Research on problem solving. In D. L. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 269–283). New York: MacMillian Publishing.

Bardar, E. M., Prather, E. E., Brecher, K., & Slater, T. F. (2006). Development and validation of the Light and Spectroscopy Concept Inventory. Astronomy Education Review, 5 (2), 103.

Bell, R. L. , & Lederman, N. G. (2003). Understandings of the nature of science and decision making on science and technology based issues. Science Education, 87 (3), 352–377.

Ben-Zvi-Assaraf, O., & Orion, N. (2005a). The development of system thinking skills in the context of Earth System education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42, 1–43.

Ben-Zvi-Assaraf, O. , & Orion, N. (2005b). A study of junior high students' perceptions of the water cycle. Journal of Geosciences Education, 53, 366–373.

Ben-Zvi-Assaraf, O., & Orion, N. (2009). a design based research of an earth systems based environmental curriculum. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education, 5 (1), 47–62.

Ben-Zvi-Assaraf, O., & Orion, N. (2010a). System thinking skills at the elementary school level. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 540–563.

Ben-Zvi-Assaraf, O., & Orion, N. (2010b). Four case studies and six years later: Developing system thinking skills in junior high School and sustaining them over time. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 1253–1280.

Bickmore, B. R., Thompson, K. R., Grandy, D. A., & Tomlin, T. (2009). Science as storytelling for teaching the nature of science and the science-religion interface. Journal of Geoscience Education, 57 (3), 178–190.

Booth-Sweeney, L. & Sterman, J. D. (2000). Bathtub dynamics: Initial results of a systems thinking inventory. System Dynamics Review, 16 (4), 249–286. Retrieved February 28, 2014 from http://web.mit.edu/jsterman/www/Bathtub%20Dynamics.pdf

Booth-Sweeney, L., & Sterman, J. D. (2007). Thinking about systems: Student and teacher conceptions of natural and social systems. System Dynamics Review, 23, 285–312.

Boyle, A. , Maguire, S. , Martin, A. , Milsom, C. , Nash, R. , Rawlinson, S. , & Conchie, S. (2007). Fieldwork is good: The student perception and the affective domain. Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 31 (2), 299–317.

Catley, K. M., & Novick, L. R. (2009). Digging deep: Exploring college students' knowledge of macroevolutionary time. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (3), 311–332.

Cheek, K. A. (2010). Commentary: A summary and analysis of twenty-seven years of geoscience conceptions research. Journal of Geoscience Education, 58 (3), 122–134.

Clark, S. K., Libarkin, J. C., Kortz, K. M., & Jordan, S. C. (2011). Alternative conceptions of plate tectonics held by nonscience undergraduates. Journal of Geoscience Education, 59 (4), 251–262.

Dickerson, D., Callahan, T. J., Van Sickle, M., & Hay, G. (2005). Students' conceptions of scale regarding groundwater. Journal of Geoscience Education, 53, 374–380.

Draper, F. (1993). A proposed sequence for developing system thinking in a grades 4–12 curriculum. System Dynamic Review, 9 (2), 207–214.

Driver, R., Guesne, E., & Tiberghien, A. (Eds.). (1985). Children's ideas in Science. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Driver, R., Squires, A., Rushworth, P., & Wood-Robinson, V. (1994). Making sense of secondary science: Research into children's ideas. New York: Routledge.

Drost, R. (2013). Memory and decision making: Determining action when the sirens sound. Weather, Climate, and Society, 5 (1), 43–54. Emery, R. E. (1992). Parenting in context: Systemic thinking about parental conflict and its influence on children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 60, 909–912.

Evagorou, M., Korfiatis, K., Nicolaou, C., & Constantinou, C., (2009). An investigation of the potential of interactive simulations for developing system thinking skills in elementary school: A case study with fifth graders and sixth graders. International Journal of Science Education, 31, 655–674.

Faughnan, J. G., & Elson, R. (1998). Information technology and the clinical curriculum: Some predictions and their implications for the class of 2003. Academic Medicine, 73, 766–769.

Fordyce, D. (1998). The development of system thinking in engineering education: An interdisciplinary model. European Journal of Engineering Education, 13, 283–292.

Francek, M. (2013). A compilation and review of over 500 geoscience misconceptions. International Journal of Science Education, 35 (1), 31–64.

Frank, M. (2000). Engineering systems thinking and systems thinking. Systems Engineering, 3, 63–168.

Goldstone, R. L., & Wilensky, U. (2008). Promoting transfer complex systems principles. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 17, 465–516. Grace, M. (2009). Developing high quality decision making discussions about biological conservation in a normal classroom setting. International Journal of Science Education, 31 (4), 551–570.

Graczyk, S. L. (1993). Get with the system: General system theory for business officials. School Business Affairs, 59, 16–20. Gruenewald, D. A., & Smith, G. A. (2007). Place-based education in the global age: Local diversity. Ann Arbor, MI: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hambrick, D. Z., Libarkin, J. C., Petcovic, H. L., Baker, K. M., Elkins, J., Callahan, C. N., Rench, T., Turner, S., & Ladue, N. D. (2012). A test of the circumvention-of-limits hypothesis in scientific problem solving: The case of geological bedrock mapping. Journal of Experimental Psychology. General, 141, 397–403.

Hazen, R. M., & Trefil, J. (2009). Science matters: Achieving scientific literacy. New York: Random House.

Hmelo-Silver, C. E., Marathe, S., & Liu, L. (2007). Fish swim, rocks sit, and lungs breathe: Expert–novice understanding of complex systems. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 16, 307–331.

Hmelo-Silver, C. E., & Pfeffer, M. G. (2004). Comparing expert and novice understanding of a complex system from the perspective of structures, behaviors, and functions. Cognitive Science, 28, 127–138.

Hurst, S. D. (1998). Use of "virtual" field trips in teaching introductory geology. Computers and Geosciences, 24 (7), 653–658.

Israel, A. L. (2012). Putting geography education into place: What geography educators can learn from place-based education, and vice versa. Journal of Geography, 111 (2), 76–81. doi:10.1080/0022134 1.2011.583264

Jackson, D. F. (1997). Case studies of microcomputer and interactive video simulations in middle school earth science teaching. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 6 (2), 127–141.

Jacobson, M. J., & Wilensky, U. (2006). Complex systems in education: Scientific and educational importance and implications for the learning sciences. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 15 (1), 11–34.

Jolley, A., Lane, E., Kennedy, B., & Frappé-Sénéclauze, T.-P. (2012). SPESS: A new instrument for measuring student perceptions in Earth and ocean science. Journal of Geoscience Education, 60 (1), 83–91.

Kali, Y., Orion, N., & Eylon B. (2003). Effect of knowledge integration activities on students' perception of the Earth's crust as a cyclic system. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40, 545–565. doi:10.1002/tea.10096

Kelemen, D., & Rosset, E. (2009). The human function compunction: Teleological explanation in adults. Cognition, 111 (1), 138–143. Kern, E. L., & Carpenter, J. R. (1984). Enhancement of student values, interest and attitudes in earth science through a field-oriented approach. Journal of Geological Education, 32 (5), 299–305.

Kim, D. H. (1999). Introduction to system thinking. Westford, MA: Pegasus Communications, Inc.

King, C. (2008). Geoscience education: An overview. Studies in Science Education, 44 (2), 187-222.

Kumar, M. (2013). New K-12 science education standards may face implementation challenges. EOS, 94 (18), 166-167.

LaDue, N. D. , & Clark, S. K. (2012). Educator perspectives on earth system science literacy: Challenges and priorities. Journal of Geoscience Education, 60 (4), 372–383.

Lawton, J. (2001). Earth system science. Science, 292 (5524), 1965.

Lesh, R. (2006). Modeling students modeling abilities: The teaching and learning of complex systems in education. The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 15, 45–52.

Lewis, J. P. (1998). Mastering project management: Applying advanced concepts of system thinking, control and evaluation, resource allocation. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Libarkin, J. (2008). Concept inventories in higher education science. Commissioned paper for the Board on Science Education of the National Academies. Retrieved from http://blogs.ethz.ch/didacbiol/files/2012/07/BOSE-Conf-2008-Libarkin.pdf

Libarkin, J. C. (2001). Development of an assessment of student conception of the nature of science. Journal of Geoscience Education, 49 (5), 435–442.

Libarkin, J. C. , & Anderson, S. W. (2005). Assessment of learning in entry-level geoscience courses: Results from the Geoscience Concept Inventory. Journal of Geoscience Education, 53 (4), 394.

Libarkin, J. C. , and Anderson, S. W. (2006). The geoscience concept inventory: application of Rasch analysis to concept inventory development in higher education. In X. Liu and W. Boone (Eds.), Applications of Rasch measurement in science education (pp. 45–73). Maple Grove, MN: JAM Press.

Libarkin, J. C. , Jardeleza, S. E. , & McElhinny, T. L. (2014). The role of concept inventories in course assessment. In V. Tong (Ed.), Geoscience: Research-enhanced education in universities (pp. 275–297), New York: Springer.

Libarkin, J. C., & Kurdziel, J. P. (2006). Ontology and the teaching of earth system science. Journal of Geoscience Education, 54 (3), 408. Libarkin, J. C., & Schneps, M. H. (2012). Elementary children's retrodictive reasoning about earth science. International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education, 5 (1), 47–62.

Libarkin, J. C. , Ward, E. M. G. , Anderson, S. W. , Kortemeyer, G. , & Raeburn, S. P. (2011). Revisiting the Geoscience Concept Inventory: A call to the community. GSA Today, 21, 26–28.

Llerandi Roman, P. A. (2007). The effects of a professional development geoscience education institute upon secondary school science teachers in Puerto Rico (Ph.D.). Purdue University, United States— Indiana. Retrieved from

http://search.proquest.com.proxy2.cl.msu.edu/docview/304840730/abstract/13C82EBE1B71CB667CC/15?accountid=12598 Mandinach, E. B. (1989). Model-building and the use of computer simulation of dynamic systems. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 5, 221–243.

Mayer, V. J. (1991). Framework for earth systems. Education Science Activities, 28, 8-9.

Mayer, V. J., & Fortner, R. W. (Eds.). (1995). Science is a study of earth: A resource guide for science curriculum restructure. Columbus: Ohio State University Research Foundation.

McConnell, D. A., Steer, D. N., Owens, K. D., Borowski, W., Dick, J., Foos, A., & Heaney, P. J. (2006). Using concepts to assess and improve student conceptual understanding in introductory geoscience courses. Journal of Geoscience Education, 54 (1), 61–68. McConnell, D. A., & Van Der Hoeven Kraft, K. J. (2011). Affective domain and student learning in the geosciences. Journal of Geoscience Education, 59 (3), 106–110. doi:10.5408/1.3604828

McNeal, K. S., Miller, H. R., & Herbert, B. E. (2008). The effect of using inquiry and multiple representations on introductory geology students' conceptual model development of coastal eutrophication. Journal of Geoscience Education, 56 (3), 201–211.

Miele, E. A., & Powell, W. G. (2010). Science and the city: Community cultural and natural resources at the core of a place-based, science teacher preparation program. Journal of College Science Teaching, 40 (2), 40–44.

National Research Council (NRC) . (1996). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Orion, N. (1993). A model for the development and implementation of field trips as an integral part of the science curriculum. School Science & Mathematics, 93, 6.

Orion, N. (2002). An earth systems curriculum development model. In V. Mayer (Ed.), Global science literacy (pp. 159–168). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Orion, N. (2007). A holistic approach for science education for all. Eurasia journal for mathematics, science and technology education, 3, 99–106.

Orion, N., & Ault, C. (2007). Learning earth sciences. In S. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 653–688). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Orion, N., & Bassis, T. (2008). Characterization of high school students' system thinking skills in the context of earth systems. National Association for Research in Science Teaching, (NARST) Symposium, Baltimore, MD.

Orion, N., Ben-Menacham, O. and Shur, Y. (2008). Raising scholastic achievement in minority-reached classes through earth systems teaching. Journal of Geosciences Education, 55, 469–477.

Orion, N. & Cohen, C. (2007). A design-based research of an oceanography module as a part of the Israeli high school earth sciences program. Journal of Geographie und ihre Didaktik, 4, 246–259.

Orion, N., & Fortner, R. W. (2003). Mediterranean models for integrating environmental education and earth sciences through earth systems education. Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies, 8 (1), 97–111.

Ossimitz, G. (2000). Teaching system dynamics and systems thinking in Austria and Germany. Proceedings of the 18th International Conference of the System Dynamics Society, Bergen, Norway.

Parker, L. C., Krockover, G. H., Eichinger, D. C., & Lasher-Trapp, S. (2008). Ideas about the nature of science held by undergraduate atmospheric science students. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 89 (11), 1681–1688.

Patterson, T. C. (2007). Google Earth as a (not just) geography education tool. Journal of Geography, 106 (4), 145–152.

Petcovic, H., & Ruhf, R. (2008). Geoscience conceptual knowledge of preservice elementary teachers: Results from the Geoscience Concept Inventory. Journal of Geoscience Education, 56 (3), 251–260.

Pettit, C., & Wu, Y. (2008). A virtual knowledge world for natural resource management. In C. Pettit, W. Cartwright, I. Bishop, K. Lowell, D. Pullar, & D. Duncan (Eds.), Landscape analysis and visualisation (pp. 533–550). Heidelberg: Springer Berlin. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-540-69168–6 26

Pyle, E. J. (2008). A model of inquiry for teaching earth science. Electronic Journal of Science Education, 12 (2). Retrieved from http://ejse.southwestern.edu/article/view/7770

Raia, F. (2008). Causality in complex dynamic systems: A challenge in earth systems science education. Journal of Geoscience Education, 56, 81–94.

Rossbacher, L. (2002). Geologic column: Knowing a place. Geotimes, 47, 48.

Russell, D., Davies, M., & Totten, I. (2008). GEOWORLDS: Utilizing Second Life to develop advanced geosciences knowledge. In 2008 Second IEEE International Conference on Digital Games and Intelligent Toys Based Education (pp. 93–97). Presented at the 2008 Second IEEE International Conference on Digital Games and Intelligent Toys Based Education, Banff, AB, Canada. doi:10.1109/DIGI?.2008.50 Rutherford, F. J., & Ahlgren, A. (1991). Science for all Americans (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Sanchez, C. A. (2012). Enhancing visuospatial performance through video game training to increase learning in visuospatial science domains. Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 19 (1), 58–65.

Semken, S., & Butler Freeman, C. B. (2008). Sense of place in the practice and assessment of place-based science teaching. Science Education, 92 (6), 1042–1057.

Senge, P. M. (1998). "Fifth discipline": Review and discussion. System Practice and Action Research, 11 (3) 259–273.

Sexton, J. M. (2012). College students' conceptions of the role of rivers in canyon formation. Journal of Geoscience Education, 60 (2), 168–178.

Sibley, D. (2009). A cognitive framework for reasoning with scientific models. Journal of Geoscience Education, 57 (4), 255–263.

Sibley, D. F. (2005). Visual abilities and misconceptions about plate tec-tonics. Journal of Geoscience Education, 53, 471–477.

Sobel, D. (2004). Place-based education: Connecting classrooms and communities. Great Barrington, MA: The Orion Society. Stainfield, J., Fisher, P., Ford, B., & Solem, M. (2000). International virtual field trips: A new direction? Journal of Geography in Higher

Stainfield, J. , Fisher, P. , Ford, B. , & Solem, M. (2000). International virtual field trips: A new direction? Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 24 (2), 255–262.

Steed, M. (1992). Stella, a simulation construction kit: Cognitive processes and educational implications. Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science, 11, 39–52.

Stokes, A. , & Boyle, A. P. (2009). The undergraduate geoscience fieldwork experience: Influencing factors and implications for learning. Geological Society of America Special Papers, 461, 291–311.

Sunderlin, D. (2009). Integrative mapping of global-scale processes and patterns on "imaginary Earth" continental geometries: A teaching tool in an earth history course. Journal of Geoscience Education, 57 (1), 73–81.

Teed, R. , & Slattery, W. (2011). Changes in geologic time understanding in a class for preservice teachers. Journal of Geoscience Education, 59 (3), 151–162.

Thomson, N., & Chapman Beall, S. (2008). An inquiry safari: What can we learn from skulls? Evolution: Education and Outreach, 1 (2), 196–203.

Treagust, D. F. (1986). Evaluating students' misconceptions by means of diagnostic multiple choice items. Research in Science Education, 16, 199–207.

Ullmer, E. J. (1986). Work design in organizations: Comparing the organizational elements models and the ideal system approach. Educational Technology, 26 (4), 12–18.

Verhoeff, R. P., Waarlo, A. J., & Boersma, K. T. (2008). Systems modeling and the development of coherent understanding of cell biology. International Journal of Science Education, 30, 543–568.

Wandersee, J. H., Mintzes, J. J., & Novak, J. D. (1994). Research on alternative conceptions in science. in D. L. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 177–210). New York: MacMillian.

Wang, S. K., & Reeves, T. C. (2006). The effects of a web-based learning environment on student motivation in a high school earth science course. Educational Technology Research and Development, 54 (6), 597–621.

Wiggins, G. P., & McTighe, J. (2005). Understanding by design (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Wilensky, U., & Resnick, M. (1999). Thinking in levels: A dynamic systems approach to making sense of the world. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 8, 3–19.

Woodhouse, J., & Knapp, C. (2000). Place-based curriculum and instruction. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EDO-RC-00–6. Yunker, M., Orion, N., & Lernau, H. (2011). Merging playfulness with the formal science curriculum in an outdoor learning environment. Children, Youth and Environments, 21 (2), 271–293.

Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 61 (1–2), 89–99.

Environmental Education

Arslan, H. O., Cigdemoglu, C., & Moseley, C. (2012). A three-tier diagnostic test to assess pre-service teachers' misconceptions about global warming, greenhouse effect, ozone layer depletion, and acid rain. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (11), 1667–1686. Ashley, M. (2005). Tensions between indoctrination and the development of judgment: The case against early closure. Environmental Education Research, 11 (2), 187–197.

Bauman, Z. (1993). Postmodern ethics. Oxford: Blackwell.

Bodzin, A. M. (2011). The implementation of a geospatial information technology (GIT)-supported land use change curriculum with urban middle school learners to promote spatial thinking. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48, 281–300.

Boeve-de Pauw, J. , & Van Petegem, P. (2011). The effect of Flemish eco-schools on student environmental knowledge, attitudes, and affect. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (11), 1513–1538.

Bögeholz, S. (2006). Nature experience and its importance for environmental knowledge, values and action: Recent German empirical contributions. Environmental Education Research, 12 (1), 65–84.

Bolscho, D., & Michelsen, G. (Eds.). (1999). Methoden der Umweltbildungsforschung. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Boyes, E., & Stanisstreet, M. (2012). Environmental education for behaviour change: Which actions should be targeted? International Journal of Science Education, 34 (10), 1591–1614.

Carson, R. (1962). Silent spring. New York: Houghton-Mifflin.

Castano, C. (2008). Socio-scientific discussions as a way to improve the comprehension of science and the understanding of the interrelation between species and the environment. Research in Science Education, 38 (5), 565–587.

Chawla, L. (1998). Significant life experiences: A review of research on sources of environmental sensitivity. Journal of Environmental Education, 29 (3), 11–21.

Dierking, L. D., & Falk, J. H. (1997). School field trips: Assessing their long-term impact. Curator, 40, 211–218.

Dillon, J. (2003). On learners and learning in environmental education: Missing theories, ignored communities. Environmental Education Research, 9 (2), 215–226.

Dillon, J. , & Dickie, I. (2012). Learning in the natural environment: Review of social and economic benefits and barriers. Natural England Commissioned Reports, Number 092. London: Natural England. Retrieved from

http://publications.naturalengland.org.uk/publication/1321181

Dillon, J. , & Scott, W. (2002). Perspectives on environmental education– related research in science education. International Journal of Science Education, 24, 1111–1117.

Dimick, A. S. (2012). Student empowerment in an environmental science classroom: Toward a framework for social justice science education. Science Education, 96, 990–1012.

Disinger, J. (1984). Environmental education research news. The Environmentalist, 4, 109–112.

Disinger, J. (1990). Environmental education for sustainable development? Journal of Environmental Education, 21 (4), 3–6.

Duhn, I. (2012). Making "place" for ecological sustainability in early childhood education. Environmental Education Research, 18 (1), 19–29.

Eaton, D. (2000). Cognitive and affective learning in outdoor education. Dissertation Abstracts International—Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 60, 10–A, 3595.

Ebenezer, J., Kaya, O. N., & Ebenezer, D. L. (2011). Engaging students in environmental research projects: Perceptions of fluency with innovative technologies and levels of scientific inquiry abilities. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48, 94–116.

Evagorou, M., Jimenez-Aleixandre, M. P., & Osborne, J. (2012). Should we kill the grey squirrels? A study exploring students' justifications and decision-making. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (3), 401–428.

Evans, J. , & Boyden, S. (Eds.). (1970). Education and the environmental crisis. Canberra, Australia: Australian Academy of Science. Ferreira, J.-A. (2013). Transformation, empowerment and the governing of environmental conduct: Insights to be gained from a "history of the present" approach. In R. B. Stevenson , M. Brody , J. Dillon , & A. E. J. Wals (Eds.), International handbook of research in environmental education (pp. 63–68). New York: Routledge.

Fettis, G. C., & Ramsden, M. J. (1995). Sustainability—what is it and how should it be taught? ENTRÉE' 95 Proceedings, 81–90. Fields, D. A. (2009). What do students gain from a week at science camp? Youth perceptions and the design of an immersive, researchoriented astronomy camp. International Journal of Science Education, 31 (2), 151–171.

Foster, J. (2001). Education as sustainability. Environmental Education Research, 7 (2), 153–165.

Goodson, I. F. (1983). School subjects and curriculum change. London/Sydney: Croom Helm.

Gough, A. (2013a). The emergence of environmental education research. In R. B. Stevenson , M. Brody , J. Dillon , & A. E. J. Wals (Eds.), International handbook of research in environmental education (pp. 13–22). New York: Routledge.

Gough, N. (2013b). Thinking globally in environmental education. In R. B. Stevenson, M. Brody, J. Dillon, & A. E. J. Wals (Eds.), International handbook of research in environmental education (pp. 33–44). New York: Routledge.

Greenwood, D. A., & McKenzie, M. (Eds.). (2009). Context, experience and the socioecological: Inquiries into practice. Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 14 (1), n.p.

Greig, S., Pike, G., & Selby, D. (1987). Earthrights education as if the planet really mattered. London: World Wildlife Fund. Gunckel, K. L., Covitt, B. A., Salinas, I., & Anderson, C. W. (2012). A learning progression for water in socio-ecological systems. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 843–868.

Gurevitz, R. (2000). Affective approaches to environmental education: Going beyond the imagined worlds of childhood? International Journal of Science Education, 24, 645–660.

Hart, P. (2003). Reflections on reviewing educational research: (Re) searching for value in environmental education. Environmental Education Research, 9 (2), 241–256.

Hart, P. (2007). Environmental education. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 689–726). New York: Routledge.

Hart, P., & Nolan, K. (1999). A critical analysis of research in environmental education. Studies in Science Education, 34, 1–69. Harvester, L., & Blenkinsop, S. (2010). Environmental education and ecofeminist pedagogy: Bridging the environmental and the social. Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 15, 120–134.

Hesselink, F., van Kempen, P. P., & Wals, A. E. J. (2000). ESDebate: International on-line debate on education for sustainable development. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

Hines, J. M., Hungerford, H. R., & Tomera, A. N. (1987). Analysis and synthesis of research on responsible environmental behavior: A meta-analysis. Journal of Environmental Education, 18 (2), 1–8.

Hopkins, C. (1998). The content of education for sustainable development. In M. J. Scoullos (Ed.), Environment and society: Education and public awareness for sustainability; proceedings of the Thessaloniki International Conference. Paris: Unesco.

Hungerford, H. R., & Volk, T. L. (1990). Changing learner behavior through environmental education. Journal of Environmental Education, 21 (3), 8–21.

Ideland, M., Malmberg, C., & Winberg, M. (2011). Culturally equipped for socio-scientific issues? A comparative study on how teachers and students in mono- and multiethnic schools handle work with complex issues. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (13), 1835–1859.

lozzi, L. A. (1981). *Research in environmental education 1971–1980* (ED214762). Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse for Science, Mathematics, and Environmental Education.

Jakobsson, A., Mäkitalo, Å., & Säljö, R. (2009). Conceptions of knowledge in research on students' understanding of the greenhouse effect: Methodological positions and their consequences for representations of knowing. Science Education, 93, 978–995. Jensen, B. B., & Schnack, K. (1997). The action competence approach in environmental education. Environmental Education Research, 3 (2), 163–178.

Jickling, B. (1999). Education for sustainability: A seductive idea, but is it enough for my grandchildren? In Blanken, ir. H. (Ed.), NME met een duurzaam perspectief, essaybundel bij de slotconferentie NME Extra Impuls 1996–1999 (pp. 34–38) (EE in a sustainable perspective, a collection of essays in the context of the final conference of the program Extra Impulse EE 1996–1999). Amsterdam: NCDO. Jickling, B. (2004a). Making ethics an everyday activity: How can we reduce the barriers? Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 9

Jickling, B. (2004a). Making ethics an everyday activity: How can we reduce the barriers? Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 9 (1), 11–28.

Jickling, B. (Ed.). (2004b). Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 9 (1).

Judson, E. (2011). The impact of field trips and family involvement on mental models of the desert environment. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (13), 1455–1472.

Kim, M., & Tan, H. T. (2013). A collaborative problem-solving process through environmental field studies. International Journal of Science Education, 35 (3), 357–387.

Kirkeby Hansen, P. J. (2010). Knowledge about the greenhouse effect and the effects of the ozone layer among Norwegian pupils finishing compulsory education in 1989, 1993, and 2005—What now? International Journal of Science Education, 32 (3), 397–419.

Knapp, D. (1998). The Thessaloniki Declaration—the beginning of the end for environmental education. Environmental Communicator, 28 (2), 2–14.

Kollmuss, A., & Agyeman, J. (2002). Mind the gap: Why do people act environmentally and what are the barriers to pro-environmental behavior? Environmental Education Research, 8 (3), 239–260.

Kyburz-Graber, R. (1999). Environmental education as critical education: How teachers and students handle the challenge. Cambridge Journal of Education, 29 (3), 415–432.

Kyburz-Graber, R. (2013). Socio-ecological approaches to environmental education and research: A paradigmatic response to behavioral change orientations. In R. B. Stevenson , M. Brody , J. Dillon , & A. E. J. Wals (Eds.), International handbook of research in environmental education (pp. 23–32). New York: Routledge.

Kyburz-Graber, R., Rigendinger, L., Hirsch Hadorn, G., & Werner Zentner, K. (1997a). Sozio-ökologische Umweltbildung. Hamburg: Krämer.

Kyburz-Graber, R., Rigendinger, L., Hirsch Hadorn, G., & Werner Zentner, K. (1997b). A socio-ecological approach to interdisciplinary environmental education in senior high schools. Environmental Education Research, 3 (1), 17–28.

Lambert, J. L., Lindgren, J., & Bleicher, R. (2012). Assessing elementary science methods students' understanding about global climate change. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (8), 1167–1187.

Lee, Y. C. , & Grace, M. (2012). Students' reasoning and decision making about a socioscientific issue: A cross-context comparison. Science Education, 96, 787–807.

Levine Rose, S., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2012). Should Great Lakes City build a new power plant? How youth navigate socioscientific issues. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 541–567.

Lombardi, D., & Sinatra, G. M. (2012). College students' perceptions about the plausibility of human-induced climate change. Research in Science Education, 42 (2), 201–217.

Lombardi, D. , & Sinatra, G. M. (2013). Emotions about teaching about human-induced climate change. International Journal of Science Education, 35 (1), 167–191.

Luehmann, A. L. (2009). Students' perspectives of a science enrichment programme: Out-of-school inquiry as access. International Journal of Science Education, 31 (13), 1831–1855.

Maller, C. (2005). Hands-on contact with nature in primary schools as a catalyst for developing a sense of community and cultivating mental health and wellbeing. Eingana, 28, 16–21.

Mallya, A., Mensah, F. M., Contento, I. R., Koch, P. A., & Barton, A. C. (2012). Extending science beyond the classroom door: Learning from students' experiences with the *Choice, Control and Change* (*C3*) curriculum. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 244–269. Malone, K. (2008). Every experience matters: An evidence based research report on the role of learning outside the classroom for children's whole development from birth to eighteen years. Report commissioned by Farming and Countryside Education for UK Department Children, School and Families. Wollongong, Australia: University of Wollongong.

Manjengwa, J., (1999). Environmental education. Harare, Zimbabwe: Open University Press.

Marcinkowski, T. (1993). A contextual review of the "quantitative paradigm" in EE research. In R. Mrazek (Ed.), Alternative paradigms in environmental education research (pp. 29–78). Troy, OH: North American Association for Environmental Education.

Marcinkowski, T. (2003). Commentary on Rickinson's "Learners and learning in environmental education: A critical review of the evidence" (*EER* 7(3)), Environmental Education Research, 9 (2), 181–213.

Martin, G. C. , & Wheeler, K. (Eds.). (1975). Insights into environmental education. London: Oliver and Boyd.

McCrea, E. J. (n.d.). The roots of environmental education: How the past supports the future. Retrieved from

http://cms.eetap.org/repository/moderncms_documents/History.Final.20060315.1.1.pdf

McKeown, R., & Hopkins, C. (2003). EE does not equal ESD: Defusing the worry. Environmental Education Research, 9 (1), 118–128. McNeill, K. L., & Houle Vaughn, M. (2012). Urban high school students' critical science agency: Conceptual understandings and

environmental actions around climate change. Research in Science Education, 42 (2), 373-399.

Moss Gamblin, K. (2012). Personal communication. July 9, 2012.

National Association for Research in Science Teaching (NARST) . (2013). NARST strand descriptions. Retrieved from www.narst.org/about/strands.cfm

Nisiforou, O., & Charalambides, A. G. (2012). Assessing undergraduate university students' level of knowledge, attitudes and behaviour towards biodiversity: A case study in Cyprus. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (7), 1027–1051.

Nundy, S. (1998). The fieldwork effect: An exploration of fieldwork at KS2. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Southampton.

Nundy, S. (1999a). The fieldwork effect: The role and impact of fieldwork in the upper primary school. International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education, 8, 190–198.

Nundy, S. (1999b). Thoughts from the field: In their own words... Horizons, 4, 20–22.

O'Donoghue, R., & McNaught, C. (1991). Environmental education: The development of a curriculum through "grass-roots" reconstructive action. International Journal of Science Education, 13 (4), 391–404.

Oerke, B., & Bogner, F. X. (2013). Social desirability, environmental attitudes, and general ecological behaviour in children . International Journal of Science Education, 35 (5), 713–730.

Oliveira, A. W., Akerson, V. L., & Oldfield, M. (2012). Environmental argumentation as sociocultural activity. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 869–897.

Online Colloquium . (1998). The future of environmental education in a postmodern world. Whitehorse, Canada: Yukon College. Pawley, D. (2000). Sustainability: A big word with little meaning. Independent, 11 July. Retrieved from www.audacity.org/Resourcing%20the%20future.htm

Payne, P. G., & Wattchow, B. (2009). Phenomenological seconstruction, slow pedagogy, and the corporeal turn in wild environmental/outdoor education. Canadian Journal of Environmental Education. 14, 15–32.

Pike, G., & Selby, D. (1995). Reconnecting: From national to global curriculum. Guildford, UK: World Wide Fund for Nature UK.

Posch, P. (1993). Research issues in environmental education. Studies in Science Education, 21, 21-48.

Pritchard, T. (1975). World environmental education: The role of the IUCN. In G. C. Martin & K. Wheeler (Eds.), Insights into environmental education (pp. 177–194). London: Oliver and Boyd.

Ramsey, J. M., Hungerford, H. R., & Volk, T. L. (1992). Environmental education in the K–12 curriculum: Finding a niche. Journal of Environmental Education, 23 (2), 35–45.

Randler, C. , Ilg, A. , & Kern, J. (2005). Cognitive and emotional evaluation of an amphibian conservation program for elementary school students. Journal of Environmental Education, 37, 43–52.

Ratinen, I. J. (2013). Primary student-teachers' conceptual understanding of the greenhouse effect: A mixed methods study. International Journal of Science Education, 35 (6), 929–955.

Rauch, F. (2002). The potential of education for sustainable development for reform in schools. Environmental Education Research, 8 (1), 43–51.

Reid, A., & Nikel, J. (2003). Reading a critical review of evidence: Notes and queries on research programmes in environmental education. Environmental Education Research, 9 (2), 149–165.

Rickinson, M. (2001). Special issue: Learners and learning in environmental education: A critical review of the evidence. Environmental Education Research, 7 (3), 208–320.

Rickinson, M. (2003). Reviewing research evidence in environmental education: Some methodological reflections and challenges. Environmental Education Research, 9 (2), 257–271.

Rickinson, M., Dillon, J., Teamey, K., Morris, M., Choi, M.Y., Sanders, D., & Benefield, P. (2004). A review of research on outdoor learning. Preston Montford, Shropshire, UK: Field Studies Council.

Robottom, I. (Ed.). (1987). Environmental education: Practice and possibility. Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Robottom, I. (2003). Communities, environmental issues and environmental education research. Education Relative A L'Environnement: Regards; Recherches; Reflexion, 4, 77–97.

Robottom, I., & Hart, P. (1993). Research in environmental education. Engaging the debate. Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press. Ruiz-Mallen, I., Barraza, L., Bodenhorn, B., de la Paz Ceja-Adame, M., & Reyes-García, V. (2010). Contextualising learning through the participatory construction of an environmental education programme. International Journal of Science Education, 32 (13), 1755–1770. Russell, C., & Dillon, J. (Eds.). (2010). Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education, 10 (1). Special Issue on Environmental Education in Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education.

Sachs, W. (1995). Global ecology and the shadow of development. Retrieved from

www.laucksfoundation.org/public_html/lauckswebpage/reprints/131.pdf

Sauvé, L. (1996). Environmental education and sustainable development. Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 1, 7–35. Sauvé, L., & Berryman, T. (2003). Researchers and research in environmental education: A critical review essay on Mark Rickinson's report on learners and learning. Environmental Education Research, 9 (2), 167–180.

Sauvé, L., Brunelle, R., & Berryman, T. (2005). Influence of the globalized and globalizing sustainable development framework on national policies related to environmental education. Policy Futures in Education, 3 (3), 271–283.

Saylan, C., & Blumstein, D. T. (2011). The failure of environmental education [and how we can fix it]. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Scott, W., & Gough, S. (2003). Sustainable development and learning. Framing the issues. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Selby, D. (2001). The signature of the whole: Radical interconnectedness and its implications for global and environmental education. Encounter. Education for Meaning and Social Justice, 14 (1), 5–16.

Semken, S. , & Freeman, C. B. (2008). Sense of place in the practice and assessment of place-based science teaching. Science Education, 92, 1042–1057.

Sia, A. P., Hungerford, H. R., & Tomera, A. N. (1985/1986). Selected predictors of responsible environmental behaviour. Journal of Environmental Education, 17 (2), 31–40.

Skamp, K., Boyes, E., & Stanisstreet, M. (2013). Beliefs and willingness to act about global warming: Where to focus science pedagogy? Science Education, 97, 191–217.

Smyth, J. (1998). Environmental education—the beginning of the end or the end of the beginning? Environmental Communicator, 28 (4), 14–16.

Stapp, W. (1974). Historical setting of environmental education. In W. B. Stapp , A. E. J. Wals , & S. L. Stankorb (Eds.), Environmental education for empowerment. Action research and community problem solving (pp. 41–49). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.

Stapp, W., (1970). The concept of environmental education. Education Digest, 35 (7), 8–10.

State Education and Environment Roundtable (SEER) . (2000). *The effects of environment-based education on student achievement* [online]. Retrieved from www.seer.org/pages/research/CSAPII2005.pdf

Sterling, S. (2001). Sustainable education: Re-visioning learning and change. Dartington: Green Books Ltd.

Sterling, S. (2005). LinkingThinking: New perspectives on thinking and learning for sustainability. Perthshire, Scotland: WWF Scotland. Stern, P. (2000). Toward a coherent theory of environmentally significant behavior. Journal of Social Issues, 50 (3), 65–84.

Sternäng, L., & Lundholm, C. (2011). Climate change and morality: Students' perspectives on the individual and society. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (8), 1131–1148.

Stevenson, R. B., Brody, M., Dillon, J., & Wals, A. E. J. (Eds.). (2013). International handbook of research in environmental education. New York: Routledge.

Summers, M., Childs, A., & Corney, G. (2005). Education for sustainable development in initial teacher training: Issues for interdisciplinary collaboration. Environmental Education Research, 11 (5), 623–647.

Summers, M., Corney, G., & Childs, A. (2003). Teaching sustainable development in primary schools: An empirical study of issues for teachers. Environmental Education Research, 9 (3), 327–346.

Svihla, V., & Linn, M. C. (2012). A design-based approach to fostering understanding of global climate change. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (5), 651–676.

Swan, J. A. (2010). Transpersonal psychology and the ecological conscience. Journal of Transpersonal Psychology, 42 (1), 2–25. Symons, G. (2000). Commitment to sustainable development: A rationale for the curriculum? Primary Teaching Studies, 11 (2), 23–29. Tal, T. (2008). Learning about agriculture within the framework of education for sustainability. Environmental Education Research, 14 (3), 273–290.

Taskin, O. (2009). The environmental attitudes of Turkish senior high school students in the context of postmaterialism and the new environmental paradigm. International Journal of Science Education, 31 (4), 481–452.

Taylor, N., Nathan, S., & Coll, R. K. (2003). Education for sustainability in regional New South Wales, Australia: An exploratory study of some teachers' perceptions. International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education, 12 (4), 291–311.

Tilbury, D. (1995). Environmental education for sustainability: Defining the new focus of environmental education in the 1990s. Environmental Education Research, 1 (2), 195–212.

Tomas, L., Ritchie, S. M., & Tones, M. (2011). Attitudinal impact of hybridized writing about a socioscientific issue. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48, 878–900.

Tran, N. E. (2011). The relationship between students' connections to out-of-school experiences and factors associated with science learning. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (12), 1625–1651.

Tseverini, I. (2011). Towards an environmental education without scientific knowledge: An attempt to create an action model based on children's experiences, emotions and perceptions about their environment. Environmental Education Research, 17 (1), 53–67.

UNESCO-EPD . (1997). Declaration of Thessaloniki. (UNESCO Publication No. EPD-97/CONF.401/CLD.Z). Paris: Author. United Nations . (2002). Report of the World Summit on Sustainable Development. Johannesburg, South Africa, 26 August–4 September 2002. New York: United Nations.

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (1975). The Belgrade Charter. A global framework for environmental education. Retrieved from www.envir.ee/orb.aw/class=file/action=preview/id=1011467/The%2BBelgrade%2BCharter.pdf United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (1978). Intergovernmental Conference on Environmental Education: Tbilisi (USSR), 14–26 October 1977. Final Report. Paris: Author.

United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) . (1972). Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. Retrieved from www.unep.org/Documents.Multilingual/Default.Print.asp?documentid=97&articleid=1503

Vasconcelos, C. (2012). Teaching environmental education through PBL: Evaluation of a teaching intervention program. Research in Science Education, 42 (2), 219–232.

Volk, T., & McBeth, W. (1997). Environmental literacy in the United States. Washington, DC: North American Association for Environmental Education.

Wagner, J. (1993). Ignorance in educational research: Or, how can you *not* know that? Educational Researcher, 22 (5), 15–23. Wals, A. E. J. (1993). Critical phenomenology and environmental education research. In R. Mrazek (Ed.), Alternative paradigms in environmental education research (pp. 153–174). Troy, OH: North American Association for Environmental Education.

Wals, A. E. J., & Jickling, B. (1999). Process-based environmental education: Setting standards without standardizing. In B. B. Jensen, K. Schnack, & V. Simovska (Eds.). Critical environmental and health education. Copenhagen: Royal School of Educational Studies. Ward, M. (2002). Environmental management: Expertise, uncertainty, responsibility. In E. Janse van Rensburg, J. Hattingh, H. Lotz-Sisitka, & R. O'Donoghue (Eds.), Environmental education, ethics and action in Southern Africa (pp. 28–35). Pretoria, South Africa: Human Sciences Research Council.

Wheeler, K. (1975). The genesis of environmental education. In G. C. Martin & K. Wheeler (Eds.), Insights into environmental education (pp. 2–20). London: Oliver and Boyd.

Whittington, A. (2006). Challenging girls' constructions of femininity in the outdoors. Journal of Experiential Education, 28, 205–221. Williams, D. R., & Dixon, P. S. (2013). Synthesis of research between 1990 and 2010: Impact of garden-based learning on academic outcomes. Review of Educational Research, 83 (2), 211–235.

Williams, M. (Ed.). (1996). Understanding geographical and environmental education: The role of research. London: Cassell. World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) . (1987). Our common future. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Zelezny, L. (1999). Educational interventions that improve environmental behaviors: A meta-analysis. Journal of Environmental Education, 31 (1), 5–14.

From Inquiry to Scientific Practices in the Science Classroom

Abd-El-Khalick, F., BouJaoude, S., Duschl, R., Lederman, N. G., Mamlok-Naaman, R., Hofstein, A., Niaz, M., (2004). Inquiry in science education: International perspectives. Science Education, 88 (3), 397–419.

Abell, S. K., Anderson, G., & Chezem, J. (2000). Science as argument and explanation: Exploring concepts of sound in third grade. In J. Minstrell & E. van Zee (Eds.), Inquiring into inquiry learning and teaching in science (pp. 65–79). Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Akar, E. (2005). Effectiveness of 5E Cycle on students' understanding of acid-based concepts. A thesis submitted to the graduate school of natural and applied science. Middle East Technical University. Ankara, Turkey. Retrieved from https://etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12605747/index

Alberts, B. (2000). Some thoughts of a scientist on inquiry. In J. Minstrell & E. van Zee (Eds.), Inquiring into inquiry learning and teaching in science (pp. 3–13). Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) . (1989). Science for all Americans. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from www.project2061.org/publications/bsl/online/index.php?chapter=1

American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) . (1993). Project 2061 atlas of scientific literacy, Volumes 1 and 2. Retrieved January 26, 2013, from www.project2061.org/publications/atlas/default.htm

Anderson, R. D. (2002). Reforming science teaching? What research says about inquiry. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 13 (1), 1–12.

Anderson, R. D. (2007). Inquiry as an organizing theme for science curricula. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 807–830). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Atar, H. Y. (2011). Investigating the relationship between teachers' nature of science conceptions and their practice of inquiry science. Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching, 12 (2), 1–26.

Atay, D. P., & Tekkaya, C. (2008). Promoting students' learning in genetics with the learning cycle. The Journal of Experimental Education, 76 (3), 259–280.

Au, W. (2007). High stakes testing and curricular control: A qualitative metasynthesis. Educational Researcher, 36 (5), 258–267. Barrow, L. (2006). A brief history of inquiry: From Dewey to standards. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 17, 265–278. Blanchard, M. R., Southerland, S. A., Osborne, J. W., Sampson, V. D., Annetta, L. A., & Granger, E. M. (2010). Is inquiry possible in light of accountability? A quantitative comparison of the relative effectiveness of guided inquiry and verification laboratory instruction. Science Education, 94, 577–616. Blumenfeld, P., Soloway, R., Marx, R., Krajcik, J., Guzdial, M., & Palincsar, A. (1991). Motivating project-based learning: Sustaining the doing, supporting the learning. Educational Psychologist, 26, 369, 398.

Brand, B. R., & Moore, S. J. (2011). Enhancing teachers' application of inquiry-based strategies using a constructivist sociocultural professional development model. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (7), 889–913.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (1999). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Braund, M., & Reiss, M. (2006). Towards a more authentic science curriculum: The contribution of out-of-school learning. International Journal of Science Education. 28 (12), 1373–1388.

Breslyn, W. , & McGinnis, J. R. (2011). A comparison of exemplary biology, chemistry, earth science, and physics teachers' conceptions and enactment of inquiry. Science Education, 96, 48–77.

Brossard, D., Lewenstein, B., & Bonney, R. (2005). Scientific knowledge and attitude change: The impact of a citizen science project. International Journal of Science Education, 27 (9), 1099–1121.

Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. Educational Researcher, 18 (1), 32–42. Bybee, R., Taylor, J., Gardner, A., Van Scotter, P., Powell, J., Westbrook, A., & Landes, N. (2006). The BSCS 5E instructional model: Origins and effectiveness. A Report prepared for the office of science education National Institutes of Health. Colorado Springs, CO: BSCS.

Bybee, R. W. (2000). Teaching science as inquiry. In J. Minstrell & E. van Zee (Eds.), Inquiring into inquiry learning and teaching in science (pp. 20–46). Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Bybee, R. W. (2006). Scientific inquiry and science teaching. In L. Flick & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Scientific inquiry and nature of science (pp. 1–14). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer Publishers.

Bybee, R. W., & Van Scotter, P. (2007). Reinventing the science curriculum. Educational Leadership, 64 (4), 43-47.

Capps, D. K., & Crawford, B. A. (2012). Inquiry-based instruction and teaching about nature of science: Are they happening? Journal of Science Teacher Education. doi:10.1007/s10972-012-9314-z

Capps, D. K., & Crawford, B. A. (2013). Inquiry-based professional development: What does it take to support teachers in learning about inquiry and nature of science? International Journal of Science Education, 35 (12), 1947–1978.

Capps, D. K. Crawford, B. A., & Constas, M. (2012). A review of empirical literature on inquiry professional development: Alignment with best practices and a critique of the findings. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23 (3), 291–318.

Champagne, A. B., Kouba, V. L., & Hurley, M. (2000). Assessing inquiry. In J. Minstrell & E. van Zee (Eds.), Inquiring into inquiry learning and teaching in science (pp. 447–470). Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Chinn, C., & Malhotra, B. (2002). Epistemologically authentic inquiry in schools: A theoretical framework for evaluating inquiry tasks. Science Education, 86 (2), 175–218.

Cohn, J. (2008). Citizen science: Can volunteers do real research? Bio-Science, 58 (3), 192–197.

Conner, T., Capps, D. K., Crawford, B. A., & Ross, R. M. (2013). Engage all of your students using project-based learning. Science Scope, 36 (7), 62–67.

Crawford, B. A. (1999). Is it realistic to expect a preservice teacher to create an inquiry-based classroom? Journal of Science Teacher Education, 10, 175–194.

Crawford, B. A. (2000). Embracing the essence of inquiry: New roles for science teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37, 916–937.

Crawford, B. A. (2007). Learning to teach science as inquiry in the rough and tumble of practice. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (4), 613–642.

Crawford, B. A., Capps, D. K., van Driel, J., Lederman, N. G., Lederman, J., Luft, J., Wong, S., Tan, A., Lim, S., Loughran, J., & Smith, K. (2013). Learning to teach science as inquiry: Developing an evidence-based framework for effective teacher professional development. In C. Bruguiére, A. Tiberghien, & P. Clément (Eds.), Topics and trends in current science education Vol. I. (pp. 193–212). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Crawford, B. A., Krajcik, J. S., & Marx, R. W. (1999). Elements of a community of learners in a middle school science classroom. Science Education, 83, 701–723.

Crawford, B. A., Ross, R., & Allmon, W. (2014). Fossil finders: Using fossils to teach about evolution, inquiry and nature of science. Retrieved from http://fossilfinder.coe.uga.edu/

Cuevas, P., Lee, O., Hart, J., & Deaktor, R. (2005). Improving science inquiry with elementary students of diverse backgrounds. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42, 337–357.

Dewey, J. (1910). Science as subject matter and as method. Science, 121–127.

Dewey, J. (1971). How we think. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company. Originally published in 1910.

Drake, K. N., & Long, D. (2009). Rebecca's in the dark? A comparative study of problem-based learning and direct instruction/experiential learning in two 4th-grade classrooms. Journal of Elementary Science Education, 21 (1), 1–16.

Driver, R. (1989). The construction of scientific knowledge in school classrooms. In R. Miller (Ed.), Doing science: Images of science in education (pp. 83–107). New York: Routledge.

Driver, R., Squires, A., Rushworth, P., & Wood-Robinson, V. (1994). Making sense of secondary science: Children's ideas in science. London and New York: Routledge.

Duschl, R. A. (2003). Assessment of inquiry. In J. M. Atkin & J. E. Coffey (Eds.), Everyday assessment in the science classroom (pp. 41–59). Arlington, VA: National Science Teachers Association Press.

Duschl, R. A., Schweingruber, H. A., & Shouse, A. W. (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science in grades K–8. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Fazio, X., Melville, W., & Bartley, A. (2010). The problematic nature of the practicum: A key determinant of pre-service teachers' emerging inquiry-based science practices. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21 (6), 665–681.

Fogleman, J., McNeill, K. L., & Krajcik, J. (2011). Examining the effect of teachers' adaptations of a middle school science-oriented curriculum on student learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (2), 149–169.

Forbes, C. T., & Davis, E. (2010). Curriculum design for inquiry: Pre-service elementary teachers' mobilization and adaptation of science curriculum materials. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (7), 820–839.

Furtak, E., Siedal, T., Iverson, H., & Briggs, D. (2012). Experimental and quasi-experimental studies of inquiry-based science teaching: A Meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research, 82 (3), 300–329.

Galloway, A., Tudor, M., & Vanderhaegen. (2006). The reliability of citizen science: A case study of Oregon white oak stand surveys. Wildlife Society Bulletin, 34 (5), 1425–1429.

Geier, R., Blumenfeld, P., Marx, R., Krajcik, J., Fishman, B., Soloway, E., & Clay-Chambers, J. (2008). Standardized test outcomes for students engaged in inquiry based science curriculum in the context of urban reform. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (8), 922–939.

Goldfisher, D., Crawford, B. A., Capps, D., & Ross, R. (2014). Fossils, inquiry, and the English language learners. Science Scope. Haberman, M. (1991). The pedagogy of poverty versus good teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 73, 290–294.

Harms, M. C. , & Yager, R. E. (1981). What research says to the science teacher. Vol. 3. Arlington, VA: National Science Teachers Association.

Harris, C., & Rooks, D. (2010). Managing inquiry-based science: Challenges in enacting complex science instruction in elementary and middle school. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21 (2), 227–240.

Hasson, E., & Yarden, A. (2012). Separating the research question from the laboratory techniques: Advancing high-school biology teachers' ability to ask research questions. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (10), 1296–1320.

Hmelo-Silver, C. , Duncan, R. , & Chinn, C. (2007). Scaffolding and achievement in problem-based and inquiry learning: A response to Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark (2006). Educational Psychologist, 42 (2), 99–107.

Horizon Research Corporation, Inc. (1999). Local systemic change core evaluation data collection manual. Chapel Hill, NC: Author.

Hsu, C.-K., Hwang, G.-J., Chuang, C.-W., & Chang, C.-K. (2012). Effects on learners' performance of using selected and open network resources in a problem-based learning activity. Journal of Educational Technology, 43 (4), 606–623.

Ireland, J., Watters, J., Brownlee, J., & Lupton, M. (2011). Elementary teacher's conceptions of inquiry teaching: Messages for teacher development. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23 (2), 1–17.

Jones, M. T., & Eick, C. J. (2009). Implementing inquiry kit curriculum: Obstacles, adaptations, and practical knowledge development in two middle school science teachers. Science Education, 91 (3), 492–513.

Kahle, J., Meece, J., & Scantlebury, K. (2000). Urban African-American middle school science students: Does standards-based teaching make a difference? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37 (9), 1019–1041.

Kang, N. H. (2007). Learning to teach science: Personal epistemologies, teaching goals, and practices of teaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 24, 478–498.

Kennedy, M. M. (2010). Attrition and the quest for teacher quality. Educational Researcher, 39 (8), 591–598.

Keys, C. W., & Bryan, L. (2001). Co-constructing inquiry-based science with teachers: Essential research for lasting reform. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (6), 631–645.

Keys, C. W., & Kennedy, V. (1999). Understanding inquiry science teaching in context: A case study of an elementary teacher. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 10, 315–333.

Kim, M., & Tan, A.-L. (2011). Rethinking difficulties of teaching inquiry-based practical work: Stories from elementary pre-service teachers. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (4), 465–486.

Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R. E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: An analysis of the failure of constructivist, discovery, problem-based, experiential, and inquiry-based teaching. Educational Psychologist, 41, 75–86.

Kolodner, J., Camp, P., Crismond, D., Fasse, B., Gray, J., Holbrook, J., Puntambekar, S., & Ryan, M. (2003). Problem-based learning meets case-based reasoning in the middle-school science classroom: Putting learning by design into practice. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 12 (4), 495–547.

Krajcik, J. , Blumenfeld, P. , Marx, R. , Bass, K. , Fredricks, J. , & Soloway, E. (1998). Inquiry in project based-science classrooms. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 7 (3&4), 313–350.

Krajcik, J., & Czerniak, C. (2014). Teaching science in elementary and middle school children science: A project-based science approach (4th ed.). New York: Routledge.

Krajcik, J., McNeill, K., & Reiser, B. (2007). Learning-goals-driven design model: Developing curriculum materials that align with national standards and incorporate project-based pedagogy. Science Education. doi:10.1002/sce.20240

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lavonen, J., & Laaksonen, S. (2009). Context of teaching and learning school science in Finland: Reflections on PISA 2006 results. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (8), 922–944.

Lee, O. , Buxton, C. , Lewis, S. , & LeRoy, K. (2006). Science inquiry and student diversity: Enhanced abilities and continuing difficulties after an instructional intervention. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42, 921–946.

Lee, Y. (2011). Enhancing pedagogical content knowledge in a collaborative school-based PD program for inquiry-based science teaching. Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching, 12 (2), 1–30.

Leonard, J., Boakes, N., & Moore, C. M. (2009). Conducting science inquiry in primary classrooms? Case studies of two preservice teachers' inquiry-based practices. Journal of Elementary Science Education, 21 (1), 27–50.

Lotter, C., Harwood, W. S., & Bonner, J. J. (2007). The influence of core teaching conceptions on teachers' use of inquiry teaching practices. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44, 1318–1347.

Lustick, D. (2009). The failure of inquiry: Preparing science teachers with an authentic investigation. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20 (6), 583–604.

Lynch, S., Kuipers, J., Pyke, C., & Szesze, M. (2005). Examining the effects of a highly rated science curriculum unit on diverse students: Results from a planning grant. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42, 921–946.

Marx, R., Blumenfeld, P., Krajcik, J., & Soloway, E. (1994). Enacting project-based science. The Elementary School Journal, 97 (4), Special Issue: Science (Mar., 1994), 341–358.

Marx, R. W., Blumenfeld, P. C., Krajcik, J., Blunk, M., Crawford, B., Kelly, B., & Meyer, K. (1994). Enacting project-based science: Experiences of four middle grade teachers. Elementary School Journal, 94 (5), 499–516.

Marx, R. W., Blumenfeld, P. C., Krajcik, J. S., Fishman, B., Soloway, E., Geier, R., & Revital, T. T. (2004). Inquiry-based science in the middle grades: Assessment of learning in urban systemic reform. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (10), 1063–1080.

Maskiewicz, A. C. , & Winters, V. A. (2012). Understanding the co-construction of inquiry practices: A case study of a responsive teaching environment. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 429–464.

Mayer, R. E. (2004). Should there be a three-strikes rule against pure discovery learning? The case for guided methods of instruction. American Psychologist, 59, 14–19. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.59.1.14

McCrathy, C. (2005). Effects of thematic based, hands on science teaching versus a textbook approach for students with disabilities. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42, 245–263.

McNeil, K. (2009). Teachers' use of curriculum to support students in writing scientific arguments to explain phenomena. Science Education, 93 (2), 233–268.

Meyer, X. S., & Crawford, B. A. (2011). Teaching science as a cultural way of knowing: Merging authentic inquiry, nature of science, and multicultural strategies. Cultural Studies in Science Education. 6 (3), 525–547. doi:10.1007/s11422-011-9318-6

Minner, D. D., Levy, A. J., & Century, J. (2010). Inquiry-based science instruction—what is it and does it matter? Results from a research synthesis years 1984 to 2002. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 474–496.

Minstrell, J. (2000). Implications for teaching and learning inquiry: A summary. In J. Minstrell & E. van Zee (Eds.), Inquiring into inquiry learning and teaching in science (pp. 471–496). Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science. Minstrell, J., & van Zee, E. H. (Eds.). (2000). Inquiring into inquiry learning and teaching in science. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science. Association for the Advancement of Science.

National Research Council (NRC) . (1996). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. National Research Council (NRC) . (2000). Inquiry and the national science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council (NRC) . (2012). A framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

NGSS Lead States . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Nugent G. , Toland, M. , Levy, R. , Kunz, G. , Harwood, D. , Green, D. , & Kitts, K. (2012). The impact of an inquiry-based geoscience field course on preservice teachers. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23 (5), 503–529.

Osborne, J., Erduran, S., & Simon, S. (2004). Enhancing the quality of argumentation in school science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (10), 994–1020.

Pajares, F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. Review of Educational Research, 62 (3), 307–332.

Passmore, C. M., & Stewart, J. (2002). A modeling approach to teaching evolutionary biology in high schools. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39, 185–204.

Passmore, C. M., Stewart, J., & Cartier, J. (2009). Model-based inquiry and school science: Creating connections. School Science and Mathematics, 109 (7), 394–402.

Peterson, R., & Treagust, D. (1998). Learning to teach primary science through problem-based learning. Science Education, 82 (2), 215–237.

Philipp, R. A. (2007). Mathematics teachers' beliefs and affect. In F. K. Lester (Ed.), Second handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning (Vol. 2, pp. 257–315). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Pine, J. P., Aschbacher, P. A., Roth, E., Jones, M., McPhee, C., Martin, C., Phelps, S., Kyle, T., & Foley, B. (2006). Fifth graders' science inquiry abilities: A comparative study of students in textbook and inquiry curricula. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (5), 467–484.

Polman, J. (2000). Designing project-based science: Connecting learners through guided inquiry. Williston, VT: Teachers College Press. Posner, G., Strike, K., Hewson, P., & Gertzog, W. (1982). Accommodation of a science concept: Toward a theory of conceptual change. Science Education, 66 (2), 211–227.

Roehrig, G. H., & Luft, J. (2004). Constraints experienced by beginning secondary science teachers in implementing scientific inquiry lessons. International Journal of Science Education, 26 (1), 3–24.

Roth, W. M. (1995). Authentic school science: Knowing and learning in open-inquiry laboratories. Dordrecht, the Netherlands, and Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Roth, W. M., & Calabrese-Barton, A. (2004). Rethinking scientific literacy. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Ruiz-Primo, M. A., Li, M., Tsai, S.-P., & Schneider, J. (2010). Testing one premise of scientific inquiry in science classrooms: Examining students' scientific explanations and student learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (5), 583–608.

Sadeh, I., & Zion, M. (2009). The development of dynamic inquiry performances within an open inquiry setting: A comparison to guided inquiry setting. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (10), 1137–1160.

Sadler, T., Barab, S., & Scott, B. (2007). What do students gain by engaging in socioscientific inquiry? Research in Science Education, 37 (4), 371–391.

Samarapungavan, A., Patrick, H., & Mantzicopoulos, P. (2011). What kindergarten students learn in inquiry-based science classrooms. Cognition and Instruction, 29 (4), 416–470.

Schmidt, H. G. (1983). Problem based learning: Rationale and description. Medical Education, 17, 11–16.

Schneider, R., Krajcik, J., & Blumenfeld . (2005). Enacting reform-based science materials: The range of teacher enactments in reform classrooms. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42 (3), 283–312.

Schneider R. M., Krajcik, J., Marx, R., & Soloway, E. (2002). Performance of students in project-based science classrooms on a national measure of science achievement. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (5), 410–422.

Schroeder, C., Scott, T., Tolson, H., Huang, T.-Y., & Lee, Y.-H. (2007). A meta-analysis of national research: Effects of teaching strategies on student achievement in science in the United States. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (10), 1136–1160. Schwab, J. J. (1958). The teaching of science as inquiry. Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 14, 374–380.

Schwab, J. J. (1960). Inquiry, the science teacher, and the educator. The School Review, 68 (2), 176–195.

Schwartz, R., & Crawford, B. A. (2004). Authentic scientific inquiry as a context for teaching nature of science: Identifying critical elements for success. In L. Flick & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Scientific inquiry and nature of science: Implications for teaching, learning, and teacher education (pp. 331–356). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Publishing Co.

Schwartz, R. S., Lederman, N. G., & Crawford, B. A. (2004). Developing views of nature of science in an authentic context: An explicit approach to bridging the gap between nature of science and scientific inquiry. Science Education, 88, 610–645.

Schwarz, C. (2009). Developing preservice elementary teachers' knowledge and practices through modeling centered scientific inquiry. Science Education, 93, 720–744.

Settlage, J. (2007). Demythologizing science teacher education: Conquering the false ideal of open inquiry. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18 (4), 461–467.

Shymansky, J. A., Kyle, W. C., & Alport, J. M. (1983). The effects of new science curricula on student performance. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 20 (5), 387–404.

Singer, J. , Marx, R. , Krajcik, J. , & Clay Chambers, J. (2000). Constructing extended inquiry projects: Curriculum projects for science education reform. Educational Psychologist, 35 (3), 165–178.

Songer, N., Lee, H., & Kam, R. (2001, April). Technology-rich inquiry science in urban classrooms: What are the barriers to inquiry pedagogy? A paper presented at the 2001 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Seattle, WA. Strike, K., & Posner, G. (1982). Conceptual change and science teaching. European Journal of Science Education, 4 (3), 231–240. Taber, K. S. (2010). Constructivism and direct instruction as competing instructional paradigms: An essay review of Tobias and Duffy's constructivist instruction: Success or failure? Education Review, 13 (8), 1–44. Retrieved from www.edrev.info/essays/v13n8index.html Talanquer, V., Tomanek, D., & Novodvorsky, I. (2013). Assessing students' understanding of inquiry: What do prospective science teachers notice? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50 (2), 189–208.

Thacker, B., Kim, E., Trefz, K., & Lea, S. (1994). Comparing problem solving performance of physics students in inquiry-based and traditional introductory physics courses. American Journal of Physics, 62 (7), 627–633.

Trautmann, N., MaKinster, J., & Avery, L. (2004, April). What makes inquiry so hard? (And why is it worth it?) Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Vancouver, BC.

Turpin, T., & Cage, B. N. (2004). The effects of an integrated, activity-based science curriculum on student achievement, science process skills, and science attitudes. Electronic Journal of Literacy through Science, 3, 1–17. Retrieved from http://ejlts.ucdavis.edu/article/2004/3/3 Vygotsky, L. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher mental processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Wallace, C. W., & Kang, N. (2004). An investigation of experienced secondary science teachers' beliefs about inquiry: An examination of competing belief sets. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41, 936–960.

Wee, B., Shepardson, D., Fast, J., & Harbor, J. (2007). Teaching and learning about inquiry: Insights and challenges in professional development. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18 (1), 63–89.

Welch, W. , Klopfer, L. , Aikenhead, G. , & Robinson, J. (1981). The role of inquiry in science education: Analysis and recommendations. Science Education, 65, 33–50.

Wheeler, G. F. (2000). In J. Minstrell & van Zee, E. (Eds.), Inquiring into inquiry learning and teaching in science (pp. 471–496). Washington DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

White, B., & Frederiksen, J. (1998). Inquiry, modeling, and metacognition: Making science accessible to all students. Cognition and Instruction, 16 (1), 3–118.

White, B., & Frederiksen, J. (2000). An approach to making scientific inquiry accessible to all. In J. Minstrell & E. van Zee (Eds.), Inquiring into inquiry learning and teaching in science (pp. 331–370). Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science. Wilson, C. D., Taylor, J. A., Kowalski, S. M., & Carlson, J. (2010). The relative effects and equity of inquiry-based and commonplace science teaching on students' knowledge, reasoning, and argumentation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (3), 276–301.

Windschitl, M. (2003). Inquiry projects in science teacher education: What can investigative experiences reveal about teacher thinking and eventual classroom practice? Science Education, 87 (1), 112–143.

Windschitl, M. (2004). Folk theories of "inquiry:" How preservice teachers reproduce the discourse and practices of an atheoretical scientific method. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (5), 481–512.

Windschitl, M., & Thompson, J. (2012). Transcending simple forms of school science investigation? The impact of preservice instruction on teachers' understandings of model-based inquiry. American Educational Research Journal, 43 (4), 783–835.

Windschitl, M., Thompson, J., & Braaten, M. (2008). Beyond the scientific method: Model-based inquiry as a new paradigm of preference for school science investigations. Science Education, 92, 941–967.

Woolnough, B. (2000). Authentic science in schools? An evidence-based rationale. Physics Education, 35 (4), 293–300.

Yager, R. (2000). The history and future of science education reform. The Clearing House, 74 (1), 51-54.

Yoon, H.-G., Joung, Y. J., & Kim, M. (2011). The challenges of science inquiry teaching for pre-service teachers in elementary

classrooms: Difficulties on and under the scene. Research in Science Education, 42 (3), 589–608.

Zembal-Saul, C., Krajcik, J., & Blumenfeld, P. (2002). Elementary student teachers' science content representations. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (6) 443–463.

Scientific Literacy, Science Literacy, and Science Education

Agin, M. L. (1974). Education for scientific literacy: A conceptual frame of reference and some applications. Science Education 58, 403–415.

Aikenhead, G. (1994). What is STS science teaching? In J. Solomon & G. Aikenhead (Eds.), STS education: International perspectives on reform (pp. 47–59). New York: Teachers College Press.

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1989). Science for all Americans. Washington, DC: Author.

Bruner, J. S. (1960). The process of education. New York: Vintage Books.

Bybee, R. W. (1997). Achieving scientific literacy: From purposes to practices. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Bybee, R. W., & DeBoer, G. E. (1994). Research on goals for the science curriculum. In D. L. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 357–387). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Bybee, R., & MacRae, B. (2011). Scientific literacy and student attitudes: Perspectives from PISA 2006 science. International Journal of Science Education, 33, 7–26.

Clark, J., Case, J. M., Davies, N., Sheridan, G., & Toerien, R. (2011). "Struggling up Mount Improbable": A cautionary (implementation) tale of a Vision II scientific literacy curriculum in South Africa. In C. Linder, L. Östman, D. A. Roberts, P.-O. Wickman, G. Erickson, & A. MacKinnon (Eds.), Exploring the landscape of scientific literacy (pp. 272–287). New York: Routledge.

Council of Ministers of Education, Canada (CMEC). (1997). Common framework of science learning outcomes K to 12: Pan-Canadian protocol for collaboration on school curriculum for use by curriculum developers. Toronto, ON: Author. ISBN 0-88987-111-6.

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

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

Feinstein, N. (2011). Salvaging science literacy. Science Education, 95, 168–185. doi:10.1002/sce.20414

Fensham, P. J. (1992). Science and technology. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), Handbook of research on curriculum (pp. 789–829). New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Fensham, P. J. (2012). The science curriculum; the decline of expertise and the rise of bureaucratise. Journal of Curriculum Studies. doi:10. 1080/00220272.2012.737862

Gabel, L. L. (1976). The development of a model to determine perceptions of scientific literacy. Doctoral dissertation. The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Gauthier, D. P. (1963). Practical reasoning: The structure and foundations of prudential and moral arguments and their exemplification in discourse. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Harlen, W. (2001a). The assessment of scientific literacy in the OECD/PISA project. In H. Behrendt , H. Dahncke , R. Duit , W. Gräber , M. Komorek , & A. Kross (Eds.), Research in science education—past, present, and future (pp. 49–60). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Harlen, W. (2001b). The assessment of scientific literacy in the OECD/PISA project. Studies in Science Education, 36, 79–104. Hurd, P. D. (1958). Science literacy for American schools. Educational Leadership, 16, 13–16.

Jenkins, E. W. (1990). Scientific literacy and school science education. School Science Review, 71 (256), 43–51.

Kelly, G. J. (2011). Scientific literacy, discourse, and epistemic practices. In C. Linder, L. Östman, D. A. Roberts, P.-O. Wickman, G.

Erickson, & A. MacKinnon (Eds.), Exploring the landscape of scientific literacy (pp. 61–73). New York: Routledge.

Klopfer, L. E. (1969). Science education in 1991. The School Review, 77, 199–217.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Layton, D., Jenkins, E. W., Macgill, S., & Davey, A. (1993). Inarticulate science? Perspectives on the public understanding of science and some implications for science education. Nafferton, Driffield, East Yorkshire, UK: Studies in Education Ltd.

Linder, C. , Östman, L. , Roberts, D. A. , Wickman, P.-O. , Erickson, G. , & MacKinnon, A. (Eds.). (2011). Exploring the landscape of scientific literacy. New York: Routledge.

Linder, C., Östman, L., & Wickman, P.-O. (Eds.). (2007). Promoting scientific literacy: Science education research in transaction. Uppsala, Sweden: Uppsala University.

Matthews, M. R. (1994). Science teaching: The role of history and philosophy of science. New York: Routledge.

McEneaney, E. H. (2003). The worldwide cachet of scientific literacy. Comparative Education Review, 47 (2), 217-237.

Millar, R. (2006). Twenty First Century Science: Insights from the design and implementation of a scientific literacy approach in school science. International Journal of Science Education, 28 (13), 1499–1521.

Millar, R. (2010). Increasing participation in science beyond GCSE: The impact of Twenty First Century Science. School Science Review, 91 (337), 67–73.

Millar, R. (2012). Rethinking science education: Meeting the challenge of "science for all". School Science Review, 93 (345), 21–30. Millar, R., & Osborne, J. (Eds.). (1998). Beyond 2000: Science education for the future. London: King's College London, School of

Education. Retrieved from www.nuffieldfoundation.org/beyond-2000-science-education-future

Miller, J. D. (2000). The development of civic scientific literacy in the United States. In D. D. Kumar & D. E. Chubin (Eds.), Science, technology, and society: A sourcebook for research and practice (pp. 21–47). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

National Research Council . (1996). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2012). A framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Norris, S. P., & Phillips, L. M. (2003). How literacy in its fundamental sense is central to scientific literacy. Science Education, 87, 224–240.

OECD . (1999). Measuring student knowledge and skills: A new framework for assessment. Paris: OECD.

OECD . (2003). The PISA 2003 assessment framework: Mathematics, reading, science and problem solving knowledge and skills. Paris: OECD.

OECD . (2006). The PISA 2006 assessment framework for science, reading and mathematics. Paris: OECD.

OECD . (2013). PISA 2015 draft science framework. Paris: OECD. Retrieved from www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts

Orpwood, G. (1998). The logic of advice and deliberation: Making sense of science curriculum talk. In D. A. Roberts & L. Östman (Eds.), Problems of meaning in science curriculum (pp. 54–70). New York: Teachers College Press.

Osborne, J. (2007a). Engaging young people with science: Thoughts about future direction of science education. In C. Linder , L. Östman , & P.-O. Wickman (Eds.), Promoting scientific literacy: Science education research in transaction (pp. 105–112). Uppsala, Sweden: Uppsala University.

Osborne, J. (2007b). Science education for the twenty first century. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education 3 (3), 173–184.

Pella, M. O., O'Hearn, G. T., & Gale, C. W. (1966). Referents to scientific literacy. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 4, 199–208. Roberts, D. A. (1982). Developing the concept of "curriculum emphases" in science education. Science Education, 66, 243–260.

Roberts, D. A. (1995). Junior high school science transformed: Analysing a science curriculum policy change. International Journal of Science Education, 17, 493–504.

Roberts, D. A. (2007). Scientific literacy/science literacy. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 729–780). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Roberts, D. A. (2011). Competing visions of scientific literacy: The influence of a science curriculum policy image. In C. Linder , L. Östman , D. A. Roberts , P.-O. Wickman , G. Erickson , & A. MacKinnon (Eds.), Exploring the landscape of scientific literacy (pp. 11–27). New York: Routledge.

Roth, W.-M., & Barton, A. C. (2004). Rethinking scientific literacy. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Roth, W.-M., & Lee, S. (2002). Scientific literacy as collective praxis. Public Understanding of Science, 11, 33–56.

Roth, W.-M., & Lee, S. (2004). Science education as/for participation in the community. Science Education, 88, 263–291.

Rudolph, J. L. (2002). Scientists in the classroom. New York: Palgrave.

Rutherford, F. J., & Ahlgren, A. (1991). Science for all Americans. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ryder, J. (2001). Identifying science understanding for functional scientific literacy. Studies in Science Education, 36, 1–44. Sadler, T. D. (2009). Situated learning in science education: Socio-scientific issues as contexts for practice. Studies in Science Education 45 (1), 1–42.

Sadler, T. D., & Zeidler, D. L. (2009). Scientific literacy, PISA, and socioscientific discourse: Assessment for progressive aims of science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (8), 909–921.

Twenty-First Century Science . www.nuffieldfoundation.org/twenty-first-century-science

Zeidler, D. L., & Sadler, T. D. (2011). An inclusive view of scientific literacy. In C. Linder, L. Östman, D. A. Roberts, P.-O. Wickman, G. Erickson, & A. MacKinnon (Eds.), Exploring the landscape of scientific literacy (pp. 176–192). New York: Routledge.

The History of Science Curriculum Reform in the United States

American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) . (1967). Science—A process approach. New York, NY: Xerox Division, Ginn & Company.

American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) . (1990). Science for all Americans. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. (Published in 1989 by AAAS)

American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) . (1993). Benchmarks for science literacy. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) . (1998). Blueprints for reform. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) . (2001/2007). Atlas of science literacy. Washington, DC: Author.

American Chemical Society . (1988). ChemCom: Chemistry in the community. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.

Atkin, J. M., Bianchini, J., & Holthuis, N. (1997). The different worlds of Project 2061. In S. Raizen & E. Britton (Eds.), Bold ventures: Volume 2. Case studies of innovation in science education (pp. 131–245). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Atkin, J. M., & Black, P. (2007). History of science curriculum reform in the United States and the United Kingdom. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research in science education (pp. 781–806). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Banilower, E. R., Smith, P. S., Weiss, I. R., Malzahn, K. A., Campbell, K. M., & Weis, A. M. (2013). Report of the 2012 national survey of science and mathematics education. Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research, Inc.

Banilower, E. R., Smith, P. S., Weiss, I. R., & Pasley, J. D. (2006). The status of K-12 science teaching in the United States: Results from a national observation study. In D. W. Sunal & E. L. Wright (Eds.), The impact of state and national standards on K-12 science teaching (pp. 83–112). Greenwich, CT: IAP.

Bestor, A. (1953). Educational wastelands: The retreat from learning in our schools. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press. Biological Sciences Curriculum Study . (1963a). *Biological science: An inquiry into life* (BSCS Yellow Version). New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Biological Sciences Curriculum Study . (1963b). *Biological science: Molecules to man* (BSCS Blue Version). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin. Biological Sciences Curriculum Study . (1963c). *High school biology* (BSCS Green Version). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Bradbury, R. H. (1915). Recent tendencies in high school chemistry. School Science and Mathematics, 15, 782–793.

Bradbury, R. H. (1922). A first book in chemistry. New York, NY: Appleton.

Bransford, J. D., Barron, B., Pea, R. D., Meltzoff, A., Kuhl, P., Bell, P., Stevens, R., Schwartz, D. L., Vye, N., Reeves, B., Roschelle, J., & Sabelli, N. (2006). Foundations and opportunities for an interdisciplinary science of learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 19–34). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Bruford, W. H. (1975). The German tradition of self-cultivation: Bildung from Humboldt to Thomas Mann. London: Cambridge University Press.

Bruner, J. (1960). The process of education. New York, NY: Vintage.

Bruner, J., Goodnow, J., & Austin, G. (1956). A study of thinking. New York, NY: Wiley.

Bybee, R. (1979). Science education and the emerging ecological society. Science Education, 63, 95–109.

Caldwell, O. (1909). An investigation of the teaching of biological subjects in secondary schools. School Science and Mathematics, 9, 581–597.

Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Institute for Advanced Study . (2009). The opportunity equation: Transforming mathematics and science education for citizenship and the global economy. A report of the Commission on Mathematics and Science Education. New York, NY: Author.

Chemical Bond Approach . (1962). Chemical systems. St. Louis: McGraw Hill.

Chemical Education Material Study . (1963). Chemistry: An experimental science. San Francisco, CA: Freeman.

Coulter, J. (1915). The mission of science in education. School Science and Mathematics, 15, 93–100.

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

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

DeBoer, G. (2006). History of the science standards movement in the United States. In D. W. Sunal & E. L. Wright (Eds.), The impact of state and national standards on K–12 science teaching (pp. 7–49). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

DeBoer, G. (in press). Joseph Schwab: His work and his legacy, a biographical essay. In M. R. Matthews (Ed.), International handbook of research in history, philosophy and science teaching. New York, NY: Springer.

DeBoer, G. E., Herrmann-Abell, C. F., Gogos, A., Michiels, A., Regan, T. & Wilson, P. (2008). Assessment linked to science learning goals: Probing student thinking through assessment. In J. Coffey, R. Douglas, & C. Stearns (Eds.). Assessing student learning: Perspectives from research and practice (pp. 231–252). Arlington, VA: NSTA Press.

DeBoer, G. E., Lee, H. S. & Husic, F. (2008). Assessing integrated understanding of science. In Y. Kali, M. C. Linn, & J. E. Roseman (Eds.). Coherent science education: Implications for curriculum, instruction, and policy (pp.153–182). New York, NY: Columbia University Teachers College Press.

De Lucchi, L., & Malone, L. (2011). The effect of educational policy on curriculum development. In G. E. DeBoer (Ed.), The role of public policy in K–12 science education (pp. 355–394). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Dewey, J. (1900/1990). The school and society. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. (Originally published in 1900)

diSessa, A. (2006). A history of conceptual change research: Threads and fault lines. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 265–281). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Downing, E. (1915). Some data regarding the teaching of zoology in secondary schools. School Science and Mathematics, 15, 36–43. Duane, J. E. (1973). Individualized instruction: Programs and materials. Englewood, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Duschl, R. A., Maeng, S., & Sezen, A. (2011). Learning progressions and teaching sequences: A review and analysis. Studies in Science Education, 47 (2) 123–182.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 et. seq. (1965).

Educational Development Center . (1969). Elementary science study. Manchester, MO: Webster Division, McGraw-Hill. Goals 2000: Educate America Act, 20 U.S.C. § 5801 *et. seq.* (1994).

Greeno, J. G. (2006). Learning in activity. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 79–96). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, E. H. (1894). Elementary lessons in physics: Mechanics (including hydrostatics) and light. New York, NY: Henry Holt. Available at http://archive.org/stream/elementarylesson00halliala#page/n3/mode/2up

Herrmann Abell, C. F. & DeBoer, G. E. (2011). Using distractor-driven standards-based multiple-choice assessments and Rasch modeling to investigate hierarchies of chemistry misconceptions and detect structural problems with individual items. Chemical Education Research and Practice, 12, 184–192.

Holton, G. (2003). The Project Physics course, then and now. Science and Education, 12, 779–786.

Hunter, G. (1910). The methods, content and purpose of biologic science in the secondary schools of the U.S. School Science and Mathematics, 10, 1–10, 103–111.

Hurd, P. (1970). New directions in teaching secondary school science. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Huxley, T. (1899). Science and education. New York, NY: Appleton.

Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, 20 U.S.C. § 8001 et. seq. (1994).

Kali, Y., Koppal, M., Linn, M. C., & Roseman, J. E. (2008). In Y. Kali, M. C. Linn, & J. E. Roseman (Eds.), Designing coherent science education: Implications for curriculum, instruction, and policy (pp. xvi). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Kellaghan, T., & Madaus, G. (1995). National curricula in European countries. In L. McNeil (Ed.), The hidden consequences of a national curriculum (pp. 79–118). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Kesidou, S., & Roseman, J. E. (2002). How well do middle school science programs measure up? Findings from Project 2061's curriculum review study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (6) 522–549.

Kolodner, J. L. (2006). Case-based reasoning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 225–242). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Kolodner, J. L., Camp, P. J., Crismond, D., Fasse, B., Gray, J., Holbrook, J., Puntambekar, S., & Ryan, M. (2003). Problem-based learning meets case-based reasoning in the middle-school classroom: Putting learning by design into practice. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 12 (4), 495–547.

Krajcik, J. S., & Blumenfeld, P. C. (2006). Project-based learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 317–333). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Krajcik, J. S., McNeill, K. L., & Reiser, B. J. (2007). Learning-goals-driven design model: Developing curriculum materials that align with national standards and incorporate project-based pedagogy. Science Education, 92 (1), 1–32.

Krajcik, J. S., Slotta, J. D., McNeill, K. L., & Reiser, B. J. (2008). Designing learning environments to support students' integrated understanding. In Y. Kali , M. C. Linn , & J. E. Roseman (Eds.), Designing coherent science education (pp. 39–64). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

James, W. (1899). Talks to teachers on psychology: And to students on some of life's ideals. New York, NY: Henry Holt. Available at www.gutenberg.org/files/16287/16287-h/16287-h.htm

Linn, M. C., Songer, N. B., & Eylon, B.-S. (1996). In R. Calfee & D. Berliner (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology (pp. 438–490). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Matthews, M. R. (in press). International handbook of research in history, philosophy and science teaching. New York, NY: Springer. McNeil, L. (1995). Local reform initiatives and a national curriculum: Where are the children? In L. McNeil (Ed.), The hidden consequences of a national curriculum (pp. 13–46). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Merrill, R., & Ridgway, D. (1969). The CHEM study story. San Francisco, CA: Freeman.

Millikan, R. A., & Gale, H. G. (1941). New elementary physics. Boston, MA: Ginn.

Moon, T. J. (1921). Biology for beginners. New York, NY: Henry Holt. Available at https://archive.org/details/biologyforbegin00moongoog Moon, T. J., & Brezinski, B. (1974). Environmental education from a historical perspective. School Science and Mathematics, 74, 371–374.

Moon, T. J., Mann, P. B., & Otto, J. H. (1956). Modern biology. New York, NY: Holt.

National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) . (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Defense Education Act of 1958. 1 U.S.C. § 101, 72 Stat. 1581 (1958).

National Education Association (NEA) . (1893). Report of the committee on secondary school studies. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Education Association (NEA) . (1918). Cardinal principles of secondary education: A report of the commission on the reorganization of secondary education (U.S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin No. 35). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. National Research Council (NRC) . (1996). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. National Research Council (NRC) . (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school. Report of the Committee on Developments in the Science of Learning. J. D. Bransford , A. L. Brown , & R. R. Cocking (Eds.). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council (NRC) . (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching in grades K–8. Report of the committee on science of learning, kindergarten through eighth grade. R. A. Duschl , H. A. Schweingruber , & A. W. Shouse (Eds.). Washington, DC:

National Academies Press.

National Research Council (NRC) . (2008). Common standards for K-12 education. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council (NRC) . (2012). A framework for K–12 science education. Report of the committee on a conceptual framework for new K–12 science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

National Science Board . (1983). Educating Americans for the 21st century: A report to the American people and the National Science Board. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation.

National Society for the Study of Education . (1947). Science education in American schools: Forty-Sixth Yearbook of the NSSE. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

NGSS Lead States . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6301 *et seq.* (2002).

Papert, S. (2006). Afterword: After how comes what. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 581–586). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Pfeiffer, D. (2002). Signing the Section 504 rules: More to the story. Ragged Edge Online, Issue 1. Retrieved December 6, 2010, from www.ragged-edge-mag.com/0102/0102ft6.html

Physical Sciences Study Committee (PSSC) . (1960). Physics. Boston, MA: D. C. Heath.

Project Physics . (1970). The project physics course. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Ravitch, D. (1983). The troubled crusade. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Roseman, J. E., Linn, M. C., & Koppal, M. (2008). Characterizing curriculum coherence. In M. C. Linn, J. E. Roseman, & Y. Kali (Eds.), Designing coherent science education: Implications for curriculum, instruction, and policy (pp. 13–38). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Rudolph, J. L. (2008). The legacy of inquiry and the Biological Science Curriculum Study, in R. W. Bybee (Ed.), BSCS: Measuring our success—the first 50 years of BSCS. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Rudolph, J. L., & Meshoulam, D. (in press). Science education in American high schools. In H. R. Slotten (Ed.), Oxford encyclopedia of American scientific, medical, and technological history. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Sawyer, R. K. (2006a). Conclusion: The schools of the future. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 567–580). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Sawyer, R. K. (2006b). Introduction: The new science of learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 1–16). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Schlesinger, A. M., Jr. (1986). The cycles of American history. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Schwab, J. J. (1954). Eros and education: A discussion of one aspect of discussion. Journal of General Education, 8, 54–71.

Schwab, J. J. (1962). The teaching of science as enquiry. In J. J. Schwab & P. F. Brandwein (Eds.) The teaching of science (pp. 1–103). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schwab, J. J. (1963). Biology teachers' handbook. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Science Curriculum Improvement Study . (1970). Science Improvement Curricululm Study (SCIS). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Slotta, J. D. , & Linn, M. C. (2009). WISE Science: Web-based inquiry in the classroom. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Smith, A. , & Hall, E. (1902). The teaching of chemistry and physics in the secondary school. New York, NY: Longmans, Green.

Smith, M. (1954). The diminished mind. Chicago, IL: Regnery.

Spencer, H. (1864). Education: Intellectual, moral, and physical. New York, NY: Appleton.

Strong, L. (1962). Chemistry as a science in the high school. The School Review, 70, 44–50.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. 20 U.S.C. §§ 1681–1688 et seq.

U.S. Department of Education . (1991). America 2000: An education strategy sourcebook. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Office of Education . (1951). Life adjustment for every youth. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Webb, H. (1915). Is there a royal road to science? School Science and Mathematics, 15, 679–685.

Weiss, I. R. (2006). A framework for investigating the influence of the national science standards. In D. W. Sunal & E. L. Wright (Eds.), The impact of state and national standards on K–12 science teaching (pp. 51–79). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Zumwalt, K. (1995). What's a national curriculum anyway? In L. McNeil (Ed.), The hidden consequences of a national curriculum (pp. 1–12). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Scientific Practices and Inquiry in the Science Classroom

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2012). Examining the sources for our understandings about science: Enduring conflations and critical issues in research on nature of science in science education. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (3), 353–374.

Abd-El-Khalick, F., BouJaoude, S., Duschl, R., Lederman, N. G., Mamlok-Naaman, R., Hofstein, A., ... Tuan, H.-I. (2004). Inquiry in science education: International perspectives. Science Education, 88 (3), 397–419.

Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Lederman, N. G. (2000). Improving science teachers' conceptions of the nature of science: A critical review of the literature. International Journal of Science Education, 22 (7), 665–702.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. , Waters, M. , & Le, A. P. (2008). Representations of nature of science in high school chemistry textbooks over the past four decades. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (7), 835–855.

Acher, A., Arca, M., & Sanmarti, N. (2007). Modeling as a teaching learning process for understanding materials: A case study in primary education. Science Education, 91 (3), 398–418.

Ainsworth, S., Prain, V., & Tytler, R. (2011). Drawing to learn in science. Science, 333, 1096–1097.

Allchin, D. (2011). Evaluating knowledge of the nature of (whole) science. Science Education, 95 (3), 518–542.

Alters, B. J. (1997). Whose nature of science? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34 (1), 39-55.

Ames, G. J., & Murray, F. B. (1982). When two wrongs make a right: Promoting cognitive change by social conflict. Developmental Psychology, 18, 894–897.

Armstrong, H. E. (1902). The heuristic method of teaching. School Science and Mathematics, 1 (8), 395–401.

Asterhan, C. S. C., & Schwarz, B. B. (2007). The effects of monological and dialogical argumentation on concept learning in evolutionary theory. Journal of Educational Psychology, 99 (3), 626–639.

Asterhan, C. S. C., & Schwarz, B. B. (2009). Argumentation and explanation in conceptual change: Indications from protocol analyses of peer-to-peer dialog. Cognitive Science, 33 (3), 374–400.

Baird, D., Scerri, E., & McIntyre, L. (Eds.). (2006). Philosophy of chemistry: Synthesis of a new discipline. Dordrecht: Springer.

Barton, M. L., Heidema, C., & Jordan, D. (2002). Teaching Reading in Mathematics and Science. Educational Leadership, 60 (3), 24–28. Bazerman, C. (1988). Shaping written knowledge. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Bazerman, C. (1998). Emerging perspectives on the many dimensions of scientific discourse. In J. R. Martin & R. Veel (Eds.), Reading science (pp. 15–28). London: Routledge.

Biddulph, F. , Symington, D. , & Osborne, R. (1986). The place of children's questions in primary science education. Research in Science and Technological Education, 4, 77–88.

Bowker, G. C., & Leigh Star, S. (1999). Sorting things out: Classification and its consequences. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind & experience in school. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences.

Brown, B. (2004). Discursive identity: Assimilation into the culture of science and its implications for minority students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (8), 810–834.

Burke, E. (1909). On taste. On the sublime and beautiful. Reflections on the French Revolution. A letter to a noble lord. New York: Collier. Bybee, R. W., Powell, J. C., Ellis, J. D., Giese, J. R., Parisi, L., & Singleton, L. (1991). Integrating the history and nature of science and technology in science and social studies curriculum. Science Education, 75 (1), 143–155.

Cartwright, N. (1983). How the laws of physics lie. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Chi, M., Bassok, M., Lewis, M. W., Reimann, P., & Glaser, R. (1989). Self-explanations: How students study and use examples in learning to solve problems. Cognitive Science, 13, 145–182.

Chi, M., De Leeuw, N., Chiu, M. H., & Lavancher, C. (1994). Eliciting self-explanations improves understanding. Cognitive Science, 18, 439–477.

Chiappetta, E. L., & Fillman, D. A. (2007). Analysis of five high school biology textbooks used in the United States for inclusion of the nature of science. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (15), 1847–1868.

Chin, C., & Osborne, J. F. (2008). Students' questions: A potential resource for teaching and learning science. Studies in Science Education, 44 (1), 1–39.

Chinn, A. C., & Malhotra, A. B. (2003). Epistemologically authentic inquiry in schools: A theoretical framework for evaluating inquiry task. Science Education, 86 (2), 175–218.

Collins, H., & Pinch, T. (1993). The golem: What everyone should know about science. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Common Core State Standards Initiative . (2010). Common core state standards for English language arts and literacy in history/social studies & science. Retrieved from www.corestandards.org/

Conant, J. (1957). Harvard case histories in experimental science (Vol. 1 & 2). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Donovan, S., & Bransford, J. D. (2005). How students learn science in the classroom. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Driver, R., Leach, J., Millar, R., & Scott, P. (1996). Young people's images of science. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Driver, R., Newton, P., & Osborne, J. F. (2000). Establishing the norms of scientific argumentation in classrooms. Science Education, 84 (3), 287–312.

Duschl, R. (1994). Research on the history and philosophy of science. In D. L. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 443–465). New York: MacMillan.

Duschl, R., & Grandy, R. (2013). Two views about explicitly teaching nature of science. Science and Education, 22, 2109–2139. Duschl, R., & Osborne, J. F. (2002). Supporting and promoting argumentation discourse in science education. Studies in Science

Education, 38, 39–72.

Fang, Z. (2005). Scientific literacy: A systemic functional linguistics perspective. Science Education, 89 (2), 335–347.

Fang, Z. (2006). The language demands of science reading in middle school. International Journal of Science Education, 28 (5), 491–520. Fisher, R. (1990). Teaching children to think. London: Simon and Shuster.

Ford, D. J. (2006). Representations of science within children's trade books. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43 (2), 214–235. doi:10.1002/tea.20095

Ford, M. J. (2008). Disciplinary authority and accountability in scientific practice and learning. Science Education, 92 (3), 404–423.

Ford, M. J., & Wargo, B. M. (2011). Dialogic framing of scientific content for conceptual and epistemic understanding. Science Education, 96 (3), 369–391.

Gee, J. (1996). Social linguistics and literacies (2nd ed.). London: Taylor & Francis.

Geison, J. (1995). The private science of Louis Pasteur. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Giere, R., Bickle, J., & Maudlin, R. F. (2006). Understanding scientific reasoning (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Gilbert, J., & Boulter, C. (Eds.). (2000). Developing models in science education. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Gill, P. (1996). Focus: Can we count on biology? Journal of Biological Education, 30 (3), 159–160.

Goldacre, B. (2008). Bad science. London: Harper Collins.

Goldsworthy, A., Watson, R., & Wood-Robinson, V. (2000). Developing understanding in scientific enquiry. Hatfield: Association for Science Education, UK.

Gott, R., Duggan, S., & Roberts, R. (2008). Concepts of evidence. School of Education, University of Durham, UK.

Gott, R., & Mashiter, J. (1991). Practical work in science—a task-based approach. In B. E. Woolnough (Ed.), Practical science: The role and reality of practical work in school science (pp. 53–66). Milton Keynes: Open University Press, UK.

Gott, R., & Murphy, P. (1987). Assessing investigation at ages 13 and 15. Assessment of performance unit science report for teachers: 9. London: Department of Education and Science.

Gutierrez, K., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. Educational Researcher, 32 (5), 19–25.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Martin, J. R. (1993). Writing science: Literacy and discursive power. London: Falmer Press.

Hannaway, J., & Hamilton, L. (2008). Accountability policies: Implications for school and classroom practices. Washington, DC: Urban Institute/RAND.

Hanson, N. R. (1958). Patterns of discovery. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Harré, R. (1984). The philosophies of science: An introductory survey (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harrison, A. G., & Treagust, D. F. (2002). A typology of school science models. International Journal of Science Education, 22 (9), 1011–1026.

Hempel, C. G. (1962). Deductive-nomological vs. statistical explanation. Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science, 3, 98–169.

Howson, C., & Urbach, P. (2006). Scientific reasoning: A Bayesian approach (3rd ed.). Chicago: Open Court.

Hynd, C., & Alvermann, D. E. (1986). The role of refutation text in overcoming difficulty with science concepts. Journal of Reading, 29 (5), 440–446.

Jetton, T. L., & Shanahan, C. H. (2012). Adolescent literacy in the academic disciplines: General principles and practical strategies. New York: Guilford Press.

Johnson, Ann . (2009). Hitting the brakes: Engineering design and the production of knowledge. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Kind, P. M., Kind, V., Adamson, H., & Barmby, P. (2009). Scientific argumentation, epistemic beliefs and attitudes-a quantitative

correlational study of 14–15 year old students. Paper presented at the Biennial Conference of the European Science Education Research Association, Istanbul, Turkey.

Kitcher, P. (2001). Science, truth and democracy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kitcher, P. (2010). The climate change debates. Science, 328 (5983), 1230–1234.

Klahr, D. (2000). Exploring science: The cognition and development of discovery processes. Cambridge, MA: Bradford.

Klahr, D., & Carver, S. M. (1995). Scientific thinking about scientific thinking. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 60 (4), 137–151.

Klahr, D., & Dunbar, K. (1988). Dual space search during scientific reasoning. Cognitive Science: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 12 (1), 1–48. Klahr, D., Fay, A. L., & Dunbar, K. (1993). Heuristics for scientific experimentation: A developmental study. Cognitive Psychology, 24 (1), 111–146.

Kress, G. , Jewitt, C. , Ogborn, J. , & Tsatsarelis, C. (2001). Multimodal teaching and learning: The rhetorics of the science classroom. London: Continuum Books.

Kuhn, T. E. (1962). The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakatos, I. (1970). Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes. In I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave (Eds.), Criticism and the growth of knowledge (pp. 91–196). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Latour, B. (1986). Visualization and cognition: Drawing things together. Knowledge and Society, 6, 1-40.

Latour, B. (1999). Pandora's hope: Essays on the reality of science studies. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press.

Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1986). Laboratory life: The construction of scientific facts (2nd ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Lederman, N. G. (1992). Students' and teachers' conceptions of the nature of science: A review of the research. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29, 331–359.

Lederman, N. G. (2007). Nature of science: Past, present and future. In S. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 831–879). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2004). Modeling natural variation through distribution. American Educational Research Journal, 41 (3), 635–679. doi:10.3102/00028312041003635

Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2006a). Cultivating model-based reasoning in science education. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 371–387).

Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2006b). Scientific thinking and science literacy. In W. Damon, R. M. Lerner, & N. Eisenberg (Eds.), Handbook of child psychology (pp. 153–196). New York: Wiley.

Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (2012). Seeding evolutionary thinking by engaging children in modeling its foundations. Science Education, 96 (4), 701–724.

Lemke, J. (1990). Talking science: Language, learning and values. Nor-wood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Lemke, J. (1998). Teaching all the languages of science: Words, symbols, images and actions. Retrieved from

http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/education/jlemke/papers/barcelon.htm

Longino, H. E. (2002). The fate of knowledge. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lubben, F., & Millar, R. (1996). Children's ideas about the reliability of experimental data. International Journal of Science Education, 18 (8), 955–968.

Martin, J. R., & Veel, R. (1998). Reading science. London: Routledge.

Matthews, M. (1989). A role for history and philosophy in science teaching. Interchange, 20 (2), 3–15.

Matthews, M. (1995). Constructivism and New Zealand science education. Auckland, New Zealand: Dunmore Press.

Matthews, M. (2012). Changing the focus: From nature of science to features of science. In M. S. Khine (Ed.), Advances in nature of science research (pp. 3–26). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Mayr, E. (2004). What makes biology unique? Considerations on the autonomy of a scientific discipline. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

McComas, W. F., & Olson, J. K. (1998). The nature of science in international science education standards documents. In W. F. McComas (Ed.), The nature of science in science education: Rationales and strategies (pp. 41–52). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer. McNeill, K., Lizotte, D., Krajcik, J., & Marx, R. (2006). Supporting students' construction of scientific explanations by fading scaffolds in instructional materials. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 15 (2), 153–191.

McRobbie, C., & Thomas, G. (2001). They don't teach us to explain, they only tell us other people's explanations. Paper presented at the European Association for Research on Learning, Freiburg, Switzerland.

Mercer, N., Dawes, L., Wegerif, R., & Sams, C. (2004). Reasoning as a scientist: Ways of helping children to use language to learn science. British Education Research Journal, 30 (3), 359–377.

Merzyn, G. (1987). The language of school science. International Journal of Science Education, 9 (4), 483–489.

Metz, K. E. (2008). Narrowing the gulf between the practices of science and the elementary school classroom. Elementary School Journal, 109 (2), 138–161.

Millar, R. (1998). Rhetoric and reality: What practical work in science education is *really* for. In J. Wellington (Ed.), Practical work in school science: Which way now? (pp. 16–31). London: Routledge.

Millar, R., & Driver, R. (1987). Beyond processes. Studies in Science Education, 14, 33-62.

Millar, R., Lubben, F., Gott, R., & Duggan, S. (1995). Investigating in the school science laboratory: Conceptual and procedural knowledge and their influence on performance. Research Papers in Education, 9 (2), 207–248.

Millar, R., & Osborne, J. F. (Eds.). (1998). Beyond 2000: Science education for the future. London: King's College London. National Academy of Science . (1995). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. National Research Council . (2000). Inquiry and the national science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. National Research Council . (2012). A framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. Washington, DC: Committee on a Conceptual Framework for New K–12 Science Education Standards. Board on Science Education, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education.

Nercessian, N. (2008). Model-based reasoning in scientific practice. In R. A. Duschl & R. E. Grandy (Eds.), Teaching scientific inquiry: Recommendations for research and implementation (pp. 57–79). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.

Nersessian, N. (2002). The cognitive basis of model-based reasoning in science. In P. Carruthers , S. Stich , & M. Siegal (Eds.), The cognitive basis of science (pp. 133–153). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Norris, S. P. (1997). Intellectual independence for nonscientists and other content-transcendent goals of science education. Science Education, 81 (2), 239–258.

Norris, S. P., & Phillips, L. (1994). Interpreting pragmatic meaning when reading popular reports of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 31 (9), 947–967.

Norris, S. P., & Phillips, L. (2003). How literacy in its fundamental sense is central to scientific literacy. Science Education, 87, 224–240. Norris, S. P., Phillips, L. M., & Korpan, C. A. (2003). University students' interpretation of media reports of science and its relationship to background knowledge, interest, and reading difficulty. Public Understanding of Science, 12, 123–145.

Nott, M., & Smith, R. (1995). "Talking your way out of it," "rigging" and "conjuring": What science teachers do when practicals go wrong. International Journal of Science Education, 17 (3), 399–410.

Oaksford, M., & Chater, N. (2007). Bayesian rationality: The probalistic approach to human reasoning. New York: Oxford University Press. OECD . (2012). The PISA 2015 assessment framework: Key competencies in reading, mathematics and science. Retrieved from www.oecd.org/pisa/pisaproducts/pisa2015draftframeworks.htm

Orton, T., & Roper, T. (2000). Science and mathematics: A relationship in need of counselling? Studies in Science Education, 35 (1), 123–153. doi:10.1080/03057260008560157

Osborne, J. F. (2010). Science for citizenship. In J. F. Osborne & J. Dillon (Eds.), Good practice in science teaching: What research has to say (2nd ed., pp. 46–67). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Osborne, J. F., Ratcliffe, M., Collins, S., Millar, R., & Duschl, R. (2003). What "ideas-about-science" should be taught in school science? A Delphi study of the "expert" community. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40 (7), 692–720.

Pearson, D., Moje, E. B., & Greenleaf, C. (2010). Literacy and science: Each in the service of the other. Science, 328, 459-463.

Penick, J. E., Crow, L. W., & Bonnsteter, R. J. (1996). Questions are the answers. Science Teacher, 63, 26–29.

Phillips, L. M., & Norris, S. P. (1999). Interpreting popular reports of science: What happens when the reader's world meets the world on paper? International Journal of Science Education, 21, 317–327.

Pickering, A. (1995). The mangle of practice: Time, agency & science. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Polyani, M. (1958). Personal knowledge. London: Routledge, Kegan & Paul.

Popper, K. (1972). Obective knowledge: an evolutionary approach. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Posner, G. J., Strike, K. A., Hewson, P. W., & Gerzog, W. A. (1982). Accommodation of a scientific conception: Toward a theory of conceptual change. Science Education, 66, 211–227.

Postman, N., & Weingartner, C. (1971). Teaching as a subversive activity. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Qualifications and Curriculum Authority . (2007). Programme of study: Science KS4. London: UK. Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. Quine, W. V. (1951). Main trends in recent philosophy: Two dogmas of empiricism. The Philosophical Review, 60 (1), 20–43.

Reiner, M., & Gilbert, J. K. (2000). Epistemological resources for thought experimentation in science learning. International Journal of Science Education, 22 (5), 489–506.

Rogers, E. M. (1948). Science in general education. In E. J. McGrath (Ed.), Science in general education (pp. 2–10). Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Co.

Rosenshine, B., Meister, C., & Chapman, S. (1996). Teaching students to generate questions: A review of the intervention studies. Review of Educational Research, 66, 181–221.

Roth, W.-M. (1995). Authentic school science: Knowing and learning in open-inquiry science laboratories. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Rudolph, J. L. (2003). Portraying epistemology: School science in historical context. Science Education, 87(1), 64–79. doi:10.1002/sce.1055

Ryle, G. (1949). The concept of mind. London: Hutchinson.

Sampson, V., & Clark, D. (2009). The impact of collaboration on the outcomes of scientific argumentation. Science Education, 93 (3), 448–484.

Schauble, L., Klopfer, L. E., & Raghavan, K. (1991). Students' transition from an engineering model to a science model of experimentation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 28 (9), 859–882.

Schleppegrell, M. (2004). The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Schleppegrell, M. , & Fang, Z. (2008). Reading in secondary content areas: A language-based pedagogy. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Schmidt, H. G. (1993). Foundations of problem-based learning: Rationale and description. Medical Education, 17, 11–16.

Schwab, J. J. (1962). The teaching of science as enquiry. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schwarz, B. B., Neuman, Y., & Biezuner, S. (2000). Two wrongs may make a right ... if they argue together! Cognition and Instruction, 18 (4), 461–494.

Schwarz, C. V., & White, B. Y. (2005). Metamodeling knowledge: Developing students' understanding of scientific modeling. Cognition and Instruction, 23 (2), 165–206.

Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content area literacy. Harvard Educational Review, 78 (1), 40–59.

Smith, C. L., Maclin, D., Houghton, C., & Hennessey, M. Ge. (2000). Sixth-grade students' epistemologies of science: The impact of school science experiences on epistemological development. Cognition & Instruction, 18 (3), 349–422.

Snow, C. (2008). What is the vocabulary of science? In A. Roseberry & B. Warren (Eds.), Teaching science to English language learners (pp. 71–83). Washington, DC: NSTA Press.

Snow, C. (2010). Academic language and the challenge of reading for learning about science. Science, 328, 450–452.

Stevens, P. (1978). On the Nuffield philosophy of science. Journal of Philosophy of Education, 12, 99–111.

Stewart, J., Cartier, J. L., & Passmore, C. M. (2005). Developing understanding through model-based inquiry. In J. D. Bransford (Ed.), How students learn science in the classroom (pp. 515–565). Washington, DC: National Research Council.

Szu, E., & Osborne, J. F. (2011). Scientific reasoning and argumentation from a Bayesian perspective. In M. S. Khine (Ed.), Perspectives on scientific argumentation (pp. 55–71). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Tenopir, C., & King, D. W. (2004). Communication patterns of engineers. Hoboken, New York: Wiley.

Traweek, S. (1988). Beamtimes and lifetimes: The world of high energy physicists. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Van Praagh, G. (2003). A fire to be kindled: The global influence of Christ's hospital on science education. Bury St. Edmunds, UK: St. Edmundsbury Press.

Watson, R., Goldsworthy, A., & Wood Robinson, C. (1999). What is not fair with investigations? School Science Review, 80 (292), 101–106.

Watson, R., Swain, J., & McRobbie, C. (2004). Students' discussions in practical scientific enquiries. International Journal of Science Education, 26 (1), 25–46.

Weiss, I. R. , Pasley, J. D. , Sean Smith, P. , Banilower, E. R. , & Heck, D. J. (2003). A study of K–12 mathematics and science education in the United States. Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research.

Wellington, J. (1981). What's supposed to happen, Sir? Some problems with discovery learning. School Science Review, 63, 167–173. Wellington, J. (Ed.). (1998). Practical work in school science: Which way now? London: Routledge.

Wellington, J., & Osborne, J. F. (2001). Language and literacy in science education. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wiggins, G. P., & McTighe, J. (2004). Understanding by design (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wilensky, U., & Reisman, K. (2006). Thinking like a wolf, a sheep, or a firefly: Learning biology through constructing and testing computational theories—an embodied modeling approach. Cognition and Instruction, 24 (2), 171–209.

Windschitl, M., Thompson, J., & Braaten, M. (2008). Beyond the scientific method: Model-based inquiry as a new paradigm of preference for school science investigations. Science Education, 92 (5), 941–967.

Wittgenstein, L. (1961). Tracatus logico-philosophicus. London: Routledge.

Woolnough, B., & Allsop, T. (1986). Practical work in science. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yore, L. D. (1991). Secondary science teachers' attitudes toward and beliefs about science reading and science textbooks. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 28 (1), 55–72.

Ziman, J. (1979). Reliable knowledge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zohar, A., & Nemet, F. (2002). Fostering students' knowledge and argumentation skills through dilemmas in human genetics. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (1), 35–62.

Research on Teaching and Learning of Nature of Science

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2001). Embedding nature of science instruction in preservice elementary science courses: Abandoning scientism, but ... Journal of Science Teacher Education, 12 (3), 215–233.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2005). Developing deeper understandings of nature of science: The impact of a philosophy of science course on preservice teachers' views and instructional planning. International Journal of Science Education, 27 (1), 15–42.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2012). Examining the sources for our understandings about science: Enduring conflations and critical issues in research on nature of science in science education. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (3), 353–374.

Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Akerson, V. (2004). Learning as conceptual change: Factors mediating the development of preservice teachers' views of nature of science. Science Education, 88 (5), 785–810.

Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Akerson, V. L. (2009). The influence of meta-cognitive training on preservice elementary teachers' conceptions of nature of science. International Journal of Science Education, 31 (16), 2161–2184.

Abd-El-Khalick, F., Bell, R. L., & Lederman, N. G. (1998). The nature of science and instructional practice: Making the unnatural natural. Science Education, 82 (4), 417–437.

Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Lederman, N. G. (2000a). Improving science teachers' conceptions of the nature of science: A critical review of the literature. International Journal of Science Education, 22 (7), 665–701.

Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Lederman, N. G. (2000b). The influence of history of science courses on students' views of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37 (10), 1057–1095.

Abell, S. K., & Lederman, N. G. (Eds.). (2007). Handbook of research on science education. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Abell, S., Martini, M., & George, M. (2001). "That's what scientists have to do": Preservice elementary teachers' conceptions of the nature of science during a moon investigation. International Journal of Science Education, 23 (11), 1095–1109.

Aguirre, J. M., Haggerty, S. M., & Linder, C. J. (1990). Student-teachers' conceptions of science, teaching and learning: A case study in preservice science education. International Journal of Science Education, 12 (4), 381–390.

Aikenhead, G. (1972). The measurement of knowledge about science and scientists: An investigation into the development of instruments for formative evaluation. Dissertations Abstracts International, 33, 6590A. (University Microfilms No. 72–21, 423).

Aikenhead, G. (1973). The measurement of high school students' knowledge about science and scientists. Science Education, 57 (4), 539–549.

Aikenhead, G. (1979). Science: A way of knowing. The Science Teacher, 46 (6), 23–25.

Aikenhead, G., Fleming, R. W., Ryan, A. G. (1987). High school graduates' beliefs about science-technology-society: Methods and issues in monitoring student views. Science Education, 71, 145–161.

Akerson, V. L., Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Lederman, N. G. (2000). Influence of a reflective activity-based approach on elementary teachers' conceptions of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37 (4), 295–317.

Akerson, V. L., Buzzelli, C. A., & Donnelly, L. A. (2010). On the nature of teaching nature of science: Preservice early childhood teachers' instruction in preschool and elementary settings. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, (47) 10, 213–233.

Akerson, V. L., Buzzelli, C. A., & Eastwood, J. L. (2012). Bridging the gap between preservice early childhood teachers' cultural values, perceptions of values held by scientists, and the relationships of these values to conceptions of nature of science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23 (2),133–157.

Akerson, V. L., Cullen, T. A., & Hanson, D. L. (2010). Experience teachers' strategies for assessing nature of science conceptions in the elementary classroom. Journal of Science Teacher Education, (21) 6, 723–745.

Akerson, V. L., & Donnelly, L. A. (2010). Teaching nature of science to K–2 students: What understandings can they attain? International Journal of Science Education, 32 (1), 97–124.

Akerson, V. L., & Hanuscin, D. L. (2007). Teaching nature of science through inquiry: Results of a 3 year professional development program. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (5), 653–680.

Akerson, V. L., Townsend, J. S., Donnelly, L. A., Hanson, D. L., Tira, P., & White, O. (2009). Scientific modeling for inquiring teachers network (SMIT'N): The influence on elementary teachers' views of nature of science, inquiry, and modeling. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20 (1), 21–40.

Akindehin, F. (1988). Effect of an instructional package on preservice science teachers' understanding of the nature of science and acquisition of science-related attitudes. Science Education, 72 (1), 73–82.

Allchin, D. (2011). Evaluating knowledge of the nature of (whole) science. Science Education, 95 (3), 518–542.

Alters, B. J. (1997). Whose nature of science? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34, 39-55.

American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) . (1990). Science for all Americans. New York: Oxford University Press. American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) . (1993). Benchmarks for science literacy: A Project 2061 report. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ball, D. L. , & McDiarmid, G. W. (1990). The subject-matter preparation of teachers. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 437–465). New York: Macmillan.

Bell, R. L., Blair, L., Crawford, B., & Lederman, N. G. (2003). Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40 (5), 487–509.

Bell, R. L. , & Lederman, N. G. (2003). Understandings of the nature of science and decision making in science and technology based issues. Science Education, 87 (3), 352–377.

Bell, R. L., Lederman, N. G., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2000). Developing and acting upon one's conception of the nature of science: A followup study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37 (6), 563–581.

Billeh, V. Y., & Hasan, O. E. (1975). Factors influencing teachers' gain in understanding the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 12 (3), 209–219.

Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS) . (1962). Processes of science test. New York: The Psychological Corporation. Bloom, J. W. (1989). Preservice elementary teachers' conceptions of science: Science, theories and evolution. International Journal of Science Education, 11 (4), 401–415.

Brickhouse, N. W., & Bodner, G. M. (1992). The beginning science teacher: Classroom narratives of convictions and constraints. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29, 471–485.

Carey, R. L., & Stauss, N. G. (1968). An analysis of the understanding of the nature of science by prospective secondary science teachers. Science Education, 52 (4), 358–363.

Carey, R. L., & Stauss, N. G. (1970a). An analysis of the relationship between prospective science teachers' understanding of the nature of science and certain academic variables. Georgia Academy of Science, 148–158.

Carey, R. L., & Stauss, N. G. (1970b). An analysis of experienced science teachers' understanding of the nature of science. School Science and Mathematics, 70 (5), 366–376.

Carey, S., Evans, R., Honda, M., Jay, E., & Unger, C. (1989). An experiment is when you try it and see if it works: A study of grade 7 students' understanding of the construction of scientific knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 11, 514–529.

Celik, S. , & Bayrakceken, S. (2012). The influence of an activity-based explicit approach on the Turkish prospective science teachers' conceptions. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (4), 75–95.

Clough, M. P. , & Olson, J. K. (2008). Teaching and assessing the nature of science: An introduction. Science & Education, 17 (2), 143–145.

Cobern, W. W. (1989). A comparative analysis of NOSS profiles on Nigerian and American preservice, secondary science teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 26 (6), 533–541.

Cooley, W. W., & Klopfer, L. E. (1961). Test on understanding science. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Crumb, G. H. (1965). Understanding of science in high school physics. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 3 (3), 246–250. Dogan, N. , & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2008). Turkish grade 10 students' and science teachers' conceptions of nature of science: A national study. Journal of research in Science Teaching, 45 (10), 1083–1112.

Driver, R., Leach, J., Millar, R., & Scott, P. (1996). Young people's images of science. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press. Duschl, R. A., & Grandy, R. (2013). Two views about explicitly teaching about nature of science. Science and Education, 22 (9), 2109–2139.

Duschl, R. A., & Wright, E. (1989). A case study of high school teachers' decision making models for planning and teaching science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 26 (6), 467–501.

Fah, L. Y., & Hoon, K. C. (2011). Teachers' views of the nature of science: A study on pre-service science teachers in Sabah, Malaysia. Journal of Science and Mathematics Education in Southeast Asia, 34 (2), 262–282.

Gabel, D. L., Rubba, P. A., & Franz, J. R. (1977). The effect of early teaching and training experiences on physics achievement, attitude toward science and science teaching, and process skill proficiency. Science Education, 61, 503–511.

Gilbert, S. W. (1991). Model building and a definition of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 28 (1), 73–80.

Hodson, D. (1985). Philosophy of science, science and science education. Studies in Science Education, 12, 25–57.

Hottecke, D., Henke, A., & Riess, F. (2012). Implementing history and philosophy in science teaching: Strategies, methods, results and experiences from the European HIPST project. Science & Education, 21 (9), 1233–1261.

Hurd, P. D. (1969). New directions in teaching secondary school science. Chicago: Rand-McNally.

Ibrahim, B., Buffler, A., & Lubben, F. (2009). Profiles of freshman physics students' views on the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (3), 248–264.

Irzik, G., & Nola, R. (2011). A family resemblance approach to the nature of science education. Science & Education, 20 (7–8), 591–607. Johnson, R. L., & Peeples, E. E. (1987). The role of scientific understanding in college: Student acceptance of evolution. American Biology Teacher, 49 (2), 96–98.

Jungwirth, E. (1970). An evaluation of the attained development of the intellectual skills needed for "understanding of the nature of scientific enquiry" by BSCS pupils in Israel. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 7 (2), 141–151.

Kang, S. , Scharmann, L. , & Noh, T. (2004). Examining students' views on the nature of science: Results from Korean 6th, 8th, and 10th graders. Science Education, 89 (2), 314–334.

Khishfe, R. (2008). The development of seventh graders' views of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (4), 470–496.

Khishfe, R. (2012). Relationship between nature of science understandings and argumentation skills: A role for counterargument and contextual factors. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (4), 489–514.

Khishfe, R., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2002). Influence of explicit and reflective versus implicit inquiry-oriented instruction on sixth graders' views of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (7), 551–578.

Khishfe, R., & Lederman, N. G. (2007). Relationship between instructional context and views of nature of science. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (8), 939–961.

Kimball, M. E. (1968). Understanding the nature of science: A comparison of scientists and science teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 5, 110–120.

Kleinman, G. (1965). Teachers' questions and student understanding of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 3 (4), 307–317.

Klopfer, L. E. (1964). The use of case histories in science teaching. School Science and Mathematics, 64, 660–666.

Klopfer, L. E. (1969). The teaching of science and the history of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 6, 87–95.

Klopfer, L. E., & Cooley, W. W. (1963). The history of science cases for high schools in the development of student understanding of science and scientists. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 1 (1), 33–47.

Koulaidis, V., & Ogborn, J. (1989). Philosophy of science: An empirical study of teachers' views. International Journal of Science Education, 11 (2), 173–184.

Lantz, O., & Kass, H. (1987). Chemistry teachers' functional paradigms. Science Education, 71, 117–134.

Lavach, J. F. (1969). Organization and evaluation of an inservice program in the history of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 6, 166–170.

Leach, J., Hind, A., & Ryder, J. (2003). Designing and evaluating short teaching interventions about the epistemology of science in high school classrooms. Science Education, 87 (6), 831–848.

Lederman, N. G. (1986). Students' and teachers' understanding of the nature of science: A reassessment. School Science and Mathematics, 86 (2), 91–99.

Lederman, N. G. (1992). Students' and teachers' conceptions of the nature of science: A review of the research. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29 (4), 331–359.

Lederman, N. G. (1998). The state of science education: Subject matter without context. Electronic Journal of Science Education, 3 (2), December. Available at http://wolfweb.unr.edu/homepage/jcannon/ejse/lederman.html

Lederman, N. G. (1999). Teachers' understanding of the nature of science and classroom practice: Factors that facilitate or impede the relationship. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36 (8), 916–929.

Lederman, N. G. (2007). Nature of science: Past, present, and future. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 831–880). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Lederman, N. G. (2013). A powerful way to learn. In L. Froschauer (Ed.), A year of inquiry. Arlington, VA: NSTA Press.

Lederman, N. G. , Abd-El-Khalick, F. , Bell, R. L. , & Schwartz, R. S. (2002). Views of nature of science questionnaire: Toward valid and meaningful assessment of learners' conceptions of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (6), 497–521.

Lederman, N. G., Antink, A., & Bartos, S. (2014). Nature of science, scientific inquiry, and socio-scientific issues arising from genetics: A pathway to developing a scientifically literate citizenry. Science and Education, 23 (2), 285–302.

Lederman, N. G., Bartos, S. A., & Lederman, J. S. (2014). The development, use, and interpretation of nature of science assessments. In M. R. Matthews (Ed.) International handbook of research in history, philosophy and science teaching (pp. 971-997). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer Publishing.

Lederman, N. G., & Lederman, J. S. (2011). The development of scientific literacy: A function of the interactions and distinctions among subject matter, nature of science, scientific inquiry, and knowledge about scientific inquiry. In C. Linder, L. Ostman, D. A. Roberts, P. O. Wickman, G. Erickson, & A. MacKinnon (Eds.), Exploring the landscape of scientific literacy (pp. 127–144). New York: Routledge. Lederman, N. G., & O'Malley, M. (1990). Students' perceptions of tentativeness in science: Development, use, and sources of change.

Science Education, 74, 225–239.

Lederman, N. G., & Zeidler, D. L. (1987). Science teachers' conceptions of the nature of science: Do they really influence teacher behavior? Science Education, 71 (5), 721–734.

Liang, L. L. Chen, S., Chen, X., Kaya, O. N., Adams, A. D., Macklin, M., & Ebenezer, J. (2009). Preservice teachers' views about nature of scientific knowledge development: An international collaborative study. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 7 (5), 987–1012.

Lin, H. S., & Chen, C. C. (2002). Promoting preservice teachers' understanding about the nature of science through history. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (9), 773–792.

Liu, S., & Lederman, N. G. (2007). Exploring prospective teachers' worldviews and conceptions of nature of science. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (10), 1281–1307.

Mackay, L. D. (1971). Development of understanding about the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 8 (1), 57–66. Matthews, M. R. (2012). Changing the focus: From nature of science (NOS) to features of science (FOS). In M. S. Khine (Ed.), Advances in nature of science research: Concepts and methodologies (pp. 3–26). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

McComas, W. F. (2008). Seeking historical examples to illustrate key aspects of the nature of science. Science & Education, 17 (2–3), 249–263.

McDonald, C. V. (2010). The influence of explicit nature of science and argumentation instruction on preservice primary teachers' views of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (9), 1137–1164.

Meichtry, Y. J. (1992). Influencing student understanding of the nature of science: Data from a case of curriculum development. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29, 389–407.

Morrison, J. A., Raab, F., & Ingram, D. (2009). Factors influencing elementary and secondary teachers' views on the nature of science. Journal of Research on Science Teaching, 46 (4), 384–403.

Munby, H. (1976). Some implications of language in science education. Science Education, 60 (1), 115–124.

National Research Council (NRC). (1996). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council (NRC) . (2012). A framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) . (1982). Science-technology-society: Science education for the 1980s. (An NSTA position statement). Washington, DC: Author.

NGSS Lead States . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Niaz, M. (2009). Critical appraisal of physical science as a human enterprise: Dynamics of scientific progress. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Ogunniyi, M. B. (1982). An analysis of prospective science teachers' understanding of the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 19 (1), 25–32.

Oliveira, A., Akerson, V. L., Colak, H., Pongsanon, K., & Genel, A. (2012). The implicit communication of nature of science and epistemology during inquiry discussion. Science Education, 96 (4), 652–684.

Osborne, J., Collins, S., Ratcliffe, M., Millar, R., & Duschl, R. (2003). What "ideas-about-science" should be taught in school science? A Delphi study of the expert community. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40 (7), 692–720.

Paraskevopoulou, E., & Koliopoulos, D. (2011). Teaching the nature of science through the Millikan-Ehrenhaft dispute. Science & Education, 20 (10), 943–960.

Posnanski, T. J. (2010). Developing understanding of the nature of science within a professional development program for inservice elementary teachers: Project nature of elementary science teaching. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (10), 589–621. Quigley, C., Pongsanon, K., & Akerson, V. L. (2010). If we teach them, they can learn: Young students' views of nature of science aspects to early elementary students during an informal science education program. Journal of Science Teachers Education, 21 (7), 887–907.

Riley, J. P., II. (1979). The influence of hands-on science process training on preservice teachers' acquisition of process skills and attitude toward science and science teaching. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 16 (5), 373–384.

Robinson, J. T. (1965). Science teaching and the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 3, 37–50.

Rothman, A. I. (1969). Teacher characteristics and student learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 6 (4), 340–348. Rowe, M. B. (1974). A humanistic intent: The program of preservice elementary education at the University of Florida. Science Education, 58, 369–376.

Rubba, P., & Anderson, H. (1978). Development of an instrument to assess secondary school students' understanding of the nature of scientific knowledge. Science Education, 62, 449–458.

Rubba, P., Horner, J., & Smith, J. M. (1981). A study of two misconceptions about the nature of science among junior high school students. School Science and Mathematics, 81, 221–226.

Rubba, P. A. (1977). The development, field testing and validation of an instrument to assess secondary school students' understanding of the nature of scientific knowledge. Dissertations Abstracts International, 38, 5378A. (University Microfilms No. 78–00, 998).

Rutherford, J. F. (1964). The role of inquiry in science teaching. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 2 (2), 80–84.

Sadler, T. D., Burgin, S., McKinney, L., & Ponjuan, L. (2010). Learning science through research apprenticeships: A critical review of the literature. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (3), 235–256.

Sadler, T. D., Chambers, F. W., & Zeidler, D. (2004). Student conceptualizations of the nature of science in response to a socioscientific issue. International Journal of Science Education, 26 (4), 387–409.

Salter, I. Y., Atkins, L. J. (2014). What students say versus what they do regarding scientific inquiry. Science Education (98) 1, 1–35. Sandoval, W. A. (2005). Understanding students' practical epistemologies and their influence on learning through inquiry. Science Education, 89 (5), 634–656.

Schalk, K. A. (2012). A socioscientific curriculum facilitating the development of distal and proximal NOS conceptualizations. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (1), 1–24.

Scharmann, L. C., & Harris, W. M., Jr. (1992). Teaching evolution: Understanding and applying the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29 (4), 375–388.

Scharmann, L. C. , & Smith, M. U. (1999). Defining versus describing the nature of science: A pragmatic analysis for classroom teachers and science educators. Science Education, 85 (4), 493–509.

Scharmann, L. C., Smith, M. U., James, M. C., & Jensen, M. (2005). Explicit reflective nature of science instruction: Evolution, intelligent design, and umbrellaology. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 16 (1), 27–41.

Schwartz, R., & Lederman, N. G. (2008). What scientists say: Scientists' views of nature of science and relation to science context. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (6), 727–771.

Schwartz, R. S., Lederman, N. G., & Crawford, B. (2004). Developing views of nature of science in an authentic context: An explicit approach to bridging the gap between nature of science and scientific inquiry. Science Education, 88 (4), 610–645.

Seung, E., Bryan, L. A., & Butler, M. B. (2009). Improving preservice middle grades science teachers' understanding of nature of science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20 (2), 157–177.

Smith, M. U., & Scharmann, L. (2008). A multi-year program developing an explicit reflective pedagogy for teaching pre-service teachers the nature of science. Science & Education, 17 (2–3), 219–248.

Spears, J., & Zollman, D. (1977). The influence of structured versus unstructured laboratory on students' understanding the process of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 14 (1), 33–38.

Sutherland, D., & Dennick, R. (2002). Exploring culture, language and perception of the nature of science. International Journal of Science Education, 24 (1), 25–36.

Tamir, P. (1972). Understanding the process of science by students exposed to different science curricula in Israel. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 9 (3), 239–245.

Trent, J. (1965). The attainment of the concept "understanding science" using contrasting physics courses. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 3 (3), 224–229.

Troxel, V. A. (1968). Analysis of instructional outcomes of students involved with three sources in high school chemistry. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

Urhahne, D., Kremer, K., & Mayer, J. (2011). Conceptions of the nature of science—are they general or context specific? International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 9 (3), 707–730.

Walls, L. (2012). Third grade African American students' views of the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (1), 1–37.

Welch, W. W. (1967). Science process inventory. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Welch, W. W., & Pella, M. O. (1967–1968). The development of an instrument for inventorying knowledge of the processes of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 5 (1), 64.

Welch, W. W., & Walberg, H. J. (1968). An evaluation of summer institute programs for physics teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 5, 105–109.

Wong, S. L., & Hodson, D. (2009). From the horse's mouth: What scientists say about scientific investigation and scientific knowledge. Science Education, 93 (1), 109–130.

Wong, S. L., & Hodson, D. (2010). More from the horse's mouth: What scientists say about science as a social practice. International Journal of Science Education, 32 (11), 1431–1463.

Yager, R. E., & Wick, J. W. (1966). Three emphases in teaching biology: A statistical comparison of the results. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 4 (1), 16–20.

Yacoubian, H. A., & BouJaoude, S. (2010). The effect of reflective discussions following inquiry-based laboratory activities on students' views of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (10), 1229–1252.

Zeidler, D. L., & Lederman, N. G. (1989). The effects of teachers' language on students' conceptions of the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 26 (9), 771–783.

Zeidler, D. L., Walker, K. A., Ackett, W. A., & Simmons, M. L. (2002). Tangled up in views: Beliefs in the nature of science and responses to socioscientific dilemmas. Science Education, 86 (3), 343–367.

The Evolving Landscape Related to Assessment of Nature of Science

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (1998). The influence of history of science courses on students' conceptions of the nature of science. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, Oregon.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2001). Embedding nature of science instruction in preservice elementary science courses: Abandoning scientism, but ... Journal of Science Teacher Education, 12 (3), 215–233.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2002, April). The development of conceptions of the nature of scientific knowledge and knowing in the middle and high school years: A cross-sectional study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, New Orleans, LA.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2004a). Over and over and over again: College students' views of nature of science. In L. B. Flick & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Scientific inquiry and nature of science: Implications for teaching, learning, and teacher education (pp. 389–425). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2004b, April). The relationship between students' views of nature of science and their conceptual understanding of stoichiometry: An empirical assessment. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2004c, April). Assessing and influencing epistemological views: The moderate fallacies of inference to beliefs from action and influence of action on beliefs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2005). Developing deeper understandings of nature of science: The impact of a philosophy of science course on preservice science teachers' views and instructional planning. International Journal of Science Education, 27 (1), 15–42.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2012a). Examining the sources for our understandings about science: Enduring conflations and critical issues in research on nature of science in science education. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (3), 353–374.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2012b). Nature of science in science education: Toward a coherent framework for synergistic research and development. In B. J. Fraser , K. Tobin , & C. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (Vol. 2, pp. 1041–1060). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2013). Teaching with and about nature of science, and science teacher knowledge domains. Science & Education, 22 (9), 2087–2107.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. , & Akerson, V. L. (2004). Learning as conceptual change: Factors that mediate the development of preservice elementary teachers' views of nature of science. Science Education, 88 (5), 785–810.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. , & Akerson, V. L. (2009). The influence of meta-cognitive training on preservice elementary teachers' conceptions of nature of science. International Journal of Science Education, 31 (16), 2161–2184.

Abd-El-Khalick, F., Belarmino, J., & Summers, R. (2012, March). Development and validation of a rubric to score the views of nature of science questionnaire. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Indianapolis, IN.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. , Bell, R. L. , & Lederman, N. G. (1998). The nature of science and instructional practice: Making the unnatural natural. Science Education, 82 (4), 417–436.

Abd-El-Khalick, F., & BouJaoude, S. (1997). An exploratory study of the knowledge base for science teaching. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34 (7), 673–699.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. , & BouJaoude, S. (2003). Lebanese middle school students' views of nature of science. Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies, 8 (1), 61–79.

Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Lederman, N. G. (2000a). Improving science teachers' conceptions of the nature of science: A critical review of the literature. International Journal of Science Education, 22 (7), 665–701.

Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Lederman, N. G. (2000b). The influence of history of science courses on students' views of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37 (10), 1057–1095.

Abd-El-Khalick, F. , Waters, M. , & Le, A. (2008). Representations of nature of science in high school chemistry textbooks over the past four decades. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (7), 835–855.

Aikenhead, G. S. (1973). The measurement of high school students' knowledge about science and scientists. Science Education, 57 (4), 539–549.

Aikenhead, G. S. (1974a). Course evaluation. I: A new methodology for test construction. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 11 (1), 17–22.

Aikenhead, G. S. (1974b). Course evaluation. II: Interpretation of student performance on evaluative tests. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 11 (1), 23–30.

Aikenhead, G. S. (1987). High-school graduates' beliefs about science-technology-society. III. Characteristics and limitations of scientific knowledge. Science Education, 71 (4), 459–487.

Aikenhead, G. S. (1988). An analysis of four ways of assessing student beliefs about STS topics. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 25 (8), 607–629.

Aikenhead, G. S. (1997). Student views on the influence of culture on science. International Journal of Science Education, 19 (4), 419–428.

Aikenhead, G. S., Fleming, R. W., & Ryan, A. G. (1987). High-school graduates' beliefs about science-technology-society. I. Methods and issues in monitoring student views. Science Education, 71 (2), 145–161.

Aikenhead, G. S., & Ryan, A. G. (1992). The development of a new instrument: "Views on Science-Technology-Society" (VOSTS). Science Education, 76 (5), 477–491.

Aikenhead, G. S., Ryan, A., & Fleming, R. (1989). Views on science-technology-society (from CDN.mc.5). Saskatoon, Canada: Department of Curriculum Studies, University of Saskatchewan.

Akçay, B. , & Koç, I. (2009). Inservice science teachers' views about the nature of science. Hasan Ali Yücel Faculty of Education Journal, 11, 1–11.

Akerson, V. L., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2003). Teaching elements of nature of science: A yearlong case study of a fourth grade teacher. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40 (10), 1025–1049.

Akerson, V. L., Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Lederman, N. G. (2000). Influence of a reflective explicit activity-based approach on elementary teachers' conceptions of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37 (4), 295–317.

Akerson, V. L., Buck, G. A., Donnelly, L. A., Nargund-Joshi, V., & Weiland, I. S. (2011). The importance of teaching and learning nature of science in the early childhood years. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20, 537–549.

Akerson, V. L., Cullen, T. A., & Hanson, D. L. (2009). Fostering a community of practice through a professional development program to improve elementary teachers' views of nature of science and teaching practice. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (10), 1090–1113.

Akerson, V., & Donnelly, L. A. (2010). Teaching nature of science to K-2 students: What understandings can they attain? International Journal of Science Education, 32 (1), 97–124.

Akerson, V. L., Hanson, D. L., & Cullen, T. A. (2007). The influence of guided inquiry and explicit instruction on K–6 teachers' views of nature of science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18, 751–772.

Akerson, V. L., & Hanuscin, D. L. (2007). Teaching the nature of science through inquiry: Results of a 3-year professional development programs. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (5), 653–680.

Akerson, V. L., & Volrich, M. L. (2006). Teaching nature of science explicitly in a first-grade internship setting. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43 (4), 377–394.

Akindehin, F. (1988). Effect of an instructional package on preservice science teachers' understanding of the nature of science and acquisition of science-related attitudes. Science Education, 72 (1), 73–82.

Aldridge, J., Taylor, P., & Chen, C. C. (1997, March). Development, validation and use of the beliefs about science and school science questionnaire (BASSSQ). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Oak Brook, IL.

Allen, H., Jr . (1959). Attitudes of certain high school seniors toward science and scientific careers. New York: Teachers College Press. Alters, B. J. (1997). Whose nature of science? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34 (1), 39–55.

American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) . (1990). Science for all Americans. New York: Oxford University Press. Andersen, H. O., Harty, H., & Samuel, K. V. (1986). Nature of science, 1969 and 1984: Perspectives of preservice secondary science teachers. School Science and Mathematics, 86 (1), 43–50.

Anderson, E. J., DeMelo, H. T., Szabo, M., & Toth, G. (1975). Behavioral objectives, science processes, and learning for inquiry-oriented instructional materials. Science Education, 59 (2), 263–271.

Anderson, G. J. (1970). Effects of classroom social climate on individual learning. American Educational Research Journal, 7 (2), 135–152. Anderson, O. R., & Callaway, J. (1986). Studies of information processing rates in science learning and related cognitive variables. II: A first approximation to estimating a relationship between science reasoning skills and information acquisition. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 23 (1), 67–72.

Apostolou, A., & Koulaidis, V. (2010). Epistemology and science education: A study of epistemological views of teachers. Research in Science & Technological Education, 28 (2), 149–166.

Barlow, N. (Ed.). (1993/1958). The autobiography of Charles Darwin: 1809 – 1882. New York: W. W. Norton.

Barufaldi, J. P., Bethel, L. J., & Lamb, W. G. (1977). The effect of a science methods course on the philosophical view of science among elementary education majors. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 14 (4), 289–294.

Bell, R. L. (1999). Understandings of the nature of science and decision making on science and technology based issues. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, Oregon.

Bell, R. L., Lederman, N. G., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2000). Developing and acting upon one's conceptions of the nature of science: A follow-up study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37 (6), 563–581.

Ben-Chaim, D., & Zoller, U. (1991). The STS outlook profiles of Israeli high-school students and their teachers. International Journal of Science Education, 13 (4), 447–458.

Bennett, J., & Hogarth, S. (2009). Would you want to talk to a scientist at a party? High school students' attitudes to school science and to science. International Journal of Science Education, 31 (14), 1975–1998.
Beveridge, W. I. B. (1950). The art of scientific investigation. New York: Vintage Books.

Bianchini, J. A., & Solomon, E. R. (2003). Constructing views of science tied to issues of equity and diversity: A study of beginning science teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40, 53–76.

Billeh, V. Y., & Hasan, O. E. (1975). Factors influencing teachers' gain in understanding the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 12 (3), 209–219.

Billeh, V. Y., & Malik, M. H. (1977). Development and application of a test on understanding the nature of science. Science Education, 61 (4), 559–571.

Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS) . (1962). Processes of science test. New York: The Psychological Corporation.

Borda, E. J., Burgess, D. J., Plog, C. J., DeKalb, N. C., & Luce, M. M. (2009). Concept maps as tools for assessing students'

epistemologies of science. Electronic Journal of Science Education, 13 (2). Retrieved from http://ejse.southwestern.edu/article/view/7804 Botton, C., & Brown, C. (1998). The reliability of some VOSTS items when used with preservice secondary science teachers in England. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35 (1), 53–71.

Boyd, R. N. (1983). On the current status of scientific realism. Erkenntnis, 19, 45-90.

Bradford, C. S., Rubba, P. A., & Harkness, W. L. (1995). Views about science-technology-society interactions held by college students in general education physics and STS courses. Science Education, 79 (4), 355–373.

Breedlove, C. B., & Gessert, W. L. (1970). Use of an "electronic blackboard" in a physics teaching project. School Science and Mathematics, 70 (2), 154–168.

Broadhurst, N. A. (1970). A study of selected learning outcomes of graduating high school students in south Australian schools. Science Education, 54 (1), 17–21.

Buaraphan, K. (2009a). Preservice and inservice science teachers' responses and reasoning about the nature of science. Educational Research and Review, 4 (11), 561–581.

Buaraphan, K. (2009b). Thai in-service science teachers' conceptions of the nature of science. Journal of Science and Mathematics Education in Southeast Asia, 32 (2), 188–217.

Buaraphan, K. (2010). Pre-service and in-service science teachers' conceptions of the nature of science. Science Educator, 19 (2), 35–47.

Buaraphan, K. (2011). Pre-service physics teachers' conceptions of nature of science. US-China Education Review, 8 (2), 137–148.

Buaraphan, K. (2012). Embedding nature of science in teaching about astronomy and space. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 21, 353–369.

Buaraphan, K. , & Sung-Ong, S. (2009). Thai pre-service science teachers' conceptions of the nature of science. Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching, 10 (1). Retrieved from www.ied.edu.hk/apfslt/

Buffler, A. , Lubben, F. , & Ibrahim, B. (2009). The relationship between students' views of the nature of science and their views of the nature of scientific measurement. International Journal of Science Education, 31 (9), 1137–1156.

Cakmakci, G. (2012). Promoting pre-service teachers' ideas about nature of science through educational research apprenticeship. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 37 (2). Retrieved from http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol37/iss2/8

Carey, R. L., & Stauss, N. G. (1968). An analysis of the understanding of the nature of science by prospective secondary science teachers. Science Education, 52 (4), 358–363.

Carey, R. L., & Stauss, N. G. (1970). An analysis of experienced science teachers' understanding of the nature of science. School Science and Mathematics, 70 (5), 366–376.

Chai, C. C., Deng, F., & Tsai, C. C. (2012). A comparison of scientific epistemological views between Mainland China and Taiwan high school students. Asia Pacific Education Review, 13 (1), 17–26.

Chan, K. S. (2005). Exploring the dynamic interplay of college students' conceptions of the nature of science. Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching, 6 (2), 1–16.

Chen, S. (2006). Development of an instrument to assess views on nature of science and attitudes toward teaching science. Science Education, 90, 803–819.

Choi, K., & Cho, H. H. (2002). Effects of teaching ethical issues on Korean school students' attitudes towards science. Journal of Biological Education, 37 (1), 26–30.

Choppin, B. H. (1974). The introduction of new science curricula in England and Wales. Comparative Education Review, 18 (2), 196–206. Chrouser, W. H. (1975). Outdoor vs. indoor laboratory techniques in teaching biology to prospective elementary teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 12 (1), 41–48.

Cobern, W. W., & Loving, C. C. (2002). Investigation of preservice elementary teachers' thinking about science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (10), 1016–1031.

Cooley, W. W., & Bassett, R. D. (1961). Evaluation and follow-up study of a summer science and mathematics program for talented secondary school students. Science Education, 45 (3), 209–216.

Cooley, W. W., & Klopfer, L. E. (1961). TOUS: Test on understanding science. Princeton, NJ: Education Testing Service. Cossman, G. W. (1969). The effects of a course in science and culture for secondary school students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 6 (3), 274–283.

Cotham, J. S., & Smith, E. L. (1981). Development and validation of the conceptions of scientific theories test. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 18 (5), 387–396.

Crumb, G. H. (1965). Understanding of science in high school physics. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 3, 246–250.

Curd, M., & Cover, J. A. (1998). Philosophy of science: The central issues. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Dass, P. M. (2005). Understanding the nature of scientific enterprise (NOSE) through a discourse with its history: The influence of an undergraduate "history of science" course. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 3, 87–115.

Demirbaş, M., & Balci, F. (2012). The impact of the explicit reflective approach in teaching the nature of science upon Turkish students' perceptions of science. International Journal of Asian Social Science, 2 (8), 1255–1260.

Demirbas, M., Bozdogan, A. E., & Özbek, G. (2012). An analysis from different variables of views of pre-service science teachers in Turkey on the nature of science. Research Journal of Recent Sciences, 1 (8), 29–35.

Dienye, N. E. (1987). The effect of inservice science education. British Journal of In-Service Education, 14 (1), 48-55.

Dogan, N., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2008). Turkish grade 10 students' and science teachers' conceptions of nature of science: A national study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (10), 1083–1112.

Doran, R. L., Guerin, R. O., & Cavalieri, J. (1974). An analysis of several instruments measuring "nature of science" objectives. Science Education, 58 (3), 312–329.

Driver, R., Leach, J., Millar, R., & Scott, P. (1996). Young people's images of science. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Duncan, D. K. , & Arthurs, L. (2012). Improving student attitudes about learning science and student scientific reasoning skills. Astronomy Education Review, 11 (1). Retrieved from http://aer.aas.org/resource/1/aerscz/v11/i1/p010102_s1

Durkee, P. (1974). An analysis of the appropriateness and utilization of TOUS with special reference to high-ability students studying physics. Science Education, 58 (3), 343–356.

Duschl, R. A., & Wright, E. (1989). A case study of high school teachers' decision making models for planning and teaching science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 26 (5), 467–501.

Eastwood, J. L., Sadler, T. D., Zeidler, D. L., Lewis, A., Amiri, L., & Applebaum, S. (2012). Contextualizing nature of science instruction in socioscientific issues. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (15), 2289–2315.

Engen, H. B., Smith, D. D., & Yager, R. E. (1967–1968). Student outcomes with rotation of teachers in secondary biology. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 5, 230–234.

Faryniarz, J. V. (1992). Effectiveness of microcomputer simulations in stimulating environmental problem solving by community college students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29 (5), 453–470.

Fergusson, J. , Oliver, C. , & Walter, M. R. (2012). Astrobiology outreach and the nature of science: The role of creativity. Astrobiology, 12 (12), 1143–1153.

Fisher, D. L. (1979). The impact of the inclusion of ASEP materials on some cognitive outcomes in different types of Tasmanian schools. Research in Science Education, 9, 111–118.

Fisher, D. L., & Fraser, B. J. (1980). Evaluating the impact of a national curriculum on content-free cognitive outcomes. European Journal of Science Education, 2 (1), 45–59.

Fleming, R. W. (1987). High-school gradates' beliefs about science-technology-society. II. The interaction among science, technology, and society. Science Education, 71 (2), 163–186.

Fleming, R. W. (1988). Undergraduate science students' views on the relationship between science, technology and society. International Journal of Science Education, 10 (4), 449–463.

Flores, F., Lopez, A., Gallegos, L., & Barojas, J. (2000). Transforming science and learning concepts of physics teachers. International Journal of Science Education, 22 (2), 197–208.

Folmer, V., Barbosa, N. B., Soares, F. A., & Rocha, J. B. T. (2009). Experimental activities based on ill-structured problems improve Brazilian school students' understanding of the nature of scientific knowledge. Revista Electrónica de Enseñanza de las Ciencias, 8 (1), 232–254.

Fraser, B. J. (1978). Development of a test of science-related attitudes. Science Education, 62, 509–515.

Fulton, H. F. (1971a). An analysis of student outcomes utilizing two approaches to teaching BSCS biology. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 8 (1), 21–28.

Fulton, H. F. (1971b). Individualized vs. group teaching of BSCS biology. The American Biology Teacher, 33 (5), 277–279, 291.

Gardner, P. L. (1975). Attitudes to science: A review. Studies in Science Education, 2 (1), 1–41.

Gess-Newsome, J. (2002). The use and impact of explicit instruction about the nature of science and science inquiry in an elementary science methods course. Science & Education, 11, 55–67.

Ginns, I. S., & Foster, W. J. (1978). A comparison of teaching strategies and their effect on attitudes to and understanding of science. South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 6 (2), 154–158.

Glass, L. W., & Yager, R. E. (1970). Individualized instruction as a spur to understanding the scientific enterprise. The American Biology Teacher, 32 (6), 359–361.

Goff, P., Boesdorfer, S. B., & Hunter, W. (2012). Using a multicultural approach to teach chemistry and the nature of science to undergraduate non-majors. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 7, 631–651.

Golabek, C., & Amrane-Cooper, L. (2011). Trainee teachers' perceptions of the nature of science and implications for pre-service teacher training in England. Research in Secondary Teacher Education, 1 (2), 9–13.

Good, R., & Shymansky, J. (2001). Nature-of-science literacy in *Benchmarks and Standards: Post-modern/relativist or modern/realist?* Science & Education, 10, 173–185.

Guerra-Ramos, M. T. (2012). Teachers' ideas about the nature of science: A critical analysis of research approaches and their contribution to pedagogical practice. Science & Education, 21 (5), 631–655.

Guerra-Ramos, M. T., Ryder, J., & Leach, J. J. (2010). Ideas about the nature of science in pedagogically relevant contexts: Insights from a situated perspective of primary teachers' knowledge. Science Education, 94, 282–307.

Güzel, H. (2011). Opinions of university students about the nature of science. World Applied Sciences Journal, 12 (7), 1005–1013.

Hacieminoğlu, E., Yılmaz-Tüzün, O., & Ertepinar, H. (2012). Development and validation of nature of science instrument for elementary school students. Education 3–13: International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education.

doi:10.1080/03004279.2012.671840

Haidar, A. H. (1999). Emirates pre-service and inservice teachers' views about the nature of science. International Journal of Science Education, 21 (8), 807–822.

Haidar, A. H. (2000). Professors' views on the influence of Arab society on science and technology. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 9 (3), 257–273.

Hanuscin, D. L., Akerson, V. L., & Phillipson-Mower, T. (2006). Integrating nature of science instruction into a physical science content course for preservice elementary teachers: NOS views of teaching assistants. Science Education, 90, 912–935.

Hanuscin, D. L., & Lee, M. H. (2011). Elementary teachers' pedagogical content knowledge for teaching the nature of science. Science Education, 95, 145–167.

Haukoos, G. D., & Penick, J. E. (1983). The influence of classroom climate on science process and content achievement of community college students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 20 (7), 629–637.

Haukoos, G. D., & Penick, J. E. (1985). The effects of classroom climate on college science students: A replication study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 22 (2), 163–168.

Haukoos, G. D. , & Penick, J. E. (1987). Interaction effect of personality characteristics, classroom climate, and science achievement. Science Education, 71 (5), 735–743.

Hillis, S. R. (1975). The development of an instrument to determine student views of the tentativeness of science. In E. J. Montague (Ed.), Research and curriculum development in science education: Science teacher behavior and student affective and cognitive learning (Vol. 3, pp. 34–40). Austin: University of Texas Press. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 124 404)

Hodson, D. (1991). Philosophy of science and science education. In M. R. Matthews (Ed.), History, philosophy, and science teaching: Selected readings (pp. 19–32). New York: Teachers College Press.

Holton, G., Watson, F. G., & Rutherford, F. J. (1967). Harvard project physics: A progress report. The Physics Teacher, 5 (5).

Howe, E. M. (2007). Addressing nature-of-science core tenets with the history of science: An example with sickle-cell anemia & malaria. American Biology Teacher, 69 (8), 467–472.

Howe, E. M., & Rudge, D. W. (2005). Recapitulating the history of sickle-cell anemia research: Improving students' NOS views explicitly and reflectively. Science & Education, 14, 423–441.

Huang, C. M., Tsai, C. C., & Chang, C. Y. (2005). An investigation of Taiwanese early adolescents' views about the nature of science. Adolescence, 40 (159), 645–654.

Hungerford, H., & Walding, H. (1974). The modification of elementary methods students' concepts concerning science and scientists. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Science Teachers Association.

irez, S. (2006). Are we prepared? An assessment of preservice science teacher educators' beliefs about nature of science. Science Education, 90, 1113–1143.

irez, S. (2007). Reflection-oriented qualitative approach in beliefs research. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education, 3 (1), 17–27.

irez, S., Çakir, M., & Şeker, H. (2011). Exploring nature of science understandings of Turkish pre-service science teachers. Necatibey Faculty of Education Electronic Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 5 (2), 6–17.

Irzik, G., & Nola, R. (2011). A family resemblance approach to the nature of science for science education. Science & Education, 20 (7), 591–607.

Jacobs, J. N., & Bollenbacher, J. K. (1960). Teaching ninth-grade biology by television. Audiovisual Communication Review, 8, 176–191. Johnson, G. (1972). An integrated two year chemistry-physics course compared with consecutively taught separate courses. Science Education, 56 (2), 143–154.

Johnson, R. L., & Peeples, E. E. (1987). The role of scientific understanding in college: Student acceptance of evolution. American Biology Teacher, 49 (2), 96–98.

Jones, K. M. (1969). The attainment of understandings about the scientific enterprise, scientists, and the aims and methods of science by students in a college physical science course. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 6 (1), 47–49.

Jungwirth, E. (1968). Teaching for "understanding of science." Journal of Biological Education, 2 (1), 39–51.

Jungwirth, E. (1969). Active understanding of the processes of science: An evaluation of certain aspects of the first two years of B.S.C.S. biology teaching in Israel. Journal of Biological Education, 3 (1), 45–55.

Jungwirth, E., & Jungwirth, E. (1972). TOUS revisited: A longitudinal study of the development of understanding of science. Journal of Biological Education, 6 (3), 187–195.

Kang, S., Scharmann, L. C., & Noh, T. (2005). Examining students' views on the nature of science: Results from Korean 6th, 8th, and 10th graders. Science Education, 89, 314–334.

Kaya, S. (2012). An examination of elementary and early childhood pre-service teachers' nature of science views. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Science, 46, 581–585.

Kelly, G. J. , Chen, C. , & Crawford, T. (1998). Methodological considerations for studying science-in-the-making in educational settings. Research in Science Education, 28 (1), 23–49.

Kemeny, J. G. (1959). A philosopher looks at science. Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand.

Khishfe, R. (2008). The development of seventh graders' views of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (4), 470–496.

Khishfe, R. (2012). Relationship between nature of science understandings and argumentation skills: A role for counterargument and contextual factors. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (4), 489–514.

Khishfe, R., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2002). Influence of explicit reflective versus implicit inquiry-oriented instruction on sixth graders' views of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (7), 551–578.

Kim, S. Y., & Irving, K. E. (2010). History of science as an instructional context: Student learning in genetics and nature of science. Science & Education, 19, 187–215.

Kim, S. Y., & Nehm, R. H. (2011). Sun Young & Ross H.: A cross-cultural comparison of Korean and American science teachers' views of evolution and the nature of science. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (2), 197–227.

Kimball, M. E. (1967–1968). Understanding the nature of science: A comparison of scientists and science teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 5, 110–120.

Klopfer, L. E., & Cooley, W. W. (1963). The *history of science cases for high schools* in the development of student understanding of science and scientists: A report on the HOSC instruction project. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 1 (1), 33–47.

Kokkotas, P., Piliouras, P., Malamitsa, K., & Stamoulis, E. (2009). Teaching physics to in-service primary schools teachers in the context of the history of science: The case of falling bodies. Science & Education, 18, 609–629.

Korth, W. W. (1968). The use of history of science to promote student's understanding of the social aspects of science. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Korth, W. W. (1969, February). Test every senior project: Understanding the social aspects of science. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Pasadena, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 028 087)

Koulaidis, V., & Ogborn, J. (1988). Use of systemic networks in the development of a questionnaire. International Journal of Science Education, 10 (5), 497–509.

Koulaidis, V., & Ogborn, J. (1989). Philosophy of science: An empirical-study of teachers views. International Journal of Science Education, 11 (2), 173–184.

Koulaidis, V., & Ogborn, J. (1995). Science teachers philosophical assumptions: How well do we understand them? International Journal of Science Education, 17 (3), 273–283.

Krockover, G. H. (1971). Individualizing secondary school chemistry instruction. School Science and Mathematics, 71 (6), 518-524.

Kucuk, M. (2008). Improving preservice elementary teachers' views of the nature of science using explicit-reflective teaching in a science, technology and society course. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 33 (2). Retrieved from http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol33/iss2/1/ Kuhn, T. S. (1996). The structure of scientific revolutions (3rd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (First published 1962) Lachman, S. J. (1960). The foundations of science. New York: Vantage.

Laforgia, J. (1988). The affective domain related to science education and its evaluation. Science Education, 72 (4), 407–421. Lakatos, I. (1970). Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes. In I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave (Eds.), Criticism and the growth of knowledge (pp. 91–195). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lakin, S. , & Wellington, J. (1994). Who will teach the "nature of science"? Teachers' views of science and their implications for science education. International Journal of Science Education, 16 (2), 175–190.

Laudan, L., Donovan, A., Laudan, R., Barker, P., Brown, H., Leplin, J., Thagard, P., & Wykstra, S. (1986). Scientific change: Philosophical models and historical research. Synthese, 69, 141–223.

Lavach, J. F. (1969). Organization and evaluation of an in-service program in the history of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 6, 166–170.

Lawrenz, F. (1975). The relationship between science teacher characteristics and student achievement and attitude. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 12 (4), 433–437.

Lawrenz, F., & Cohen, H. (1985). The effect of methods classes and practice teaching on student attitudes toward science and knowledge of science processes. Science Education, 69 (1), 105–113.

Lawson, A. E., Nordland, F. H., & DeVito, A. (1975). Relationship of formal reasoning to achievement, aptitudes, and attitudes in preservice teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 4, 423–431.

Leach, J., Millar, R., Ryder, J., & Séré, M.-G. (2000). Epistemological understanding in science learning: The consistency of representations across contexts. Learning and Instruction, 10, 497–527.

Leake, J. B., & Hinerman, C. O. (1973). Scientific literacy and school characteristics. School Science and Mathematics, 73 (9), 772–782. Leblebicioğlu, G., Metin, D., Yardimci, E., & Berkyürek, I. (2011). Teaching the nature of science in the nature: A summer science camp. Elementary Education Online, 10 (3), 1037–1055.

Leblebicioğlu, G., Metin, D., Yardimci, E., & Cetin, P. S. (2011). The effect of informal and formal interaction between scientists and children at a science camp on their images of scientists. Science Education International, 22 (3), 158–174.

Lederman, J. S., & Khishfe, R. (2002). Views of nature of science, Form D. Unpublished paper. Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, IL.

Lederman, J. S., & Ko, E. K. (2002). Views of nature of science, Form E. Unpublished paper. Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, IL. Lederman, N. G. (1986a). Relating teacher behavior and classroom climate to changes in students' conceptions of the nature of science. Science Education, 70 (1), 3–19.

Lederman, N. G. (1986b). Students' and teachers' understanding of the nature of science: A reassessment. School Science and Mathematics, 86 (2), 91–99.

Lederman, N. G. (1992). Students' and teachers' conceptions of the nature of science: A review of the research. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29 (4), 331–359.

Lederman, N. G. (1999). Teachers' understanding of the nature of science and classroom practice: Factors that facilitate or impede the relationship. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36, 916–929.

Lederman, N. G. (2007). Nature of science: Past, present, and future. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 831–879). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lederman, N. G., Abd-El-Khalick, F., Bell, R. L., & Schwartz, R. (2002). Views of nature of science questionnaire (VNOS): Toward valid and meaningful assessment of learners' conceptions of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (6), 497–521. Lederman, N. G., & Druger, M. (1985). Classroom factors related to changes in students' conceptions of the nature of science. Journal of

Research in Science Teaching, 22 (7), 649–662. Lederman, N. G. , & O'Malley, M. (1990). Students' perceptions of tentativeness in science: Development, use, and sources of change.

Lederman, N. G. , & O'Malley, M. (1990). Students' perceptions of tentativeness in science: Development, use, and sources of change. Science Education, 74, 225–239.

Lederman, N. G., Schwartz, R., Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Bell, R. L. (2001). Preservice teachers' understanding and teaching of nature of science: An intervention study. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 1 (2), 135–160.

Lederman, N. G. , Wade, P. , & Bell, R. (1998). Assessing the nature of science: What is the nature of our assessments? Science and Education, 7, 595–615.

Lederman, N. G. , & Zeidler, D. L. (1987). Science teachers' conceptions of the nature of science: Do they really influence teaching behavior? Science Education, 71 (5), 721–734.

Liang, L. L., Chen, S., Chen, X., Kaya, O. N., Adams, A. D., Macklin, M., & Ebenezer, J. (2006, April). Student understanding of science and scientific inquiry (SUSSI): Revision and further validation of an assessment instrument. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, San Francisco, CA.

Liang, L. L., Chen, S., Chen, X., Kaya, O. N., Adams, A. D., Macklin, M., & Ebenezer, J. (2008). Assessing preservice elementary teachers' views on the nature of scientific knowledge: A dual-response instrument. Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching, 9 (1). Retrieved from www.ied.edu.hk/apfslt/v9_issue1/liang/liang3.htm

Liang, L. L., Chen, S., Chen, X., Kaya, O. N., Adams, A. D., Macklin, M., & Ebenezer, J. (2009). Preservice teachers' views about nature of scientific knowledge development: An international collaborative study. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 7, 987–1012.

Lin, C. C., & Tsai, C. C. (2008). Exploring the structural relationships between high school students' scientific epistemological views and their utilization of information commitments toward online science information. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (15), 2001–2022.

Lin, H. S., & Chen, C. C. (2002). Promoting preservice chemistry teachers' understanding about the nature of science through history. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (9), 773–792.

Lin, H. S., & Chiu, H. L. (2004). Student understanding of the nature of science and their problem-solving strategies. International Journal of Science Education, 26 (1), 101–112.

Liu, S. Y., & Lederman, N. G. (2007). Exploring prospective teachers' worldviews and conceptions of nature of science. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (10), 1281–1307.

Liu, S. Y., Lin, C. S., & Tsai, C. C. (2011). College students' scientific epistemological views and thinking patterns in socioscientific decision making. Science Education, 95 (3), 497–517.

Liu, S. Y., & Tsai, C. C. (2008). Differences in the scientific epistemological views of undergraduate students. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (8), 1055–1073.

Lombrozo, T., Thanukos, A., & Weisberg, M. (2008). The importance of understanding the nature of science for accepting evolution. Evolution: Education and Outreach, 1, 290–298.

Lonsbury, J. G., & Ellis, J. D. (2002). Science history as a means to teach nature of science concepts: Using the development of understanding related to mechanisms of inheritance. Electronic Journal of Science Education, 7 (2). Retrieved from http://eise.southwestern.edu/article/view/7703/5470

Loving, C. C. (1997). From the summit of truth to its slippery slopes: Science education's journey through positivist-postmodern territory. American Educational Research Journal, 34 (3), 421–452.

Lowery, L. F. (1967). An experimental investigation into the attitudes of fifth grade students toward science. School Science and Mathematics, 67, 569–579.

Mackay, L. D. (1971). Development of understanding about the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 8 (1), 57–66. Mackay, L. D., & White, R. T. (1974). Development of an alternative to Likert scaling: Tests of perceptions of scientists and self (TOPOSS). Research in Science Education, 4 (1), 131–139.

Marbach-Ad, G., McGinnis, J. R., Dai, A. H., Pease, R., Schalk, K. A., & Benson, S. (2009). Promoting science for all by way of student interest in a transformative undergraduate microbiology laboratory for nonmajors. Journal of Microbiology & Biology Education, 10, 58–67. Marchlewicz, S. C., & Wink, D. J. (2011). Using the activity model of inquiry to enhance general chemistry students' understanding of nature of science. Journal of Chemical Education, 88, 1041–1047.

Markle, G., & Capie, W. (1977). Assessing a competency-based physics course: A model for evaluating science courses serving elementary teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 14 (2), 151–156.

Mayer, V. J., & Richmond, J. M. (1982). An overview of assessment instruments in science. Science Education, 66 (1), 49–66. Mbajiorgu, N. M., & Ali, A. (2003). Relationship between STS approach, scientific literacy, and achievement in biology. Science Education, 87, 31–39.

McComas, W. F. , & Olson J. K. (1998). The nature of science in international science education standards documents. In W. F. McComas (Ed.), The nature of science in science education: Rationales and strategies (pp. 41–52). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

McDonald, C. V. (2010). The influence of explicit nature of science and argumentation instruction on preservice primary teachers' views of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (9), 1137–1164.

Mead, M., & Métraux, R. (1957). Image of the scientist among high-school students: A pilot study. Science, 126, 384–390.

Meichtry, Y. J. (1992). Influencing student understanding of the nature of science: Data from a case of curriculum development. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29 (4), 389–407.

Mellado, V. (1997). Preservice teachers' classroom practice and their conceptions of the nature of science. Science & Education, 6, 331–354.

Metin, D., & Leblebicioğlu, G. (2011). How did a science camp affect children's conceptions of science? Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching, 12 (1). Retrieved from www.ied.edu.hk/apfslt/v12_issue1/kilic/index.htm

Metin, D., & Leblebicioğlu, G. (2012). Effect of a science camp on the children's views of tentative nature of science. Journal of Studies in Education, 2 (1). Retrieved from www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/jse/article/view/1348

Meyer, J. H. (1969). The influence of the invitations to enquiry. The American Biology Teacher, 31 (7), 451-453.

Miller, M. C. D., Montplaisir, L. M., Offerdahl, E. G., Cheng, F. C., & Ketterling, G. L. (2010). Comparison of views of the nature of science between natural science and nonscience majors. CBE Life Sciences Education, 9, 45–54.

Moore, R., & Sutman, F. (1970). The development of field test and validation of an inventory of scientific attitudes. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 7, 85–94.

Munby, H. (1982). The impropriety of "panel of judges" validation in science attitude scales. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 19, 617–619.

Murcia, K., & Schibeci, R. (1999). Primary student teachers' conceptions of the nature of science. International Journal of Science Education, 21 (11), 1123–1140.

Musgrave, A. (1998). Realism versus constructive empiricism. In M. Curd & J. A. Cover (Eds.), Philosophy of science: The central issues (pp. 1088–1113) New York: Norton.

Nalçaci, Ġ. Ö., Akarsu, B., & Kariper, A. I (2011). Effects of the nature of science course on science prospective teachers' knowledge and opinions. Ahmet Kelepoðlu Journal of Education, 32, 337–352.

National Research Council (NRC) . (1996). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Neumann, I., Neumann, K., & Nehm, R. (2011). Evaluating instrument quality in science education: Rasch-based analyses of a nature of science test. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (10), 1373–1405.

NGSS Lead States . (2013). Next generation science standards: For states, by states. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Nott, M. , & Wellington, J. (1995). Critical incidents in the science classroom and the nature of science. School Science Review, 76, 41–46. Nott, M. , & Wellington, J. (1995b). Probing teachers' views of the nature of science: How should we do it and where should we be looking? In F. Finley (Eds.), Proceedings of the Third International History, Philosophy, and Science Teaching Conference (Vol. 2, pp. 864–872). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Nott, M., & Wellington, J. (1996). When the black box springs open: Practical work in school science and the nature of science. International Journal of Science Education, 18 (7), 807–818.

Nott, M., & Wellington, J. (1998). Eliciting, interpreting and developing teachers' understandings of the nature of science. Science & Education, 7, 579–594.

Ogunniyi, M. B. (1982). An analysis of prospective science teachers' understanding of the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 19 (1), 25–32.

Ogunniyi, M. B. (1983). Relative effects of a history/philosophy of science course on student teachers' performance on two models of science. Research in Science & Technological Education, 1 (2), 193–199.

O'Hear, A. (1989). An introduction to the philosophy of science. New York: Oxford University Press.

Olstad, R. G. (1969). The effect of science teaching methods on the understanding of science. Science Education, 53 (1), 9–11.

Orgren, J., & Doran, R. L. (1975). The effects of adopting the revised New York state regents earth science syllabus on selected teacher and student variables. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 12 (1), 15–24.

Osborne, J., Collins, S., Ratcliffe, M., Millar, R., & Duschl, R. (2003). What "ideas-about science" should be taught in school science? A Delphi study of the expert community. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40 (7), 692–720.

Osborne, J., Simon, S., & Collins, S. (2003). Attitudes toward science: A review of the literature and its implications. International Journal of Science Education, 25 (9), 1049–1079.

Oskay, Ö. Ö., Yilmaz, A., Dinçol, S., & Erdem, A. (2011). Determination of relationship between prospective chemistry teachers' scientific epistemological views, information commitments and online searching achievement. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 15, 3484–3489.

Pearl, R. E. (1974). The present status of science attitude measurement: History, theory, and availability of measurement. School Science and Mathematics, 74 (5), 375–381.

Pegg, J., & Gummer, E. (2010). The influence of a multidisciplinary scientific research experience on teachers views of nature of science. The Montana Mathematics Enthusiast, 7 (2 & 3), 447–460.

Pella, M. O., O'Hearn, G. T., & Gale, C. W. (1966). Referents to scientific literacy. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 4, 199–208. Pomeroy, D. (1993). Implications of teachers' beliefs about the nature of science: Comparison of the beliefs of scientists, secondary science teachers, and elementary teachers. Science Education, 77, 261–278.

Popper, K. R. (1963). Conjectures and refutations: The growth of scientific knowledge. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul. Posnanski, T. J. (2010). Developing understanding of the nature of science within a professional development program for inservice elementary teachers: Project nature of elementary science teaching. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21, 589–621.

Quigley, C., Pongsanon, K., & Akerson, V. L. (2010). If we teach them, they can learn: Young students' views of nature of science

aspects to early elementary students during an informal science education program. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21, 887–907. Quigley, C., Pongsanon, K., & Akerson, V. L. (2011). If we teach them, they can learn: Young students' views of nature of science during an informal science education, 22, 129–149.

Rampal, A. (1992). Images of science and scientists: A study of school teachers' views. I. Characteristics of scientists. Science Education, 76 (4), 415–436.

Riban, D. B. (1976). Examination of a model for field studies in science. Science Education, 60 (1), 1–11.

Riban, D. B., & Koval, D. B. (1971). An investigation of the effect of field studies in science on the learning of the methodology of science. Science Education, 55 (3), 291–294.

Richardson, J. S., & Showalter, V. (1967). Effects of a unified science curriculum on high school graduates. Columbus: Ohio State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 024 593)

Riley, J. P., II (1979). The influence of hands-on science process training on preservice teachers' acquisition of process skills and attitude toward science and science teaching. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 16 (5), 373–384.

Rivers, R. H., & Vockell, E. (1987). Computer simulations to stimulate scientific problem solving. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 24 (5), 403–415.

Roehrig, G. H., & Luft, J. A. (2004). Constraints experienced by beginning secondary science teachers in implementing scientific inquiry lessons. International Journal of Science Education, 26 (1), 3–24.

Rosenberg, A. (2005). Philosophy of science: A contemporary introduction (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Rothman, A. I. (1969). Teacher characteristics and student learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 6, 340–348.

Rothman, A. I., Welch, W. W., & Walberg, H. J. (1969). Physics teacher characteristics and student learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 6, 59–63.

Rubba, P. (1976). Nature of scientific knowledge scale. Bloomington: School of Education, Indiana University.

Rubba, P. (1977). The development, field testing, and validation of an instrument to assess secondary school students' understanding of the nature of scientific knowledge. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Rubba, P., & Harkness, W. L. (1993). Examination of preservice and in-service secondary science teachers' beliefs about science-technology-society interactions. Science Education, 77 (4), 407–431.

Rubba, P. A., & Andersen, H. (1978). Development of an instrument to assess secondary school students' understanding of the nature of scientific knowledge. Science Education, 62 (4), 449–458.

Rubba, P. A., Horner, J. K., & Smith, J. M. (1981). A study of two misconceptions about the nature of science among junior high school students. School Science and Mathematics, 81 (3), 221–226.

Rudge, D. W., Cassidy, D. P., Fulford, J. M., & Howe, E. M. (2013). Changes observed in views of nature of science during a historically based unit. Science & Education. doi:10.1007/s11191-012-9572-3

Rudolph, J. L. (2000). Reconsidering the "nature of science" as a curriculum component. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 32 (3), 403–419.

Russell, C. B. , & Weaver, G. C. (2011). A comparative study of traditional, inquiry-based, and research-based laboratory curricula: Impacts on understanding of the nature of science. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 12, 57–67.

Russell, T., & Aydeniz, M. (2012). Traversing the divide between high school science students and sophisticated nature of science understandings: A multi-pronged approach. Journal of Science Education and Technology. doi:10.1007/s10956-012-9412-x

Ryan, A. G., & Aikenhead, G. S. (1992). Students' preconceptions about the epistemology of science. Science Education, 76, 559–580.

Ryder, J., Leach, J., & Driver, R. (1999). Undergraduate science students' images of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36 (2), 201–219.

Salloum, S. , & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2010). A study of practical-moral knowledge in science teaching: Case studies in physical science classrooms. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (8), 929–951.

Sandoval, W. A., & Morrison, K. (2003). High school students' ideas about theories and theory change after a biological inquiry unit. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40 (4), 369–392.

Sarkar, M. A., & Gomes, J. J. (2010). Science teachers' conceptions of nature of science: The case of Bangladesh. Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching, 11 (1). Retrieved from www.ied.edu.hk/apfslt/

Scharmann, L. C. (1988a). Locus of control: A discriminator of the ability to foster an understanding of the nature of science among preservice elementary teachers. Science Education, 72 (4), 453–465.

Scharmann, L. C. (1988b). The influence of sequenced instructional strategy and locus of control on preservice elementary teachers' understandings of the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 25 (7), 589–604.

Scharmann, L. C. (1989). Developmental influences of science process skill instruction. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 26 (8), 715–726.

Scharmann, L. C. (1990). Enhancing the understanding of the premises of evolutionary theory: The influence of diversified instructional strategy. School Science and Mathematics, 90 (2), 91–100.

Scharmann, L. C. (1994). Teaching evolution: The influence of peer teachers' instructional modeling. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 5 (2), 66–76.

Scharmann, L. C., & Harris, W. M., Jr. (1992). Teaching evolution: Understanding and applying the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29 (4), 375–388.

Schwartz, R. S., & Lederman, N. G. (2002). "It's the nature of the beast": The influence of knowledge and intentions on learning and teaching nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (3), 205–236.

Schwartz, R. S., Lederman, N. G., & Crawford, B. A. (2004). Developing views of nature of science in an authentic context: An explicit approach to bridging the gap between nature of science and scientific inquiry. Science Education, 88, 610–645.

Schwartz, R. S., Westerlund, J. F., Garcia, D. M., & Taylor, T. A. (2010). The impact of full immersion scientific research experiences on teachers' views of the nature of science. Electronic Journal of Science Education, 14(1). Retrieved from http://ejse.southwestern.edu/article/view/7325

Schwirian, P. A. (1968). On measuring attitudes toward science. Science Education, 52 (2), 172–179.

Schwirian, P. A. (1969). Characteristics of elementary teachers related to attitudes toward science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 6 (3), 203–213.

Schwirian, P. A., & Thomson, B. (1972). Changing attitudes toward science: Undergraduates in 1967 and 1971. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 9 (3), 253–259.

Scientific Literacy Research Center . (1967). Wisconsin inventory of science processes. Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Seker, H., & Welsh, L. C. (2006). The use of history of mechanics in teaching motion and force units. Science & Education, 15, 55–89. Shim, M. K., Young, B. J., & Paolucci, J. (2010). Elementary teachers' views on the nature of scientific knowledge: A comparison of inservice and preservice teachers approach. Electronic Journal of Science Education, 14 (1). Retrieved from http://ejse.southwestern.edu/article/view/7335/5619

Simpson, R. D., Shrum, J. W., & Rentz, R. (1972). The science support scale: Its appropriateness with high school students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 9 (2), 123–126.

Simpson, R. D., & Wasik, J. L. (1978). Correlation of selected affective behaviors with cognitive performance in a biology course for elementary teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 15 (1), 65–71.

Smith, M. U., Lederman, N. G., Bell, R. L., McComas, W. F., & Clough, M. P. (1997). How great is the disagreement about the nature of science: A response to Alters. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34 (10), 1101–1103.

Spears, J., & Zollman, D. (1977). The influence of structured versus unstructured laboratory on students' understanding the process of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 14 (1), 33–38.

Spears, J. D., & Hathaway, C. E. (1975). Student attitudes toward science and society. American Journal of Physics, 43 (4), 343–348. Starr, R. J. (1972). A study of invitations to enquiry and their effect on student knowledge of science processes. School Science and Mathematics, 72 (8), 714–717.

Stice, G. (1958). Facts about science test. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Sutherland, D., & Dennick, R. (2002). Exploring culture, language and the perception of the nature of science. International Journal of Science Education, 24 (1), 1–25.

Swan, M. D. (1966). Science achievement as it relates to science curricula and programs at the sixth grade level in Montana public schools. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 4, 112–123.

Symington, D. J., & Fensham, P. J. (1976). Elementary school teachers' closed-mindedness, attitudes toward science, and congruence with a new curriculum. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 13 (5), 441–447.

Tamir, P. (1972). Understanding the process of science by students exposed to different science curricula in Israel. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 9 (3), 239–245.

Tamir, P. (1994). Israeli students' conceptions of science and views about the scientific enterprise. Research in Science & Technological Education, 12 (2), 99–116.

Tamir, P., & Jungwirth, E. (1975). Students' growth as a result of studying BSCS biology for several years. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 12 (3), 263–279.

Tasar, M. F. (2006). Probing preservice teachers' understandings of scientific knowledge by using a vignette in conjunction with a paper and pencil test. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 2 (1), 53–70.

Thye, T. L., & Kwen, B. H. (2004). Assessing the nature of science views of Singaporean pre-service teachers. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 29(2). Retrieved from http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol29/iss2/1/

Trembath, R. J. (1972). The structure of science. The Australian Science Teachers Journal, 18 (2), 59-63.

Trent, J. (1965). The attainment of the concept "understanding science" using contrasting physics courses. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 3, 224–229.

Tsai, C. C. (2007). Teachers' scientific epistemological views: The coherence with instruction and students' views. Science Education, 91 (2), 222–243.

Tsai, C. C., & Liang, J. C. (2009). The development of science activities via on-line peer assessment: The role of scientific epistemological views. Instructional Science, 37 (3), 293–310.

Tsai, C. C., & Liu, S. Y. (2005). Developing a multi-dimensional instrument for assessing students' epistemological views toward science. International Journal of Science Education, 27 (13), 1621–1638.

Turgut, H. (2011). The context of demarcation in nature of science teaching: The case of astrology. Science & Education, 20, 491–515. Urhahne, D., Kremer, K., & Mayer, J. (2011). Conceptions of the nature of science—are they general or context specific? International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 9, 707–730.

van Fraassen, B. C. (1980). The scientific image. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

van Fraassen, B. C. (1998). Arguments concerning scientific realism. In M. Curd & J. A. Cover (Eds.), Philosophy of science: The central issues (pp. 1064–1087). New York: Norton.

Vesterinen, V.-M., & Aksela, M. (2012). Design of chemistry teacher education course on nature of science. Science & Education, 22: 2193–2225. doi:10.1007/s11191-012-9506-0

Voss, B. E. (1965). "Great Experiments in Biology"—A summer program for academically talented high school students. The American Biology Teacher, 27 (4), 257–259.

Wahbeh, N., & Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2013). Revisiting the translation of nature of science understandings into instructional practice: Teachers' nature of science pedagogical context knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 36 (3): 425–466. doi:10.1080/095006 93.2013.786852

Walberg, H. J. (1969). Physics, femininity, and creativity. Developmental Psychology, 1 (2), 47–54.

Walczak, M. M., & Walczak, D. E. (2009). Do student attitudes toward science change during a general education chemistry course? Chemical Education Research, 86 (8), 985–991.

Walker, K. A., & Zeidler, D. L. (2007). Promoting discourse about socio-scientific issues through scaffolded inquiry. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (11), 1387–1410.

Walls, L. (2012). Third grade African American students' views of the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (1), 1–37.

Welch, W. W. (1966a). The development of an instrument for inventorying knowledge of the processes of science. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Welch, W. W. (1966b). Welch science process inventory (form D). Madison, WI: Author.

Welch, W. W. (1969). Correlates of courses satisfaction in high school physics. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 6, 54–58.

Welch, W. W. (1972). Evaluation of the PSNS course. I: Design and implementation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 9 (2), 139–145.

Welch, W. W. (1980). A possible explanation for declining test scores or learning less science but enjoying it more. School Science and Mathematics, 80 (1), 22–28.

Welch, W. W., & Lawrenz, F. (1982). Characteristics of male and female science teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 19 (7), 587–594.

Welch, W. W., & Pella, M. O. (1967). The development of an instrument for inventorying knowledge of the processes of science. Journal of Research on Science Teaching, 5, 64–68.

Welch, W. W., & Rothman, A. I. (1968). The success of recruited students in a new physics course. Science Education, 52 (3), 270–273. Welch, W. W., & Walberg, H. J. (1967–1968). An evaluation of summer institute programs for physics teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 5, 105–109.

Welch, W. W., & Walberg, H. J. (1970). Pretest and sensitization effects in curriculum evaluation. American Educational Research Journal, 7 (4), 605–614.

Welch, W. W., & Walberg, H. J. (1972). A national experiment in curriculum evaluation. American Educational Research Journal, 9 (3), 373–383.

Wilson, L. L. (1954). A study of opinions related to the nature of science and its purpose in society. Science Education, 38 (2), 159–164. Windschitl, M. (2004). Folk theories of "inquiry": How preservice teachers reproduce the discourse and practices of an theoretical scientific method. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (5), 481–512.

Wong, S. L., & Hodson, D. (2009). From the horse's mouth: What scientists say about scientific investigation and scientific knowledge. Science Education, 93, 109–130.

Wong, S. L., & Hodson, D. (2010). More from the horse's mouth: What scientists say about science as a social practice. International Journal of Science Education, 32 (11), 1431–1463.

Wong, S. L., Hodson, D., Kwan, J., & Yung, B. H. W. (2008). Turning crisis into opportunity: Enhancing student-teachers' understanding of nature of science and scientific inquiry through a case study of the scientific research in severe acute respiratory syndrome. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (11), 1417–1439.

Wood, R. L. (1972). University education students' understanding of the nature and processes of science. School Science and Mathematics, 72 (1), 73–79.

Yacoubian, H. A., & BouJaoude, S. (2010). The effect of reflective discussions following inquiry-based laboratory activities on students' views of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (10), 1229–1252.

Yager, R. E. (1968). Critical thinking and reference materials in the physical science classroom. School Science and Mathematics, 68 (8), 743–746.

Yager, R. E., & Wick, J. W. (1966). Three emphases in teaching biology—a statistical comparison of results. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 4, 16–20.

Yalçinoğlu, P., & Anagün, S. S. (2012). Teaching nature of science by explicit approach to the preservice elementary science teachers. Elementary Education Online, 11 (1), 118–136.

Yalvac, B., Tekkaya, C., Cakiroglu, J., & Kahyaoglu, E. (2007). Turkish pre-service science teachers' views on

science-technology-society issues. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (3), 331-348.

Zeidler, D. L., & Lederman, N. G. (1989). The effect of teachers' language on students' conceptions of the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 26 (9), 771–783.

Zimmermann, E., & Gilbert, J. K. (1998). Contradictory views of the nature of science held by a Brazilian secondary school physics teacher: Educational value of interviews. Educational Research and Evaluation: An International Journal on Theory and Practice, 4 (3), 213–234.

Zingaro, J. S., & Collette, A. T. (1967–1968). A statistical comparison between inductive and traditional laboratories in college physical science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 5, 269–275.

Zoller, U., & Ben-Chaim, D. (1994). Views of prospective teachers versus practising teachers about science, technology and society issues. Research in Science & Technological Education, 12 (1), 77–89.

Zoller, U., Donn, S., Wild, R., & Beckett, P. (1991a). Students' versus their teachers' beliefs and positions on science/technology/societyoriented issues. International Journal of Science Education, 13 (1), 25–36.

Zoller, U., Donn, S., Wild, R., & Beckett, P. (1991b). Teachers' beliefs about views on selected science-technology-society topics: A probe into STS literacy versus indoctrination. Science Education, 75 (5), 541–561.

Zoller, U., Ebenezer, J., Morley, K., Paras, S., Sandberg, V., West, C., Wolthers, T., & Tan, S. H. (1990). Goal attainment in science-technology-society (S/T/S) education and reality: The case of British Columbia. Science Education, 74 (1), 19–36.

Cultural Perspectives in Science Education

Adams, J., Luitel, B. C., Afonso, E., & Taylor, P. C. (2008). A cogenerative inquiry using postcolonial theory to envisage culturally inclusive science education. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3 (4), 999–1019.

Aikenhead, G. S. (1996). Science education: Border crossing into the subculture of science. Studies in Science Education, 27, 1–52.

Aikenhead, G. S. (2006). Science education for everyday life: Evidence-based practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Aikenhead, G. S., & Jegede, O. J. (1999). Cross-cultural science education: A cognitive explanation of a cultural phenomenon. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36 (3), 269–287.

August, D., Branum-Martin, L., Cardenas-Hagan, E., & Francis, D. J. (2009). The impact of an instructional intervention on the science and language learning of middle grade English language learners. Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness, 2 (4), 345–376. Barab, S. A., & Hay, K. E. (2001). Doing science at the elbows of experts: Issues related to the science apprenticeship camp. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (1), 70–102.

Basu, S. J., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2007). Developing a sustained interest in science among urban minority youth. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 4 (3), 466–489.

Brandt, C., & Carlone, H. (2012). Ethnographies of science education: Situated practices of science learning for social/political transformation. Ethnography and Education, 7 (2), 143–150.

Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. Educational Researcher, 18, 32–42.

Buxton, C. A. (2001). Modeling science teaching on science practice? Painting a more accurate picture through an ethnographic lab study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38, 387–407.

Buxton, C. A., Lee, O., & Santau. A. (2008). Promoting science among English language learners: Professional development for today's culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 19 (5), 495–511.

Buxton, C. A., Salinas, A., Mahotiere, M., Lee, O., & Secada, W. G. (2013). Leveraging cultural resources through teacher pedagogical reasoning: Elementary grade teachers analyze second language learners' science problem solving. Teaching and Teacher Education, 32, 31–42.

Calabrese Barton, A., Kang, H., Tan, E., O'Neill, T. B., Bautista-Guerra, J., & Brecklin, C. (2013). Crafting a future in science: Tracing middle school girls' identity work over time and space. American Educational Research Journal, 50 (1), 37–75.

Calabrese Barton, A., & Osborne, M. D. (1998). Marginalized discourses and pedagogies: Constructively confronting science for all. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35, 339–340.

Calabrese Barton, A., & Tan, E. (2009). Funds of knowledge and discourses and hybrid space. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (1), 50–73.

Calabrese Barton, A., Tan, E., & Rivet, A. (2008). Creating hybrid spaces for engaging school science among urban middle school girls. American Educational Research Journal, 45 (1), 68–103.

Carlone, H. , & Johnson, A. (2012). Unpacking "culture" in cultural studies of science education: Cultural difference vs. cultural production. Ethnography and Education, 7 (2), 151–173.

Carlone, H. B. (2004). The cultural production of science in reform-based physics: Girls' access, participation, and resistance. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (4), 392–414.

Carlone, H. B., Scott, C., & Lowder, C. (in press). Becoming (less) scientific in the figured worlds of school science learning: A longitudinal study of students' identity work.

Carter, L. (2006). Postcolonial interventions within science education: Using postcolonial ideas to reconsider cultural diversity scholarship. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 38 (5), 677–691.

Carter, L. (2010). The armchair at the borders: The "messy" ideas of borders and border epistemologies within multicultural science education scholarship. Science Education, 94, 428–447.

Chaiklin, S. , & Lave, J. (1993). Understanding practice: Perspectives on activity and context. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Chinn, C. A., & Malhotra, B. A. (2002). Epistemologically authentic inquiry in schools: A theoretical framework for evaluating inquiry tasks. Science Education, 86, 175–218.

Chinn, P. (2006). Preparing science teachers for culturally diverse students: Developing cultural literacy through cultural immersion, cultural translators and communities of practice. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 1, 367–402.

Chiu, M.-H., & Duit, R. (2011). Globalization: Science education from an international perspective. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (6), 553–566.

Cobb, P. (1994). Where is the mind? Constructivist and sociocultural perspectives on mathematical development. Educational Researcher, 23, 13–20.

Cobern, W. W. (1996). Worldview theory and conceptual change in science education. Science Education, 80, 579–610.

Cobern, W., & Aikenhead, G. (1998). Cultural aspects of learning science. International Handbook of Science Education, 2, 39–52. Collins, H. M. (1982). Sociology of scientific knowledge. Bath, UK: University Press.

Costa, V. B. (1995). When science is "another world": Relationships between worlds of family, friends, school, and science. Science Education, 79 (3), 313–333.

Cowie, B. , Jones, A. , & Otrel-Cass, K. (2011). Re-engaging students in science: Issues of assessment, funds of knowledge and sites for learning. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 9 (2), 347–366.

Cunningham, C. M., & Helms, J. V. (1998). Sociology of science as a means to a more authentic, inclusive science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35 (5), 483–499.

Eisenhart, M. (1996). The production of biologists at school and work: Making scientists, conservationists, or flowery bone-heads? In B. Levinson , D. Foley , & D. Holland (Eds.) The cultural production of the educated person: Critical ethnographies of schooling and local practice (pp. 169–185). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Eisenhart, M. (2001a). Changing conceptions of culture and ethno-graphic methodology: Recent thematic shifts and their implications for research on teaching. In V. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (4th ed.; pp. 209–225). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Eisenhart, M. (2001b). Educational ethnography past, present, and future: Ideas to think with. Educational Researcher, 30 (8), 16–27. Eisenhart, M., & Finkel, E. (1998). Women's science: Learning and succeeding from the margins. University of Chicago Press.

Eisenhart, M., Finkel, E., & Marion, S. F. (1996). Creating the conditions for scientific literacy: A re-examination. American Educational Research Journal, 33, 261–295.

Elmesky, R. (2011). Rap as a roadway: Creating creolized forms of science in an era of cultural globalization. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6 (1), 49–76.

Emdin, C. (2009). Urban science classrooms and new possibilities: On intersubjectivity and grammar in the third space. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 4 (1), 239–254.

Gonsalves, A. J., Seiler, G., & Salter, D. E. (2011). Rethinking resources and hybridity. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6 (2), 389–399.

Gough, N. (2010). Thinking/acting locally/globally: Western science and environmental education in a global knowledge economy. International Journal of Science Education, 11, 1217–1237.

Grimberg, B. I., & Gummer, E. (2013). Teaching science from cultural points of intersection. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50, 12–32.

Gutiérrez, K., Rymes, B., & Larson, J. (1995). Script, counterscript, and underlife in the classroom: James Brown versus Brown v. Board of Education. Harvard Educational Review, 65(3), 445–472.

Gutiérrez, K. D. (2008). Developing a sociocritical literacy in the third space. Reading Research Quarterly, 43 (2), 148–164.

Gutiérrez, K. D., Baquedano-Lopez, P., & Tejeda, C. (1999). Rethinking diversity: Hybridity and hybrid language practices in the third space. Mind, Culture & Activity, 6 (4), 286.

Hammond, L., & Brandt, C. (2004). Science and cultural process: Defining an anthropological approach to science education. Studies in Science Education, 1, 1–47.

Hatt, B. (2007). Street smarts vs. book smarts: The figured world of smartness in the lives of marginalized, urban youth. The Urban Review, 39 (2), 145–166.

Hawkins, J., & Pea, R. D. (1987). Tools for bridging the cultures of everyday and scientific thinking. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 24 (4), 291–307.

Heath, S. B. (1983). Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hodson, D. (2003). Time for action: Science education for an alternative future. International Journal of Science Education (6), 645–670. Holland, D. C., & Eisenhart, M. A. (1990). Educated in romance: Women, achievement, and college culture. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Holland, D., & Lachicotte, W. (2007). Vygotsky, Mead and the new sociocultural studies of identity. In H. Daniels , M. Cole , & J. Wertsch (Eds.), The Cambridge companion to Vygotsky (pp. 101–135). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Holland, D. , Lachicotte, W. , Skinner, D. , & Cain, C. (1998). Identity and agency in cultural worlds. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jegede, O. (1995). Collateral learning and the eco-cultural paradigm in science and mathematics education in Africa. Studies in Science Education, 25, 97–137.

Johnson, A., Brown, J., Carlone, H., & Cuevas, A. K. (2011). Authoring identity amidst the treacherous terrain of science: A multiracial feminist examination of the journeys of three women of color in science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48, 339–366. Johnson, C. C. (2011). The road to culturally relevant science: Exploring how teachers navigate change in pedagogy. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48, 170–198.

Johnson, C. C., & Fargo, J. D. (2010). Urban school reform enabled by transformative professional development: Impact on teacher change and student learning of science. Urban Education, 45 (1), 4–29.

Kelly, G. J., & Chen, C. (2001). The sound of music: Constructing science as sociocultural practices through oral and written discourse. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36, 883–915.

Kelly, G. J., Chen, C., & Crawford, T. (1998). Methodological considerations for studying science-in-the-making in educational settings. Research in Science Education, 28 (1), 23–49.

Knain, E. (2006). Achieving science literacy through transformation of multimodal textual resources. Science Education, 90 (4), 656–659. Koch, P. A., Contento, I. R., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2010). Choice, control & change: Using science to make food and activity decisions: Linking food and the environment curriculum series. South Burlington, VT: National Gardening Association.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. American Educational Research Journal, 32, 465–491. Larson, J. (1995). Fatima's Rules and other elements of an unintended chemistry curriculum. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1986). Laboratory life: The construction of scientific facts. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Lave, J., & E. Wenger (1991). Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Lee, O. (2001). Culture and language in science education: What do we know and what do we need to know? Journal of Research in Science Teaching. 38 (5), 499–501.

Lee, O. (2005). Science Education and Student Diversity: Synthesis and Research Agenda. Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR), 10 (4), 431–440.

Lee, O. , & Buxton, C. (2011). Engaging culturally and linguistically diverse students in learning science. Theory Into Practice, 50, 277–284.

Lee, O., Deaktor, R. A., Hart, J. E., Cuevas, P., & Enders, C. (2005). An instructional intervention's impact on the science and literacy achievement of culturally and linguistically diverse elementary students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42, 857–887. Lee, O., & Fradd, S. (1998). Science for all, including students from non-English-language backgrounds. Educational Researcher, 27 (4), 12–21.

Lee, O., Lewis, S., Adamson, K., Maerten-Rivera, J., & Secada., W. G. (2008). Urban elementary school teachers' knowledge and practices in teaching science to English language learners. Science Education, 92, 733–758.

Lemke, J. L. (1990). Talking science: Language, learning, and values. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Lemke, J. L. (2001). Articulating communities: Sociocultural perspectives on science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (3), 296–316.

Levinson, B. A., Foley, D. E., & Holland, D. C. (1996). The cultural production of the educated person: Critical ethnographies of schooling and local practice. New York: SUNY Press.

Mensah, F. M. (2011). A case for culturally relevant teaching in science education and lessons learned for teacher education. The Journal of Negro Education, 80 (3), 296–309.

Michael, A., Andrade, N., & Bartlett, L. (2007). Figuring "success" in a bilingual high school. The Urban Review, 39 (2), 167–189.

Moje, E. B., Ciechanowski, K. M., Kramer, K., Ellis, L., Carrillo, R., & Collazo, T. (2004). Working toward third space in content area literacy: An examination of everyday funds of knowledge and discourse. Reading Research Quarterly, 39 (1), 38–70.

Moll, L. C. , Amanti, C. , Neff, D. , & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. Theory Into Practice, 31 (2), 132–141.

Monzó, L. D., & Rueda, R. (2009). Passing for English fluent: Latino immigrant children masking language proficiency. Anthropology & Education Quarterly 40 (1), 20–40.

Moore, D. W., Bean, T. W., Birdyshaw, D., & Ryick, J. A. (1999). Adolescent literacy: A position statement. Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 43, 97–111.

Morrison, K. A., Robbins, H. H., & Rose, D. G. (2008). Operationalizing culturally relevant pedagogy: A synthesis of classroom-based research. Equity and Excellence in Education, 41 (4), 433–452.

National Research Council . (1996). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Nieto, S. (2000). Placing equity front and center: Some thoughts on transforming teacher education for a new century. Journal of Teacher Education, 51 (3), 180–187.

O'Loughlin, M. (1992). Rethinking science education: Beyond Piagetian constructivism toward a sociocultural model of teaching and learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29, 791–820.

Parsons, E. C., & Carlone, H. (2013). Culture and science education in the 21st century: Extending and making the cultural box more inclusive. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50, 1–11.

Parsons, E. C., Travis, C., & Simpson, J. S. (2005). The Black cultural ethos, students' instructional context preferences, and student achievement: An examination of culturally congruent science instruction in the eighth grade classes of one African American and one Euro-American teacher. The Negro Educational Review, 56 (2 & 3), 183–204.

Patchen, T., & Cox-Petersen, A. (2008). Constructing cultural relevance in science: A case study of two elementary teachers. Science Education, 92, 994–1014.

Phelan, P. , Davidson, A. , & Cao, H. (1991). Students' multiple worlds: Negotiating the boundaries of family, peer, and school cultures. Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 22, 224–249.

Quigley, C. (2011). Pushing the boundaries of cultural congruence pedagogy in science education towards a third space. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6, 549–557.

Rahm, J. (2008). Urban youths' hybrid positioning in science practices at the margin: A look inside a school–museum–scientist partnership project and an after-school science program. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3 (1), 97–121.

Richardson Bruna, K. (2009). Jesús and María in the jungle: An essay on possibility and constraint in the third-shift third space. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 4 (1), 221–237.

Riojas-Cortez, M., Huerta, M. E., Flores, B. B., Perez, B., & Clark, E. R. (2008). Using cultural tools to develop scientific literacy of young Mexican American preschoolers. Early Child Development and Care, 178 (5), 527–536.

Rodriguez, A. J. (1997). The dangerous discourse of invisibility: A critique of the National Research Council's National Science Education Standards. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34, 19–37.

Rosebery, A. S., Ogonowski, M., DiSchino, M., & Warren, B. (2010). "The coat traps all your body heat": Heterogeneity as fundamental to learning. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 19 (3), 322–357.

Roth, W.-M. (2008). Bricolage, metissage, hybridity, heterogeneity, diaspora: Concepts for thinking science education in the 21st century. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3 (4), 891–916.

Roth, W.-M., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2004). Rethinking scientific literacy. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Seiler, G. (2013). New metaphors about culture: Implications for research in science teacher preparation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50 (1), 104–121.

Shumar, W. (2010). Homi Bhabha. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 5 (2), 495–506.

Sikoyo, L. N., & Jacklin, H. (2009). Exploring the boundary between school science and everyday knowledge in primary school pedagogic practices. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 30 (6), 713–726.

Tan, E., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2007). Unpacking science for all through the lens of identities-in-practice: The stories of Amelia and Ginny. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3, 43–71.

Tan, E., & Calabrese Barton, A. (2012). Empowering science and mathematics education in urban schools. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tobin, K. , & Gallagher, J. J. (1987). What happens in high school science classrooms? Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19, 549–560. Tonso, K. L. (2006). Student engineers and engineer identity: Campus engineer identities as figured world. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 1 (2), 273–307.

Traweek, S. (1988). Beamtimes and lifetimes: The world of high energy physicists. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tsurusaki, B. K., Calabrese Barton, A., Tan, E., Koch, P., & Contento, I. (2013). Using transformative boundary objects to create critical engagement in science: A case study. Science Education, 97, 1–31.

Upadhyay, B. (2009). Teaching science for empowerment in an urban classroom: A case study of a Hmong teacher. Equity & Excellence in Education, 42 (2), 217–232.

Urrieta, L. (2007). Identity production in figured worlds: How some Mexican Americans become Chicana/o activist educators. The Urban Review, 39, 117–144.

Vélez-Ibáñez, C. G., & Greenberg, J. B. (1992). Formation and transformation of funds of knowledge among U.S.-Mexican households. Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 23 (4), 313–335.

Warren, B., Ballenger, C., Ogonowski, M., Rosebery, A. S., & Hudicourt-Barnes, J. (2001). Rethinking diversity in learning science: The logic of everyday sense-making. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38, 529–552.

Wood, N. B., Erichson, E. A., & Anicha, C. L. (2013). Cultural emergence: Theorizing culture in and from the margins of science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50, 122–136.

Xu, J., Coats, L. T., & Davidson, M. L. (2011). Promoting student interest in science: The perspectives of exemplary African American teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 49 (1), 124–154.

Culturally Relevant Schooling in Science for Indigenous Learners Worldwide

Abrams, E., Taylor, P. C., & Guo, C.-J. (2013a). Contextualizing culturally relevant science and mathematics teaching for indigenous learning [Special issue]. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 11 (1), 1–21.

Abrams, E., Taylor, P. C., & Guo, C.-J. (Eds.). (2013b). Pedagogies of hope: Culturally relevant science and mathematics teaching for indigenous learners in science and mathematics [Special issue]. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 11 (1), 1–121.

Abrams, E., Yen, C.-F., Blatt, E., & Ho, L. (2009). Unpacking the complex influence of schooling, sense of place and culture on the motivation of Taiwanese elementary students to learn science in school: Using a socio-cultural approach with phenomenological research methodologies. In D. B. Zandvliet (Ed.), Diversity in environmental education research (pp. 103–129). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense. Agbo, S. A. (2004). First Nations perspectives on transforming the status of culture and language in schooling. Journal of American Indian Education, 43 (1), 1–31.

Aikenhead, G. S. (1996). Science education: Border crossing into the subculture of science. Studies in Science Education, 27, 1–52.

Aikenhead, G. S. (2006). Science education for everyday life: Evidence-based practice. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Aikenhead, G. S., & Elliott, D. (2010). An emerging decolonizing science education in Canada. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 10 (4), 321–338.

Aikenhead, G. S., & Michell, H. (2012). Bridging cultures: Indigenous and scientific ways of knowing nature. Toronto, ON: Pearson Education Canada.

Aikenhead, G. S., & Ogawa, M. (2007). Indigenous knowledge and science revisited. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 2 (3), 539–620.

Alaska Native Knowledge Network . (n.d.). Culturally-based curriculum resources. Fairbanks, AK: University of Alaska Fairbanks. Retrieved from http://ankn.uaf.edu/Resources/course/view.php?id=2

Alaska Native Knowledge Network . (2006). Alaska Federation of Natives guidelines for research. Fairbanks, AK: University of Alaska Fairbanks. Retrieved from http://ankn.uaf.edu/IKS/afnguide.html

Anderson, J. O., Lin, H.-S., Treagust, D. F., Ross, S. P., & Yore, L. D. (2007). Using large-scale assessment datasets for research in science and mathematics education: Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA). International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 5 (4), 591–614.

Appanna, S. D. (2011). Embedding indigenous perspectives in teaching school science. Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 40, 18–22.

Atkinson, J. L. (2010). Are we creating the achievement gap? Examining how deficit mentalities influence indigenous science curriculum choices. In D. J. Tippins , M. P. Mueller , M. van Eijck , & J. D. Adams (Eds.), Cultural studies and environmentalism: The confluence of eco-justice, place-based (science) education, and indigenous knowledge systems (Vol. 3, pp. 439–446). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies . (n.d.). Research at AIATSIS. Retrieved from www.aiatsis.gov.au/research/about.html

Ball, D. L., & Osborne, M. D. (1998). Teaching with difference: A response to Angela Calabrese Barton: Teaching science with homeless children: Pedagogy, representation, and identity. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35 (4), 395–397.

Bang, M. E. (2009). Understanding students' epistemologies: Examining practice and meaning in community contexts (Doctoral dissertation). Northwestern University, Evanston, IL. Retrieved from ERIC (ED530427).

Bang, M. E., Curley, L., Kessel, A., Marin, A., & Suzokovich, E. (in press). Muskrat theories, tobacco in the streets, and living Chicago as indigenous lands. Environmental Education Research.

Bang, M. E., & Medin, D. (2010). Cultural processes in science education: Supporting the navigation of multiple epistemologies. Science Education, 94 (6), 1008–1026.

Bang, M. E., Warren, B., Rosebery, A. S., & Medin, D. (2012). Desettling expectations in science education. Human Development, 55 (5–6), 302–318.

Barnhardt, R. (2005). Indigenous knowledge systems and Alaska native ways of knowing. Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 36 (1), 8–23.

Barnhardt, R. (2008). Indigenous knowledge systems and higher education: Preparing Alaska Native PhD's for leadership roles in research. Fairbanks, AK: Alaska Native Knowledge Network. Retrieved from

www.ankn.uaf.edu/curriculum/Articles/RayBarnhardt/PreparingPhDs.html

Battiste, M. (2008). Research ethics for protecting indigenous knowledge and heritage: Institutional and researcher responsibilities. In N. K. Denzin , Y. S. Lincoln , & L. Tuhiwai Smith (Eds.), Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies (pp. 497–510). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Battiste, M., Kovach, M., & Balzer, G. (2010). Celebrating the local, negotiating the school: Language and literacy in aboriginal communities. Canadian Journal of Native Education, 32, 4–12.

Bazzul, J. (2012). Neoliberal ideology, global capitalism, and science education: Engaging the question of subjectivity. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 7 (4), 1001–1020.

Belczewski, A. (2009). Decolonizing science education and the science teacher: A White teacher's perspective. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 9 (3), 191–202.

Belgarde, M. J., Mitchell, R. D., & Arquero, A. (2002). What do we have to do to create culturally responsive programs? The challenge of transforming American Indian teacher education. Action in Teacher Education, 24 (2), 42–54.

Benson, J. (2012). Student science achievement and the integration of indigenous knowledge in the classroom and on standardized tests (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH.

Bishop, R. (2008). Te Kotahitanga: Kaupapa Mâori in mainstream classrooms. In N. K. Denzin , Y. S. Lincoln , & L. Tuhiwai Smith (Eds.), Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies (pp. 439–458). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. The Urban Review, 37 (5), 425-446.

Brayboy, B. M. J. , & Castagno, A. E. (2009). Self-determination through self-education: Culturally responsive schooling for Indigenous students in the USA. Teaching Education, 20 (1), 31–53.

Brayboy, B. M. J., & Maughan, E. (2009). Indigenous knowledges and the story of the bean. Harvard Educational Review, 79 (1), 1–21. British Columbia Ministry of Education . (2011). Aboriginal education resources: Learning resources. Victoria, BC: Author. Retrieved from www.bced.gov.bc.ca/abed/documents.htm Buxton, C. (2009). Science inquiry, academic language, and civic engagement. Democracy in Education, 18 (3), 17–22.

Caduto, M. J., & Bruchac, J. (1991). The native stories from keepers of the earth. Calgary, AB: Fifth House.

Cajete, G. A. (2008). Sites of strength in indigenous research. In M. Villegas , S. R. Neugebauer , & K. R. Venegas (Eds.), Indigenous knowledge and education: Sites of struggle, strength, and survivance (pp. 204–210). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.

Cargo, M., Delormier, T., Lévesque, L., Horn-Miller, K., McComber, A., & Macaulay, A. C. (2008). Can the democratic ideal of participatory research be achieved? An inside look at an academic-indigenous community partnership. Health Education Research, 23 (5), 904–914.

Carjuzaa, J., & Fenimore-Smith, K. (2010). The give away spirit: Reaching a shared vision of ethical indigenous research relationships. Journal of Educational Controversy, 5 (2). Retrieved from www.wce.wwu.edu/Resources/CEP/eJournal/v005n002/a004.shtml

Carter, C. D. (2010). Science and the near-death experience: How consciousness survives death. Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions. Carter, L. (2010). The armchair at the borders: The "messy" ideas of borders and border epistemologies within multicultural science education scholarship. Science Education, 94 (3), 428–447.

Carter, L., & Walker, N. (2010). Traditional ecological knowledge, border theory and justice. In D. J. Tippins, M. P. Mueller, M. van Ejick, & J. D. Adams (Eds.), Cultural studies and environmentalism: The confluence of ecojustice, place-based (science) education, and indigenous knowledge systems (Vol. 3, pp. 337–348). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Castagno, A. E., & Brayboy, B. M. J. (2008). Culturally responsive schooling for indigenous youth: A review of the literature. Review of Educational Research, 78 (4), 941–993.

Castleden, H., Morgan, V. S., & Lamb, C. (2012). "I spent the first year drinking tea": Exploring Canadian university researchers' perspectives on community-based participatory research involving indigenous peoples. The Canadian Geographer/Le Géographe Canadien, 56 (2), 160–179.

Chang, J.-M., Lee, H., & Yen, C.-F. (2010). Alternative conceptions about burning held by Atayal Indigene students in Taiwan. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 8 (5), 911–935.

Chigeza, P. (2008). Language negotiations indigenous students navigate when learning science. Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 37, 91–97.

Chinn, P. W. U. (2007). Decolonizing methodologies and indigenous knowledge: The role of culture, place and personal experience in professional development. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (9), 1247–1268.

Chinn, P. W. U., Hand, B., & Yore, L. D. (2008). Culture, language, knowledge about nature and naturally occurring events, and science literacy for all: She says, he says, they say [Special issue]. L1 – Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 8 (1), 149–171. Retrieved from http://l1.publication-archive.com/show?repository=1&article=220

Connell, R. (2007). Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Council of Ministers of Education, Canada. (1997). Common framework of science learning outcomes, K to 12: Pan-Canadian protocol for collaboration on school curriculum. Retrieved from http://publications.cmec.ca/science/framework/

Eisenhart, M., Finkel, E., & Marion, S. F. (1996). Creating the conditions for scientific literacy: A re-examination. American Educational Research Journal, 33 (2), 261–295.

El-Hani, C. N., & Souza de Ferreira Bandeira, F. P. (2008). Valuing indigenous knowledge: To call it "science" will not help. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3 (3), 751–779.

Elliott, F. (2011). From indigenous science examples to indigenous science perspectives. Alberta Science Education Journal, 41 (1), 4–10. Evans, M., Hole, R., Berg, L. D., Hutchinson, P., & Sookraj, D. (2009). Common insights, differing methodologies: Toward a fusion of indigenous methodologies, participatory action research, and White studies in an urban aboriginal research agenda. Qualitative Inquiry, 15 (5), 893–910.

Fakudze, C., & Rollnick, M. (2008). Language, culture, ontological assumptions, epistemological beliefs, and knowledge about nature and naturally occurring events: Southern African perspective [Special issue]. L1 – Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 8 (1), 69–94. Retrieved from http://l1.publication-archive.com/public?fn=enter&repository=1&article=216

Ferreira, M. P., & Gendron, F. (2011). Community-based participatory research with traditional and indigenous communities of the Americas: Historical context and future directions. International Journal of Critical Pedagogy, 3 (3), 153–168.

Fine, M., Tuck, E., & Zeller-Berkman, S. (2008). Do you believe in Geneva? Methods and ethics at the global-local nexus. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, & L. Tuhiwai Smith (Eds.), Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies (pp. 157–180). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Ford, C. L., & Yore, L. D. (2012). Toward convergence of critical thinking, metacognition, and reflection: Illustrations from natural and social sciences, teacher education, and classroom practice. In A. Zohar & Y. J. Dori (Eds.), Metacognition in science education: Trends in current research (pp. 251–271). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Ford, M. J. (2008). Disciplinary authority and accountability in scientific practice and learning. Science Education, 92 (3), 404–423. Freier, G. D. (1989). Wonder of weather: 600 proverbs, sayings, facts & folklore about the always unpredictable weather. Darby, PA: Diane.

Fulton, L., & Campbell, B. L. (2004). Student-centered notebooks . Science and Children, 42 (3), 26–29.

Gadicke, J. M. (2005). Integrating aboriginal knowledge into the elementary science curriculum (Unpublished master's project). University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada.

Gallard Martínez, A. J. (2011). Argumentation and indigenous knowledge: Socio-historical influences in contextualizing an argumentation model in South African schools. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 6 (3), 719–723.

George, J. (1999). Worldview analysis of knowledge in a rural village: Implications for science education. Science Education, 83 (1), 77–95.

George, J. (2013). "Do you have to pack?" Preparing for culturally relevant science teaching in the Caribbean. International Journal of Science Education, 35 (12), 2114–2131.

Glasson, G. E., Mhango, N., Phiri, A., & Lanier, M. (2010). Sustainability science education in Africa: Negotiating indigenous ways of living with nature in the third space. International Journal of Science Education, 32 (1), 125–141.

Good, R. G., Shymansky, J. A., & Yore, L. D. (1999). Censorship in science and science education. In E. H. Brinkley (Ed.), Caught off guard: Teachers rethinking censorship and controversy (pp. 101–121). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Grande, S. (2008). Red pedagogy: The un-methodology. In N. K. Denzin , Y. S. Lincoln , & L. Tuhiwai Smith (Eds.), Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies (pp. 233–254). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gunel, M., Hand, B., & Prain, V. (2007). Writing for learning in science: A secondary analysis of six studies. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 5 (4), 615–637.

Guo, C.-J., Hsiung, T.-H., Wang, C.-L., & Yore, L. D. (2008, March-April). Border crossings: Bridging cultural perspectives with technology—Examples from Taiwan's indigenous people in the southeast area. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Baltimore, MD.

Hand, B., Villanueva, M. G., & Yoon, S. (in press). Moving from "fuzziness" to canonical knowledge: The role of writing in developing cognitive and representational resources. In P. D. Klein, P. Boscolo, L. Kirkpatrick, & C. Gelati (Eds.), Writing as learning activity (Vol. 17, pp. TBA). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Handa, V. C. , & Tippins, D. J. (2012). Tensions in the third space: Locating relevancy in preservice science teacher preparation. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education. 11 (1), 237–265.

Hansen, S. A., & VanFleet, J. W. (2003). Traditional knowledge and intellectual property: A handbook in issues and options for traditional knowledge holders in protecting their intellectual property and maintaining biological diversity. Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Hatcher, A., Bartlett, C., Marshall, A., & Marshall, M. (2009). Two-eyed seeing in the classroom environment: Concepts, approaches, and challenges. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 9 (3), 141–153.

Hofer, B. K. (2008). Personal epistemology and culture. In M. S. Khine (Ed.), Knowing, knowledge and beliefs: Epistemological studies across diverse culture (pp. 3–22). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Horsthemke, K., & Yore, L. D. (2014). Challenges of multiculturalism in science education: Indigenisation, internationalisation, and *transkulturalät*. In M. R. Matthews (Ed.), Handbook of history and philosophy of science and science teaching (pp. 1759–1792). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Hudson, M., Milne, M., Reynolds, P., Russell, K., & Smith, B. (2010). Te Ara Tika—Guidelines for Māori research ethics: A framework for researchers and ethics committee members. Auckland, New Zealand: Health Research Council of New Zealand. Retrieved from www.hrc.govt.nz/sites/default/files/Te%20Ara%20Tika%20Guidelines%20for%20Maori%20Research%20Ethics.pdf

Hudson, M., Roberts, M., Smith, L., Tiakiwai, S.-J., & Hemi, M. (2012). The art of dialogue with indigenous communities in the new biotechnology world. New Genetics and Society, 31 (1), 11–24.

Inwards, R. (1869). Weather lore: A collection of proverbs, sayings, and rules concerning the weather. London, UK: W. Tweedie. Jacobs, B., Roffenbender, J., Collman, J., Cherry, K., Bitsòi, L. L., Bassett, K., & Evans, C. H., Jr. (2010). Bridging the divide between

genomic science and indigenous peoples. Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics, 38 (3), 684–696.

Johnson, C. C. (2011). The road to culturally relevant science: Exploring how teachers navigate change in pedagogy. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (2), 170–198.

Kawagley, A. O. (2006). A Yupiaq worldview: A pathway to ecology and spirit (2nd ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Keane, M. (2008). Science education and worldview. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3 (3), 587-621.

Kelly, J., Saggers, S., Taylor, K., Pearce, G., Massey, P., Bull, J., Odo, T., Thomas, J., Billycan, R., Judd, J., Reilly, S., & Ahboo, S. (2012). "Makes you proud to be black eh?": Reflections on meaningful Indigenous research participation. International Journal for Equity in Health, 11 (40): 1–8.

Kidman, J. (2007). Engaging with Māori communities: An exploration of some tensions in the mediation of social sciences research (Tihei Oreore Monograph Series). Auckland, New Zealand: Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga, University of Auckland.

Kidman, J., Abrams, E., & McRae, H. (2011). Imaginary subjects: School science, indigenous students, and knowledge–power relations. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 32 (2), 203–220.

Kidman, J., Yen, C.-F., & Abrams, E. (2012). Indigenous students' experiences of the hidden curriculum in science education: A crossnational study in New Zealand and Taiwan. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 11 (1), 43–64.

Klug, B. J., & Whitfield, P. T. (2003). Widening the circle: Culturally relevant pedagogy for American Indian children. New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

Klump, J., & McNeir, G. (2005). Culturally responsive practices for student success: A regional sampler. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved from http://educationnorthwest.org/webfm_send/296

Langenhoven, K., Kwofie, S., & Ogunniyi, M. B. (2008). Science & indigenous knowledge systems project. Unpublished study guides, School of Science & Mathematics Education, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, South Africa.

Lederman, N. G., & Lederman, J. S. (2012). Nature of scientific knowledge and scientific inquiry: Building instructional capacity through professional development. In B. J. Fraser, K. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (Vol. 24, pp. 335–359). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Lee, H., Chiang, C. L., & Lin, Y. C. (2011, July). Bunun's worldview of nature and its influence on daily life. Paper presented at 11th international IHPST & 6th Greek History, Philosophy and Science Teaching joint conference, Thessaloniki, Greece.

Lee, H., Yen, C.-F., & Aikenhead, G. S. (2012). Indigenous elementary students' science instruction in Taiwan: Indigenous knowledge and western science. Research in Science Education, 42 (6), 1183–1199.

Levinson, M. (2012). No citizen left behind. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lewthwaite, B., & McMillan, B. (2007). Combining the views of both worlds: Perceived constraints and contributors to achieving aspirations for science education in Qikiqtani. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 7 (4), 355–376. Lewthwaite, B., & Renaud, R. (2009). Pilimmaksarniq: Working together for the common good in science curriculum development and delivery in Nunavut. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 9 (3), 154–172.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Cannella, G. S. (2009). Ethics and the broader rethinking/reconceptualization of research as construct. Cultural Studies +> Critical Methodologies, 9 (2), 273–285.

Lipka, J. (1990). Integrating cultural form and content in one Yup'ik Eskimo classroom: A case study. Canadian Journal of Education, 17 (2), 18–32.

Little Bear, L. (2009). Naturalizing indigenous knowledge (Synthesis paper). Saskatoon, SK, & Calgary, AB: University of Saskatchewan Aboriginal Education Research Centre & First Nations and Adult Higher Education Consortium. Retrieved from www.ccl-cca.ca/pdfs/ablkc/naturalizeIndigenous en.pdf

Little Bear, L. (2011, March 24). Native science and Western science: Possibilities for a powerful collaboration. The Simon Ortiz and Labriola Center Lecture on Indigenous Land, Culture, and Community [Video podcast]. Retrieved from www.youtube.com/watch?v=ycQtQZ9y3lc

Louca, L., Elby, A., Hammer, D., & Kagey, T. (2004). Epistemological resources: Applying a new epistemological framework to science instruction. Educational Psychologist, 39 (1), 57–68.

Mack, E., Augare, H., Different Cloud-Jones, L., Davíd, D., Quiver Gaddie, H., Honey, R. E., ... Wippert, R. (2012). Effective practices for creating transformative informal science education programs grounded in Native ways of knowing. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 7 (1), 49–70.

McCarty, T. L., Romero, M. E., & Zepeda, O. (2006). Reclaiming the gift: Indigenous youth counter-narratives on native language loss and revitalization. American Indian Quarterly, 30 (1), 28–48.

McConney, A., Oliver, M. C., Woods-McConney, A., & Schibeci, R. (2011). Bridging the gap? A comparative, retrospective analysis of science literacy and interest in science for Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australian students. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (14), 2017–2035.

McDermott, M. A., & Hand, B. (2010). A secondary reanalysis of student perceptions of non-traditional writing tasks over a ten year period. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (5), 518–539.

McKinley, E. (2007). Postcolonialism, indigenous students, and science education. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 199–226). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

McKinley, E., & Keegan, P. J. (2008). Curriculum and language in Aotearoa New Zealand: From science to Putaiao [Special issue]. L1 – Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 8 (1), 135–147. Retrieved from http://l1.publication-archive.com/public?fn=enter&r epository=1&article=219

McKinley, E., & Stewart, G. (2009). Falling into place: Indigenous science education and research in the Pacific. In S. M. Ritchie (Ed.), The world of science education: Handbook of research in Australasia (pp. 49–66). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.

McKinley, E., & Stewart, G. (2012). Out of place: Indigenous knowledge in the science curriculum. In B. J. Fraser, K. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (Vol. 24, pp. 541–554). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer. Mead, N., Grigg, W., Moran, R., & Kuang, M. (2010). National Indian education study 2009—Part II: The educational experiences of American Indian and Alaska Native students in grades 4 and 8 (NCES 2010–463). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from

http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/pdf/studies/2010463.pdf

Meel, B. L. (2007). Lightning fatalities in the Transkei sub-region of South Africa. Medicine, Science and the Law, 47 (2), 161–164. Meyer, C. F. , & Rhoades, E. K. (2006). Multiculturalism: Beyond food, festival, folklore, and fashion. Kappa Delta Pi Record, 42 (2), 82–87.

Michell, H. (2009). Introduction to the Special Issue on indigenous science education from place: Best practices on Turtle Island. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 9 (3), 137–140.

Michell, H., Vizina, Y., Augustus, C., & Sawyer, J. (2008). Learning indigenous science from place: Research study examining indigenous-based science perspectives in Saskatchewan First Nations and Métis community contexts. Saskatoon, SK: Aboriginal Education Research Centre. Retrieved from http://aerc.usask.ca/downloads/Learning%20Indigenous%20Science%20From%20Place.pdf Middleton, M., Dupuis, J., & Tang, J. (2012). Classrooms and culture: The role of context in shaping motivation and identity for science learning in Indigenous adolescents. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 11 (1), 111–141.

Moon, F. (2008). Preparing elementary preservice teachers for urban elementary science classrooms: Challenging cultural biases toward diverse students. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 19, 85–109.

Muller, S. (2012). "Two ways": Bringing indigenous and non-indigenous knowledges together. In J. K. Weir (Ed.), Country, native title and ecology (pp. 57–79). Canberra, ACT, Australia: ANU E Press.

Nafukho, F. M. (2006). Ubuntu worldview: A traditional African view of adult learning in the workplace. Advances in Developing Human Resources, 8 (3), 408–415.

Nasir, N. S., & Saxe, G. B. (2003). Ethnic and academic identities: A cultural practice perspective on emerging tensions and their management in the lives of minority students. Educational Researcher, 32 (5), 14–18.

New Zealand Ministry of Education . (1993). Science in the New Zealand curriculum. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media. Ogunniyi, M. B. (2006). Effects of a discursive course on two science teachers' perceptions of the nature of science. African Journal of Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 10 (1), 93–102.

Ogunniyi, M. B. (2007). Teachers' stances and practical arguments regarding a science-indigenous knowledge curriculum: Part 1. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (8), 963–986.

Ogunniyi, M. B., & Hewson, M. G. (2008). Effect of an argumentation-based course on teachers' disposition towards a science-indigenous knowledge curriculum. International Journal of Environmental & Science Education, 3 (4), 159–177.

Ovando, C. J. (1992). Science. In J. Reyhner (Ed.), Teaching American Indian students (pp. 223–240). Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology and practice. Educational Researcher, 41 (3), 93–97.

Pauka, S., Treagust, D. F., & Waldrip, B. G. (2005). Village elders' and secondary school students' explanations of natural phenomena in Papua New Guinea. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 3 (2), 213–238.

Pewewardy, C., & Hammer, P. C. (2003). Culturally responsive teaching for American Indian students. ERIC Digest. Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

Pierotti, R. J. (2010). Indigenous knowledge, ecology, and evolutionary biology. New York, NY: Routledge.

Regmi, J., & Fleming, M. (2012). Indigenous knowledge and science in a globalized age. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 7 (2), 479–484.

Richards, J., & Scott, M. (2009). Aboriginal education: Strengthening the foundations. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Policy Research Networks. Retrieved from http://cprn.org/documents/51984_FR.pdf

Richards, J., Hove, J., & Afolabi, K. (2008, June). Explaining the Aboriginal – non-Aboriginal gap in student performance in BC schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Economics Association, Vancouver, BC. Available from www.csls.ca/events/cea2008/richards.pdf

Rogers, A. (2007). The making of *Cosmic Africa:* The research behind the film. African Skies/Cieux Africains, 11 (July), 19–23. Rose, D. B. (1996). Nourishing terrains: Australian aboriginal views of landscape and wilderness. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian Heritage Commission. Retrieved from www.environment.gov.au/resource/nourishing-terrains Santoro, N., Reid, J.-A., Crawford, L., & Simpson, L. (2011). Teaching indigenous children: Listening to and learning from indigenous teachers. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (10), 65–76.

Sarche, M., Novins, D., & Belcourt-Dittloff, A. (2010). Engaged scholarship with tribal communities. In H. E. Fitzgerald, C. Burack, & S. Seifer (Eds.), Handbook of engaged scholarship: Contemporary landscapes, future directions (Vol. 1, pp. 215–233). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Setati, M. (2005). Teaching mathematics in a primary multilingual classroom. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 36 (5), 447–466.

Snively, G. J., & Williams, L. B. (2008). "Coming to know": Weaving Aboriginal and Western science knowledge, language, and literacy into the science classroom [Special issue]. L1 – Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 8 (1), 109–133. Retrieved from http://l1.publication-archive.com/public?fn=enter&repository=1&article=218

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada . (n.d.). Aboriginal research. Retrieved from www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/fundingfinancement/programs-programmes/priority_areas-domaines_prioritaires/aboriginal_research-recherche_autochtone-eng.aspx South Africa Department of Education . (2002). Revised national curriculum statement for grades R–9 (schools) – Natural sciences (Vol. 443, No. 23406). Pretoria, South Africa: Government Gazette.

Standards for Culturally-Responsive Schools Adopted by Native Educators. (Standards for CRS). (1998, March/April). Sharing Our Pathways, 3 (2). Retrieved from www.ankn.uaf.edu/sop/sopv3i2.html#standard

Stephens, S. (2003). Handbook for culturally responsive science curriculum (2nd ed.). Fairbanks, AK: Alaska Native Knowledge Network. Stewart, G. (2005). Māori in the science curriculum: Developments and possibilities. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 37 (6), 851–870. Sutherland, D., & Henning, D. (2009). Ininiwi-Kiskānītamowin: A framework for long-term science education. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 9 (3), 173–190.

Thomson, S., De Bortoli, L., Nicholas, M., Hillman, K., & Buckley, S. (2010). Challenges for Australian education: Results from PISA 2009: The PISA 2009 assessment of students' reading, mathematical and scientific literacy. Retrieved from http://research.acer.edu.au/ozpisa/9

Trujillo, O. V., Viri, D., & Figueira, A. (2002, August). The native educators research project. Paper presented at the World Indigenous Peoples Conference on Education, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.

Tuck, E. (2012). Repatriating the GED: Urban youth and the alternative to a high school diploma. The High School Journal, 95 (4), 4–18. Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples. London, UK: Zed.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2005). On tricky ground: Researching the native in the age of uncertainty. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Sage handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed., pp. 85–107). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

United Nations . (2007). United Nations declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples. Resolution 61/295. New York, NY: UN General Assembly. Retrieved from www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/DRIPS_en.pdf

United States Department of Education . (2008). Status and trends in the education of American Indians and Alaska Native: 2008 (NCES 2008–084). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2008/nativetrends/index.asp United States National Research Council . (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science in grades K–8 (R. A. Duschl , H. A. Schweingruber , & A. W. Shouse , Eds.). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

United States National Research Council . (2009). Learning science in informal environments: People, places, and pursuits (P. Bell, B. Lewenstein, A. W. Shouse, & M. A. Feder, Eds.). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

United States National Research Council . (2012). A framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas (H. Quinn , H. A. Schweingruber , & T. Keller , Eds.). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Villanueva, M. G., & Hand, B. (2011). Data versus evidence: Investigating the difference. Science Scope, 35 (1), 42-45.

Villanueva, M. G., & Webb, P. (2008). Scientific investigations: The effect of the "Science Notebooks" approach in grade 6 classrooms in Port Elizabeth, South Africa. African Journal of Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 12 (2), 3–16.

Villegas, M., Neugebauer, S. R., & Venegas, K. (Eds.). (2008). Indigenous knowledge and education: Sites of struggle, strength, and survivance. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Publishing Group.

Waldrip, B. G., Timothy, J. T., & Wilikai, W. (2007). Pedagogic principles in negotiating cultural conflict: A Melanesian example. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (1), 101–122.

Warren, E., & de Vries, E. (2009). Young Australian indigenous students' engagement with numeracy: Actions that assist to bridge the gap. Australian Journal of Education, 53 (2), 159–175.

Webb, P. (2010). Science education and literacy: Imperatives for the developed and developing world [Special issue]. Science, 328 (5977), 448–450.

Webb, P. (2012). Xhosa indigenous knowledge: Stakeholder awareness, value, and choice. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 11 (1), 89–110.

Webb, P., & Mayaba, N. (2010). The effect of an integrated strategies approach to promoting scientific literacy on grade 6 and 7 learners' general literacy skills. African Journal of Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 14 (3), 34–49.

West, R. , Stewart, L. , Foster, K. , & Usher, K. (2012). Through a critical lens: Indigenist research and the Dadirri method. Qualitative Health Research, 22 (11), 1582–1590.

Wilson, S. (2008). Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods. Black Point, NS, Canada: Fernwood.

Wood, A., & Lewthwaite, B. (2008). Māori science education in Aotearoa New Zealand. He pūtea whakarawe: Aspirations and realities. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 3 (3), 625–662.

Woods-McConney, A., Oliver, M. C., McConney, A., Major, D., & Schibeci, R. (2013). Science engagement and literacy: A retrospective analysis for Indigenous and non-Indigenous students in Aotearoa New Zealand and Australia. Research in Science Education, 43, 233–252.

Worldwide Indigenous Science Network . (n.d.). Distinctions of indigenous science. Retrieved from www.wisn.org/what-is-indigenous-science.html

Wright, N., Claxton, E., Jr., Williams, L., & Paul, T. (2011). Giving voice to science from two perspectives: A case study. In L. D. Yore, E. Van der Flier-Keller, D. W. Blades, T. W. Pelton, & D. B. Zandvliet (Eds.), Pacific CRYSTAL centre for science, mathematics, and technology literacy: Lessons learned (pp. 67–82). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.

Yore, L. D. (2008). Science literacy for all students: Language, culture, and knowledge about nature and naturally occurring events [Special issue]. L1 – Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 8 (1), 5–21. Retrieved from http://l1.publication-archive.com/show?repository=1&article=213

Yore, L. D. (2011). Foundations of scientific, mathematical, and technological literacies—Common themes and theoretical frameworks. In L. D. Yore , E. Van der Flier-Keller , D. W. Blades , T. W. Pelton , & D. B. Zandvliet (Eds.), Pacific CRYSTAL centre for science, mathematics, and technology literacy: Lessons learned (pp. 23–44). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.

Yore, L. D. (2012). Science literacy for all—More than a slogan, logo, or rally flag! In K. C. D. Tan & M. Kim (Eds.), Issues and challenges in science education research: Moving forward (pp. 5–23). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Yore, L. D., Chinn, P. W. U., & Hand, B. (Eds.). (2008). Science literacy for all: Influences of culture, language, and knowledge about nature and naturally occurring events [Special issue]. L1 – Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 8 (1), 1–171. Retrieved from http://l1.publication-archive.com/public?fn=enter&repository=1&article=299

Yore, L. D., Florence, M. K., Pearson, T. W., & Weaver, A. J. (2006). Written discourse in scientific communities: A conversation with two scientists about their views of science, use of language, role of writing in doing science, and compatibility between their epistemic views and language [Special issue]. International Journal of Science Education, 28 (2/3), 109–141.

Yore, L. D., Hand, B., & Florence, M. K. (2004). Scientists' views of science, models of writing, and science writing practices. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (4), 338–369.

Yore, L. D., Neill, B. W., Francis-Pelton, L., Pelton, T., Milford, T., & Anderson, J. A. (2014). Closing the achievement gap from a Canadian perspective. In J. Clark (Ed.). Closing the achievement gap from an international perspective: Transforming STEM for effective education (pp. 73–104). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer Publishers.

Young, L. (2003). First Nations weather. Saskatoon, SK, Canada: Saskatchewan Indian Cultural Centre & Western Development Museum. Retrieved from www.wdm.ca/skteacherguide/SICCResearch/FNWeather_TeacherGuide.pdf

Ziman, J. (2000). Real science: What it is, and what it means. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Socioscientific Issues as a Curriculum Emphasis

Abd-El-Khalick, F. (2006). Socioscientific issues in pre-college science classrooms. In D. L. Zeidler (Ed.), The role of moral reasoning and discourse on socioscientific issues in science education (pp. 41–61). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Aikenhead, G. S. (1980). Science in social issues: Implications for teaching. Ottawa, Canada: Science Council of Canada.

Aikenhead, G. S. (2005). Science-based occupations and the science curriculum: Concepts of evidence. Science Education, 89, 242–275. Aikenhead, G. S. (2006). Science education for everyday life: Evidence-based practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Aikenhead, G. S. (2007). Humanistic perspectives in the science curriculum. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 881–910). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Aikenhead, G. S., Orpwood, G., & Fensham, P. (2011). Scientific literacy for a knowledge society. In C. Linder, L. Östman, D. A. Roberts, P. Wickman, G. Erickson, & A. MacKinnon (Eds.), Promoting scientific literacy: Science education research in transaction (pp. 28–44). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Akerson, V. L., Abd-El-Khalick, F. S., & Lederman, N. G. (2000). Influence of a reflective activity-based approach on elementary teachers' conceptions of the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37, 295–317.

Albe, V. (2008a). Students' positions and considerations of scientific evidence about a controversial socioscientific issue. Science & Education, 17 (8–9), 805–827.

Albe, V. (2008b). When scientific knowledge, daily life experience, epistemological and social considerations intersect: Students' argumentation in group discussions on a socio-scientific issue. Research in Science Education, 38, 67–90.

Barab, S. A., Sadler, T. D., Heiselt, C., Hickey, D., & Zuiker, S. (2010). Erratum to: Relating narrative, inquiry, and inscriptions: Supporting consequential play. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 19(4), 387–407.

Barrett, S. E., & Nieswandt, M. (2010). Teaching about ethics through socioscientific issues in physics and chemistry: Teacher candidates' beliefs. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 380–401.

Bell, R. L., & Lederman, N. G. (2003). Understandings of the nature of science and decision making on science- and technology-based issues. Science Education, 87, 352–377.

Bell, R. L., Matkins, J. J., & Gansneder, B. M. (2011). Impacts of contextual and explicit instruction on preservice elementary teachers' understandings of the nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48, 414–436.

Bencze, J. L. (2001). Subverting corporatism in school science. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 1 (3), 349–355.

Bencze, J. L., Sperling, E., & Carter, L. (2012). Students' research-informed socio-scientific activism: Re/Visions for a sustainable future. Research in Science Education, 42, 129–148.

Ben-Zvi Assaraf, O., & Orion, N. (2005). Development of system thinking skills in the context of earth system education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42, 518–560.

Berkowitz, M. W., & Simmons, P. E. (2003). Integrating science education and character education: The role of peer discussion. In D. L. Zeidler (Ed.), The role of moral reasoning on socioscientific issues and discourse in science education (pp. 117–138). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Press.

Bowers, C. A. (2001). Educating for eco-justice and community. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Brown, M. N. (2002). The mandate for interdisciplinarity in science education: The case of economic and environmental sciences. Science & Education, 11, 513–522.

Burek, K., & Zeidler, D. L. (in-press). Seeing the forest for the trees! Conservation and activism through socioscientific issues for young students. In M. Mueller & D. J. Tippins (Eds.), Ecojustice, citizen science & youth activism: Situated tensions for science education. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Çalik, M., & Coll, R. K. (2012). Investigating socioscientific issues via scientific habits of mind: Development and validation of the scientific habits of mind survey. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (12), 1909–1930.

Chang, S. N., & Chiu, M. H. (2008). Lakatos' scientific research programmes as a framework for analysing informal argumentation about socio-scientific issues. International Journal of Science Education, 30(13), 1753–1773.

Choi, K., Lee, H., Shin, N., Kim, S., & Krajcik, J. (2011). Re-conceptualization of scientific literacy in South Korea for the 21st Century. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (6), 670–697.

Colucci-Gray, L., Camino, E., Barbiero, G., & Gray, D. (2006). From scientific literacy to sustainability literacy: An ecological framework for education. Science Education, 90, 227–252.

Davis, M. (1999). Ethics and the university. London: Routledge.

Dawson, V., & Venville, G. J. (2009). High-school students' informal reasoning and argumentation about biotechnology: An indicator of scientific literacy? International Journal of Science Education, 31, 1421–1445.

Dawson, V. M., & Venville, G. (2010). Teaching strategies for developing students' argumentation skills about socioscientific issues in high school genetics. Research in Science Education, 40 (2), 133–148.

Develaki, M. (2008). Social and ethical dimension of the natural sciences, complex problems of the age, interdisciplinarity, and the contribution of education. Science & Education, 17, 873–888.

Dolan, T. J., Nichols, B. H., & Zeidler, D. L. (2009). Using socioscientific issues in primary classrooms. Journal of Elementary Science Teacher Education, 21 (3), 1–12.

Dori, Y. J. , Tal, R.T. , & Tsaushu, M. (2003). Learning and assessing bio-technology topics through case studies with built-in dilemmas. Science Education, 87, 767–793.

Eastwood, J. L., Sadler, T. D., Zeidler, D. L., Lewis, A., Amiri, L., & Applebaum, S. (2012). Contextualizing nature of science instruction in socioscientific issues. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (15), 2289–2315.

Erduran, S., Simon, S., & Osborne, J. (2004). TAPping into argumentation: Developments in the application of Toulmin's argument pattern for studying science discourse. Science & Education, 88 (6), 915–933.

Evagorou, M. (2011). Discussing a socioscientific issue in a primary school classroom: The case of using a technology-supported environment in formal and nonformal settings. In T. D. Sadler (Ed.), Socio-scientific issues in science classrooms: Teaching, learning and research (pp. 133–159). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Evans, J. St. B. T. (2003). Of two minds: Dual-process accounts of reasoning. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 7, 454–459.

Falk, J. H., Storksdieck, M., & Dierking, L. D. (2007). Investigating public science interest and understanding: Evidence for the importance of free-choice learning. Public Understanding of Science, 16 (4), 455–469.

Falk, J. H., & Heimlich, J. E. (2009). Who is the free-choice environmental education learner? In J. H. Falk, J. E. Heimlich, & S. Foutz (Ed.), Free-choice learning and the environment (pp. 23–38). Lanham MD, AltaMira Press.

Fensham, P. J. (1983). A research base for new objectives of science teaching. Science Education, 67, 3–12.

Fensham, P. J. (2009). Real world contexts in PISA science: Implications for context-based science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (8), 884–896.

Fioravanti, C., & Velho, L. (2010). Let's follow the actors! Does actor-network theory have anything to contribute to science journalism? Journal of Science Communication, 9 (4), 1–8.

Fischer-Mueller, J. , & Zeidler, D. L. (2002). A case study of teacher beliefs in contemporary science education goals and classroom practices . Science Educator, 11 (1), 46–57.

Fleming, R. (1986a). Adolescent reasoning in socio-scientific issues. Part I: Social cognition. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 23, 677–687.

Fleming, R. (1986b). Adolescent reasoning in socio-scientific issues. Part II: Nonsocial cognition. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 23, 689–698.

Forbes, C. T., & Davis, E. A. (2008). Exploring preservice elementary teachers' critique and adaptation of science curriculum materials in respect to socioscientific issues. Science & Education, 17, 829–854.

Fowler, S. R., Zeidler, D. L., & Sadler, T. D. (2009). Moral sensitivity in the context of socioscientific issues in high school science students. International Journal of Science Teacher Education, 31 (2), 279–296.

Gaskell, P. J. (1982). Science, technology and society: Issues for science teachers. Studies in Science Education, 9, 33–46. Gauch, H. G., Jr. (2009). Responses and clarification regarding science and worldviews. In Michael R. Matthews (Ed.), Science, worldviews and education (pp. 303–325). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Gauld, C. F. (2005). Habits of mind, scholarship and decision making in science and religion. Science & Education, 14, 291–308. Grace, M. M., & Ratcliffe, M. (2002). The science and values that young people draw upon to make decisions about biological conservation issues. International Journal of Science Education, 24 (11), 1157–1169.

Green, T. F. (1975). Perspectives on thinking about change: A study on the nature of policy thinking and the principles of moral education: Final report. Report for the Kettering Foundation Exploration Fund. Syracuse, NY: Center for Human Future.

Green, T. F. (1999). Voices: The educational formation of conscience. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Halverson, K. L., Siegel, M. A., & Freyermuth, S. K. (2009). Lenses for framing decisions: Undergraduates' decision making about stem cell research. International Journal of Science Education, 31 (9), 1249–1268.

Hanegan, N. L. , Price, L. , & Peterson, J. (2007). Disconnections between teacher expectations and students confidence in bioethics. Science & Education, 17, 921–940.

Hodson, D. (1999). Going beyond cultural pluralism: Science education for sociopolitical action. Science Education, 83 (6), 775–796.

Hodson, D. (2003). Time for action: Science education for an alternative future. International Journal of Science Education, 25 (6), 645–670.

Hodson, D. (2006). Why we should prioritize learning about science. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 6 (3), 293–311.

Hodson, D. (2010). Science education as a call to action. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 10 (3), 197–206.

Hogan, K. (2002). Small groups' ecological reasoning while making an environmental management decision. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39, 341–368.

Hughes, G. (2000). Marginalization of socioscientific material in science-technology-society science curricula: Some implications for gender inclusivity and curriculum reform. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37 (5), 426–440.

Ibáñez-Orcajo, M. T., & Martínez-Aznar, M. M. (2007). Solving problems in genetics, part III: Change in the view of the nature of science. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (6), 747–769.

Karrow, D., & Fazio, X. (2010). Educating-within-place: Care, citizen science, and ecojustice. In D. Tippins, M. Mueller, M. van Eijck, & J. Adams (Eds.), Cultural studies and environmentalism: The confluence of ecojustice, place-based (science) education, and indigenous knowledge systems (pp. 193–214). New York: Springer.

Khishfe, R. (2012a). Relationship between nature of science understandings and argumentation skills: A role for counterargument and contextual factors. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (4), 489–514.

Khishfe, R. (2012b). Nature of science and decision-making. International Journal of Science Education, 1 (1), 67–100.

Khishfe, R., & Lederman, N. (2006). Teaching nature of science within a controversial topic: Integrated versus non-integrated. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43, 395–318.

Khishfe, R., & Lederman, N. (2007). Relationship between instructional context and views of nature of science. International Journal of Science Education, 29, 939–961.

Kincheloe, J. L., & Tobin, K. (2009). The much exaggerated death of positivism. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 4, 513–528. King, K., Shumow, L., & Lietz, S. (2001). Science education in an urban elementary school: Case studies of teacher beliefs and classroom practices. Science Education, 85, 89–110.

King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). Developing reflective judgment: Understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking in adolescents and adults. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (2002). The reflective judgment model: Twenty years of research on epistemic cognition. In B. K. Hofer & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), Personal epistemology: The psychology of beliefs about knowledge and knowing (pp. 37–61). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (2004). Reflective judgment: Theory and research on the development of epistemic assumptions through adulthood. Educational Psychologist, 39 (1), 5–18.

Klosterman, M. L., & Sadler, T. D. (2010). Multi-level assessment of scientific content knowledge gains associated with socioscientific issues-based instruction. International Journal of Science Education, 32, 1017–1043.

Klosterman, M. L., Sadler, T., & Brown, J. (2012). Science teachers' use of mass media to address socio-scientific and sustainability issues. Research in Science Education, 42, 51–74.

Kolstø, S. D. (2000). Consensus projects: Teaching science for citizenship. International Journal of Science Education, 22 (6), 645–664. Kolstø, S. D. (2001a). Scientific literacy for citizenship: Tools for dealing with the science dimension of controversial socioscientific issues. Science Education, 85, 291–310.

Kolstø, S. D. (2001b). "To trust or not to trust, ..."—pupils' ways of judging information encountered in a socioscientific issue. International Journal of Science Education, 23 (9), 877–901.

Kolstø, S. D. (2006). Patterns in students' argumentation confronted with a risk-focused socio-scientific issue. International Journal of Science Education, 28, 1689–1716.

Kolstø, S. D., Bungum, B., Arnesen, E., Isnes, A., Kristensen, T., Mathiassen, K., Mestad, I., Quale, A., Tonning, A. S. V., & Ulvik, M. (2006). Science students' critical examination of scientific information related to socioscientific issues. Science Education, 90, 632–655. Kuhn, D. (1993). Science as argument: Implications for teaching and learning scientific thinking. Science Education, 77, 319–337.

Lakatos, I. (1970). The methodology of scientific research programmes. In I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave (Eds.), Criticism and the growth of knowledge (pp. 91–195). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lakatos, I. (1978). Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes. New York: Cambridge University Press. Latour, B. (2005). Reassembling the social: An introduction to Actor-Network Theory. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Lederman, N. G., Antink, A., & Bartos, S. (2014). Nature of science, scientific inquiry, and socio-scientific issues arising from genetics: A pathway to developing a scientifically literate citizenry. Science & Education 2 3(2), 285–302.

Lee, H., Abd-El-Khalick, F., & Choi, K. (2006). Korean science teachers' perceptions of the introduction of socioscientific issues into the science curriculum. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 6 (2), 97–117.

Lee, H., Chang, H., Choi, K., Kim, S. W., & Zeidler, D. L. (2012). Developing character and values for global citizens: Analysis of preservice science teachers' moral reasoning on socioscientific issues. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (6), 925–953. Lee, H., & Witz, K. G. (2009). Science teachers' inspiration for teaching socio-scientific issues: Disconnection with reform efforts.

International Journal of Science Education, 31, 931–960.

Lee, H., Yoo, J., Choi, K., Kim, S., Krajcik, J., Herman, B., & Zeidler, D. L. (2013). Socioscientific issues as a vehicle for promoting character and values for global citizens. International Journal of Science Education, 35 (12), 2079–2113.

Lee, S., & Roth, W. M. (2003). Of traversals and hybrid spaces: Science in the community. Mind, Culture, & Activity, 10, 120–142.

Lee, Y. C. (2007). Developing decision-making skills for socio-scientific issues. Journal of Biological Education, 41, 170–177.

Lee, Y. C. (2008). Exploring the roles and nature of science: A case study of severe acute respiratory syndrome. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (4), 515–541.

Lemke, J. L. (2001). Articulating communities: Sociocultural perspectives on science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (3), 296–316.

Lester, B. T., Ma, L., Lee, O., & Lambert J. (2006). Social activism in elementary science education: A science, technology, and society approach to teacher global warming. International Journal of Science Education, 28 (4), 315–339.

Levinson, R. (2006). Towards a theoretical framework for teaching controversial socio-scientific issues. International Journal of Science Education, 8, 1201–1224.

Levinson, R. (2008). Promoting the role of the personal narrative in teaching controversial socio-scientific issues. Science & Education, 17, 855–871.

Levinson, R. (2013). Practice and theory of socio-scientific issues: An authentic model? Studies in Science Education, 49(1), 99–116.

Levinson, R., & Turner, S. (2001). Valuable lessons: Engaging with the social context of science in schools. London: The Wellcome Trust. Lewis, J., & Leach, J. (2006). Discussion of socio-scientific issues: The role of science knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 28, 1267–1287.

Linn, M. C., Clark, D., & Slotta, J. D. (2003). WISE design for knowledge integration. Science Education, 87 (4), 517–538.

Linn, M. C., Eylon, B., & Davis, E. A. (2004). The knowledge integration perspective on learning. In M. Linn, E. Davis, & P. Bell (Eds.), Internet environments for science education (pp. 29–46). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Linn, M. C., Lee, H.-S., Tinker, R., Husic, F., & Chiu, J. L. (2006). Teaching and assessing knowledge integrations in science. Science Education, 313, 1049–1050.

Liu, S. Y., Lin, C. S., & Tsai, C. C. (2011). College students' scientific epistemological views and thinking patterns in socioscientific decision making. Science Education, 95, 497–517.

Lyons, T. (2006). Different countries, same science classes. Students' experiences of school science in their own words. International Journal of Science Education, 28, 591–613.

Matkins, J. J., & Bell, R. L. (2007). Awakening the scientist inside: Global climate change and the nature of science in an elementary science methods course. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18, 137–163.

Matthews, M. R. (2009). Teaching the philosophical and worldview components of science. Science & Education, 18 (6–7), 697–728. McLaughlin, T. (2003). Teaching controversial issues in citizenship education. In A. Lockyer , B. Crick , & J. Annette (Eds.), Education for democratic citizenship (pp. 149–160). Ashgate, UK: Aldershot.

Melville, W., Yaxley, B., & Wallace, J. (2007). Virtues, teacher professional expertise, and socioscientific issues. Canadian Journal of Environmental Education, 12, 95–109.

Moore, W. S. (1989). The "learning environment preferences": Exploring the construct validity of an objective measure of the Perry scheme of intellectual development. Journal of College Student Development, 30, 504–514.

Mueller, M. (2008). EcoJustice as ecological literacy is much more than being "green!" Educational Studies, 44, 155–166.

Mueller, M. P. (2009). Educational reflections on the "ecological crisis": Ecojustice, environmentalism and sustainability. Science & Education, 18, 1031–1056.

Mueller, M. P., & Tippins, D. J. (2010). The need for confluence: Why a "river" runs through it. In D. Tippins, M. Mueller, M. van Eijck, & J. Adams (Eds.), Cultural studies and environmentalism: The confluence of ecojustice, place-based (science) education, and indigenous knowledge systems (pp. 1–4). New York: Springer.

Mueller, M. P., & Zeidler, D. L. (2010). Moral-ethical character and science education: Ecojustice ethics through socioscientific issues (SSI). In D. Tippins, M. Mueller, M. van Eijck, & J. Adams (Eds.), Cultural studies and environmentalism: The confluence of ecojustice, place-based (science) education, and indigenous knowledge systems (pp. 105–128). New York: Springer.

Mueller, M. P. , Zeidler, D. L. , & Jenkins, L. L. (2011). Earth's role in moral reasoning and functional scientific literacy. In J. L. DeVitis & T. Yu (Eds.), Character and moral education: A reader (pp. 382–391). New York: Peter Lang.

Nielsen, J. A. (2012). Science in discussions: An analysis of the use of science content in socioscientific discussions. Science Education, 96, 428–456.

Nuangchalerm, P. (2009). Development of socioscientific issues-base teaching for preservice teachers. Journal of Social Sciences, 5 (3), 239–243.

Nuangchalerm, P. (2010). Engaging students to perceive nature of science through socioscientific issues-based instruction. European Journal of Social Sciences, 13 (1), 34–37.

Orpwood, G. W. F., & Roberts, D. A. (1980). Science and society: Dimensions for science education for the '80s. Orbit, 51, 21–25. Osborne, J., Erduran, S., & Simon, S. (2004). Enhancing the quality of argumentation in school science. Journal or Research in Science Teaching, 41, 994–1020.

Östman, L., & Almqvist, J. (2011). What do values and norms have to do with scientific literacy? In C. Linder, L. Östman, D. A., Roberts, P., Wickman, G., Erickson, & A. MacKinnon (Eds.), Promoting scientific literacy: Science education research in transaction (pp. 160–173). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Patronis, T., Potari, D., & Spiliotopoulou, V. (1999). Students' argumentation in decision-making on a socio-scientific issue: Implications for teaching. International Journal of Science Education, 21, 745–754.

Pea, R., & Collins, A. (2008). Learning how to do science education: Four waves of reform. In Y. Kali, M. C. Linn, & J. E. Roseman (Eds.), Designing coherent science education: Implications for curriculum, instruction, and policy (pp. 3–12). New York: Teachers College Press.

Pedretti, E. (2003). Teaching science, technology, society and environment (STSE) education: Preservice teachers' philosophical and pedagogical landscapes. In D. L. Zeidler (Ed.), The role of moral reasoning on socioscientific issues and discourse in science education (pp. 219–239). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Press.

Pedretti, E. G., Bencze, J. L., Hewitt, J., Romkey, L., & Jivraj, A. (2007). Promoting issues-based STSE perspectives in science teacher education: Problems of identity and ideology. Science & Education, 17, 941–960.

Perry, W. G. (1970). Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pouliot, C. (2009). Using the deficit model, public debate model and co-production of knowledge models to interpret point of view of students concerning citizens' participation in socioscientific issues. International Journal of Environmental & Science Education, 4 (1), 49–73.

Ratcliffe, M. (1997). Pupil decision-making about socio-scientific issues within the science curriculum. International Journal of Science Education, 19 (2), 167–182.

Ratcliffe, M., & Grace, M. (2003). Science education for citizenship: Teaching socio-scientific issues. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Ratcliffe, M., & Millar, R. (2009). Teaching for understanding of science in context: Evidence from the pilot trials of the twenty first century science courses. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (8), 945–959.

Reiss, M. (1999). Teaching ethics in science. Studies in Science Education, 34, 115–140.

Reiss, M. (2003). Science education for social justice. In C. Vincent (Ed.), Social justice education and identity (pp. 153–164). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Reiss, M. (2008). The use of ethical frameworks by students following a new science course for 16–18 year-olds. Science & Education, 17, 889–902.

Roberts, D. A. (2007). Scientific literacy/science literacy. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 729–780). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Roberts, D. A. (2011). Competing visions of scientific literacy: The influence of a science curriculum policy image. In C. Linder , L. Östman , D. A. Roberts , P. Wickman , G. Erickson , & A. MacKinnon (Eds.), Promoting scientific literacy: Science education research in transaction (pp. 11–27). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Roszak, T. (1968). The making of a counter culture: Reflection on the technocratic society and its youthful opposition. New York: Anchor Books.

Roth, W. -M., & Désautels, J. (2004). Educating for citizenship: Reappraising the role of science education. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 4 (2), 149–168.

Roth, W.-M., & Lee, S. (2004). Science education as/for participation in the community. Science Education, 88 (2), 263–294.

Sadler, T. D. (2004a). Informal reasoning regarding socioscientific issues: A critical review of the research. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (5), 513–536.

Sadler, T. D. (2004b). Moral and ethical dimensions of socioscientific decision-making as integral components of scientific literacy. Science Educator, 13, 39–48.

Sadler, T. D. (2004c). Moral sensitivity and its contribution to the resolution of socio-scientific issues. Journal of Moral Education, 33 (3), 339–358.

Sadler, T. D. (2004d). Moral and ethical dimensions of socioscientific decision-making as integral components of scientific literacy. The Science Educator, 13, 39–48.

Sadler, T. D. (2005). Evolutionary theory as a guide to socioscientific decision-making. Journal of Biological Education, 39 (2), 68–72.

Sadler, T. D. (2009). Situated learning in science education: Socio-scientific issues as contexts for practice. Studies in Science Education, 45 (1), 1–42.

Sadler, T. D. (2011). Situating socio-scientific issues in classrooms as a means of achieving goals of science education. In T. D. Sadler (Ed.), Socio-scientific issues in science classrooms: Teaching, learning and research (pp. 1–9). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer. Sadler, T. D., Amirshokoohi, A., Kazempour, M., & Allspaw, K. M. (2006). Socioscience and ethics in science classrooms: Teacher

perspectives and strategies. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43, 353–376.

Sadler, T. D., Barab, S. A., & Scott, B. (2007). What do students gain by engaging in socioscientific inquiry? Research in Science Education, 37 (4), 371–391.

Sadler, T. D., Chambers, F. W., & Zeidler, D. L. (2004). Student conceptualizations of the nature of science in response to a socioscientific issue. International Journal of Science Education, 26, 387–409.

Sadler, T. D. , & Donnelly, L. A. (2006). Socioscientific argumentation: The effects of content knowledge and morality. International Journal of Science Education, 28, 1463–1488.

Sadler, T. D., & Fowler, S. R. (2006). A threshold model of content knowledge transfer for socioscientific argumentation. Science Education, 90 (6), 986–1004.

Sadler, T. D., Klosterman, M. L., & Topcu, M. S. (2011). Learning science content and socio-scientific reasoning through classroom explorations of global climate change. In T. D. Sadler (Ed.), Socio-scientific issues in science classrooms: Teaching, learning and research (pp. 45–77). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Sadler, T. D., & Zeidler, D. L. (2004). The morality of socioscientific issues: Construal and resolution of genetic engineering dilemmas. Science Education, 88 (1), 4–27.

Sadler, T. D., & Zeidler, D. L. (2005a). Patterns of informal reasoning in the context of socioscientific decision-making. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42 (1), 112–138.

Sadler, T. D., & Zeidler, D. L. (2005b). The significance of content knowledge for informal reasoning regarding socioscientific issues: Applying genetics knowledge to genetic engineering issues. Science Education, 89 (1), 71–93.

Sadler, T. D., & Zeidler, D. L. (2009). Scientific literacy, PISA, and socioscientific discourse: Assessment for progressive aims of science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (8), 909–921.

Santos, W. L. P. dos. (2009). Scientific literacy: A Freirean perspective as a radical view of humanistic science Education. Science Education, 93, 361–382.

Saunders, K. J., & Rennie, L. J. (2013). A pedagogical model for ethical inquiry into socioscientific issues in science. Research in Science Education, 43, 253–274.

Schommer-Aikins, M., & Hutter, R. (2002). Epistemological beliefs and thinking about everyday controversial issues. Journal of Psychology, 136 (1), 5–20.

Seethaler, S., & Linn, M. (2004). Genetically modified food in perspective: An inquiry-based curriculum to help middle school students make sense of tradeoffs. International Journal of Science Education, 26 (14), 1765–1785.

Serpell, R. (2011). Social responsibility as a dimension of intelligence, and as an educational goal: Insights from programmatic research in an African society. Child Development Perspectives, 5 (2), 126–133.

Sharma, A. (2010). Working for change: Reflections on the issue of sustainability and social change. In D. Tippins , M. Mueller , M. van Eijck , & J. Adams (Eds.), Cultural studies and environmentalism: The confluence of ecojustice, place-based (science) education, and indigenous knowledge systems (pp. 171–179). New York: Springer.

Simon, S., & Amos, R. (2011). Decision making and use of evidence in a socio-scientific problem on air quality. In T. D. Sadler (Ed.), Socio-scientific issues in the classroom (Vol. 39, pp. 167–192). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Simonneaux, L. (2008). Argumentation in socio-scientific contexts. In S. Erduran & M. P. Jiménez-Aleixandre (Eds.), Argumentation in science education: Perspectives from classroom-based research (pp. 179–199). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Simonneaux, J., & Simonneaux, L. (2012). Educational configurations for teaching environmental socioscientific issues within the perspective of sustainability. Research in Science Education, 42, 75–94.

Slotta, J. D., & Linn, M. C. (2009). WISE science. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Smith, G. A., & Williams, D. R. (Eds.). (1999). Ecological education in action: On weaving education, culture, and the environment. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sperling, E., & Bencze, J. L. (2010). "More than particle theory": Citizenship through school science. Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, 10 (3), 255–26.

Sternäng, L., & Lundholm, C. (2011). Climate change and morality: Students' perspectives on the individual and society. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (8), 1131–1148.

Tal, R., & Hochberg, N. (2003). Reasoning, problem-solving and reflections: Participating in WISE project in Israel. Science Education International, 14, 3–19.

Tal, T., Kali, Y., Magid, M., & Madhok, J. J. (2011). Enhancing the authenticity of a web-based module for teaching simple inheritance. In T. D. Sadler (Ed.), Socio-scientific issues in science classrooms: Teaching, learning and research (pp. 11–38). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Tal, T. , & Kedmi, Y. (2006). Teaching socioscientific issues: Classroom culture and students' performances. Cultural Studies of Science Education, 1 (4), 615–644.

Tippins, D. J., Mueller, M. P., van Eijck, M., & Adams, J. (Eds.). (2010). Cultural studies and environmentalism: The confluence of ecojustice, place-based (science) education, and indigenous knowledge systems. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Topcu, M. S., Sadler, T. D., & Yilmaz-Tuzun, O. (2010). Preservice science teachers' informal reasoning about socioscientific issues: The influence of issue context. International Journal of Science Education, 32, 2475–2495.

Toulmin, S. E. (1958). The uses of argument. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Tsai, C.-C., & Liu, S.-Y. (2005). Developing a postdimensional instrument for assessing students' epistemological views toward science. International Journal of Science Education, 27, 1621–1638.

Tytler, R. (2012). Socio-scientific issues, sustainability and science education. Research in Science Education, 4 2, 155–163.

Tytler, R., Duggan, S., & Gott, R. (2001). Dimensions of evidence, the public understanding of science and science education. International Journal of Science Education, 23, 815–832.

UNESCO . (2012). Education for sustainable development (ESD). Retrieved December 6, 2012 from www.inruled.org/en/research/themes/a25999.html

van Eemeren, F. H., & Houtlosser, P. (2007). The study of argumentation as normative pragmatics. Pragmatics: Quarterly Publication of the International Pragmatics Association, 15 (1), 161–177.

Walker, K. A., & Zeidler, D. L. (2007). Promoting discourse about socio-scientific issues through scaffolded inquiry. International Journal of Science Education, 29, 1387–1410.

Wongsri, P., & Nuangchalerm, P. (2010). Learning outcomes between socioscientific issues-based learning and conventional learning activities. Journal of Social Sciences, 6 (2), 240–243.

Wu, Y. T., & Tsai, C. C. (2007). High school students' informal reasoning on a socio-scientific issues: Qualitative and quantitative analyses. International Journal of Science Education, 29, 1163–1187.

Wu, Y. T., & Tsai, C. C. (2011). High school students' informal reasoning regarding a socio-scientific issue, with relation to scientific epistemological beliefs and cognitive structures. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (3), 371–400.

Yang, F.-Y. (2005). Student views concerning evidence and the expert in reasoning a socio-scientific issue and personal epistemology. Educational Studies, 31 (1), 65–84.

Zandvliet, D., & Fisher, D. L. (2007). Sustainable communities, sustainable environments. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers. Zeidler, D. L. (1984). Moral issues and social policy in science education: Closing the literacy gap. Science Education, 68 (4), 411–419. Zeidler, D. L. (1985). Hierarchical relationships among formal cognitive structures and their relationship to principled moral reasoning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 22 (5), 461–471.

Zeidler, D. L. (1997). The central role of fallacious thinking in science education. Science Education, 81 (4), 483–496.

Zeidler, D. L. (2001). Standard F: Participating in program development. In E. Siebert & W. McIntosh (Eds.), Pathways to the science standards: College edition (pp. 18–22). Arlington: VA National Science Teachers Association.

Zeidler, D. L. (2002). Dancing with maggots and saints: Past and future visions for subject matter knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and pedagogical content knowledge in reform and science teacher education. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 13 (1), 27–42. Zeidler, D. L. (in-press). STEM education: A deficit framework for the 21st century? A sociocultural socioscientific response. Cultural

Zeidler, D. L. (in-press). STEM education: A deficit framework for the 21st century? A sociocultural socioscientific response. Cultural Studies in Science Education.

Zeidler, D. L., Applebaum, S. M., & Sadler, T. D. (2011). Enacting a socioscientific issues classroom: Transformative transformations. In T. D. Sadler (Ed.), Socio-scientific issues in science classrooms: Teaching, learning and research (pp. 277–306). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Zeidler, D. L., Berkowitz, M., & Bennett, K. (2014). Thinking (scientifically) responsibly: The cultivation of character in a global science education community. In M. P. Mueller, D. J. Tippins, & A. J. Steward (Eds.), Assessing schools for generation R (Responsibility): A guide to legislation and school policy in science education (pp. 83–99). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Zeidler, D. L., Herman, B., Ruzek, M., Linder, A., & Lin, S. S. (2013). Cross-cultural epistemological orientations to socioscientific issues. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 50 (3), 251–283.

Zeidler, D. L., & Keefer, M. (2003). The role of moral reasoning and the status of socioscientific issues in science education: Philosophical, psychological and pedagogical considerations. In D. L. Zeidler (Ed.), The role of moral reasoning on socioscientific issues and discourse in science education (pp. 7–38). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Press.

Zeidler, D. L., Lederman, N. G., & Taylor, S. C. (1992). Fallacies and student discourse: Conceptualizing the role of critical thinking in science education. Science Education, 75 (4), 437–450.

Zeidler, D. L., & Lewis, J. (2003). Unifying themes in moral reasoning on socioscientific issues and discourse. In D. L. Zeidler (Ed.), The role of moral reasoning on socioscientific issues and discourse in science education (pp. 289–306). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Press.

Zeidler, D. L., & Nichols, B. H. (2009). Socioscientific issues: Theory and practice. Journal of Elementary Science Teacher Education, 21 (2), 49–58.

Zeidler, D. L., Osborne, J., Erduran, S., Simon, S., & Monk, M. (2003). The role of argument and fallacies during discourse about socioscientific issues. In D. L. Zeidler (Ed.), The role of moral reasoning on socioscientific issues and discourse in science education (pp. 97–116). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Press.

Zeidler, D. L., & Sadler, T. D. (2008a). The role of moral reasoning in argumentation: Conscience, character and care. In S. Erduran & M. Pilar Jiménez-Aleixandre (Eds.), Argumentation in science education: Perspectives from classroom-based research (pp. 201–216). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer Press.

Zeidler, D. L., & Sadler, T. D. (2008b). Social and ethical issues in science education: A prelude to action. Science & Education, 17 (8, 9), 799–803.

Zeidler, D. L., & Sadler, D. L. (2011). An inclusive view of scientific literacy: Core issues and future directions of socioscientific reasoning. In C. Linder, L. Östman, D. A. Roberts, P. Wickman, G. Erickson, & A. MacKinnon (Eds.), Promoting scientific literacy: Science education research in transaction (pp. 176–192). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Zeidler, D. L., Sadler, T. D., Applebaum, S., & Callahan, B. E. (2009). Advancing reflective judgment through socio-scientific issues. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46, 74–101.

Zeidler, D. L., Sadler, T. D., Simmons, M. L., & Howes, E. V. (2005). Beyond STS: A research-based framework for socioscientific issues education. Science Education, 89 (3), 357–377.

Zeidler, D. L., & Schafer, L. E. (1984). Identifying mediating factors of moral reasoning in science education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 21 (1), 1–15.

Zeidler, D. L., Walker, K. A., Ackett, W. A., & Simmons, M. L. (2002). Tangled up in views: Beliefs in the nature of science and responses to socio-scientific dilemmas. Science Education, 86, 343–367.

Project Assessment

Abt Associates, Inc . (2010). Review of final MSP evaluations, performance period 2007: Analytic and technical support for mathematics and science partnerships. Report to the U.S. Department of Education OESE/Mathematics and Science Partnerships, Washington, DC. American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) . (1993). Benchmarks for science literacy. New York: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, B. (2002). Evaluating systemic reform: Evaluation needs, practices, and challenges. In J. W. Altschuld & D. D. Kumar (Eds.), Evaluation of science and technology education at the dawn of a new millennium (pp. 49–80). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum. Anderson, K. (2011). Science education and test-based accountability: Reviewing their relationship and exploring implications for future policy. Science Education, 96 (1), 104–129.

Apple, M. (2001). Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God and inequality. New York: Routledge.

Banilower, E. R., Heck, D. J., & Weiss, I. R. (2005). Can professional development make the vision of the standards a reality? The impact of the National Science Foundation's Local Systemic Change Through Teacher Enhancement Initiative. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44, 375–395.

Banilower, E. R., Smith, P. S., Weiss, I. R., Malzahn, K. A., Campell, K. A., & Weis, A. M. (2013). Report of the 2012 national survey of science and mathematics education. Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research, Inc.

Bush, V. (1960). Science-the endless frontier. Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

Bybee, R. W., & Fuchs, B. (2006). Preparing the 21st century workforce: A new reform in science and technology education. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43, 349–352.

Carpenter, T. P., Blanton, M. L., Cobb, P., Franke, M. L., Kaput, J., & McClain, K. (2004). Scaling up innovative practices in mathematics and science. Research Report from National Center for Improving Student Learning and Achievement in Mathematics and Science. Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Chatterji, M. (2002). Models and methods for examining standards-based reforms and accountability initiatives: Have the tools of inquiry answered pressing questions on improving schools? Review of Educational Research, 72 (3), 345–386.

Chen, H. -T. (1990). Theory-driven evaluations. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Clune, W. H., Porter, A. C., & Raizen, S. A. (1999, September 29). Systemic reform: What is it? How do we know? Education Week, 19 (5), 31.

Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy . (2005). How to solicit rigorous evaluations of mathematics and science partnerships (MSP) projects: A user-friendly guide for MSP state coordinators. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago.

Cobb, P. , Confrey, J. , diSessa, A. , Lehrer, R. , & Schauble, L. (2003). Design experiments in educational research. Educational Researcher, 32, 9–13.

Cohen, D. K. , & Hill, H. C. (2000). Instructional policy and classroom performance: The mathematics reform in California. Teachers College Record, 102, 294–343.

Colbert, P., Wyatt-Smith, C., & Klenowski, V. (2012). A systems level approach to building sustainable assessment cultures: Moderation, quality task design and dependability of judgment. Policy Futures in Education, 10 (4), 387–402.

Corcoran, T. B. (1995, June). Helping teachers teach well: Transforming professional development. Consortium for Policy Research in Education Policy Briefs, 16, 1–11.

Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M., & Hanson, W. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research (pp. 209–240). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). The flat earth and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dee, T. S., & Jacob, B. (2011). The impact of No Child Left Behind on student achievement. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 30 (3), 418–446.

Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. Educational Researcher, 38 (3), 181–199.

Desimone, L. M., Porter, A. C., Garet, M. S., Yoon, K. S., & Birman, B. F. (2002). Effects of professional development on teachers' instruction: Results from a three-year longitudinal study. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24 (2), 81–112.

Dow, P. B. (1999). Schoolhouse politics: Lessons from the Sputnik era. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Elmore, R. F. (1993). The development and implementation of large-scale curriculum reforms. Paper prepared for the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education, Center for Policy Research in Education.

Elmore, R. F. (1996). Getting to scale with good educational practice. Harvard Educational Review, 66 (1), 1–26.

Finn, C. E. (2002). No Child Left Behind: What will it take? Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.

Fretchling, J., Frierson, H., Hood, S., & Hughes, G. (2002). The 2002 user-friendly handbook for project evaluation. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation.

Fretchling, J., Stevens, F., Lawrenze, F., & Sharp, L. (1993). The user-friendly handbook for project evaluation: Science mathematics and technology education. NSF 93–152. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation.

Garet, M. S., Birman, B. F., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Herman, R., & Yoon, K. S. (1999). Designing effective professional development: Lessons from the Eisenhower Program. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Glesne, C. (2011). Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Goertz, M. E., Floden, R. E., & O'Day, J. A. (1996). Systemic reform. [Volume I: Findings and conclusions.] Studies of education reform. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED397553)

Government Accountability Office (GAO) . (2003). Program evaluation: An evaluation culture and collaborative partnerships help build agency capacity. GAO-03–454. Washington, DC: Author.

Government Accountability Office (GAO) . (2009). Program evaluation: A variety of rigorous methods can help identify effective interventions. Report to Congressional Requesters, GAO-10–3. Washington, DC: Author.

Government Accountability Office (GAO). (2012). Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education: Strategic planning needed to better manage overlapping programs across multiple agencies. GAO-12–108. Washington, DC: Author.

Greene, J. C., DeStefano, L., Burgon, H., & Hall, J. (2006). An educative, values-engaged approach to evaluating STEM educational programs. New Directions for Evaluation, 2006 (109), 53–71.

Guskey, T. R., & Yoon, K. S. (2009). What works in professional development? Phi Delta Kappan, 90 (7), 495–500.

Gullickson, A. R., & Hanssen, C. E. (2006). Local evaluation in multisite STEM programs: Relating evaluation use and program results. New Directions for Evaluation, 109, 97–103.

Guyton, E., Fox, M. C., & Sisk, K. A. (1991). Comparison of teacher attitudes, teacher efficacy, and teacher performance of first-year teachers prepared by alternative and traditional teacher education programs. Action in Teacher Education, 13 (2), 1–9.

Hargreaves, A., & Goodson, I. (2006). Educational change over time? The sustainability and non-sustainability of three decades of secondary school change and continuity. Educational Administration Quarterly, 42 (1), 3–41.

Heck, D. J. (1998). Evaluating equity in statewide systemic initiatives: Asking the right questions. Journal of Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering, 4, 161–181.

Hershberg, T. (2005). Value-added assessment and systemic reform: Response to America's human capital development challenge. Paper presented at the Challenge of Education Reform: Standards, Accountability, Resources and Policy, Cancun, Mexico.

Hess, F. (1999). Spinning wheels: The politics of urban school reform. Washington, DC: Brookings Intit. Press.

Horizon Research, Inc . (1994). Reflections from Wingspread: Lessons learned about the National Science Foundation's Systemic Initiative. A report on the March 1994 Wingspread conference. Chapel Hill, NC: Author.

Ingersoll, R. M. (2007, February). Misdiagnosing the teacher quality problem. (CPRE Policy Brief No. RB-49). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Jacob, B. A., & Lefgren, L. (2004). The impact of teacher training on student achievement: Quasi-experimental evidence from school reform efforts in Chicago. Journal of Human Resources, 39 (1), 50–79.

Jaquith, A., Mindich, D., Chung Wei, R., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). Teacher professional learning in the United States: Case studies of state policies and strategies. Dallas, TX: National Staff Development Council.

Kahle, J. B. (2004). Will girls be left behind? Gender differences and accountability. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41, 961–969.

Kahle, J. B. (2007). Systemic reform: Research, vision, and politics. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), The handbook of research on science education (pp. 911–942). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kahle, J. B., Meece, J., & Scantlebury, K. (2000). Urban African-American middle school science students: Does standards-based teaching make a difference? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37, 1019–1041.

Kahle, J. B., & Woodruff, S. B. (2011). Science teacher education research and policy: Are they connected? In G. DeBoer (Ed.), Research in science education: Vol. 5, The role of public policy in K–12 science education, (pp. 47–75), Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing. Kahle, J. B., & Woodruff, S. B. (2013). Ohio's 30 years of mathematics and science education reform: Practices, politics, and policies. In B. S. Wojnowski & C. Pea (Eds.), Models and approaches to STEM professional development (pp. 79–102). Arlington, VA: National Science Teachers Association Press.

Katzenmeyer, C., & Lawrenz, F. (2006). National science foundation perspectives on the nature of STEM program evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation, 2006 (109), 7–18.

Kennedy, M. M. (1999). Form and substance in mathematics and science professional development. NISE brief (vol. 3, no. 2). Madison: University of Wisconsin–Madison, National Institute for Science Education.

Kroger, L. E., Campbell, H. L., Thacker, A. A., Becker, D. E., & Wise, L. L. (2007). Behind the numbers: Interviews in 22 states about achievement data and the No Child Left Behind Act policies. Retrieved from www.cep-dc.org/displayDocument.cfm?DocumentID=180 Kumar, D. D., & Altschuld, J. W. (2003). The need for comprehensive evaluation in science education. Review of Policy Research, 20 (4), 603–615.

Laguarda, K. (1998). Assessing the SSI's impacts on student achievement: An imperfect science. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. Lawrenz, F. (1975). The relationship between teacher characteristics and student achievement and attitude. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 12, 433–437.

Lee, O., Deaktor, R., Enders, C., & Lambert, J. (2008). Impact of a multi-year professional development intervention on science achievement of culturally and linguistically diverse elementary students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45, 726–747. Loucks-Horsley, S., Love, N., Stiles, K. E., Mundry, S., & Hewson, P. W. (2003). Designing professional development for teachers of science and mathematics. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Magnusson, S., Borko, H., Krajcik, J. S., & Layman, J. W. (1992). The relationship between teacher content and pedagogical content knowledge and student content knowledge of heat energy and temperature. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National American Association for Research in Science Teaching, Boston, MA.

Mason, K., Brewer, J., Redman, J., Bomar, C., Ghenciu, P., LeDocq, M., & Chapel, C. (2012). SySTEMically improving student academic achievement in mathematics and science. Journal for Quality & Participation, 35 (2), 20–24.

McLaughlin, M. (1990). The RAND change agent study revisited: Macro perspectives and micro realities. Educational Researcher, 19, 11–16.

Monk, D. H. (1994). Subject area preparation of secondary mathematics and science teachers and student achievement. Economics of Education Review, 13 (2), 125–145.

Moore, M. H. (1995). Creating public value: Strategic management in government. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

National Center for Education Statistics . (2009). Science literacy performance of 15-year-olds. Retrieved from

http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/pisa/pisa2009highlights_4.asp

National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTA) . (1989). Curriculum and evaluation standards for school mathematics. Reston, VA: Author.

National Research Council (NRC) . (1996). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council (NRC) . (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science in grades K–8. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council (NRC) . (2010). Rising Above the Gathering Storm, revisited: Rapidly approaching category 5. My Members of the 2005 "Rising Above the Gathering Storm" Committee; Prepared for the Presidents of the National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering and Institute of Medicine. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Science Foundation (NSF). (2002). Math and Science Partnership (MSP): Program solicitation. NSF-02–061. Retrieved from www.nsf.gov/pubs/2002/nsf02061/nsf02061.html

National Science Foundation (NSF) . (2004). A more synergistic whole: Education lessons about learning. Retrieved from www.nsf.gov/about/history/nsf0050/education/moresynergistic.htm

National Science Foundation (NSF) . (2010). User-friendly handbook for project evaluation. Retrieved from www.westat.com/pdf/projects/2010ufhb.pdf

National Science Foundation (NSF) . (2012). Math and Science Partnership (MSP): Program solicitation. (NSF 12–518). Retrieved from www.nsf.gov/pubs/2012/nsf12518/nsf12518.htm

Nelkin, D. (1977). Science textbook controversies and the politics of equal time. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) . (1988). Elementary and secondary education for science and engineering—A technical memorandum (OTA-TM-SET-41). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Oyer, E. (2011). Evaluation report: 2010–2011 Illinois Mathematics and Science Partnership. Carmel, IN: EvalSolutions, Inc.

Pane, J. F., Williams, V. L., Olmsted, S. S., Yuan, K., Spindler, E., & Slaughter, M. E. (2009). Math science partnership of southwest Pennsylvania: Measuring progress toward goals. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Patton, M. Q. (2006). Evaluation for the way we work. The Nonprofit Quarterly, 13 (1), 28–33.

Penuel, W. R., & Fishman, B. J. (2012). Large-scale science education intervention research we can use. Journal of Research in Science Education, 49, 281–304.

Penuel, W. R., Fishman, B. J., Cheng, B. H., & Sabelli, N. (2011). Organizing research and development at the intersection of learning, implementation, and design. Educational Researcher, 40 (7), 331–337.

Popham, W. J. (2008). Transformative assessment. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sahlberg, P. (2006). Education reform for raising economic competitiveness. Journal of Educational Change, 7 (4), 259–287.

Sanders, L. R., Borko, H., & Lockard, J. D. (1993). Secondary science teachers' knowledge base when teaching science courses in and out of their area of certification. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 30, 723–736.

Schneider, B. L., & Keesler, V. A. (2007). School reform 2007: Transforming education into a scientific enterprise. Annual Review of Sociology, 33, 197–217.

Schorr, L. B., & Kubisch A. C. (1995, September). New approaches to evaluation: Helping Sister Mary Paul, Geoff Canada, and Otis Johnson while convincing Pat Moynihan, Newt Gingrich, and the American public. Presentation at Annie E. Casey Foundation Annual Research/Evaluation Conference, Baltimore, MD.

Schroeder, C. M., Scott, T. P., Tolson, H., Huang, T. Y., & Lee, Y. H. (2007). A meta-analysis of national research: Effects of teaching strategies on student achievement in science in the United States. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44, 1436–1460. Shavelson, R. J., & Towne, L. (2002). Scientific research in education. Washington, DC: National Research Council, National Academies

Press. Slavin, R. E. (2005). Sand, bricks and seeds: School change strategies and readiness for reform. In D. Hopkins (Ed.), The practice and

theory of school improvement (pp. 265–279). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer. Smith, M., & O'Day, J. (1991). Systemic school reform. In S. Fuhrman & B. Malen (Eds.), The politics of curriculum and testing (pp. 233– 267). Bristol, PA: Falmer.

Spicer, D. E. (2012). Rhetoric, reality and research: The rhetoric of systemic reform, the reality of leadership development and current trends in school leadership research in the United States. Italian Journal of Sociology of Education, 1, 305–319.

Stobart, G. (2009). Testing times: The uses and abuses of assessment. London: Routledge.

Supovitz, J. (1996, December). The impact over time of Project Discovery on teachers' attitudes, preparation, and teaching practice. Final report. Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research, Inc.

Supovitz, J., & Taylor, B. S. (2005). Systemic education evaluation: Evaluating the impact of systemwide reform in education. American Journal of Evaluation, 26 (2), 204–230.

Supovitz, J. A., & Turner, H. M. (2000). The effects of professional development on science teaching practices and classroom culture. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37, 963–980.

Thomas B. Fordham Foundation . (2012). The state of state science standards. Washington, DC: Author.

Toch, T. (1991). In the name of excellence. New York: Oxford University.

U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) . (2002). No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) . (2005). Scientifically based evaluation methods (FR Doc. 05–1317). Federal Register 70(Jan. 25):3586–89. Retrieved from www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2005-01-25/pdf/05-1317.pdf

U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) . (2008, September). ESEA: Mathematics and science partnerships (OESE). FY 2008 program performance report. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) . (n.d.). Mathematics and science partnerships program. Retrieved from www.ed-msp.net/ W. K. Kellogg Foundation . (1998). W. K. Kellogg Foundation evaluation handbook. Battle Creek, MI: Author.

Ward, J. H. Jr. (1963), Hierarchical grouping to optimize an objective function. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 58, 236–244.

Weiss, C. H. (2000). Which links to which theories shall we evaluate? New Directions for Evaluation, 87, 35-45.

Weiss, I. R., & Pasley, J. D. (2008, March). Using research findings and practice-based insights: Guidance for policy, practice, and future research. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City.

Weiss, I. R., & Webb, N. (2003). Study of the impact of the Statewide Systemic Initiatives program: Lessons learned. Chapel Hill, NC: Horizon Research, Inc.

Westat . (2002). Criteria for classifying designs of MSP evaluations. Retrieved from

http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/evaluation/assistance_data.asp

Wieman, C. (2012). Applying new research to improve science education: Insights from several fields on how people learn to become experts can help us to dramatically enhance the effectiveness of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education. Issues in Science and Technology, 29 (1), 25–32.

Wilson, S. , Floden, R. , & Ferrini-Mundy, J. (2001). Teacher preparation research: Current knowledge, gaps, and recommendations. Seattle, WA: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Wise, K. C. (1996). Strategies for teaching science: What works? Clearing House, 69 (6), 337-338.

Woodruff, S. B., Hung, H. L., & Seabrook, L. (2009, November). Exploratory cluster analysis: Variability and commonality of the implementation and impact of Ohio Mathematics and Science Partnership (OMSP) projects. Panel presentation at the Annual Conference of the American Evaluation Association, Orlando, FL.

Woodruff, S. B., Li, Y., & Kao, H. C. (2010). Evaluation of Ohio Mathematics and Science Partnership program: Instrument validity and reliability study and study of programmatic and project-level effect size, June 2010. Oxford, OH: Miami University, Ohio's Evaluation & Assessment Center for Mathematics and Science Education.

Woodruff, S. B., McCollum, T. L., Li, Y., & Bautista, N. U. (2010, March). Enhancing elementary teachers' content and pedagogical knowledge through sustained professional development. Paper presented at the Annual International Conference of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Philadelphia, PA.

Woodruff, S. B., Zorn, D., Noga, J., & Seabrook, L. (2009, April). State-sponsored professional development: Lessons learned through dialogue across evaluation, theory, research, and practice. Panel presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Woodruff, S. B., Zorn, D., Raffle, H., & Oches, B. (2011). Ohio Mathematics and Science Partnership Program cross-project evaluation: Year 2 final report. Oxford, OH: Miami University, Ohio's Evaluation & Assessment Center for Mathematics and Science Education.
Woodruff, S. B., Zorn, D., Raffle, H., & Oches, B. (2012). Ohio Mathematics and Science Partnership Program cross-project evaluation: Final report. Oxford, OH: Miami University, Ohio's Evaluation & Assessment Center for Mathematics and Science Education.
Final report. Oxford, OH: Miami University, Ohio's Evaluation & Assessment Center for Mathematics and Science Education.
Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. L. (2007). Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement. Issues and answers report, REL 2007 – No. 033. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of

Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest.

Zorn, D., Seabrook, L., Marks, J., Chappell-Young, J., Hung, S., Marx, M., (2009). The Ohio Mathematics and Science Partnership program external evaluation: Year 2 report. Oxford, OH: Miami University, Ohio's Evaluation & Assessment Center for Science and Mathematics Education.

Zucker, A. A., & Shields, P. M. (1997). SSI strategies for reform: Preliminary findings from the evaluation of the National Science Foundation's Statewide Systemic Initiatives Program. Menlo, Park, CA: SRI International.

Zucker, A. A., Shields, P. M., Adelman, N., & Powell, J. (1995). Evaluation of the National Science Foundation's Statewide Systemic Initiatives Program: Second year report (Report No. NSF 96–48). Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation.

Precollege Engineering Education

Ainley, J., Pratt, D., & Hansen, A. (2006). Connecting engagement and focus in pedagogic task design. British Educational Research Journal, 32 (1), 23–38.

American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) . (1993). Benchmarks for science literacy. Washington, DC: Author. Anning, A. (1997). Drawing out ideas: Graphicacy and young children. International Journal of Technology and Design Education, 7 (3), 219–239.

Apedoe, X., Ellefson, M., & Schunn, C. (2012). Learning together while designing: Does group size make a difference? Journal of Science Education and Technology, 21 (1), 83–94.

Apedoe, X., Reynolds, B., Ellefson, M., & Schunn, C. (2008). Bringing engineering design into high school science classrooms: The heating/cooling unit. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 17 (5), 454–465.

Baker, D., & Leary, R. (1995). Letting girls speak out about science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 32 (1), 3-27.

Bamberger, Y., Cahill, C., Hagerty, J., Short, H., & Krajcik, J. S. (2010). Learning science by doing design: How can it work at the middle school level? Journal of Education, Informatics and Cybernetics, 2 (2), 41–46.

Barlex, D. (Ed.). (2007). Design and technology—for the next generation. Whitchurch, UK: Cliffeco Communications. Barnett, M. (2005). Engaging inner city students in learning through designing remote operated vehicles. Journal of Science Education and Technology. 14 (1), 87–100.

Barron, B., Schwartz, D. L., Vye, N. J., Moore, A., Petrosino, A., Zech, L., & Bransford, J. D. (1998). Doing with understanding: Lessons from research on problem- and project-based learning. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 7 (3 & 4), 271–311.

Benson, C., & Lunt, J. (Eds.). (2011). International handbook of primary technology education: Reviewing the past twenty years (Vol. 7). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.

Blumenfeld, P. C., Kempler, T. M., & Krajcik, J. S. (2006). Motivation and cognitive engagement in learning environments. In The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 475–488). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Blumenfeld, P. C., Soloway, E., Marx, R., Krajcik, J. S., Guzdial, M., & Palincsar, A. (1991). Motivating project-based learning: Sustaining the doing, supporting the learning. Educational Psychologist, 26 (3), 369–398.

Brophy, S., Klein, S., Portsmore, M., & Rogers, C. (2008). Advancing engineering education in P–12 classrooms. Journal of Engineering Education, 97 (3), 369–387.

Brotman, J. S., & Moore, F. M. (2008). Girls and science: A review of four themes in the science education literature. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (9), 971–1002.

Cajas, F. (2001). The science/technology interaction: Implications for science literacy. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 38 (7), 715–729.

Capobianco, B. M. (2010). Exploring a science teacher's uncertainty with integrating engineering design: An action research study. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 22 (7), 645–660.

Capobianco, B. M., Diefes-Dux, H. A., Mena, I., & Weller, J. (2011). What is an engineer? Implications of elementary school student conceptions for engineering education. Journal of Engineering Education, 100 (2), 304–328.

Carlsen, W. S. (1998). Engineering design in the classroom: Is it good science education or is it revolting? Research in Science Education, 28 (1), 51–63.

Cunningham, C. M. (2009). Engineering is Elementary. The Bridge, 30, 11–17.

Cunningham, C. M., Knight, M. T., Carlsen, W. S., & Kelly, G. (2007). Integrating engineering in middle and high school classrooms. International Journal of Engineering Education, 23 (1), 3.

Dewey, J. (1913). Interest and effort in education. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Engle, R. A., & Conant, F. R. (2002). Guiding principles for fostering productive disciplinary engagement: Explaining an emergent argument in a community of learners classroom. Cognition and Instruction, 20 (4), 399–483.

Falkenheim, J. C., & Burrelli, J. S. (2012, March). Diversity in science and engineering employment in industry (NSF 12–311). Arlington, VA: National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics.

Fantz, T. D., & Katsioloudis, P. J. (2011). Analysis of engineering content within technology education programs. Journal of Technology Education, 23 (1), 19–31.

Fleer, M. (2000a). Interactive technology: Can children construct their own technological design briefs? Research in Science Education, 30 (2), 241–253.

Fleer, M. (2000b). Working technologically: Investigations into how young children design and make during technology education. International Journal of Technology & Design Education, 10 (1), 43–59.

Fleer, M., & Sukroo, J. (1995). I can make my robot dance: Technology for 3–8 year olds. Carlton, VIC: Curriculum Corporation. Fortus, D., Dershimer, R. C., Krajcik, J. S., Marx, R. W., & Mamlok-Naaman, R. (2004). Design-based science and student learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41 (10), 1081–1110.

Fortus, D., Krajcik, J. S., Dershimer, R. C., Marx, R. W., & Mamlok-Naaman, R. (2005). Design-based science and real-world problemsolving. International Journal of Science Education, 27 (7), 855–879.

Hmelo, C. E., Holton, D. L., & Kolodner, J. L. (2000). Designing to learn about complex systems. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 9 (3), 247–298.

Hogan, K., Nastasi, B. K., & Pressley, M. (2000). Discourse patterns and collaborative scientific reasoning in peer and teacher-guided discussions. Cognition and Instruction, 17 (4), 379–432.

Jones, A., & De Vries, M. (2009). International handbook of research and development in technology education (Vol. 5). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Jones, M. G., Howe, A., & Rua, M. J. (2000). Gender differences in students' experiences, interests, and attitudes toward science and scientists. Science Education, 84 (2), 180–192.

Kafai, Y. B., & Ching, C. C. (2001). Affordances of collaborative software design planning for elementary students' science talk. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 10 (3), 323–363.

Kanter, D. E. (2010). Doing the project and learning the content: Designing project-based science curricula for meaningful understanding. Science Education, 94 (3), 525–551.

Katehi, L., Pearson, G., & Feder, M. A. (2009). Engineering in K–12 education: Understanding the status and improving the prospects. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Kelly, G. J. (2008). Inquiry, activity, and epistemic practice. In R. A. Duschl & R. E. Grandy (Eds.), Teaching scientific inquiry: Recommendations for research and implementation (pp. 99–117; 288–291). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Kelly, G. J. (2011). Scientific literacy, discourse, and epistemic practices. In C. Linder , L. Ostman , D. A. Roberts , P.-O. Wickman , G. Erickson , & A. MacKinnon (Eds.), Exploring the landscape of scientific literacy (pp. 61–73). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kolodner, J. L. (2002). Facilitating the learning of design practices: Lessons learned from an inquiry into science education. Journal of Industrial Teacher Education, 39 (3).

Kolodner, J. L. (2006). Case-based reasoning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 225–242). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kolodner, J. L., Camp, P. J., Crismond, D., Fasse, B., Gray, J., Holbrook, J., Puntambekar, S., & Ryan, M. (2003). Problem-based learning meets case-based reasoning in the middle-school science classroom: Putting Learning by Design into practice. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 12 (4), 495–547.

Krajcik, J. S., & Blumenfeld, P. C. (2006). Project-based learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 317–334). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Krajcik, J. S., McNeill, K. L., & Reiser, B. J. (2008). Learning-goals-driven design model: Developing curriculum materials that align with national standards and incorporate project-based pedagogy. Science Education, 92 (1), 1–32.

Kuhn, D., & Phelps, E. (1982). The development of problem-solving strategies. In H. Reese (Ed.), Advances in child development and behavior (Vol. 17, pp. 1–44). New York, NY: Academic.

Lachapelle, C. P., & Cunningham, C. M. (2014). Engineering in elementary schools. In J. Strobel, S. Purzer, & M. Cardella (Eds.), Engineering in pre-college settings: Synthesizing research, policy, and practices. Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.

Lachapelle, C. P., Cunningham, C. M., Jocz, J., Kay, A. E., Phadnis, P., Wertheimer, J., & Arteaga, R. (2011). Engineering is Elementary: An evaluation of years 4 through 6 field testing. Boston: Museum of Science.

Lawson, A. E. (1985). Science teaching and the development of thinking. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Levy, S. T. (2013). Young children's learning of water physics by constructing working systems. International Journal of Technology and Design Education, 23 (3), 537–566.

McKay, M., & McGrath, B. (2007). Real-world problem-solving using real-time data. International Journal of Engineering Education, 23 (1), 36–42.

Mehalik, M. M., Doppelt, Y., & Schunn, C. D. (2008). Middle-school science through design-based learning versus scripted inquiry: Better overall science concept learning and equity gap reduction. Journal of Engineering Education, 97 (1), 1–15.

Merton, R. K. (1973). The sociology of science: Theoretical and empirical investigations. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press. Miller, P. H., Blessing, J. S., & Schwartz, S. (2006). Gender differences in high-school students' views about science. International Journal of Science Education, 28 (4), 363–381.

National Research Council (NRC) . (2012). A framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Obama, B. H. (2009, November 23). Remarks on the "Educate to Innovate" Campaign. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/DCPD-200900940/content-detail.html

O'Neill, T. B. (2010). Fostering spaces of student ownership in middle school science. Equity & Excellence in Education, 43 (1), 6–20. O'Neill, T. B. , & Calabrese Barton, A. (2005). Uncovering student ownership in science learning: The making of a student created minidocumentary. School Science and Mathematics, 105 (6), 292–301.

Park, R. L. (2003). The seven warning signs of bogus science. Chronicle of Higher Education, 49, B20.

Partnership for 21st Century Skills . (2009). Framework for 21st century learning. Washington, DC: Author.

Penner, D. E., Giles, N. D., Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (1997). Building functional models: Designing an elbow. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34 (2), 125–143.

Penner, D. E., Lehrer, R., & Schauble, L. (1998). From physical models to biomechanics: A design-based modeling approach. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 7 (3/4), 429–449.

Rasinen, A. (2003). An analysis of the technology education curriculum of six countries. Journal of Technology Education, 15 (1), 31–47. Roth, W.-M. (1995a). From "wiggly structures" to "unshaky towers": Problem framing, solution finding, and negotiation of courses of actions during a civil engineering unit for elementary students. Research in Science Education, 25 (4), 365–381.

Roth, W.-M. (1995b). Inventors, copycats, and everyone else: The emergence of shared resources and practices as defining aspects of classroom communities. Science Education, 79 (5), 475–502.

Roth, W.-M. (1996). Art and artifact of children's designing: A situated cognition perspective. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 5 (2), 129–166.

Roth, W.-M. (1997). Interactional structures during a Grade 4–5 open-design engineering unit. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34 (3), 273–302.

Roth, W.-M., & Lee, Y.-J. (2007). "Vygotsky's neglected legacy": Cultural-historical activity theory. Review of Educational Research, 77 (2), 186–232.

Roth, W.-M., Tobin, K., & Ritchie, S. (2001). Re/constructing elementary science. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Rutland, M., & Barlex, D. (2008). Perspectives on pupil creativity in design and technology in the lower secondary education curriculum in England. International Journal of Technology and Design Education, 18, 139–165.

Schaffer, S. (1989). Glass works: Newton's prisms and the uses of experiment. In T. Pinch & S. Schaffer (Eds.), The uses of experiment: Studies in the natural sciences (pp. 67–104). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Schauble, L., Klopfer, L. E., & Raghavan, K. (1991). Students' transition from engineering model to a science model of experimentation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 28 (9), 859–882.

Silk, E. M., Schunn, C. D., & Cary, M. S. (2009). The impact of an engineering design curriculum on science reasoning in an urban setting. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 18 (3), 209–223.

Sorby, S. A. (1999). Developing 3-D spatial visualization skills. Engineering Design Graphics Journal, 63 (2), 21–32.

Review of Science Education Program Evaluation

Altschuld, J. W., & Kumar, D. D. (Eds.). (2002a). Evaluation of science and technology at the dawn of a new millennium. New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Altschuld, J. W., & Kumar, D. D. (2002b). What does the future have in store for the evaluation of science and technology education? In J. W. Altschuld & D. Kumar (Eds.), Evaluation of science and technology education at the dawn of a new millennium (pp. 1–22). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

American Evaluation Association (AEA) . (2004). Guiding principles for evaluators. Retrieved from www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=51 American Evaluation Association (AEA) . (2007). AEA evaluation policy task force charge. Retrieved from www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=151 American Evaluation Association (AEA) . (2011). AEA statement on cultural competence in evaluation. Retrieved from www.eval.org/p/cm/ld/fid=92

Anderson, B. (2002). Evaluating systemic reform: Evaluation needs, practices, and challenges. In J. W. Altschuld & D. Kumar (Eds.), Evaluation of science and technology education at the dawn of a new millennium (pp. 49–80). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Bennett, C., & Rockwell, K. (1995). Targeting outcomes of programs (TOP): An integrated approach to planning and evaluation. Unpublished manuscript. Lincoln: University of Nebraska.

Bennett, C. , & Rockwell, K. (2004). Targeting outcomes of programs (TOP): A hierarchy for targeting outcomes and evaluating their achievement. Lincoln: University of Nebraska. Retrieved from

http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1047&context=aglecfacpub

Bimbaum, M., & Crohn, K. (Eds.). (2010). Challenges in evaluation of environmental education programs and policies. Evaluation and Program Planning, 33 (2): 67–204.

Brackett, A. (2009). Review of NOAA education program evaluation reports for the committee to review the NOAA Education Program. Commissioned paper prepared for the National Academy of Sciences. April 17, 2009. Retrieved from www7.nationalacademies.org/bose/1NOAA%20Evaluation.pdf

Brandon, P. R., Taum, A. K. H., Young, D. B., & Pottenger, F. M. (2008). The development and validation of the inquiry science observation coding sheet. Evaluation and Program Planning, 31 (3), 247–258.

Brandon, P. R., Taum, A. K., Young, D. B., Pottenger, F. M., & Speitel, T. W. (2008). The complexity of measuring the quality of program implementation with observations: the case of middle school inquiry-based science. American Journal of Evaluation, 29 (3), 235–250.

Camargo, C., & Shavelson, R. (2009). Direct measures in environmental education evaluation: Behavioral intentions versus observable actions. Applied Environmental Education and Communication, 8, 165–173.

Cannon, J. R. (2002). Distance learning in science education: Practices and evaluation. In J. W. Altschuld & D. Kumar (Eds.), Evaluation of science and technology education at the dawn of a new millennium (pp. 243–266). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers. Carleton-Hug, A. , & Hug, J. W. (2010). Challenges and opportunities for evaluating environmental education programs. Evaluation and Program Planning, 33 (2), 159–164.

Cheek, D. W. (2002). Musings on science program evaluation in an era of educational accountability. In J. W. Altschuld & D. Kumar (Eds.), Evaluation of science and technology education at the dawn of a new millennium (pp. 81–104). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Coghlan, A. T., Preskill, H., & Catsambas, T. (2003). An overview of appreciative inquiry in evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation, 2003 (100), 5–22.

Cousins, J. B., Elliott, C., Amo, C., Bourgeois, I., Chouinard, J., Goh, S. C., & Lahey, R. (2008). Organizational capacity to do and use evaluation: Results of a pan-Canadian survey of evaluators. Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation, 23 (3), 1–35.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Cronan, M. (2012). NSF industrial innovation and partnerships. Research Development and Grant Writing News, 2 (11), 2-6.

Cronbach, L. J. (1982). Designing evaluations of educational and social programs. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dunaway, K. E. , Morrow, J. A. , & Porter, B. E. (2012). Development and validation of the Cultural Competence of Program Evaluators (CCPE) self-report scale. American Journal of Evaluation, 33 (4), 496–514.

Falk, J. H., Dierking, L. D., & Storksdieck, M. (2005). A review of research on lifelong science learning. Washington, DC: Board on Science Education, the National Academies.

Feuer, M. J., Towne, L., & Shavelson, R. J. (2002). Scientific culture and educational research. Educational Researcher, 31 (8), 4–14. Fitzpatrick, J. L., Worthen, B. R., & Sanders, J. R. (2004). Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Inc.

Fleischman, H. L., Hopstock, P. J., Pelczar, M. P., & Shelley, B. E. (2010). *Highlights from PISA 2009: Performance of U.S. 15-year-old students in reading, mathematics, and science literacy in an international context* (NCES 2011–004). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2011004

Flowers, A. B. (2010). Blazing an evaluation pathway: Lessons learned from applying utilization-focused evaluation to a conversation education program. Evaluation and Program Planning, 33 (2), 165–171.

Frechtling, J., Mark M. M., Rog, D. J., Thomas, V., Frierson, H., Hood, S., ... & Johnson, E. (2010). The 2010 user-friendly handbook for project evaluation. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation. Retrieved from

www.westat.com/Westat/expertise/evaluation/process.cfm

Friedman, A. J. (Ed.). (2008). Framework for evaluating impacts of informal science education projects. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation. Retrieved from www.aura-astronomy.org/news/EPO/eval_framework.pdf

Greene, J. C. (2007). Mixed methodology in social inquiry. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Greene, J. C., Boyce, A., & Ahn, J. (2011). A values-engaged, educative approach for evaluating education programs: A guidebook for practice. University of Illinois.

Greene, J. C., DeStefano, L., Burgon, H., & Hall, J. (2006). An educative, values-engaged approach to evaluating STEM educational programs. New Directions for Evaluation, 2006 (109), 53–71.

Greenseid, L. O., & Lawrenz, F. (2011). Tensions and trade-offs in voluntary involvement: Evaluating the collaboratives for excellence in teacher preparation. New Directions for Evaluation, 2011 (129), 25–31.

Hanssen, C. E., Lawrenz, F., & Dunet, D. O. (2008). Concurrent meta-evaluation: A critique. American Journal of Evaluation, 29 (4), 572–582.

Hickey, D. T., & Zuiker, S. J. (2003). A new perspective for evaluating innovative science programs. Science Education, 87 (4), 539–563. Hood, S. (2001). Nobody knows my name: In praise of African American evaluators who were responsive. New Directions for Evaluation, 2001 (92), 31–43.

Hood, S. , Hopson, R. K. , & Frierson, H. T. (2005). The role of culture and cultural context: A mandate for inclusion, the discovery of truth and understanding in evaluative theory and practice. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Hood, S. , & Rosenstein, B. (2005). Culturally responsive evaluation. In S. Mathison (Ed.), Encyclopedia of evaluation (pp. 97–102). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

House, E. R., & Howe, K. R. (2000). Deliberative democratic evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation, 2000 (85), 3–23.

Huffman, D. (2002). Evaluating science inquiry: A mixed-method approach. In J. W. Altschuld & D. Kumar (Eds.), Evaluation of science and technology education at the dawn of a new millennium (pp. 219–242). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Huffman, D., & Lawrenz, F. (Eds). (2006). Critical issues in STEM evaluation (No. 109). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Huffman, D., Lawrenz, F., Thomas, K., & Clarkson, L. (2006). Collaborative evaluation communities in urban schools: A model of evaluation capacity building for STEM education. New Directions for Evaluation, 2006 (109), 73–85.

Huffman, D., Thomas, K., & Lawrenz, F. (2008). A collaborative immersion approach to evaluation capacity building. American Journal of Evaluation, 29 (3), 358–368.

Ingersoll, R. M., & May, H. (2012). The magnitude, destinations, and determinants of mathematics and science teacher turnover. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 34 (4), 435–464.

Johnson, J. , Hall, J. , Greene, J. C. , & Ahn, J. (2013). Exploring alternative approaches for presenting evaluation results. American Journal of Evaluation.

Johnson, K., & Weiss, I. R. (2011). Compulsory project-level involvement and the use of program-level evaluations: Evaluating the local systemic change for teacher enhancement program. New Directions for Evaluation, 2011 (129), 17–23.

King, J. A., & Lawrenz, F. (Eds). (2011). Multisite evaluation practice: Lessons and reflections from four cases (No. 129). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

King, J. A., Ross, P. A., Callow-Heusser, C., Gullickson, A. R., Lawrenz, F., & Weiss, I. R. (2011). Reflecting on multisite evaluation practice. New Directions for Evaluation, 2011 (129), 59–71.

Kumar, D. D., & Altschuld, J. W. (2002). Complementary approaches to evaluating technology in science teacher education. In J. W. Altschuld & D. Kumar (Eds.), Evaluation of science and technology education at the dawn of a new millennium (pp. 165–186). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Labin, S. N. , Duffy, J. L. , Meyers, D. C. , Wandersman, A. , & Lesesne, C. A. (2012). A research synthesis of the evaluation capacity building literature. American Journal of Evaluation, 33 (3), 307–338.

Lawrenz, F. (2007a). Review of science education program evaluation. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 943–1006). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lawrenz, F. (2007b). Summary and critique of selected evaluations of NASA educational programs. Paper prepared for the National Research Council Committee for the Review and Evaluation of NASA's Pre-College Education Program, Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://sites.nationalacademies.org/DBASSE/BOSE/DBASSE_071087

Lawrenz, F., & Desjardins, C. D. (2012). Trends in U.S. government-funded multisite K–12 science program evaluation. In B. J. Fraser, K. G. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (Vol. 1, pp. 723–734). New York, NY: Springer. Lawrenz, F., Gullickson, A., & Toal, S. (2007). Dissemination: Handmaiden to evaluation use. American Journal of Evaluation, 28 (3), 275–289.

Lawrenz, F., & Huffman, D. (2006). Methodological pluralism: The gold standard of STEM evaluation. New Directions for Evaluation, 2006 (109), 19–34.

Lee, Y. J., & Chue, S. (2011). The value of fidelity of implementation criteria to evaluate school-based science curriculum innovations. International Journal of Science Education, 35 (15), 2508–2537.

Lewthwaite, B., & Fisher, D. (2005). The development and validation of a primary science curriculum delivery evaluation questionnaire. International Journal of Science Education, 27 (5), 593–606.

Lin, H., Lawrenz, F., Lin, S., & Hong, Z. (2012). Relationships among affective factors and preferred engagement in science-related activities. Public Understanding of Science. doi:10.1177/0963662511429412

Mark, M. M., & Henry, G. T. (2013). Multiple routes: Evaluation, assisted sense-making, and pathways to betterment. In M. C. Alkin (Ed.), Evaluation roots: A wider perspective of theorists' views and influences (2nd ed., pp. 144–156). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Mark, M. M., Henry, G. T., & Julnes, G. (2000). Evaluation: An integrated framework for understanding, guiding, and improving policies and programs. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Maxwell, J. A. (2004). Causal explanation, qualitative research, and scientific inquiry in education. Educational Researcher, 33 (2), 3–11. Mertens, D. M. (2005). Inclusive evaluation. In S. Mathison (Ed.), Encyclopedia of evaluation (pp. 248–249). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Mertens, D. M. (2010). Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Mertens, D. M., & Ginsberg, P. E. (Eds.). (2009). The handbook of social research ethics. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. Mertens, D. M., & Hopson, R. K. (2006). Advancing evaluation of STEM efforts through attention to diversity and culture. New Directions for Evaluation, 2006 (109), 35–51.

Minner, D., Ericson, E., Wu, S., & Martinez, A. (2012). Compendium of research instruments for STEM education part 2: Measuring students' content knowledge, reasoning skills, and psychological attributes. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates. Retrieved from http://abtassociates.com/Reports/2012/Compendium-of-Research-Instruments-for-STEMEd-%281%29.aspx

Minner, D. , Martinez, A. , & Freeman, B. (2012). Compendium of research instruments for STEM education part 1: Teacher practices, PCK, and content knowledge. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates. Retrieved from http://abtassociates.com/Reports/2012/Compendium-of-Research-Instruments-for-STEM-Educat.aspx

Moore, T. J., Stohlmann, M. S., Wang, H. H., Tank, K. M., & Roehrig, G. H. (in press). Implementation and integration of engineering in K–12 STEM education. In J. Strobel, S. Purzer, & M. Cardella (Eds.), Engineering in precollege settings: Research into practice. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

National Research Council (NRC) . (1999). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=9853

National Research Council (NRC) . (2002). Scientific research in education. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=10236

National Research Council (NRC) . (2007). Taking science to school: Learning and teaching science in grades K–8. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=11625

National Research Council (NRC) . (2008). NASA's elementary and secondary education program: Review and critique. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12081

National Research Council (NRC) . (2009). Learning science in informal environments: People, ideas, and pursuits. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12190

National Research Council (NRC) . (2010a). NOAA's education program: Review and critique. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council (NRC) . (2010b). Surrounded by science: Learning science in informal environments. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=12614

National Research Council (NRC) . (2011). Learning science through computer games and simulations. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13078

National Research Council (NRC) . (2012a). A framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13165

National Research Council (NRC). (2012b). Discipline-based education research: Understanding and improving learning in undergraduate science and engineering. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13362

National Research Council (NRC) . (2012c). Education for life and work: Developing transferable knowledge and skills in the 21st Century. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Retrieved from www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=13398

National Science Foundation (NSF) . (2012). Math and science partnership (MSP) program solicitation. Retrieved from www.nsf.gov/pubs/2012/nsf12518/nsf12518.pdf

Patton, M. Q. (1978). Utilization-focused evaluation (1st ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Patton, M. Q. (2008). Utilization-focused evaluation (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Patton, M. Q. (2011). Developmental evaluation applying complexity concepts to enhance evaluation. New York, NY: Guildford Press.

Patton, M. Q. (2012). Essentials of utilization-focused evaluation. Thousand Oaks: CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Pawson, R., & Tilley, N. (1997). Realistic evaluation. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Preskil, H., & Catsambas, T. T. (2006). Evaluation through appreciative inquiry. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Provasnik, S., Kastberg, D., Ferraro, D., Lemanski, N., Roey, S., & Jenkins, F. (2012). Highlights from TIMSS 2011: Mathematics and science achievement of U.S. fourth- and eighth-grade students in an international context (NCES 2013–009). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2013009

Roehrig, G. H., Moore, T. J., Wang, H. H., & Park, M. S. (2012). Is adding the E enough? Investigating the impact of K–12 engineering standards on the implementation of STEM integration. School Science and Mathematics, 112 (1), 31–44.

Roseland, D., Greenseid, L. O., Volkov, B. B., & Lawrenz, F. (2011). Documenting the impact of multisite evaluations on the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics field. New Directions for Evaluation, 2011 (129), 39–48.

Roseland, D., Volkov, B. B., & Callow-Heusser, C. (2011). The effect of technical assistance on involvement and use: The case of a research, evaluation, and technical assistance project. New Directions for Evaluation, 2011 (129), 33–38.

Rossi, P. H., Freeman, H. E., & Lipsey, M. W. (2004). Evaluation: A systematic approach (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Rossi, P. H., Freeman, H. E., & Rosenbaum, S. (1979). Evaluation: A systematic approach. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. Shavelson, R., Philips, D., Towne, L., & Feuer, M. J. (2003). On the science of education design studies. Educational Researcher, 32 (1), 25–28.

Shaw, I., Greene, J. C., & Mark, M. M. (Eds.). (2006). The SAGE handbook of evaluation. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. Stake, R. (1967). The countenance of educational evaluation. Teachers College Record, 68 (7), 523–540.

Stevahn, L., King, J. A., Ghere, G., & Minnema, J. (2005). Establishing essential competencies for program evaluators. American Journal of Evaluation, 26 (1), 43–59.

Stevens, F. , Lawrenz, F. , Ely, D. , & Huberman, M. (1993). The user-friendly handbook for project evaluation. Washington, DC: National Science Foundation.

Stockdill, S. H., Baizerman, D., & Compton, D. (Eds.). (2002). Toward a definition of the ECB process: A conversation with the ECB literature. New Directions for Evaluation, 2002 (93), 7–26.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2001). Evaluation models. New Directions for Evaluation, 2001 (89), 7–98.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2005). CIPP model (context, input, process, product). In S. Mathison (Ed.), International handbook of educational evaluation (pp. 60–65). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Stufflebeam, D. L., Foley, W. J., Gephart, W. J., Guba, E. G., Hammond, R. L., Merriman, H. O., & Provus, M. M. (1971). Educational evaluation and decision-making in education. Itasca, IL: Peacock Publishers Incorporated.

Stufflebeam, D. L., & Shinkfield, A. J. (2007). Evaluation theory, models, and applications. San Francisco, CA: Wiley.

Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). (2010). SAGE handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Thompson-Robinson, M., Hopson, R., & SenGupta, S. (Eds). (2004). In search of cultural competence in evaluation: Toward principles and practices (No. 102). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Toal, S. A., & Gullickson, A. R. (2011). The upside of an annual survey in light of involvement and use: Evaluating the advanced technological education program. New Directions for Evaluation, 2011 (129), 9–15.

Tobin, K., & Roth, W. (2002). Evaluation of science teaching performance through coteaching and cogenerative dialoguing. In J.W. Altschuld & D. Kumar (Eds.), Evaluation of science and technology education at the dawn of a new millennium (pp. 187–218). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Turner, R. C., Keiffer, E. A., & Gitchel, W. D. (2010). Observing inquiry-based learning environments: The scholastic inquiry observation (SIO) instrument. Presented at the American Educational Research Association annual conference. Retrieved from http://gk12.uark.edu/programresults/SIO Validation.pdf

U.S. Department of Education (DOE) . (2007). Report of the Academic Competitiveness Council. Retrieved from http://ecommerce.nsta.org//nstaexpress/acc.pdf

U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) . (n.d.). Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) related materials. Retrieved from www.whitehouse.gov/omb/mgmt-gpra/index-gpra

U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) . (2010). Evaluating programs for efficacy and cost-efficiency [Memorandum: M-10–32]. Retrieved from www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/memoranda/2010/m10-32.pdf

Worthen, B. R., & Sanders, J. R. (1973). Educational evaluation: Theory and practice. Worthington, OH: C. A. Jones Publishing Company. VanDerHeyden, A., McLaughlin, T., Algina, J., & Snyder, P. (2012). Randomized evaluation of a supplemental grade-wide mathematics intervention. American Educational Research Journal, 49 (6), 1251–1284.

Yarbrough, D. B., Shulha, L. M., Hopson, R. K., & Caruthers, F. A. (2011). The program evaluation standards: A guide for evaluators and evaluation users (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Zint, M. (2013). Advancing environmental education program evaluation. In R. B. Stevenson , M. Brody , J. Dillon , & A. E. J. Wals (Eds.), International handbook of research on environmental education (pp. 298–309). New York, NY: Routledge.

Zvoch, K. (2012). How does fidelity of implementation matter? Using multilevel models to detect relationships between participant outcomes and the delivery and receipt of treatment. American Journal of Evaluation, 33 (4), 547–565.

The Central Role of Assessment in Pedagogy

Alexander, R. (2006). Towards dialogic thinking: Rethinking classroom talk. York, UK: Dialogos.

Alexander, R. (2008). Essays in pedagogy. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Applebee, A. N., Langer, J. A., Nystrand, M., & Gamoran, A. (2003). Discussion based approaches to developing understanding: Classroom instruction and student performance in middle and high school English. American Educational Research Journal, 40 (3), 685–730.

Atkin, J. M. (1980). The government in the classroom. Dædalus, 109 (3), 85–97.

Baines, E., Blatchford, P., & Kutnick, P. (2009). Promoting effective group work in the primary classroom. London, UK: Routledge.

Black, H. D., & Dockrell, W. B. (1984). Criterion-referenced assessment in the classroom. Edinburgh, UK: Scottish Council for Research in Education.

Black, P. , Harrison, C. , Hodgen, J. , Marshall, M. , & Serret, N. (2010). Validity in teachers' summative assessments. Assessment in Education, 17 (2), 215–232.

Black, P. , Harrison, C. , Hodgen, J. , Marshall, M. , & Serret, N. (2011). Can teachers' summative assessments produce dependable results and also enhance classroom learning? Assessment in Education, 18 (4), 451–469.

Black, P. , Harrison, C. , Lee, C. , Marshall, B. , & Wiliam, D. (2002). Working inside the black box: Assessment for learning in the classroom. London, UK: GL Assessment.

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., & Wiliam, D. (2003). Assessment for learning: putting it into practice. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (2009). Developing the theory of formative assessment. Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability, 21 (1), 5–31.

Blatchford, P., Baines, E., Rubie-Davies, C., Bassett, P., & Chowne, A. (2006). The effect of a new approach to group-work on pupilpupil and teacher-pupil interaction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 98, 750–765.

Bruner, J. (1966). Toward a theory of instruction. New York: Norton for Harvard University Press.

Butler, R. (1988). Enhancing and undermining intrinsic motivation; the effects of task-involving and ego-involving evaluation on interest and performance. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 58 (1), 1–14.

Cole, K. C. (2009). Something incredibly wonderful happens: Frank Oppenheimer and the world he made up. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, Harcourt.

Connolly, C. , Klenowski, V. , & Wyatt-Smith, C. M. (2011). Moderation and consistency of teacher judgment: Teachers' views. British Educational Research Journal, 1, 1–22.

Dawes, L. , Mercer, M. , & Wegerif, R. (2004). Thinking together. Birmingham, UK: Imaginative Minds Ltd.

Dewey, J. (1985). The later works, 1925–1953, Volume 7: 1932. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.

Dewey, J. (2012). Unmodern philosophy and modern philosophy. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.

Dweck, C. S. (2000). Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality and development. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Dweck, C. S. (2006). Mindset: The new psychology of success. New York: Random House.

Eisner, E. (1978). The educational imagination. New York: Macmillan.

Emerson, R. W. (1834). Journal, April 11.

Fisher R. (2005). Teaching children to learn (2nd ed.). Cheltenham, UK: Nelson Thornes.

Foos, P. W., Mora, J. J., & Tkacz, S. (1994). Student study techniques and the generation effect. Journal of Educational Psychology, 86 (4), 567–576.

Freire, P. (1983). Banking education. In H. Giroux & D. Purpel (Eds.), The hidden curriculum and moral education: Deception of discovery (p. 284). Berkeley, CA: McCutchen.

Freire, P. (1992). Pedagogy of hope. New York: Continuum.

Greene, M. (1983). Introduction. In H. Giroux & D. Purpel (Eds.), The hidden curriculum and moral education: Deception of discovery (pp. 1–5). Berkeley, CA: McCutchen.

Groome, T. H. (1998). Educating for life. New York: Crossroad.

Gunn, S. J. (2007). Literature review. In C. Wyatt-Smith & G. Masters (Eds.), Proposals for a new model of senior assessment: Realising potentials. Unpublished report prepared for Queensland Studies Authority. Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.

Hallam, S., & Ireson, J. (1999). Pedagogy in the secondary school. In P. Mortimore (Ed.), Understanding pedagogy and its impact on learning (pp. 68–97). London, UK: Paul Chapman.

Harlen, W. (2013). Assessment and inquiry-based science education. Trieste, Italy: Global Network of Science Academies.

Harris, L. H., & Brown, G. T. L. (2009). The complexity of teachers' conceptions of assessment: tensions between the needs of schools and students. Assessment in Education, 16 (3), 363–381.

Hawkins, D. (1974). The informed vision: Essays on learning and human nature. New York: Agathon Press.

Hawkins, D. (1983). Nature closely observed. Daedalus, 112 (2), 65-89.

Hipkins, R., & Robertson, S. (2011). Moderation and teacher learning: What can research tell us about their inter-relationships? Wellington: New Zealand Council for Educational Research.

Johnson, D. W. , Johnson, R. T. , & Stanne, M. B. (2000). Co-operative learning methods: A meta-analysis. Retrieved from www.tablelearning.com/uploads/File/EXHIBIT-B.pdf

King, A. (1995). Inquiring minds really do want to know—using questioning to teach critical thinking. Teaching of Psychology, 22 (1), 13–17.

Koretz, D. (1998). Large scale portfolio assessments in the US: Evidence pertaining to the quality of measurement. Assessment in Education, 5 (3), 309–334.

Mansell, W., James, M., & the Assessment Reform Group. (2009). Assessment in schools. Fit for purpose? A commentary by the Teaching and Learning Research Programme. London, UK: ESRC TLRP, Institute of Education London. Retrieved from www.tlrp.org/pub/commentaries.html

Menand, L. (2001). The metaphysical club: A story of ideas in America. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Mercer, N., Dawes, L., Wegerif, R., & Sams, C. (2004). Reasoning as a scientist: Ways of helping children to use language to learn science. British Educational Research Journal, 30 (3), 359–377.

Milroy, D. (1992). Teaching and learning: What a child expects from a good teacher. In Education: Putting the Record Straight (pp. 57–61). Stafford, UK: Network Educational Press.

National Research Council (NRC) . (2011). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

OECD . (2013). Education at a Glance 2013: OECD indicators. Paris, France: OECD. Retrieved from

www.oecd.org/edu/eag2013%20%28eng%29--FINAL%2020%20June%202013.pdf

Parr, J. M., & Timperley, H. S. (2008). Teachers, schools and using evidence: Considerations of preparedness. Assessment in Education, 15 (1), 57–71.

Poehner, M. E., & Lantolf, J. P. (2005). Dynamic assessment in the language classroom. Language Teaching Research, 9 (3), 233–265. Rowe, M. B. (1974). Wait time and rewards as instructional variables, their influence on language, logic and fate control. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 11, 81–94.

Sadler, D. R. (1987). Specifying and promulgating achievement standards. Oxford Review of Education, 13 (2), 191-209.

Shapley, K. S., & Bush, M. J. (1999). Developing a valid and reliable portfolio assessment in the primary grades: Building on practical experience. Applied Measurement in Education, 12 (2), 111–132.

Shulman, L. S. (1999). Knowledge and teaching: Foundation of the new reform. In M. J. Leach & B. Moon (Eds.), Learners and pedagogy (pp. 61–71). London, UK: Chapman.

Simon, M. & Forgette-Giroux, R. (2000). Impact of a content selection framework on portfolio assessment at the classroom level. Assessment in Education, 7 (1), 83–101.

Stanley, G., McCann, R., Gardner, J., Reynolds, L., & Wild, I. (2009). Review of teacher assessment: What works best and issues for development. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Centre for Educational Development—Report commissioned by the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.

Tyler, R. W. (1969). Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Webb, D. C. (2009). Designing professional development for assessment. Educational Designer, 1 (2). Retrieved from www.educationalde-signer.org/ed/volume1/issue2/article6/

Wiliam, D. , & Black, P. J. (1996). Meanings and consequences: A basis for distinguishing formative and summative functions of assessment. British Educational Research Journal, 22 (5), 537–548.

Wiliam, D., & Thompson, M. (2007). Integrating assessment with instruction: What will it take to make it work? In C. A. Dwyer (Ed.), The future of assessment: Shaping teaching and learning (pp. 53–82). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wood, D. (1998). How children think and learn. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Wyatt-Smith, C. , Klenowski, V. , & Gunn, S. (2010). The centrality of teachers' judgement practice in assessment: A study of standards in moderation. Assessment in Education, 17 (1), 59–75.

Wyatt-Smith, C. M., & Bridges, S. (2008). Meeting in the middle— assessment, pedagogy, learning and students at educational disadvantage. Evaluation for the Literacy and Numeracy in the Middle Years of Schooling Initiative Strand A. Queensland Government Report. Retrieved from http://education.qld.gov.au/literacy/docs/deewr-myp-final-report.pdf

Wyatt-Smith, C. M., & Cumming, J. J. (2003). Curriculum literacies: Expanding domains of assessment. Assessment in Education, 10 (1), 47–59.

Large-Scale Assessments in Science Education

Abedi, J. , & Hejri, F. (2004). Accommodations for students with limited English proficiency in the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Applied Measurement in Education, 17 (4), 371–392.

American Federation of Teachers (AFT) . (1995). What secondary students abroad are expected to know: Gateway exams taken by average-achieving students in France, Germany, and Scotland. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.

American Federation of Teachers & National Center for Improving Science Education . (1994). What college-bound students abroad are expected to know about biology: Exams from England, and Wales, France, Germany and Japan. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.

American Federation of Teachers & National Center for Improving Science Education . (1996). What college-bound students abroad are expected to know about chemistry and physics: Exams from England, and Wales, France, Germany and Japan. Washington, DC: American Federation of Teachers.

Beaton, A. E., Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Gonzalez, E. J., Kelly, D. L., & Smith, T. A. (1996). Science achievement in the middle school years: IEA's Third International Mathematics and Science Study. Chestnut Hill, MA: Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation, and Educational Policy, Boston College.

Black, P., & Atkin, J. M. (Eds.). (1996). Changing the subject: Innovations in science, maths and technology education (1st ed.). London: Routledge.

Britton, E. D., De Long-Cotty, B. D., & Levenson, T. (2005). Bringing technology education into K–8 classrooms: A guide to curricular resources about the designed world. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Britton, E. D., & Raizen, S. A. (Eds.). (1996). Examining the examinations: An international comparison of science and mathematics examinations for college-bound students. Boston: Kluwer Academic.

Britton, E. D., & Schneider, S. A. (2007). Large-scale assessment in science education. In S. K. Abell & R. J. Larsen (Eds.), Handbook of research in science education (pp. 1007–1040). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Campbell, J. R., Voelkl, K. E., & Donahue, P. L. (1998). NAEP 1996 trends in academic progress. Addendum. Achievement of U.S. students in science, 1969 to 1996; mathematics, 1973 to 1996; reading, 1971 to 1996; writing, 1984 to 1996 (rev. ed.). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, US Department of Education.

Carnoy, M., & Rothstein, R. (2013). What do international tests really show about U.S. student performance? Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute. Retrieved from www.epi.org/publication/us-student-performance-testing/

Clarke-Midura, J., Code, J., Dede, C., Mayrath, M., & Zap, N. (2012). Thinking outside the bubble: Virtual performance assessments for measuring complex learning. In J. Clarke-Midura, M. Mayrath, & C. Dede (Eds.), Technology-based assessments for 21st century skills: Theoretical and practical implications from modern research (pp. 125–148). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Cogan, L. S., Wang, H. A., & Schmidt, W. H. (2001). Culturally specific patterns in the conceptualization of the school science curriculum: Insights from TIMSS. Studies in Science Education, 36, 105–133.

College Board . (2009). Science: College Boards standards for college success. Retrieved from http://professionals.collegeboard.com/profdownload/cbscs-science-standards-2009.pdf

Comber, L. C., & Keeves, J. P. (1973). Science education in nineteen countries: An empirical study. New York: Wiley. Committee on Assessing Technological Literacy. (2006). Tech tally: Approaches to assessing technological literacy. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Dolan, R. P., Hall, T. E., Banerjee, M., Chun, E., & Strangman, N. (2005). Applying principles of universal design to test delivery: The effect of computer-based read-aloud on test performance of high school students with learning disabilities. Journal of Technology, Learning & Assessment, 3 (7): 4–32.

Doran, R. L., Lawrenz, F., & Hegelson, S. (1994). Research on assessment in science. In D. L. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 388–442). New York: Macmillan.

Gobert, J., Sao Pedro, M., Baker, R. S., Toto, E., & Montalvo, O. (2012). Leveraging educational data mining for real time performance assessment of scientific inquiry skills within microworlds. Journal of Educational Data Mining, 4, 153–185.

Harmon, M., Smith, T. A., Martin, M. O., Kelly, D. L., Beaton, A. E., Mullis, I. V. S.,... Orpwood, G. (1997). Performance assessment in IEA's Third International Mathematics and Science Study. Chestnut Hill, MA: Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation, and Educational Policy, Boston College.

Herman, J., Dai, Y., Htut, A. M., Martinez, M., & Rivera, N. (2010). CRESST evaluation report: Evaluation of the Enhanced Assessment Grants (EAGs). Los Angeles: CRESST.

Herman, J. L., & Haertel, H. (Eds.). (2005). Uses and misuses of data for educational accountability and improvement. NSSE Yearbook, 104 (2).

Herman, J. L., Webb, N. M., & Zuniga, S. A. (2005, April). Measurement issues in the alignment of standards and assessments: A case study. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Hudson, L. (1991). National initiatives for assessing science education. In A. Champagne , B. Lovitts , & B. Calinger (Eds.), Assessment in the service of instruction (p. 107). Washington, DC: American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Hutchison, D., & Schagen, I. (2006, November). Comparisons between PISA and TIMSS: Are we the man with two watches? Paper presented at the 2nd IEA International Research Conference, Washington, DC. Retrieved from

www.iea.nl/fileadmin/user_upload/IRC/IRC_2006/Papers/IRC2006_Hutchison_Schagen.pdf

International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) . (1988). Science achievement in seventeen countries: A preliminary report (1st ed.). Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

International Technology Education Association . (2000). Standards for technological literacy: Content for the study of technology. Reston, VA: International Technology Education Association.

Johnson, S. S. (1975). Update on education: A digest of the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Retrieved from www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED113381

Keeves, J. P. (1992). The IEA study of science III: Changes in science education and achievement, 1970 to 1984. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

Kifer, E. (2000). Large-scale assessment: Dimensions, dilemmas, and policy. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Kimmelman, P., Kroeze, D., Schmidt, W., Van der Ploeg, A., McNeely, M., & Tan, A. (1999). A first look at what we can learn from high performing school districts: An analysis of TIMSS data from the First in the World Consortium. Washington, DC: National Center of Educational Statistics.

Koretz, D. (2009). How do American students measure up? Making sense of international comparisons. Future of Children, 19 (1), 37–51. LaPointe, A., Askew, J. M., & Mead, N. A. (1992). Learning science. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

LaPointe, A., Mead, N. A., & Phillips, G. W. (1989). A world of differences: An international assessment of mathematics and science. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Linn, M. C., De Benedictis, T., Delucchi, K., Harris, A., & Stage, E. (1987). Gender differences in National Assessment of Educational Progress science items: What does "I don't know" really mean? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 24 (3), 267–278.

Liu, X., & Ruiz, M. E. (2008). Using data mining to predict K–12 students' performance on large-scale assessment items related to energy. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (5), 554–573. doi:10.1002/tea.20232

Lutkus, A. D., Weiner, A. W., Daane, M. C., & Jin, Y. (2003). The Nation's Report Card: Reading 2002, trial urban district assessment. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2003523 Martin, M. O., Mullis, I. V. S., Beaton, A. E., Gonzalez, E. J., Kelly, D. L., & Smith, T. A. (1997). Science achievement in the primary school years: IEA's Third International Mathematics and Science Study. Chestnut Hill, MA: Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation, and Educational Policy, Boston College.

Martin, M. O., Mullis, I. V. S., & Foy, P. (2008). TIMSS 2007 international science report: Findings from IEA's Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study at the fourth and eighth grades. Chestnut Hill, MA: TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College.

Martin, M. O., Mullis, I. V. S., Foy, P., & Stanco, G. M. (2012). TIMSS 2011 international results in science. Chestnut Hill, MA: TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College.

Martin, M. O., Mullis, I. V. S., Gonzalez, E. J., & Chrostowski, S. J. (2004). TIMSS 2003: International science report: Findings from IEA's Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study at the fourth and eighth grades. Chestnut Hill, MA: TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center, Boston College.

Martin, M. O., Mullis, I. V. S., Gonzalez, E. J., Gregory, K. D., Smith, T. A., Chrostowski, S. J., ... O'Connor, K. M. (2000). TIMSS 1999: International science report: Findings from IEA's repeat of the Third International Mathematics and Science Study at the eighth grade. Chestnut Hill, MA: International Study Center, Boston College.

Mayer, R. E., & Johnson, C. (2008). Revising the redundancy principle in multimedia learning. Journal of Educational Psychology, 100, 380–386.

McIntosh, S. (2012). State high school exit exams: A policy in transition. Washington, DC: Center on Education Policy.

McKnight, C., & Britton, E. (1992). Methods for analyzing curricular materials. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Survey of Mathematics and Science Opportunities, Technical Report Series.

Meade, S. D., & Dugger, W. E., Jr. (2004). Reporting on the status of technology education in the U.S. Technology Teacher, 64 (2), 29–35.

Minnesota Department of Education . (2012). Minnesota Comprehensive Assessments-Series III (MCA-III): Test specifications for science. Retrieved from

http://education.state.mn.us/mdeprod/idcplg?ldcService=GET_FILE&dDocName=003177&RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&Ren dition=primary

Minstrell, J. A., Anderson, R., Kraus, P., & Minstrell, J. E. (2008). Bridging from practice to research and back: Tools to support formative assessment. In J. Coffey, R. Douglas, & C. Sterns (Eds.), Science assessment: Research and practical approaches (pp. 39–56). Arlington, VA: NSTA Press.

More About the NAEP Technology and Engineering Literacy (TEL) Assessment. (2012). Retrieved from the National Center for Education Statistics website: http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/tel/moreabout.asp

Mullis, I. V. S. , & Jenkins, L. B. (1988). The science report card: Elements of risk and recovery. Trends and achievement based on the 1986 National Assessment. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. Retrieved from

www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED300265

Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Beaton, A. E., Gonzalez, E. J., Kelly, D. L., & Smith, T. A. (1998). Mathematics and science achievement in the final year of secondary school: IEA's Third International Mathematics and Science Study. Chestnut Hill, MA: Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation, and Educational Policy, Boston College.

National Academy of Engineering . (2010). Standards for K–12 engineering education? Washington, DC: National Academies Press. NAEP—About the District Assessment. (2012a). Retrieved from the National Center for Education Statistics website: http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/about/district.asp

NAEP—About State NAEP. (2012b). Retrieved from the National Center for Education Statistics website: http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/about/state.asp National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) . (1975). *Selected results from the national assessments of science: scientific principles and procedures* (No. 04–5-02). Princeton, NJ: National Assessment of Educational Progress.

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) . (1978). The national assessment in sciences: Changes in achievement, 1969–72. Denver, CO: Educational Commission of the States.

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) . (1987). *Learning by doing—a manual for teaching and assessing higher order skills in science and mathematics* (No. 17, HOS-80). Princeton, NJ: National Assessment of Educational Progress.

National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) . (1992). Trends in academic progress: Achievement of U.S. students in science 1969–70 to 1990, mathematics 1973 to 1990, reading 1971 to 1990, and writing 1984 to 1990. Princeton, NJ: National Assessment of Educational Progress.

National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) . (2009). Science framework for the 2009 national assessment of educational progress. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from www.nagb.org/content/nagb/assets/documents/publications/frameworks/science-09.pdf National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) . (2010). Technology and engineering literacy framework for the 2014 National Assessment of Educational Progress: Pre-publication edition. Retrieved from http://nagb.org/publications/frameworks.htm

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) . (1996). *Pursuing excellence: A study of U.S. eighth-grade mathematics and science teaching, learning, curriculum, and achievement in international context* (No. NCES 97–198). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) . (2006). Highlights from the TIMSS 1999 video study of eighth-grade science teaching. Washington, DC: Author.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) . (2011). *The nation's report card: Science 2009* (No. 2011–451). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2011451

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) . (2012). *The nation's report card: Science 2011* (No. 2012–465). Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2011451

National Research Council (NRC) . (2011). A framework for K–12 science education: Practices, crosscutting concepts, and core ideas. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Nohara, D. (2001). A comparison of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the Third International Mathematics and Science Study Repeat (TIMSS-R), and the Programme of International Student Assessment (PISA) (Working Paper No. 2001–07). Washington, DC: National Center of Educational Statistics.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) . (2001). Knowledge and skills for life: First results from the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), 2000. Education and skills. Paris: Author.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) . (2003). Literacy skills for the world of tomorrow. Further results from PISA 2000. Paris: Author.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) . (2004). Learning for tomorrow's world: First results from PISA 2003. Paris: Author.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) . (2007a). PISA 2006: Data (Vol. 2). Paris: Author.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) . (2007b). PISA 2006: Science competencies for tomorrow's world (Vol. 1). Paris: Author.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) . (2010). PISA computer-based assessment of student skills in science. Paris: Author.

Pellegrino, J., Chudowsky, N., & Glaser, R. (2001). Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Phillips, G. W. (2010). International benchmarking: State education performance standards. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. Retrieved from www.air.org/files/AIR_Int_Benchmarking_State_Ed__Perf_Standards.pdf

Postlethwaite, T. N. (1995). International empirical research in comparative education: An example of the studies for the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. Journal für Internationale Bildungsforschung, 1 (1), 1–19.

Postlethwaite, T. N., & Wiley, D. E. (1992). The IEA study of science II: Science achievement in twenty-three countries. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

Quellmalz, E. (2013). Assessment of student learning in integrated science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (iSTEM). Conference paper written at the request of the Committee on Integrated STEM Education, National Academy of Engineering, Washington, DC.

Quellmalz, E. S., DeBarger, A., Haertel, G., & Kreikemeier, P. (2005). Validities of science inquiry assessments: Final report. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International.

Quellmalz, E. S., Haertel, G. D., DeBarger, A., & Kreikemeier, P. (2005). *A study of evidence of the validities of assessments of science inquiry in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), Trends in Mathematics and Science Survey (TIMSS), and the New Standards Science Reference Exam (NSSRE) in science (Validities Technical Report no. 1).* Menlo Park, CA: SRI International. Ouellmalz, E. S., & Pellegrino, J. W. (2009). Technology and testing . Science, 323, 75–79.

Quellmalz, E. S., Timms, M. J., Silberglitt, M. D., & Buckley, B. C. (2012). Science assessments for all: Integrating science simulations into balanced state science assessment systems. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 363–393. doi:10.1002/tea.21005 Raizen, S. A., & Britton, E. D. (Eds.). (1997). Bold ventures: Patterns among innovations in science and mathematics education (Vol. 1). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Robitaille, D. F., Schmidt, W. H., Raizen, S., McKnight, C., Britton, E., & Nicol, C. (1993). *Curriculum frameworks for mathematics and science* (TIMSS Monograph No. 1.). Vancouver: Pacific Educational Press.

Rosier, M. J., & Keeves, J. P. (1991). The IEA study of science I: Science education and curricula in twenty-three countries (1st ed.). Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

Ruddock, G., Clausen-May, T., Purple, C., & Ager, R. (2006). *Validation study of the PISA 2000, PISA 2003 and TIMSS-2003 international studies of pupil attainment* (Research Report No. RR772). Retrieved from the United Kingdom Department of Education website: https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/RR772.pdf

Schmidt, W. H., Jakwerth, P. M., & McKnight, C. C. (1998). Curriculum-sensitive assessment: Content does make a difference. International Journal of Educational Research, 29, 503–527.

Schmidt, W. H. , McKnight, C. C. , Cogan, L. S. , Jakwerth, P. M. , & Houang, R. T. (1999). Facing the consequences: Using TIMSS for a closer look at U.S. mathematics and science education. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Schmidt, W. H., McKnight, C. C., Houang, R. T., Wang, H., Wiley, D. E., Cogan, L. S., & Wolfe, R. G. (2001). Why schools matter: A cross-national comparison of curriculum and learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schmidt, W. H., McKnight, C. C., & Raizen, S. (Eds.). (1997). A splintered vision: An investigation of U.S. science and mathematics education. New York: Springer.

Schmidt, W. H., Raizen, S., Britton, E. D., Bianchi, L. J., & Wolfe, R. G. (1997). Many visions, many aims, volume II: A cross-national investigation of curricular intentions in school science. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Schneider, R. M., Krajcik, J., Marx, R. W., & Soloway, E. (2002). Performance of students in project-based science classrooms on a national measure of science achievement. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39 (5), 410–422.

Scott, E., & Owen, E. (2005). Brief: Comparing NAEP, TIMSS and PISA results. Washington, DC: National Center of Educational Statistics. Retrieved from the National Center for Education Statistics website: http://nces.ed.gov/timss/pdf/naep_timss_pisa_comp.pdf Silberglitt, M., Vineyard, R. N., King, K., & Bowler, K. (2011, June). Balanced, multilevel science assessment systems. Paper presented at the National Conference on Student Assessment, Orlando, FL.

Stevenson, H. W. (1998). A study of three cultures. Phi Delta Kappan, 79 (7), 524–529.

Stigler, J. W., Gonzales, P., Kwanaka, T., Knoll, S., & Serrano, A. (1999). *The TIMSS videotape classroom study: Methods and findings from an exploratory research project on eighth-grade mathematics instruction in Germany, Japan, and the United States* (No. NCES 99–074). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics.

Tamir, P. (1988). Assessment and evaluation in science education: Opportunities to learn and outcomes. In B. J. Fraser & K. G. Tobin (Eds.), International handbook of science education (pp. 761–789). London: Kluwer Academic.

Travers, K. J., & Westbury, I. (1988). The IEA study of mathematics I: Analysis of mathematics curricula (Vol. 1). Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

Valverde, G. A. , & Schmidt, W. H. (2000). Greater expectations: Learning from other nations in the quest for "world-class standards" in US school mathematics and science. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 32 (5), 651–687.

Vinovskis, M. A. (1998). Overseeing the Nation's Report Card: The creation and evolution of the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB). Retrieved from www.nagb.org/content/nagb/assets/documents/publications/95222.pdf

Von Secker, C. (2004). Science achievement in social contexts: Analysis from National Assessment of Educational Progress. Journal of Educational Research, 98 (2), 67–78.

Wang, J. (1998). Comparative study of student science achievement between United States and China. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35 (3), 329–336.

Welch, W. W., Huffman, D., & Lawrenz, F. (1998). The precision of data obtained in large-scale science assessments: An investigation of bootstrapping and half-sample replication methods. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 3, 697–704.

Welch, W. W., Walberg, H. J., & Fraser, B. J. (1986). Predicting elementary science learning using national assessment data. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 23 (8), 699–706.

Wiley, D. E., & Wolfe, R. G. (1992). Major survey design issues for the IEA Third International Mathematics and Science Study. Prospects, 22 (3), 297–304.

Wilson, M. R., & Bertenthal, M. W. (Eds.). (2005). Systems for state science assessment. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. Yee, L., de Lange, J., & Schmidt, W. (2006). PISA: Promises, problems and possibilities. In M. Sanz-Solé, J. Soria, J. L. Varona, & J. Verdera (Eds.), Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians Vol. III (pp. 1668–1672). Available at www.icm2006.org/proceedings/Vol_III/contents/ICM_Vol_3_80.pdf

Developing Understandings of Practice

Abell, S. K. (2008). Twenty years later: Does pedagogical content knowledge remain a useful idea? International Journal of Science Education 30 (10), 1405–1416.

Abell, S. K., & Lederman, N. G. (Eds.). (2007). Handbook of science education. Philadelphia: Erlbaum.

Adams, P. E., & Krockover, G. H. (1997). Beginning science teacher cognition and its origins in the preservice secondary science teacher program. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34 (6), 633–653.

Adler, S. A. (1993). Teacher education: Research as reflective practice. Teaching and Teacher Education, 9, 159–167.

Akcay, H., & Yager, R. (2010). Accomplishing the Visions for Teacher Education programs advocated in the National Science Education Standards. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21 (6), 643–664.

Akerson, V. L., Cullen, T. A., & Hanson, D. L. (2009). Fostering a community of practice through a professional development program to improve elementary teachers' views of nature of science and teaching practice. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (10), 1090–1113.

Allan, E., Shane, J., Brownstein, E., Ezrailson, C., Hagevik, R., & Veal, W. (2009). Using performance-based assessments to prepare safe science teachers. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20 (6), 495–500.

Anderson, R. D., & Mitchener, C. P. (1994). Research on science teacher education. In D. L. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 3–44). New York: Macmillan.

Angeli, C., & Valanides, N. (2005). Preservice elementary teachers as information and communication technology designers: An instructional systems design model based on an expanded view of pedagogical content knowledge. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 21 (4), 292–302.

Appleton, K. (1992). Discipline knowledge and confidence to teach science: Self-perceptions of primary teacher education students. Research in Science Education, 22 (1), 11–19.

Appleton, K. (2008). Developing science pedagogical content knowledge through mentoring elementary teachers. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 19 (6), 523–545.

Appleton, K., & Kindt, I. (2002). Beginning elementary teachers' development as teachers of science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 13 (1), 43–61.

Aubusson, P. (2005). Evolution from a problem-based to a project-based secondary teacher education program: Challenges, dilemmas and possibilities. In G. F. Hoban (Ed.), The missing links in teacher education design: Developing a multi-linked conceptual framework (pp. 37–55). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.
Baird, J. R., & Mitchell, I. J. (Eds.). (1986). Improving the quality of teaching and learning: An Australian case study—the PEEL project. Melbourne: Monash University Printing Service.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bennett, N. , Summers, M. , & Askew, M. (1994). Knowledge for teaching and teaching performance. In A. Pollard (Ed.), Look before you leap? Research evidence for the curriculum at key stage two (pp. 23–36). London: Tufnell Press.

Berry, A., & Loughran, J. J. (2002). Developing an understanding of learning to teach in teacher education. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), Improving teacher education practices through self-study (pp. 13–29). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Berry, A., & Milroy, P. (2002). Changes that matter. In J. Loughran, I. Mitchell, & J. Mitchell (Eds.), Learning from teacher research (pp. 196–221). New York: Teachers College Press.

Beyer, C. J., & Davis, E. A. (2012). Learning to critique and adapt science curriculum materials: Examining the development of preservice elementary teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. Science Education, 96 (1), 130–157.

Bhattacharyya, S., Volk, T., & Lumpe, A. (2009). The influence of an extensive inquiry-based field experience on pre-service elementary student teachers' science teaching beliefs. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20 (3), 199–218.

Bianchini, J. A., Johnston, C. C., Oram, S. Y., & Cavazos, L. M. (2003). Learning to teach science in contemporary and equitable ways: The successes and struggles of first-year science teachers. Science Education, 87 (3), 419–443.

Bullock, S. M. (2011). Inside teacher education: Challenging prior views of teaching and learning. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Bullock, S. M., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (2012). Self-studies of science teacher education practices. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer. Burgoon, J., Heddle, M., & Duran, E. (2011). Re-examining the similarities between teacher and student conceptions about physical science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 22 (2), 101–114.

Carlsen, W. S. (1991). Effects of new biology teachers' subject-matter knowledge on curricular planning. Science Education, 75 (6), 631–647.

Carr, M., & Symington, D. (1991). The treatment of science discipline knowledge in primary teacher education. Research in Science Education, 21 (1), 39–46.

Chin, P. (1997). Teaching and learning in teacher education: Who is carrying the ball? In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), Teaching about teaching: Purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education (pp. 117–129). London: Falmer Press.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (Eds.). (1995). Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes. New York: Teachers College Press. Clark, C., & Peterson, P. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed., pp. 255–296). New York: MacMillan.

Clarke, A. (1994). Student-teacher reflection: Developing and defining a practice that is uniquely one's own. International Journal of Science Education, 16 (5), 497–509.

Clarke, A., & Erickson, G. (Eds.). (2003). Teacher research. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Clarke, A., & Erickson, G. (2004). Self-study: The fifth commonplace. Australian Journal of Education, 48 (2), 199–211.

Clift, R., Houston, W., & Pugach, M. (Eds.). (1990). Encouraging reflective practice in education. New York: Teachers College Press. Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1990). Research on teaching and teacher research: The issues that divide. Educational Researcher, 19 (2), 2–11.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (Eds.). (1993). Inside/outside: Teacher research and knowledge. New York: Teachers College Press. Colquhoun, Y. (2006). Cases: A teacher's perspective. In J. Loughran & A. Berry (Eds.), Looking into practice: Cases of science teaching and learning (2nd ed., Vol. 1, pp. 11–14). Melbourne: Monash University and the Catholic Education Office Melbourne.

Daehler, K. R., Folsom, J., & Shinohara, M. (2011). Making sense of science: Energy for teachers for Grades 6–8. San Francisco: WestEd/NSTA press.

Dana, T. M., McLoughlin, A. S., & Freeman, T. B. (1988). Creating dissonance in prospective teachers' conceptions of teaching and learning science. Paper presented at the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, San Diego, CA.

Davis, E. A., & Smithey, J. (2009). Beginning teachers moving toward effective elementary science teaching. Science Education, 93 (4), 745–770.

De Jong, O., Van Driel, J. H., & Verloop, N. (2005). Preservice teachers' pedagogical content knowledge of using particle models in teaching chemistry. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42 (8), 947–964.

Dias, M., Eick, C., & Brantley-Dias, L. (2011). Practicing what we teach: A self-study in implementing an inquiry-based curriculum in a middle grades classroom. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 22 (1), 53–78.

Dietz, C., & Davis, E. (2009). Preservice elementary teachers' reflection on narrative images of inquiry. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20 (3), 219–243.

Dresner, M. (2002). Monitoring forest biodiversity with teachers in the woods. Journal of Environmental Education, 34 (1), 4-8.

Dresner, M., & Starvel, E. (2004). Mutual benefits of scientist/teacher partnerships. Academic Exchange Quarterly, 8, 252–256.

Dresner, M., & Worley, E. (2006). Teacher research experiences, partnerships with scientists, and teacher networks sustaining factors from professional development. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 17 (1), 1–14.

Driver, R., Guesne, E., & Tiberghien, A. (Eds.). (1985). Children's ideas in science. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press. Duncan, R., Pilitsis, V., & Piegaro, M. (2010). Development of preser-vice teachers' ability to critique and adapt inquiry-based instructional materials. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21 (1), 81–102.

Eick, C., & Dias, M. (2005). Building the authority of experience in communities of practice: The development of preservice teachers' practical knowledge through coteaching in inquiry classrooms. Science Education, 89 (3), 470–491.

Eick, C. J., Ware, F. N., & Jones, M. T. (2004). Coteaching in a secondary science methods course: Learning through a coteaching model that supports early teacher practice. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 15 (3), 197–209.

Faikhamta, C., & Clarke, A. (2012). A self-study of a Thai teacher educator developing a better understanding of PCK for teaching about teaching science. Research in Science Education, 42, 1–25.

Falk, A. (2012). Teachers learning from professional development in elementary science: Reciprocal relations between formative assessment and pedagogical content knowledge. Science Education, 96 (2), 265–290.

Fazio, X., Melville, W., & Bartley, A. (2010). The problematic nature of the practicum: A key determinant of pre-service teachers' emerging inquiry-based science practices. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21 (6), 665–681.

Featherstone, D., Munby, H., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (1997). Finding a voice while learning to teach. London: Falmer Press.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1994). The knower and the known: The nature of knowledge in research on teaching. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Review of research in education (Vol. 20, pp. 3–56). Washington DC: American Educational Research Association.

Finegold, P. (2010). Professional reflections: International perspectives on science teachers' continuing professional development. York, UK: National Science Learning Centre.

Fitzpatrick, B. (1996). The application of constructivist learning strategies to the redesign of the lower secondary science curriculum. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 21st Annual Conference of the Western Australian Science Education Association, Perth, Western Australia.

Fleer, M., & Grace, T. (2003). Building a community of science learners through legitimate collegial participation. In J. Wallace & J. Loughran (Eds.), Leadership and professional development in science education: New possibilities for enhancing teacher learning (pp. 116–133). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Forbes, C. T. (2011). Preservice elementary teachers' adaptation of science curriculum materials for inquiry-based elementary science. Science Education, 95 (5), 927–955.

Garbett, D. (2011). Developing pedagogical practices to enhance confidence and competence in science teacher education. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 22 (8), 729–743.

Garbett, D. (2012). The transformation from expert science teacher to science teacher educator. In S. M. Bullock & T. Russell (Eds.), Selfstudies of science teacher education practices (Vol. 12, pp. 31–44). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Geddis, A. N. (1996). Science teaching and reflection: Incorporating new subject-matter into teachers' classroom frames. International Journal of Science Education, 18 (2), 249–265.

Geelan, D. R. (1996). Learning to communicate: Developing as a science teacher. Australian Science Teachers Journal, 42 (1), 30–43. Gomez-Zwiep, S. (2008). Elementary teachers' understanding of students' science misconceptions: Implications for practice and teacher education. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 19 (5), 437–454.

Grimmett, P. P., & Erickson, G. (1988). Reflection in teacher education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Grossman, P., & McDonald, M. (2008). Back to the future: Directions for research in teaching and teacher education. American Educational Research Journal, 45 (1), 184–205.

Gunckel, K. (2011). Mediators of a preservice teacher's use of the inquiry-application instructional model. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 22 (1), 79–100.

Gunning, A., & Mensah, F. (2011). Preservice elementary teachers' development of self-efficacy and confidence to teach science: A case study. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 22 (2), 171–185.

Hamilton, M. L., Pinnegar, S., Russell, T., Loughran, J., & LaBoskey, V. (Eds.). (1998). Reconceptualizing teaching practice: Self-study in teacher education. London: Falmer Press.

Hashweh, M. Z. (1996). Effects of science teachers' epistemological beliefs in teaching. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 33 (1), 47–63.

Hewson, P. W., Beeth, M. E., & Thorley, R. (1998). Teaching for conceptual change. In B. Fraser & K. Tobin (Eds.), International handbook of science education (pp. 198–218). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Hoban, G. (2003). Changing the balance of a science teacher's belief system. In J. Wallace & J. Loughran (Eds.), Leadership and professional development in science education: New possibilities for enhancing teacher learning (pp. 19–33). London: RoutlegeFalmer. Hoban, G. F. (1997). Learning about learning in the context of a science methods course. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), Teaching about teaching: Purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education (pp. 133–149). London: Falmer Press.

Howitt, C. (2007). Pre-service elementary teachers' perceptions of factors in an holistic methods course influencing their confidence in teaching science. Research in Science Education, 37 (1), 41–58.

Ireland, J., Watters, J., Brownlee, J., & Lupton, M. (2012). Elementary teachers' conceptions of inquiry teaching: Messages for teacher development. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23 (2), 159–175.

Isabelle, A. , & de Groot, C. (2008). Alternate conceptions of preservice elementary teachers: The Itakura method. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 19 (5), 417–435.

Johanna, J., Lavonen, J., Koponen, I., & Kurki-Suonio, K. (2002). Experiences from long-term in-service training for physics teachers in Finland. Physics Education, 37 (2), 128–134.

Johnston, A., & Settlage, J. (2008). Framing the professional development of members of the science teacher education community. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 19 (6), 513–521.

Kang, N.-H. (2007). Elementary teachers' teaching for conceptual understanding: Learning from action research. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18 (4), 469–495.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2003). Teachers as researchers: Qualitative inquiry as a path to empowerment. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Klopfer, L. E. (1991). A summary of research in science education- 1989. Science Education, 75, 255-402.

Koballa, T., Glynn, S., & Upson, L. (2005). Conceptions of teaching science held by novice teachers in an alternative certification program. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 16 (4), 287–308.

Koballa, T., Upson Bradbury, L., Glynn, S., & Deaton, C. (2008). Conceptions of science teacher mentoring and mentoring practice in an alternative certification program. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 19 (4), 391–411.

Koch, J., & Appleton, K. (2007). The effect of a mentoring model for elementary science professional development. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18 (2), 209–231.

Korthagen, F. A. J. (1992). Techniques for stimulating reflection in teacher education seminars. Teaching and Teacher Education, 8 (3), 265–274.

Korthagen, F. A. J., Kessels, J., Koster, B., Langerwarf, B., & Wubbels, T. (Eds.). (2001). Linking theory and practice: The pedagogy of realistic teacher education. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Larkin, D. (2012). Misconceptions about "misconceptions": Preservice secondary science teachers' views on the value and role of student ideas. Science Education, 96 (5), 927–959.

Lederman, N. G., Gess-Newsome, J., & Latz, M. S. (1994). The nature and development of preservice science teachers' conceptions of subject matter and pedagogy. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 31 (2), 129–146.

Lee, E. , Brown, M. N. , Luft, J. A. , & Roehrig, G. H. (2007). Assessing beginning secondary science teachers' PCK: Pilot year results. School Science and Mathematics, 107 (2), 52–60.

Lindsay, S. (2006). Cases: Opening the classroom door. In J. Loughran & A. Berry (Eds.), Looking into practice: Cases of science teaching and learning (pp. 3–6). Melbourne: Catholic Education Office (Melbourne) and Monash University.

Lindsay, S. (2011). Scientific literacy: A symbol of change. In J. Loughran , K. Smith , & A. Berry (Eds.), Scientific literacy under the microscope: A whole school approach to science teaching and learning (pp. 3–15). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers. Lockard, D. L. (1993). Secondary science teachers' knowledge base when teaching science courses in and out of their area of certification. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 30, 723–736.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Loughran, J. (1994). Bridging the gap: An analysis of the needs of second-year science teachers. Science Education, 78 (4), 365–386. Loughran, J. J. (2002). Effective reflective practice: In search of meaning in learning about teaching . Journal of Teacher Education, 53 (1), 33–43.

Loughran, J. J., & Northfield, J. R. (1996). Opening the classroom door: Teacher, researcher, learner. London: Falmer Press. Loughran, J. J., Smith, K., & Berry, A. (2011). Scientific literacy under the microscope: A whole school approach to science teaching and learning. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Luft, J. A., Firestone, J. B., Wong, S. S., Ortega, I., Adams, K., & Bang, E. (2011). Beginning secondary science teacher induction: A two-year mixed methods study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (10), 1199–1224.

Lustick, D. (2009). The failure of inquiry: Preparing science teachers with an authentic investigation. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20 (6), 583–604.

Lustick, D. (2010). The priority of the question: Focus questions for sustained reasoning in science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21 (5), 495–511.

Maor, D. (1999). Teachers-as-learners: The role of multimedia professional development program in changing classroom practice. Australian Science Teachers Journal, 45 (3), 45–50.

McGoey, J., & Ross, J. (1999). Research, practice, and teacher internship. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36 (2), 121–139. McMaster, J. (1997). Theory into practice. In J. R. Baird & I. J. Mitchell (Eds.), Improving the quality of teaching and learning: An Australian case study—the PEEL project (3rd ed., pp. 135–143). Melbourne: Monash University.

Milner, A., Sondergeld, T., Demir, A., Johnson, C., & Czerniak, C. (2012). Elementary teachers' beliefs about teaching science and classroom practice: An examination of pre/post NCLB testing in science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23 (2), 111–132. Mitchell, I. J. (1999). Bridging the gulf between research and practice. In J. J. Loughran (Ed.), Researching teaching: Methodologies and practices in understanding pedagogy (pp. 44–64). London: Falmer Press.

Mitchell, I. J. (2002). Learning from teacher research for teacher research. In J. J. Loughran, I. Mitchell, & J. Mitchell (Eds.), Learning from teacher research (pp. 249–266). New York: Teachers College Press.

Mueller, A. (2003). Looking back and looking forward: Always becoming a teacher educator through self-study. Reflective Practice, 4 (1), 67–84.

Mulholland, J., & Wallace, J. (2005). Growing the tree of teacher knowledge: Ten years of learning to teach elementary science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42 (7), 767–790.

Munby, H., Cunningham, M., & Lock, C. (2000). School science culture: A case study of barriers to developing professional knowledge. Science Education, 84 (2), 193–211.

Munby, H., & Russell, T. (1994). The authority of experience in learning to teach: Messages from a physics methods class. Journal of Teacher Education, 45 (2), 86–95.

Munby, H., Russell, T., & Martin, A. K. (2001). Teachers' knowledge and how it develops. In V. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (4th ed., pp. 877–904). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Nicol, C. (1997). Learning to teach prospective teachers to teach mathematics: Struggles of a beginning teacher educator. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), Teaching about teaching: Purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education (pp. 95–116). London: Falmer Press. Nilsson, P., & Loughran, J. J. (2012). Understanding and assessing primary science student teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23 (7), 699–721.

Northfield, J. R., & Gunstone, R. F. (1997). Teacher education as a process of developing teacher knowledge. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), Teaching about teaching: Purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education (pp. 48–56). London: Falmer Press.

Olmstead, M. (2007). Enacting a pedagogy of practicum supervision: One student teacher's experiences of powerful differences. In T. Russell & J. J. Loughran (Eds.), Enacting a pedagogy of teacher education: Values, relationships and practices. (pp. 138–148). London: Routledge.

Osborne, R. J., & Freyburg, P. (Eds.). (1985). Learning in science: The implications of children's science. Auckland: Heinemann. Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. Review of Educational Research, 62 (3), 307–332.

Pereira, P. (2000). Reconstructing oneself as a learner of mathematics. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), Exploring myths and legends of teacher education. Proceedings of the third international conference of the self-study of teacher education practices. Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, England (pp. 204–207). Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University.

Polanyi, M. (1966). The tacit dimension. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Posnanski, T. (2010). Developing understanding of the nature of science within a professional development program for inservice elementary teachers: Project nature of elementary science teaching. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21 (5), 589–621.

Posner, G. J., Strike, K. A., Hewson, P. W., & Gertzog, W. A. (1982). Accommodation of a scientific conception: Toward a theory of conceptual change. Science Education, 66 (2), 211–227.

Pringle, R. (2006). Preservice teachers' exploration of children's alternative conceptions: Cornerstone for planning to teach science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 17 (3), 291–307.

Putnam, R. T., & Borko, H. (1997). What do new views of knowledge and thinking have to say about research on teacher learning? Educational Researcher, 29 (1), 4–15.

Radford, D. L. (1998). Transferring theory into practice: A model for professional development for science education reform. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35 (1), 73–88.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 102–119). New York: Macmillan.

Richardson, V. (1997). Constructivist teaching and teacher education: Theory and practice. In V. Richardson (Ed.), Constructivist teacher education: Building a world of new understandings (pp. 3–14). London: Falmer Press.

Ritter, J. (2009). Developing a vision of teacher education: How my classroom teacher understandings evolved in the university environment. Studying Teacher Education, 5 (1), 45–60.

Roth, K. (2007). Science teachers as researchers. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 1203–1260). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Roychoudhury, A., & Rice, D. (2010). Discourse of making sense of data: Implications for elementary teachers' science education. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21 (2), 181–203.

Russell, T. (1995). Returning to the physics classroom to re-think how one learns to teach physics. In T. Russell & F. A. J. Korthagen (Eds.), Teachers who teach teachers: Reflections on teacher education (pp. 95–109). London: Falmer Press.

Russell, T. (1997). Teaching teachers: How I teach IS the message. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), Teaching about teaching: Purpose, passion and pedagogy in teacher education (pp. 32–47). London: Falmer Press.

Russell, T. (2000). Moving beyond 'default' teaching styles and programme structures: The rise, fall, and marginal persistence of reflective practice in pre-service teacher education in the period 1984–2000. Paper presented at the Making a difference through reflective practices: Values and actions. The first Carfax International Conference on Reflective Practice, University College Worcester, July 13–16, 2000. Russell, T., & Bullock, S. (1999). Discovering our professional knowledge as teachers: Critical dialogues about learning from experience. In J. Loughran (Ed.), Researching teaching: Methodologies and practices for understanding pedagogy (pp. 132–151). London: Falmer Press

Sarason, S. (1990). The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it is too late? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schibeci, R. A., & Hickey, R. (2000). Is it natural or processed? Elementary school teachers and conceptions about materials. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37 (10), 1154–1170.

Schneider, R. (2007). Science teacher educators as a community of practice. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18 (5), 693–697. Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York: Basic Books.

Schön, D. A. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schuck, S., & Segal, G. (2002). Learning about our teaching from our graduates, learning about our learning with critical friends. In J. Loughran & T. Russell (Eds.), Improving teacher education practices through self-study (pp. 88–101). London: RoutledgeFalmer. Segal, G. (1999). Collisions in a science education reform context: Anxieties, roles and power. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

Settlage, J., & "Dee" Goldston, M. J. "Dee." (2007). Prognosis for science misconceptions research. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18 (6), 795–800.

Shulman, J. H. (1992). Case methods in teacher education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher, 15 (2), 4–14.

Shymansky, J. A., Woodworth, G., Norman, O., Dunkhase, J., Matthews, C., & Liu, C.-T. (1993). A study of changes in middle school teachers' understanding of selected ideas in science as a function of an in-service program focusing on student preconceptions. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 30 (7), 737–755.

Skamp, K. (1991). Primary science and technology: How confident are teachers? Research in Science Education, 21 (1), 290–299. Smith, D., & Jang, S. (2011). Pathways in learning to teach elementary science: Navigating contexts, roles, affordances and constraints. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 22 (8), 745–768.

Smith, K. (1997). Learning to teach: A story of five crises. In D. Featherstone , H. Munby , & T. Russell (Eds.), Finding a voice while learning to teach (pp. 98–108). London: Falmer Press.

Smith, K. (2011). Learning from teacher thinking. In J. Loughran , K. Smith , & A. Berry (Eds.), Scientific literacy under the microscope: A whole school approach to science teaching and learning (pp. 25–36). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Solomon, J., & Tresman, S. (1999). A model for continued professional development: Knowledge, belief and action. Journal of In-Service Education, 25 (2), 307–319.

Stump, S. L. (2010). Reflective tutoring: Insights into preservice teacher learning. School Science and Mathematics, 110 (1), 47–54. Tobin, K. (2003). The challenges of attaining a transformative science education in urban high schools. In J. Wallace & J. Loughran (Eds.), Leadership and professional development in science education: New possibilities for enhancing teacher learning (pp. 33–47). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Trumbull, D. (1999). The new science teacher: Cultivating good practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Upson Bradbury, L., & Koballa, T. (2007). Mentor advice giving in an alternative certification program for secondary science teaching: Opportunities and roadblocks in developing a knowledge base for teaching. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18 (6), 817–840. Uzuntiryaki, E., Boz, Y., & Kirbulut, D. (2010). Do pre-service chemistry teachers reflect their beliefs about constructivism in their teaching practices? Research in Science Education, 40 (3), 403–424.

Vail Lowery, N. (2002). Construction of teacher knowledge in context: Preparing elementary teachers to teach mathematics and science. School Science and Mathematics, 102 (2), 68–83.

Van Driel, J. H., De Jong, O., & Verloop, N. (2002). The development of preservice chemistry teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. Science Education, 86 (4), 572–590.

Veal, W. R. (1999, March). The TTF model to explain PCK in teacher development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Boston, MA. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 443690)

Vikström, A. (2008). What is intended, what is realized, and what is learned? Teaching and learning biology in the primary school classroom. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 19 (3), 211–233.

Wagler, R. (2010). Using science teaching case narratives to evaluate the level of acceptance of scientific inquiry teaching in preservice elementary teachers. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21 (2), 215–226.

Wallace, J. (2003). Learning about teacher learning: Reflections of a science educator. In J. Wallace & J. Loughran (Eds.), Leadership and professional development in science education (pp. 1–16). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Wallace, J., & Louden, W. (Eds.). (2002). Dilemmas of science teaching: Perspectives on problems of practice. London: RoutledgeFalmer. Wallace, J., & Loughran, J. (2012). Science teacher learning. In B. J. Fraser, K. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (Vol. 24, pp. 295–306). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the U.S. and abroad. Dallas, TX: National Staff Development Council.

Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

White, G., Russell, T., & Gunstone, R. F. (2002). Curriculum change. In J. Wallace & W. Louden (Eds.), Dilemmas of science teaching: Perspectives on problems of practice (pp. 231–244). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Whitehead, J. (1993). The growth of educational knowledge: Creating your own living educational theories. Bournemouth: Hyde Publications.

Wieringa, N. (2011). Teachers' educational design as a process of reflection-in-action: The lessons we can learn from Donald Schön's *The Reflective Practitioner* when studying the professional practice of teachers as educational designers. Curriculum Inquiry, 41 (1), 167–174.

Zeichner, K. M., & Gore, J. M. (1990). Teacher socialization. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 329–348). New York: Macmillan.

Science Teacher Attitudes and Beliefs

Adams, W. K., Perkins, K. K., Podolefsky, N. S., Dubson, M., Finkelstein, N. D., & Wieman, C. E. (2006). New instrument for measuring student beliefs about physics and learning physics: The Colorado Learning Attitudes about Science Survey. Physical Review Special Topics-Physics Education Research, 2 (1). doi:10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.2.010101

Akyol, G., Tekkaya, C., Sungur, S., & Traynor, A. (2012). Modeling the interrelationships among preservice science teachers' understanding and acceptance of evolution, their views on nature of science and self-efficacy beliefs regarding teaching evolution. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23 (8), 937–957.

Alexander, P. A., & Dochy, F. J. R. C. (1995). Conceptions of knowledge and beliefs: A comparison across varying cultural and educational communities. American Educational Research Journal, 32 (2), 413–442.

Allum, N., Sturgis, P., Tabourazi, D., & Brunton-Smith, I. (2008). Science knowledge and attitudes across cultures: A meta-analysis. Public Understanding of Science, 17, 35–54.

Amato, S.A. (2004). Improving student teachers' mathematical knowledge. *Proceedings of the* 10th International Congress on Mathematical Education. Copenhagen, Denmark.

Amirshokoohi, A. (2010). Elementary preservice teachers' environmental literacy and views toward science, technology, and society (STS) issues. Science Educator, 19 (1), 56–63.

Angle, J., & Moseley, C. (2010). Science teacher efficacy and outcome expectancy as predictors of students' end-of-instruction (EOI) biology I test scores. School Science and Mathematics, 109 (8), 473–483.

Apostolou, A., & Koulaidis, V. (2010). Epistemology and science education: A study of epistemological views of teachers. Research in Science & Technological Education, 28 (2), 149–166.

Appleton, K. (1995). Student teachers' confidence to teach science: Is more science knowledge necessary to improve self-confidence? International Journal of Science Education, 17, 357–369.

Ashton, P. T., & Webb, R. B. (1986). Making a difference: Teachers' sense of efficacy and student achievement. New York: Longman. Atwater, M. M., Gardner, C., & Kight, C. R. (1991). Beliefs and attitudes of urban primary teachers toward physical science and teaching physical science. Journal of Elementary Science Education, 3, 3–12.

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. American Psychologist, 37 (2), 122–147.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: W. H. Freeman.

Barbour, I. A. (2000). When science meets religion: Enemies, strangers or partners? San Francisco: HarperCollins.

Barmby, P., Kind, P. M., & Jones, K. (2008). Examining changing attitudes in secondary school science. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (8), 1075–1093.

Begum, S. (2012). A secondary science teacher's beliefs about environmental education and its relationship with the classroom practices. International Journal of Social Sciences and Education, 2 (1), 10–29.

Bell, P., & Linn, M. C. (2002). Beliefs about science: How does science instruction contribute? In B. K. Hofer & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), Personal epistemology: The psychology of beliefs about knowledge and knowing (pp. 321–346). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Berkman, M. B., & Plutzer, E. (2011). Defeating creationism in the courtroom, but not in the classroom. Science, 331 (6016), 404–405. Berland, L. K., & Hammer, D. (2012). Framing for scientific argumentation. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49 (1), 68–94.

Berman, P., McLaughlin, M., Bass, G., Pauly, E. & Zellman, G. (1977). Federal programs supporting educational change. Vol VII: Factors affecting implementation and continuation (Report No. R-1589/7-HEW). Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation (Eric Document No. ED140-432).

Blalock, C., Lichtenstein, M., Owen, S., Pruski, L., Marshall, C., & Toepperwein, M. (2008). In pursuit of validity: A comprehensive review of science attitude instruments 1935–2005. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (7), 961–977.

Blancke, S., De Smedt, J., De Cruz, H., Boudry, M., & Braeckman, J. (2012). The implications of the cognitive sciences for the relation between religion and science education: The case of evolutionary theory. Science & Education, 21 (8), 1167–1184.

Bleicher, R. E. (2007). Nurturing confidence in preservice elementary science teachers. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18, 841–860.

Blonder, R., Benny, N., & Jones, M. G. (in press). Teaching self-efficacy of science teachers. In C. Czerniak, R. H. Evans, & J. Luft (Eds.), The role of science teachers' beliefs in international classrooms: From teacher actions to student learning.

Boldrin, A., & Mason, L. (2009). Distinguishing between knowledge and beliefs: Students' epistemic criteria for differentiating. Instructional Science: An International Journal of the Learning Sciences, 37 (2), 107–127.

Bong, M. (2006). Asking the right question. How confident are you that you could successfully perform these tasks? In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents (pp. 287–305). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Boone, H. N., Gartin, S. A., Boone, D. A., & Hughes, J. E. (2006). Modernizing the agricultural education curriculum: An analysis of agricultural education teachers' attitudes, knowledge, and understanding of biotechnology. Journal of Agricultural Education, 47 (1), 78–89. Bottcher, F., & Meisert, A. (2011). Argumentation in science education: A model based framework. Science & Education, 20 (2), 103–140. Breslyn, W., & McGinnis, J. R. (2011). A comparison of exemplary biology, chemistry, earth science, and physics teachers' conceptions and enactment of inquiry. Science Education, 96 (1), 48–77.

Brown, P. L., Abell, S. K., Demir, A., & Schmidt, F. J. (2006). College science teachers' views of classroom inquiry. Science Education, 90, 784–802.

Bursal, M., & Paznokas, L. (2006). Mathematics anxiety and preservice elementary teachers' confidence to teach mathematics and science. School Science and Mathematics, 106, 173–180.

Carleton, L. E., Fitch, J. C., & Krockover, G. H. (2008). An inservice teacher education program's effect on teacher efficacy and attitudes. The Educational Forum, 72, 46–62.

Chandler, M. J. , Hallett, D. , & Sokol, B. W. (2002). Competing claims about competing knowledge claims. In B. K. Hofer & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), Personal epistemology: The psychology of beliefs about knowledge and knowing (pp. 145–168). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Choi, S., & Ramsey, J. (2009). Constructing elementary teachers' beliefs, attitudes, and practical knowledge through an inquiry-based elementary science course. School Science and Mathematics, 109 (6), 313–324.

Colburn, A., & Henriques, L. (2006). Clergy views on evolution, creationism, science, and religion. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43 (4), 419–442.

Conley, A. M., Pintrich, P. R., Vekiri, I., & Harrison, D. (2004). Changes in epistemological beliefs in elementary science students. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 29, 186–204.

Cordero, E. C. , Todd, A. M. , & Abellera, D. (2008). Climate change education and the ecological footprint. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 89 (6), 865–872.

Cotton, D. R. E. (2006). Implementing curriculum guidance on environmental education: The importance of teachers' beliefs. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 38 (1), 67–83.

Coulson, R. (1992). Development of an instrument for measuring attitudes of early childhood educators towards science. Research in Science Education, 22, 101–105.

Crawford, B. (2007). Learning to reach science as inquiry in the rough and tumble of practice. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44 (4), 613–642.

Crippen, K. J. (2012). Argument as professional development: Impacting teacher knowledge and beliefs about science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23 (8), 847–866.

Cross, D., & Hong, J. (2012). An examination of teachers' emotions in the school context. Teaching and Teacher Education, 28, 957–967. Dagher, Z. R., & BouJaoude, S. (1997). Scientific views and religious beliefs of college students: The case of biological evolution. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 34 (5), 429–445.

DeBellis, V. A., & Goldin, G. A. (2006). Affect and meta-affect in mathematical problem solving: A representational perspective. Educational Studies in Mathematics, 63, 131–147.

Deniz, H. (2011). Examination of changes in prospective elementary teachers' epistemological beliefs in science and exploration of factors meditating that change. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 20 (6), 750–760.

Deniz, H., Donnelly, L., & Yilmaz, I. (2008). Exploring the factors related to acceptance of evolutionary theory among Turkish pre-service biology teachers: Toward a more informative conceptual ecology for biological evolution. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (4), 420–443.

Dewey, J. (1922). Human nature and conduct. New York: Henry Holt.

Eagly, A., & Chaiken, S. (1993). The psychology of attitudes. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Group/Thomson Learning.

Eagly, A. H. (1992). Uneven progress: Social psychology and the study of attitudes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63, 693–710.

Eberle, F. (2008). Teaching and coherent science: An investigation of teachers' beliefs about and practice of teaching science coherently. School Science and Mathematics, 108 (3), 103–112.

Eick, C. J., & Reed, C. J. (2002), What makes an inquiry-oriented science teacher? The influence of learning histories on student teacher role identity and practice. Science Education, 86, 401–416.

Elby, A., & Hammer, D. (2010). Epistemological resources and framing: A cognitive framework for helping teachers interpret and respond to their students' epistemologies. In L. D. Bendixen & F. C. Feucht (Eds.), Personal epistemology in the classroom: Theory, research, and implications for practice (pp. 409–433). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Elder, A. D. (2002). Characterizing fifth grade students' epistemological beliefs in science. In B. K. Hofer & P. R. Pintrich (Eds.), Personal epistemology: The psychology of beliefs about knowledge and knowing (pp. 347–363). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Elstad, E., & Turmo, A. (2010). Students' self-regulation and teachers' influences in science: Interplay between ethnicity and gender. Research in Science & Technological Education, 28 (3), 249–260. doi: 10.1080/02635143.2010.501751

Enochs, L. G., & Riggs, I. M. (1990). Further development of an elementary science teaching efficacy belief instrument: A preservice elementary scale. School Science and Mathematics, 90, 694–706.

Ernest, P. (1989). The knowledge, beliefs and attitudes of the mathematics teacher: A model. Journal of Education for Teaching, 15, 13–34.

Ertmer, P. A., Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T., Sadik, O., Sendurer, E., & Sendurer, P. (2012). Teacher beliefs and technology integration practices: A critical relationship. Computers & Education, 59, 423–435.

Evans, B. (2011). Content knowledge, attitudes, and self-efficacy in the mathematics New York City Teaching Fellows (NYCTF) Program. School Science and Mathematics, 111 (5), 225–235.

Evans, G., & Durant, J. (1995). The relationship between knowledge and attitudes in the public understanding of science in Britain. Public Understanding of Science, 4, 57–74.

Fang, Z. (1996). A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices. Educational Research, 38 (1), 47-65.

Fishbein, M. (1967). A consideration of beliefs and their role in attitude measurement. In M. Fishbein (Ed.), Readings in attitude theory and measurement. (pp. 257–266). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Fletcher, S., & Luft, J. (2011). Early career secondary science teachers: A longitudinal study of beliefs in relation to field experiences. Science Education, 95 (6), 1124–1146.

Fonseca, M., Costa, P., Lencastre, L., & Tavares, F. (2012). Disclosing biology teachers' beliefs about biotechnology and biotechnology education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 28, 368–381.

Forbes, C. T., & Davis, E. A. (2010). Beginning elementary teachers' beliefs about the use of anchoring questions in science: A longitudinal study. Science Education, 94 (2), 365–387.

Friedrichsen, P., Van Driel, J. H., & Abell, S. K. (2011). Taking a closer look at science teaching orientations. Science Education, 95 (2), 358–376.

Gardner, G. E., & Jones, M. G. (2011). Science instructors' perceptions of the risks of biotechnology: Implications for science instruction. Research in Science Education, 41 (5), 711–738.

Gardner, G. E., & Jones, M. G. (accepted March 28, 2013). Exploring pre-service teachers' perceptions of the risks of emergent technologies: Implications for teaching and learning. Journal of Nano Education.

Gibbs, S., & Powell, B. (2012). Teacher efficacy and pupil behaviour: The structure of teachers' individual and collective beliefs and their relationship with numbers of pupils excluded from school. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 82 (4), 564–584.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 569–582. Goddard, R. D., Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2004). Collective efficacy beliefs: Theoretical developments, empirical evidence, and future directions. Educational Researcher, 33, 3–13.

Gregoire, M. (2003). Is it a challenge or a threat? A dual-process model of teachers' cognition and appraisal processes during conceptual change. Educational Psychology Review, 15 (2), 147–179.

Guskey, T. (1988). Teacher efficacy, self-concept, and attitudes toward the implementation of instructional innovation. Teaching and Teacher Education, 4 (1), 63–69.

Harlen, W. (1997). Primary teachers' understanding in science and its impact in the classroom. Research in Science Education, 27 (3), 323–337.

Hartshorne, R. (2008). Effects of hypermedia-infused professional development on attitudes toward teaching science. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 38, 333–351.

Harty, H., Samuel, J. V., & Anderson, H. O. (1991). Understanding the nature of science and attitudes towards science and science teaching of preservice elementary teachers in three preparation sequences. Journal of Elementary Science Education, 3, 13–22. Harwood, W., Reiff, R., & Phillipson, T. (2002, January). Scientists' conceptions of scientific inquiry: Voices from the front. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Education of Teachers in Science, Charlotte, NC.

Haury, D. (1989). The contribution of science locus of control orientation to expressions of attitude toward science teaching. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 26, 503–517.

Hofer, B. K. (2001). Personal epistemology research: Implications for learning and instruction. Educational Psychology Review, 13 (4): 353–382.

Hofer, B. K., & Pintrich, P. R. (1997). The development of epistemological theories: Beliefs about knowledge and knowing and their relation to learning. Review of Educational Research, 67 (1), 88–140.

Holt, C. , Hargrove, P. , & Harris, S. (2011). An investigation into the life experiences and beliefs of teachers exhibiting highly effective classroom management behaviors. Teacher Education and Practice, 24 (1), 96–113.

Hutchins, K., & Friedrichsen, P. (2012). Science faculty belief systems in a professional development program: Inquiry in college laboratories. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23 (8), 867–887.

Jaccard, J., Litardo, H., & Wan, C. K. (1999). Subjective culture: Social psychological models of behavior. In J. Adamopolis & Y. Kashima (Eds.), Social psychology and cultural context. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jarrett, O. S. (1999). Science interest and confidence among preservice elementary teachers. Journal of Elementary Science Education, 11 (1), 49–59.

Jarvis, T. & Pell, A. (2004). Primary teachers' changing attitudes and cognition during a two-year science in-service programme and their effect on pupils. International Journal of Science Education 26 (14), 1787–1811.

Jones, M. G., & Carter, G. (2007). Science teacher attitudes and beliefs. Handbook of research on science education, 1067–1104. Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implication of research on teacher belief. Educational Psychologist, 27, 65–90.

Kane, R. G., Sandretto, S., & Heath, C. (2002). Telling half the story: A critical review of the research into tertiary teachers' beliefs. Review of Educational Research, 72 (2), 177–228.

Katz, S. H. (2002). Questions for a millennium: Religion and science from the perspective of a scientist. Zygon, 37 (1), 45–54. Kaya, O. N., Yager, R., Dogan, A. (2009). Changes in attitudes towards science–technology–society of preservice science teachers. Research in Science Education, 39 (2), 257–279.

Kidman, G. (2009). Attitudes and interests towards biotechnology: The mismatch between students and teachers. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology, 5 (2), 135–143.

Kim, S. Y., & Nehm, R. H. (2011). A cross-cultural comparison of Korean and American science teachers' views of evolution and the nature of science. International Journal of Science Education, 33 (2), 197–227.

King, P. M., & Kitchener, K. S. (1994). Developing reflective judgment: Understanding and promoting intellectual growth and critical thinking in adolescents and adults. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Koballa, T. R., Jr. (1986). Teaching hands-on science activities: Variables that moderate attitude-behavior consistency. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 23, 493–502.

Lan, Y. (2012). Development of an attitude scale to assess teachers' attitudes toward nanotechnology. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (8), 1189–1210.

Leavy, A. M., McSorley, F. A., & Boté, L. A. (2007). An examination of what metaphor construction reveals about the evolution of preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning. Teaching and Teacher Education, 23 (7), 1217–1233.

Lederman, N. G. (2007). Nature of science: Past, present, and future. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 831–880). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lester, B. T., Ma, L., Lee, O., & Lambert, J. (2006). Social activism in elementary science education: A science, technology, and society approach to teach global warming. International Journal of Science Education, 28 (4), 315–339.

Liang, L. L., & Gabel, D. L. (2005). Effectiveness of a constructivist approach to science instruction for prospective elementary teachers. International Journal of Science Education, 27, 1143–1162.

Luehmann, A. L. (2007). Identity development as a lens to science teacher preparation. Science Education, 91 (5), 822–839.

Luft, J. A. , & Roehrig, G. H. (2007). Capturing science teachers' epistemological beliefs: The development of the teacher beliefs interview. Electronic Journal of Science Education, 11 (2).

Lumpe, A., Czerniak, C., Haney, J., & Beltyukova, S. (2012). Beliefs about teaching science: The relationship between elementary teachers' participation in professional development and student achievement. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (2), 153–166.

Lumpe, A. T., Haney, J. J., & Czerniak, C. M. (2000). Assessing teachers' beliefs about their science teaching context. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37, 275–292.

Maggioni, L., & Parkinson, M. M. (2008). The role of teacher epistemic cognition, epistemic beliefs, and calibration in instruction. Educational Psychology Review, 20 (4), 445–461.

Maier, M., Greenfield, D., & Bulotsky-Shearer, R. (in press). Development and validation of a preschool teachers' attitudes and beliefs toward teaching science questionnaire. Early Childhood Research Quarterly.

Mansour, N. (2009). Science teachers' beliefs and practices: Issues, implications and research agenda. International Journal of Environmental and Science Education, 4 (1), 25–48.

Mansour, N. (2011), Science teachers' views of science and religion vs. the Islamic perspective: Conflicting or compatible? Science Education, 95 (2), 281–309.

Markic, S. , & Eilks, I. (2012). A comparison of student teachers' beliefs from four different science teaching domains using a mixed methods design. International Journal of Science Education, 34 (4), 589–608.

Martin-Dunlop, C., & Fraser, B. J. (2007). Learning environment and attitudes associated with an innovative science course designed for prospective elementary teachers. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 6, 163–190.

McCulloch, A. (2009). Insights into graphing calculator use: Methods for capturing activity and affect. International Journal for Technology in Mathematics Education, 16 (2), 1–7.

McDevitt, T. M., Heikkinen, H. W., Alcorn, J. K., Ambrosio, A. L., & Gardner, A. L. (1993). Evaluation of the preparation of teachers in science and mathematics: Assessment of preservice teachers' attitudes and beliefs. Science Education, 77, 593–610.

McDonald, C. V. (2010). The influence of explicit nature of science and argumentation instruction on preservice primary teachers' views of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47 (9), 1137–1164.

McGinnis, R., Parker, P., & Graeber, A. (2004). A cultural perspective of the induction of five reform-minded beginning mathematics and science teachers. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41, 720–747.

Mohapatra, A. K., Priyadarshini, D., & Biswas, A. (2010). Genetically modified food: knowledge and attitude of teachers and students. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 19 (5), 489–497.

Moore, R. (1975). A two-year study of a CCSS group's attitudes toward science and science teaching. School Science and Mathematics, 75, 288–290.

Mugaloglu, E., & Bayram, H. (2009). How are prospective science teachers' values and their attitudes towards science associated? Implications for science teacher training programs. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 1, 749–752.

Muis, K. R. (2007). The role of epistemic beliefs in self-regulated learning. Educational Psychologist, 42, 173–190.

Mulholland, J., & Wallace, J. (1996). Breaking the cycle: Preparing elementary teachers to teach science. Journal of Elementary Science Education, 8, 17–38.

Murphy, C. , Neil, P. , & Beggs, J. (2007). Primary science teacher confidence revisited: Ten years on. Educational Research, 49, 415–430.

Murphy, P. K., & Mason, L. (2006). Changing knowledge and changing beliefs. In P. A. Alexander & P. Winne (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology (pp. 305–324). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

National Research Council . (1996). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2000). Inquiry and the national science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. National Research Council . (2012). A framework for K – 12 science education: Practices, cross-cutting concepts and core ideas. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Nehm, R. H., Kim, S. Y., & Sheppard, K. (2009). Academic preparation in biology and advocacy for teaching evolution: Biology versus non-biology teachers. Science Education, 93 (6), 1122–1146.

Nieto, S. (1999). The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities. New York: Teachers College Press.

Nisbett, R., & Ross, L. (1980). Human inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgement. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall. Ogan-Bekiroglu, F., & Eskin, H. (2012). Examination of the relationship between engagement in scientific argumentation and conceptual knowledge. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 10 (6), 1415–1443.

Olafson, L., & Schraw, G. (2006). Teachers' beliefs and practices within and across domains. International Journal of Educational Research, 45 (1–2), 71–84.

Ost, D. (1971). An evaluation of an institute for teachers of secondary-school biology. American Biology Teacher, 33 (9), 546–548. Otero, V. K., & Nathan, M. J. (2008). Preservice elementary teachers' views of their students' prior knowledge of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45 (4), 497–523.

Pajares, F. (1997). Current directions in self-efficacy research. In H. W. Marsh , R. G. Craven , & D. M. McInerney (Eds.), International advances in self research (pp. 1–49). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. Review of Educational Research, 62, 307–332.

Palmer, D. (2011). Sources of efficacy information in an inservice program for elementary teachers. Science Education, 95 (4), 577–600.

Palmer, D. H. (2001). Factors contributing to attitude exchange amongst preservice elementary teachers. Science Education, 86, 122–138. Palmer, D. H. (2004). Situational interest and the attitudes towards science of primary teacher education students. International Journal of Science Education, 26, 895–908.

Papadimitriou, V. (2004). Prospective primary teachers' understanding of climate change, greenhouse effect, and ozone layer depletion. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 13 (2), 299–307.

Pardo, R., & Calvo, F. (2002). Attitudes toward science among the European public: A methodological analysis. Public Understanding of Science, 11, 155–195.

Pedersen, J. E., & McCurdy, D. W. (1992). The effects of hands-on, minds-on teaching experiences on attitudes of preservice elementary teachers. Science Education, 76, 141–146.

Pilitsis, V., & Duncan, R. (2012). Changes in belief orientation of pre-service teachers and their relation to inquiry activities. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23 (8), 909–936.

Prokop, P., Leskova, A., Kubiatko, M., & Diran, C. (2007). Slovakian students' knowledge of and attitudes toward biotechnology. International Journal of Science Education, 29, 895–907.

Ramey-Gassert, L., Shroyer, G., & Staver, J. (1996). A qualitative study of factors influencing science teaching self-efficacy of elementary level teachers. Science Education, 80, 283–315.

Reid, N. (2006). Thoughts on attitude measurement. Research in Science & Technological Education, 24, 3–27.

Rizk, N., Jaber, L., Halwany, S., & BouJaoude, S. (2012). Epistemological beliefs in science: An exploratory study of Lebanese university students' epistemologies. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 10 (3), 473–496.

Rokeach, M. (1968). Beliefs, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rutledge, M. L. , & Mitchell, M. A. (2002). High school biology teachers' knowledge structure, acceptance & teaching of evolution. The American Biology Teacher, 64 (1), 21–28.

Ryan, S. (2004). Message in a model: Teachers' responses to a court-ordered mandate for curriculum reform. Educational Policy, 18, 661–685.

Saad, R., & BouJaoude, S. (2012). The relationship between teachers' knowledge and beliefs about science and inquiry and their classroom practices. EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education, 8 (2), 113–128.

Sandoval, W. A. (2005). Understanding students' practical epistemologies and their influence on learning through inquiry. Science Education, 89 (4), 634–656.

Scharmann, L. C., & Hampton, C. M. (1995). Cooperative learning and preservice elementary teacher science self efficacy. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 6 (3), 125–133.

Schommer, M. (1990). Effects of beliefs about the nature of knowledge on comprehension. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82 (3), 498–504.

Schommer-Aikins, M. (2004). Explaining the epistemological belief system: Introducing the embedded systemic model and coordinated research approach. Educational Psychologist, 39 (1), 19–29.

Schoon, K. J. & Boone, W. (1998). Self-efficacy and alternative conceptions of science preservice elementary teachers. Science Education, 82 (5), 553–568.

Schraw, G., Dunkle, M. E., & Bendixen, L. D. (1995). Cognitive processes in well-defined and ill-defined problem solving. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 9, 523–538.

Schultz, P. A., Hong, J. Y., Cross, D. I., & Osbon, J. N. (2006). Reflections on investigating emotion in educational activity settings. Educational Psychology Review, 18 (4), 343–360.

Schwartz, B., & Glassner, A. (2003). The blind and the paralytic: Supporting argumentation in every day and scientific issues. In J. Andriessen, M. Baker, & D. Suthers (Eds.), Arguing to learn: Confronting cognitions in computer-supported collaborative learning environments (pp. 227–260). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Schwartz, R., & Lederman, N. G. (2008). What scientists say: Scientists' views of nature of science and relation to science context. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (6), 727–771.

Schwirian, P. M. (1969). Characteristics of elementary teachers related to attitudes toward science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 6, 203–213.

Settlage, J., Southerland, S. A., Smith, L. K., & Ceglie, R. (2009). Constructing a doubt-free teaching self: Self-efficacy, teacher identity, and science instruction within diverse settings. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46 (1), 102–125.

Shrigley, R. L. (1974). The correlation of science attitude and science knowledge of preservice elementary teachers. Science Education, 58 (2), 143–151.

Simpson, R. D., Koballa, T. R., Oliver, J. S., & Crawley, F. (1994). Research on the affective dimension of science learning. In D. Gable (Ed.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 211–234). New York: Macmillan.

Skaalvik, E. M. , & Skaalvik, S. (2007). Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy, and teacher burnout. Journal of Educational Psychology, 99 (3), 611.

Skamp, K. (1991). Primary science and technology: How confident are teachers? Research in Science Education, 21, 290-299.

Smith, M. U., & Siegel, H. (2004). Knowing, believing, and understanding: The goals of science education? Science and Education, 13, 553–582.

Solomon, J., Scott, L., & Duveen, J. (1996). Large-scale exploration of pupils' understanding of the nature of science. Science Education, 80 (5), 493–508.

Songer, N. B., & Linn, M. C. (1991). How do students' views of science influence knowledge integration? Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 28, 761–784.

Southerland, S., Sinatra, G., & Mathews, M. (2001). Beliefs, knowledge, and science education. Educational Psychology Review, 13 (4), 325-351.

Southerland, S. A., Gess-Newsome, J., & Johnston, A. (2003). Portraying science in the classroom: The manifestation of scientists' beliefs in classroom practice. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 40, 669–691.

Stipek, D. , & Byler, P. (1997). Early childhood education teachers: Do they practice what they preach? Childhood Research Quarterly, 12, 305–325.

Stolberg, T. (2007). The religio-scientific frameworks of preservice primary teachers: An analysis of their influence on their teaching of science. International Journal of Science Education, 29 (7), 909–930.

Stolberg, T. L. (2008). Understanding the approaches to the teaching of religious education of preservice primary teachers: The influence of religio-scientific frameworks. Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies, 24 (1), 190–203.

Strike, K. A., & Posner, G. J. (1982). Conceptual change and science teaching. European Journal of Science Education, 4 (3), 231–240. Sutherland, L., Howard, S., & Markauskaite, L. (2010). Professional identity creation: Examining the development of beginning preservice teachers' understanding of their work as teachers. Teaching and Teacher Education, 26 (3), 455–465.

Thomas, J. A., Pedersen, J. E., & Finson, K. (2001). Validating the Draw-a-Science-Teacher-Test Checklist (DASTT-C): Exploring mental models and teacher beliefs. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 12 (4), 295–310.

Tippett, C. (2009). Argumentation: The language of science. Journal of Elementary Science Education, 21 (1), 17–25.

Tschannen-Moran, M. & Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. Teaching and Teacher Education, 17, 783–805.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk-Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. Review of Educational Research, 68, 202–248.

van Aalderen-Smeets, S. I., Walma van der Molen, J. H., & Asma, L. J. (2011). Primary teachers' attitudes toward science: A new theoretical framework. Science Education, 96 (1), 158–182.

Varma, T., Volkmann, M., & Hanuscin, D. (2009). Preservice elementary teachers' perceptions of their understanding of inquiry and inquiry-based science pedagogy: Influence of an elementary science education methods course and a science field experience. Journal of

Elementary Science Education, 21 (4), 1–22.

Vedder, P., Horenczyk, G., Liebkind, K. & Nickmans, G. (2006). Problems in ethno-cultural diverse educational settings and strategies to cope with these challenges. Educational Research Review, 1 (2): 157–168.

Volkmann, M. J., Abell, S. K., & Zgagacz, M. (2005). Teaching physics to preservice teachers: The challenges of inquiry. Science Education, 89, 847–869.

Wenner, G. J. (1993). Relationship between science knowledge levels and beliefs toward science instruction held by preservice elementary teachers. Journal of Science Education and Technology, 2, 461–468.

Young, T. (1998). Student teachers' attitudes towards science (STATS). Evaluation and Research in Education, 12, 96–111.

Research on Science Teacher Knowledge

Abell, S. (2008). Twenty years later: Does pedagogical content knowledge remain a useful idea? International Journal of Science Education, 30, 1405–1416.

Abell, S. K. (2007). Research on science teacher knowledge. In S. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 1105–1149). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Akyol, G., Tekkaya, C., Sungur, S., & Traynor, A. (2012). Modeling the interrelationships among pre-service science teachers' understanding and acceptance of evolution, their views on nature of science and self-efficacy beliefs regarding teaching evolution. Journal

of Science Teacher Education, 23, 937–957. doi:10.1007/s10972-012-9296-x Alexander, P. A., Schallert, D. L., & Hare, V. C. (1991). Coming to terms: How researchers in learning and literacy talk about knowledge. Review of Educational Research, 61, 315–343.

Alonzo, A. C., Kobarg, M., & Seidel, T. (2012). Pedagogical content knowledge as reflected in teacher-student interactions: Analysis of two video cases. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 1211–1239.

Anderson, C. W., & Smith, E. L. (1987). Teaching science. In V. Richardson-Koehler (Ed.), Educators' handbook: A research perspective (pp. 84–111). New York: Longman.

Anderson, D., & Clark, M. (2012). Development of syntactic subject matter knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge for science by a generalist elementary teacher. Teachers and Teaching: Theory & Practice, 18, 315–330. doi:10.1080/13540602.2012.629838

Appleton, K. (2008). Developing science pedagogical content knowledge through mentoring elementary teachers. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 19, 523–545.

Asikainen, M. A., & Hirvonen, P. E. (2010). Finnish cooperating physics teachers' conceptions of physics teachers' teacher knowledge. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21, 431–450.

Avraamidou, L., & Zembal-Saul, C. (2005). Giving priority to evidence in science teaching: A first-year elementary teacher's specialized practices and knowledge. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42, 965–986.

Ball, D. , Thames, M. H. , & Phelps, G. (2008). Content knowledge for teaching: What makes it special? Journal of Teacher Education, 59, 389–407. doi:10.1177/0022487108324554

Barnes, M. B., Hodge, E. M., Parker, M., & Koroly, M. J. (2006). The teacher research update experience: Perceptions of practicing science, mathematics, and technology teachers. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 17, 243–263. doi:10.1007/s10972-006-9007-6 Baumert, J., Kunter, M., Blum, W., Brunner, M., Voss, T., Jordan, A., (2010). Teachers' mathematical knowledge, cognitive activation in the classroom, and student progress. American Educational Research Journal, 47, 133–180.

Berry, A., Loughran, J., & van Driel, J. H. (2008). Revisiting the roots of pedagogical content knowledge. International Journal of Science Education, 30, 1271–1280.

Berry, A., & van Driel, J. H. (2012). Teaching about teaching science: Aims, strategies and backgrounds of science teacher educators. Journal of Teacher Education, 64, 117–128.

Beyer, C. J., & Davis, E. A. (2012). Learning to critique and adapt science curriculum materials: Examining the development of pre-service elementary teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. Science Education, 96, 130–157.

Bindernagel, J. A. , & Eilks, I. (2009). Evaluating roadmaps to portray and develop chemistry teachers' PCK about curricular structures concerning sub-microscopic models. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 10, 77–85.

Bleicher, R. E., & Lindgren, J. (2005). Success in science learning and preservice science teaching self-efficacy. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 16, 205–225.

Boz, N., & Boz, Y. (2008). A qualitative case study of prospective chemistry teachers' knowledge about instructional strategies: Introducing particulate theory. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 19, 135–156.

Bozdogan, A. E., Karsli, F., & Sahin, C. (2011). A study on the prospective teachers' knowledge, teaching methods and attitudes towards global warming with respect to different variables. Energy Education Science and Technology. Part B: Social and Educational Studies, 3, 315–330.

Brown, P., Friedrichsen, P., & Abell, S. K. (2013). The development of prospective secondary biology teachers' PCK. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24, 133–155. doi:10.1007/s10972-012-9312-1

Brown, S., & McIntyre, D. (1993). Making sense of teaching. Bucking-ham, UK: Open University Press.

Burgoon, J. N., Heddle, M. L., & Duran, E. (2010). Re-examining the similarities between teacher and student conceptions. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21, 859–872. doi:10.1007/s10972-009-9177-0

Calderhead, J. (1996). Teachers: Beliefs and knowledge. In D. Berliner & R. Calfee (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology (pp. 709–725). New York: Macmillan.

Carrier, S. J. (2013). Elementary pre-service teachers' science vocabulary: Knowledge and application. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24, 405–425. doi:10.1007/s10972-012-9270-7

Carter, K. (1990). Teachers' knowledge and learning to teach. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 291–310). New York: Macmillan.

Cheung, D., Ma, H. J., & Yang, J. (2009). Teachers' misconceptions about the effects of addition of more reactants or products on chemical equilibrium. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 7, 1111–1133.

Childs, A. , & McNicholl, J. (2007). Science teachers teaching outside of subject specialism: Challenges, strategies adopted and implications for initial teacher education. Teacher Development, 11, 1–20.

Chinn, P. W. U. (2012). Developing teachers' place-based and culture-based pedagogical content knowledge and agency. In B. J. Fraser, K. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 323–334). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-9041-7_30

Cibik, A. S. , & Darcin, E. S. (2009). Pre-service science teachers' knowledge level about some basic air pollutants. Journal of Baltic Science Education, 8, 22–34.

Cochran, K. F., DeRuiter, J. A., & King, R. A. (1993). Pedagogical content knowing: An integrative model for teacher preparation. Journal of Teacher Education, 44, 263–272.

Coenders, F., Terlouw, C., Dijkstra, S., & Pieters, J. (2010). The effects of the design and development of a chemistry curriculum reform on teachers' professional growth: A case study. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21, 535–557. doi:10.1007/s10972-010-9194-z Cohen, R., & Yarden, A. (2009). Experienced junior-high-school teachers' PCK in light of a curriculum change: "The cell is to be studied longitudinally." Research in Science Education, 39, 131–155. doi:10.1007/s11165-008-9088-7

Crippen, K. J. (2012). Argument as professional development: Impacting teacher knowledge and beliefs about science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23, 847–866. doi:10.1007/s10972-012-9282-3

Danusso, L., Testa, I., & Vicentini, M. (2010). Improving prospective teachers' knowledge about scientific models and modelling: Design and evaluation of a teacher education intervention. International Journal of Science Education, 32, 871–905.

Davidowitz, B., & Rollnick, M. (2011). What lies at the heart of good undergraduate teaching? A case study in organic chemistry. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 12, 355–366.

Davis, E. A., & Petish, D. (2005). Real-world applications and instructional representations among prospective elementary science teachers. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 16, 263–286.

De Jong., O. , van Driel, J. H. , & Verloop, N. (2005). Preservice teachers' pedagogical content knowledge of using particle models in teaching chemistry. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42, 947–964.

Deng, Z. (2007). Transforming the subject matter: Examining the intellectual roots of pedagogical content knowledge. Curriculum Inquiry, 37, 279–295.

Dreschler, M., & van Driel, J. H. (2008). Experienced teachers' pedagogical content knowledge of teaching acid–base chemistry. Research in Science Education, 38, 611–631.

Dresner, M., & Worley, E. (2006). Teacher research experiences, partnerships with scientists, and teacher networks sustaining factors from professional development. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 17, 1–14.

Emereole, H. U. (2009). Learners' and teachers' conceptual knowledge of science processes: The case of Botswana. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 7, 1033–1056.

Everett, S. A., Otto, C. A., & Luera, G. R. (2009). Preservice elementary teachers' growth in knowledge of models in a science capstone course. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 7, 1201–1225.

Falk, A. (2012). Teachers learning from professional development in elementary science: Reciprocal relations between formative assessment and pedagogical content knowledge. Science Education, 96, 265–290.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1986). Philosophy of research on teaching: Three aspects. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed., pp. 37–49). New York: Macmillan.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1994). The knower and the known: The nature of knowledge in research on teaching. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Review of research in education (pp. 3–56). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Fischer, H. E., Borowksi, A., & Tepner, O. (2012). Professional knowledge of science teachers. In B. J. Fraser, K. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 435–448). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4020-9041-7_30

Friedrichsen, P., van Driel, J., & Abell, S. (2011). Taking a closer look at science teaching orientations. Science Education, 95, 358–376. Friedrichsen, P. J., Abell, S. K., Pareja, E. M., Brown P. L., Lankford, D. M., & Volkmann, M. J. (2009). Does teaching experience matter? Examining biology teachers' prior knowledge for teaching in an alternative certification program. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46, 357–383.

Galili, I. , & Lehavi, Y. (2006). Definitions of physical concepts: A study of physics teachers' knowledge and views. International Journal of Science Education, 28, 521–541.

Gardner, A. L., & Gess-Newsome, J. (2011, April). A PCK rubric to measure teachers' knowledge of inquiry based instruction using three data sources. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Orlando, FL.

Gess-Newsome, J., Cardenas, S., Austin, B. A., Carlson, J., Gardner, A. L., Stuhlsatz, M. A. M., Taylor, J. A., & Wilson, C. D. (2011, April). Impact of educative materials and transformative professional development on teachers' PCK, practice, and student achievement. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Research in Science Teaching, Orlando, FL.

Goodnough, K. (2006). Enhancing pedagogical content knowledge through self-study: An exploration of problem-based learning. Teaching in Higher Education, 11, 301–318.

Gullberg, A., Kellner, E., Attorps, I., Thoren, I., & Tarneberg, R. (2008). Prospective teachers' initial conceptions about pupils' understanding of science and mathematics. European Journal of Teacher Education, 31, 257–278.

Halai, N. (2012). Developing understanding of innovative strategies of teaching science through action research: A qualitative metasynthesis from Pakistan. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 10, 387–415.

Harlow, D. B., Swanson, L. H., & Otero, V. K. (2012). Prospective elementary teachers' analysis of children's science talk in an undergraduate physics course. Journal of Science Teacher Education. doi:10.1007/s10972-012-9319-7

Hashweh, M. Z. (2005). Teacher pedagogical constructions: A reconfiguration of pedagogical content knowledge. Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 11, 273–292.

Hayhoe, D., Bullock, S., & Hayhoe, K. (2011). A kaleidoscope of understanding: Comparing real with random data, using binary-choice items, to study preservice elementary teachers' knowledge of climate change. Weather, Climate and Society, 3, 254–260.

Heller, J., Daehler, K. R., Wong, N., Shinohara, M., & Miratrix, L. W. (2012). Differential effects of three professional development models on teacher knowledge and student achievement in elementary science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 333–362. Henze, I., van Driel, J. H., & Verloop, N. (2007). The change of science teachers' personal knowledge about teaching models and modelling in the context of science education reform. International Journal of Science Education, 29, 1819–1846.

Henze, I., van Driel, J. H., & Verloop, N. (2008). Development of experienced science teachers' pedagogical content knowledge of models of the solar system and the universe. International Journal of Science Education, 30, 1321–1342.

Hill, H. C. , Rowan, B. , & Ball, D. L. (2005). Effects of teachers' mathematical knowledge for teaching on student achievement. American Educational Research Journal, 42, 371–406.

Hume, A., & Berry, A. (2011). Constructing CoRes—a strategy for building PCK in pre-service science teacher education. Research in Science Education, 41, 341–355. doi:10.1007/s11165-010-9168-3

Hume, A., & Berry, A. (2013). Enhancing the practicum experience for pre-service chemistry teachers through collaborative CoRe design with mentor teachers. Research in Science Education, 43, 2107–2136. doi:10.1007/s11165-012-9346-6.

Johnston, J., & Ahtee, M. (2006). Comparing primary student teachers' attitudes, subject knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge needs in a physics activity. Teaching and Teacher Education, 22, 503–512.

Justi, R., & van Driel, J. H. (2006). The use of the Interconnected Model of Teacher Professional Growth for understanding the development of science teachers' knowledge on models and modelling. Teaching and Teacher Education, 22, 437–450.

Jüttner, M., & Neuhaus, B. (2012). Development of items for a pedagogical content knowledge-test based on empirical analysis of pupils' errors. International Journal of Science Education, 34, 1125–1143.

Kang, N. H. (2007). Elementary teachers' teaching for conceptual understanding: Learning from action research. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18, 469–495. doi:10.1007/s10972-007-9050-y

Kansanen, P. (2009). Subject-matter didactics as a central knowledge base for teachers, or should it be called pedagogical content knowledge? Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 17, 29–39.

Kanter, D., & Konstantopoulos, S. (2010). The impact of project-based science on minority student achievement, attitudes, and career plans: An examination of the effects of teacher content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and inquiry-based practices. Science Education, 94, 855–887.

Käpylä, M., Heikkinen, J., & Asunta, T. (2009). Influence of content knowledge on pedagogical content knowledge: The case of teaching photosynthesis and plant growth. International Journal of Science Education, 31, 1395–1415.

Kariotoglou, P., Spyrtou, A., & Tselfes, V. (2009). How student teachers understand distance force interactions in different contexts. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 7, 851–873.

Kaya, O. N. (2009). The nature of relationships among the components of pedagogical content knowledge of preservice science teachers: "Ozone layer depletion" as an example. International Journal of Science Education, 31, 961–988.

Kellner, E., Gullberg, A., Attorps, I., Thoren, I., & Tarneberg, R. (2011). Prospective teachers' initial conceptions about pupils' difficulties in science and mathematics: A potential resource in teacher education. International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 9, 843–866.

Kennedy, M. M. (2010). Attribution error and the quest for teacher quality. Educational Researcher, 39, 591–598.

Kind, V. (2009a). Pedagogical content knowledge in science education: Perspectives and potential for progress. Studies in Science Education, 45, 169–204.

Kind, V. (2009b). A conflict in your head: An exploration of trainee science teachers' subject matter knowledge development and its impact on teacher self-confidence. International Journal of Science Education, 31, 1529–1562.

Kind, V., & Kind, P. M. (2011). Beginning to teach chemistry: How personal and academic characteristics of pre-service science teachers compare with their understandings of basic chemical ideas. International Journal of Science Education, 33, 2123–2158.

Kirschner, S., Borowksi, A., & Fischer, H. E. (2011, September). measuring physics teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. Paper presented at the biannual conference of the European Science Education Research Association, Lyon, France.

Lambert, J. L., Lindgren, J., & Bleicher, R. (2012). Assessing elementary science methods students' understanding about global climate change. International Journal of Science Education, 34, 1167–1187.

Lederman, N. G., Gess-Newsome, J., & Latz, M. S. (1994). The nature and development of preservice science teachers' conceptions of subject matter and pedagogy. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 31, 129–146.

Leite, L., Mendoza, J., & Borsese, A. (2007). Teachers' and prospective teachers' explanations of liquid-state phenomena: A comparative study involving three European countries. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44, 349–374.

Loughran, J., Milroy, P., Berry, A., Mulhall, P., & Gunstone, R. (2001). Science cases in action: Documenting science teachers' pedagogical content knowledge through PaP-eRs. Research in Science Education, 31, 289–307.

Loughran, J. , Mulhall, P. , & Berry, A. (2008). Exploring pedagogical content knowledge in science teacher education: A case study. International Journal of Science Education, 30, 1301–1320.

Loughran, J. J., & Berry, A. (2012). Developing science teacher educators' pedagogy of teacher education. In B. J. Fraser, K. Tobin, & C. J. McRobbie (Eds.), Second international handbook of science education (pp. 401–415). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Loughran, J. J. , Berry, A. , & Mulhall, P. (2012). Understanding and developing science teachers' pedagogical content knowledge (2nd ed.). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Loughran, J. J., Mulhall, P., &. Berry, A. (2004). In search of pedagogical content knowledge in science: Developing ways of articulating and documenting professional practice. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41, 370–391.

Magnusson, S., Krajcik, J., & Borko, H. (1999). Nature, sources and development of pedagogical content knowledge. In J. Gess-Newsome & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Examining pedagogical content knowledge (pp. 95–132). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Marks, R. (1990). Pedagogical content knowledge: From a mathematical case to a modified conception. Journal of Teacher Education, 41, 3–11.

Mason, C. L. (1999). The triad approach: A consensus for science teaching and learning. In J. Gess-Newsome & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Examining pedagogical content knowledge: The construct and its implications for science education (pp. 277–292). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Morrison, J. A., & Estes, J. C. (2007). Using scientists and real-world scenarios in professional development for middle school science teachers. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18, 165–184. doi:10.1007/s10972-006-9034-3

Mulholland, J., & Wallace, J. (2005). Growing the tree of teacher knowledge: Ten years of learning to teach elementary science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42, 767–790.

Nadelson, L. S., & Nadelson, S. (2010). K–8 educators perceptions and preparedness for teaching evolution topics. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21, 843–858.

Nehm, R. H., Kim, S. Y., & Sheppard, K. (2009). Academic preparation in biology and advocacy for teaching evolution: Biology versus non-biology teachers. Science Education, 93, 1122–1146.

Nehm, R. H., & Schonfeld, I. S. (2007). Does increasing biology teacher knowledge of evolution and the nature of science lead to greater preference for the teaching of evolution in schools? Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18, 699–723.

Nelson, M. M. , & Davis, E. A. (2012). Preservice elementary teachers' evaluations of elementary students' scientific models: An aspect of pedagogical content knowledge for scientific modeling. International Journal of Science Education, 34, 1931–1959.

Nilsson, P. (2008). Teaching for understanding: The complex nature of pedagogical content knowledge in pre-service education. International Journal of Science Education, 30, 1281–1299.

Nilsson, P., & Loughran, J. J. (2012). Exploring the development of pre-service science elementary teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23, 699–721.

Nilsson, P., & van Driel, J. H. (2011). How will we understand what we teach?—Primary student teachers' perceptions of their development of knowledge and attitudes towards physics. Research in Science Education, 41, 541–560.

Nivalainen, V. , Asikainen, M. A. , & Nirvonen, P. E. (2013). Open guided inquiry laboratory in physics teacher education. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24, 449–474. doi:10.1007/s10972-012-9316-x

Nugent, G. , Toland, M. D. , Levy, R. , Kunz, G. , Harwood, D. , Green, D. , & Kitts, K. (2012). The impact of an inquiry-based geoscience field course on pre-service teachers. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23, 503–529.

Orleans, A. V. (2010). Enhancing teacher competence through online training . Asia Pacific Education Researcher, 19, 371–386.

Osborne, J., Simon, S., & Collins, S. (2003). Attitudes towards science: A review of the literature and its implications. International Journal of Science Education, 25, 1049–1079.

Özden, M., Usak, M., Prokop, P., Turkoglu, T., & Bahar, C. (2008). Student teachers' knowledge of and attitudes toward chemical hormone usage in biotechnology. African Journal of Biotechnology, 7, 3892–3899.

Padilla, K. , Ponce-de-Léon, A. M. , Rembado, F. M. , & Garritz, A. (2008). Undergraduate professors' pedagogical content knowledge: The case of "amount of substance." International Journal of Science Education, 30, 1389–1404.

Padilla, K., & van Driel, J. H. (2011). The relationships between PCK components: The case of quantum chemistry professors. Chemistry Education Research and Practice, 12, 367–378.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research. Cleaning up a messy construct. Review of Educational Research, 62, 307–332.

Papageorgiou, G., Stamovlasis, D., & Johnson, P. (2013). Primary teachers' understanding of four chemical phenomena: Effect of an inservice training course. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24, 763–787. doi:10.1007/s10972-012-9295-y

Park, S., & Chen, Y. C. (2012). Mapping out the integration of the components of pedagogical content knowledge (PCK): Examples from high school biology classroom. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 922–941.

Park, S., Jang, J. Y., Chen, Y. C., & Jung, J. (2011). Is pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) necessary for reformed science teaching? Evidence from an empirical study. Research in Science Education, 41, 245–260.

Park, S., & Oliver, J. S. (2008a). Revisiting the conceptualisation of pedagogical content knowledge (PCK): PCK as a conceptual tool to understand teachers as professionals. Research in Science Education, 38, 261–284.

Park, S., & Oliver, J. S. (2008b). National board certification (NBC) as a catalyst for teachers' learning about teaching: The effects of the NBC process on candidate teachers' PCK development. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45, 812–834.

Park, S., & Oliver, J. S. (2009). The translation of teachers' understanding of gifted students into instructional strategies for teaching science. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20, 333–351.

Patrick, P. G., & Tunnicliffe, S. D. (2010). Science teachers' drawings of what is inside the human body. Journal of Biological Education, 44, 81–87.

Reynolds, M. C. (Ed.). (1989). The knowledge base for the beginning teacher. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Roehrig, G. H., & Luft, J. (2006). Does one size fit all? The induction experience of beginning science teachers from different teacherpreparation programs. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43, 963–985.

Rollnick, M., Bennett, J., Rhemtula, M., Dharsey, N., & Ndlovu, T. (2008). The place of subject matter knowledge in pedagogical content knowledge: A case study of South African teachers teaching the amount of substance and chemical equilibrium. International Journal of Science Education, 30, 1365–1388.

Roth, K. J., Garnier, H. E., Chen, C., Lemmens, M., Schwille, K., & Wickler, N. I. Z. (2011). Videobased lesson analysis: Effective science PD for teacher and student learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48, 117–148.

Sanders, L. R., Borko, H., & Lockard, J. D. (1993). Secondary science teachers' knowledge base when teaching science courses in and out of their area of certification. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 30, 723–736.

Sawada, D., Piburn, M., Judson, E., Turley, J., Falconer, K., Benford, R., & Bloom, I. (2002). Measuring reform practices in science and mathematics classrooms: The Reformed Teaching Observation Protocol. School Science and Mathematics, 102, 245–253.

Schmelzing, S., van Driel, J. H., Jüttner, M., Brandenbusch, S., Sandmann, A., & Neuhaus, B. J. (2013). Development, evaluation, and validation of a paper-and-pencil test for measuring two components of biology teachers' pedagogical content knowledge concerning the "cardiovascular system." International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 11, 1369–1390. doi:10.1007/s10763-012-9384-6 Schneider, R. M. (2013). Opportunities for teacher learning during enactment of inquiry science curriculum materials: Exploring the potential for teacher educative materials . Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24, 323–346. doi:10.1007/s10972-012-9309-9 Schneider, R. M., & Plasman, K. (2011). Science teacher learning progressions: A review of science teachers' pedagogical content

knowledge development. Review of Educational Research, 81, 530–565. Schwartz-Bloom, M. D. , Halpin, M. J. , & Reiter, J. P. (2011). Teaching high school chemistry in the context of pharmacology helps both

teachers and students learn. Journal of Chemical Education, 88, 744–750. Schwarz, C. , & Gwekwerere, Y. (2007). Using a guided inquiry and modeling instructional framework (EIMA) to support pre-service K–8

Schwarz, C. , & Gwekwerere, Y. (2007). Using a guided inquiry and modeling instructional framework (EIMA) to support pre-service K–8 science teaching. Science Education, 91, 158–186.

Settlage, J. (2013). On acknowledging PCK's shortcomings. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24, 1–12.

Shen, J., Gibbons, P. C., Wiegers, J. F., & McMahon, A. P. (2007). Using research based assessment tools in professional development in current electricity. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18, 431–459. doi:10.1007/s10972-007-9061-8

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher, 15, 4–14.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 1–22.

Siegel, M. A., & Wissehr, C. (2011). Preparing for the plunge: Preservice teachers' assessment literacy. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 22, 371–391.

Sperandeo-Mineo, R. M., Fazio, C., & Tarantino, G. (2006). Pedagogical content knowledge development and pre-service physics teacher education: A case study. Research in Science Education, 36, 235–268.

Taber, K., & Tan, K. C. D. (2011). The insidious nature of "hard-core" alternative conceptions: Implications for the constructivist research programme of patterns in high school students' and pre-service teachers' thinking about ionisation energy. International Journal of Science Education, 33, 259–297.

Tobin, K., Tippins, D. J., & Gallard, A. J. (1994). Research on instructional strategies for teaching science. In D. L. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 45–93). New York: Macmillan.

Tretter, T. R., Brown, S. L., Bush, W. S., Saderholm, J. C., & Holmes, V. L. (2013). Valid and reliable science content assessments for science teachers. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 24, 269–295. doi:10.1007/s10972-012-9299-7

Trundle, K. C. , Atwood, R. K. , & Christopher, J. E. (2006). Preservice elementary teachers' knowledge of observable moon phases and pattern of change in phases. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 17, 87–101. doi:10.1007/s10972-006-9006-7

Usak, M., Özden, M., & Eilks, I. (2011). A case study of beginning science teachers' subject matter (SMK) and pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) of teaching chemical reaction in Turkey. European Journal of Teacher Education, 34, 407–429.

van der Valk, T., & Broekman, H. (1999). The lesson preparation method: A way of investigating pre-service teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. European Journal of Teacher Education, 22, 11–22.

Van Dijk, E. M. (2009). Teachers' views on understanding evolutionary theory: A PCK-study in the framework of the ERTE-model. Teaching and Teacher Education, 25, 259–267.

Van Dijk, E. M. , & Kattman, U. (2007). A research model for the study of science teachers' PCK and improving teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 23, 885–897.

van Driel, J. H., Verloop, N., & de Vos, W. (1998). Developing science teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 35, 673–695.

Verloop, N. , van Driel, J. , & Meijer, P. (2001). Teacher knowledge and the knowledge base of teaching. International Journal of Educational Research, 35, 441–461.

Volkmann, M., & Zgagacz, M. (2004). Learning to teach physics through inquiry: The lived experiences of a graduate teaching assistant. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 41, 584–602.

Waldron, F., Pike, S., Varley, J., Murphy, C., & Greenwood, R. (2007). Student teachers' prior experiences of history, geography and science: Initial findings of an all-Ireland survey. Irish Educational Studies, 26, 177–194.

Wandersee, J. H., Mintzes, J. J., & Novak, J. D. (1994). Research on alternative conceptions in science. In D. L. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 177–210). New York: Macmillan.

Wilson, M. (2005). Constructing measures: An item response modeling approach. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Learning to Teach Science

Abrahams, I., & Millar, R. (2008). Does practical work really work? A study of the effectiveness of practical work as a teaching and learning method in school science. International Journal of Science Education, 30 (14), 1945–1969.

American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1989). Science for all Americans. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. American Association for the Advancement of Science . (1993). Benchmarks for science literacy. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. American Association for the Advancement of Science . (2001). Designs for science literacy. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. Anderson, R. D. , & Mitchener, C. P. (1996). Research on science teacher education. In D. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 3–44). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Ausubel, D. (1968). Educational psychology: A cognitive view. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Baird, J. R., Gunstone, R. F., Penna, C., Fensham, P. J., & White, R. T. (1990). Researching balance between cognition and affect in science teaching and learning. Research in Science Education, 20, 11–20.

Baird, J. R., & Mitchell, I. M. (Eds.). (1986). Improving the quality of teaching and learning: An Australian Case Study—The PEEL Project. Melbourne, VIC, Australia: Monash University.

Bullock, S. M. (2011). Inside teacher education: Challenging prior views of teaching and learning. Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Bullock, S. M., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (2012). Self-studies of science teacher education practices. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer. Bryan, L. A., & Abell, S. K. (1999). The development of professional knowledge in learning to teach elementary science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36, 121–139.

Chinn, C. A., & Brewer, W. F. (1998). Theories of knowledge acquisition. In B. J. Fraser & K. G. Tobin (Eds.), International handbook of science education, Part one (pp. 97–113). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Cook-Sather, A. (2002). Authorizing students' perspectives: Toward trust, dialogue, and change in education. Educational Researcher, 31 (4), 3–14.

Costa, V. B. (1993). School science as a rite of passage: A new frame for familiar problems. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 30, 649–668.

Council of Ministers of Education, Canada . (1997). Pan-Canadian protocol for collaboration on school curriculum: Common framework of science learning outcomes K–12 (draft). Toronto, ON: Author.

Crawford, B. A., Krajcik, J. S., & Marx, R. W. (1999). Elements of a community of learners in a middle school science classroom. Science Education, 83, 701–723.

Curriculum Corporation . (1994a). Science—a curriculum profile for Australian schools. Carlton, VIC, Australia: Curriculum Corporation. Curriculum Corporation . (1994b). A statement on science for Australian schools. Carlton, VIC, Australia: Curriculum Corporation. Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. New York, NY: Macmillan.

DiSessa, A. (1993). Toward an epistemology of physics. Cognition and Instruction, 10, 105–225.

Driver, R. (1989). Changing conceptions. In P. Adey , J. Bliss , J. Head , & M. Shayer (Eds.), Adolescent development and school science (pp. 79–99). Lewes, UK: Falmer Press.

Duhigg, C. (2012). The power of habit: Why we do what we do in life and business. Toronto, ON: Doubleday Canada.

Duit, R., & Treagust, D. F. (1998). Learning in science—from behaviourism towards social constructivism and beyond. In B. J. Fraser & K. G. Tobin (Eds.), International handbook of science education, Part one (pp. 3–26). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Duschl, R. A. (1990). Restructuring science education: The importance of theories and their development. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Duschl, R. A., & Hamilton, R. J. (1998). Conceptual change in science and in the learning of science. In B. J. Fraser & K. G. Tobin (Eds.), International handbook of science education, Part two (pp. 1047–1065). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers. Elby, A. (2001). Helping physics students learn how to learn. American Journal of Physics, Physics Education Research Supplement, 69 (7), S54–S64.

Farnham-Diggory, S. (1994). Paradigms of knowledge and instruction. Review of Educational Research, 64, 463–477.

Featherstone, D., & Grade 10 science students . (1997). Students as critical friends: Helping students find voices. In D. Featherstone, H. Munby, & T. Russell (Eds.), Finding a voice while learning to teach (pp. 120–136). London, UK: Falmer Press.

Franklin, U. (1994). Making connections: Science and the future of citizenship. Paper presented at the meeting of the Science Teachers Association of Ontario, Toronto.

Guzzetti, B. J., Snyder, T. E., Glass, G. V., & Gamas, W. S. (1993). Promoting conceptual change in science: A comparative meta-

analysis of instructional interventions from reading education and science education. Reading Research Quarterly, 28 (2), 117–154.

Handelsman, J., Ebert-May, D., Beichner, R., Bruns, P., Chang, A., DeHaan, R., (2004). Scientific teaching. Science, 304, 521–522.

Hattie, J. (2008). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. London, UK: Routledge.

Hattie, J. (2012). Visible learning for teachers: Maximizing impact on learning. London, UK: Routledge.

Hewson, P. W., Beeth, M. E., & Thorley, N. R. (1998). Teaching for conceptual change. In B. J. Fraser & K. G. Tobin (Eds.), International handbook of science education (pp. 199–218). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Hodson, D. (1998). Teaching and learning science: Towards a personalized approach. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Hoetker, J., & Ahlbrand, W. P. (1969). The persistence of the recitation. American Educational Research Journal, 6 (2), 145–167. Jeong, H., & Songer, N. B. (2008). Understanding scientific evidence and the data collection process: Explorations of why, who, when, what, and how. In C. L. Petroselli (Ed.), Science education issues and developments (pp. 169–200). New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Kagan, D. M. (1992). Implications of research on teacher belief. Educational Psychologist, 27 (1), 65–90.

Kelly, G. (1955). The psychology of personal constructs. New York, NY: Norton.

Knight, R. D. (2004). Five easy lessons: Strategies for successful physics teaching. San Francisco, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Krajcik, J. S., & Blumenfeld, P. C. (2006). Project-based learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 317–333). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Lederman, N. G. (1992). Students' and teachers' conceptions of the nature of science: A review of the research. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 29, 331–359.

Lederman, N. G. (1998). The state of science education: Subject matter without context. Electronic Journal of Science Education, 3 (2). Retrieved from http://wolfweb.unr.edu/homepage/jcannon/ejse/lederman.html

Linn, M. C. (2006). The knowledge integration perspective on learning and instruction. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 243–264). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Linn, M. C. (2008). Teaching for conceptual change: Distinguish or extinguish ideas. In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), International handbook of research on conceptual change (pp. 694–722). London, UK: Routledge.

Linn, M. C., & Eylon, B.-S. (2006). Science education: Integrating views of learning and instruction. In P. A. Alexander & P. H. Winne (Eds.), Handbook of educational psychology (2nd ed., pp. 511–544). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Linn, M. C., & Eylon, B.-S. (2011). Science learning and instruction: Taking advantage of technology to promote knowledge integration. London, UK: Routledge.

Linn, M. C., Kali, Y., Davis, E. A., & Horwitz, P. (2008). Policies to promote coherence. In Y. Kali, M. C. Linn, & J. E. Roseman (Eds.), Designing coherent science education: Implications for curriculum, instruction, and policy (pp. 201–210). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Loughran, J. J., Hamilton, M. L., LaBoskey, V. K., & Russell, T. (Eds.). (2004). International handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education practices. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Martin, J. R. (1990). Literacy in science: Learning to handle text as technology. In R. Christie (Ed.), Literacy for a changing world (pp. 79–117). Hawthorn, VIC, Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research.

McDevitt, T. M., & Ormrod, J. E. (2002). Child development and education. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.

McGoey, J. , & Ross, J. (1999). Research, practice, and teacher internship. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 36 (2), 117–120. Mintzes, J. J. , Wandersee, J. H. , & Novak, J. D. (1997). Meaningful learning in science: The human constructivist perspective. In G. D.

Phye (Ed.), Handbook of academic learning: Construction of knowledge (pp. 404-447). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Mishra, P. , & Koehler, M. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. Teachers College Record, 108 (6), 1017–1054.

Mitchell, I. (2009). Teaching for effective learning: The complete book of PEEL teaching procedures (4th ed.). Melbourne, VIC, Australia: PEEL Publishing (see also http://peelweb.org).

Mitchell, I. , Mitchell, J. , McKinnon, R. , & Scheele, S. (2004). PEEL in practice: 1100 ideas for quality teaching. Melbourne, VIC, Australia: PEEL Publishing.

Munby, H., Cunningham, M., & Lock, C. (2000). School science culture: A case study of barriers to developing professional knowledge. Science Education, 84 (2), 193–211.

Munby, H. , & Russell, T. (1994). The authority of experience in learning to teach: Messages from a physics method class. Journal of Teacher Education, 45 (2), 86–95.

National Research Council . (1996). National science education standards. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2006). Learning to think spatially. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Northfield, J. (1998). Teacher education and the practice of science teacher education. In B. J. Fraser & K. G. Tobin (Eds.), International handbook of science teacher education (pp. 695–706). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Novak, J. (1987). Human constructivism: Toward a unity of psychological and epistemological meaning making. In J. D. Novak (Ed.), Proceedings of the second international seminar on misconceptions and educational strategies in science and mathematics (Vol. 1, pp. 349–360). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Department of Education.

Novak, J. (1989). The use of metacognitive tools to facilitate meaningful learning. In P. Adey (Ed.), Adolescent development and school science (pp. 227–239). London, UK: Falmer Press.

Novak, J. (1993). Human constructivism: A unification of psychological and epistemological phenomena in meaning making. International Journal of Personal Construct Psychology, 6, 167–193.

Novak, J., & Gowin, D. B. (1984). Learning how to learn. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ontario Ministry of Education . (2008). The Ontario curriculum grades 11 and 12: Science. Toronto, ON: Queen's Printer.

Özdemir, G., & Clark, D. B. (2007). An overview of conceptual change theories. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education, 3 (4), 351–361.

Pelech, J., & Pieper, G. (Ed.). (2010). The comprehensive handbook of constructivist teaching: From theory to practice. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Pfundt, H., & Duit, R. (1994). Students' alternative frameworks and science education. Kiel, Germany: Institute for Science Education, University of Kiel.

Posner, G. J., Strike, K. A., Hewson, P. W., & Gertzog, W. A. (1982). Accommodation of a scientific conception: Toward a theory of conceptual change. Science Education, 66, 211–227.

Russell, T. (2000). Teaching to build on school experiences. In R. Upitis (Ed.), Who will teach? A case study of teacher education reform (pp. 227–240). San Francisco, CA: Caddo Gap Press.

Sarason, S. B. (1996). Revisiting"the culture of the school and the problem of change." New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Sawyer, R. K. (2006). Introduction: The new science of learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 1–16). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Schön, D. A. (1995). The new scholarship requires a new epistemology. Change, 27, 27-34.

Scott, P., Asoko, H., & Driver, R. (1992). Teaching for conceptual change: A review of strategies. In R. Duit, F. Goldberg, & H. Neidderer (Eds.), Research in physics learning: Theoretical issues and empirical studies (pp. 310–329). Kiel, Germany: Schmidt & Klannig.

Scott, P. H., & Driver, R. H. (1998). Learning about science teaching: Perspectives from an action research project. In B. J. Fraser & K. G. Tobin (Eds.), International handbook of science education (pp. 67–80). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers. Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum . (1996). Science education in Scottish schools: Looking to the future. Broughty Ferry,

Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum . (1996). Science education in Scottish schools: Looking to the future. Broughty Ferry, Scotland: Author. Tudge, J. , & Scrimsher, S. (2003). Lev S. Vygotsky on education: A cultural-historical, interpersonal, and individual approach to

development. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), Educational psychology, a century of contributions (pp. 207–228). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Vosniadou, S. (1994). Capturing and modeling the process of conceptual change. Learning and Instruction, 4, 45–69.

Vosniadou, S. (Ed.). (2008). International handbook of research on conceptual change. London: Routledge.

Wandersee, J., Mintzes, J., & Novak, J. (1994). Research on alternative conceptions in science. In D. Gabel (Ed.), Handbook of research on science teaching and learning (pp. 177–210). New York: Macmillan.

White, R. (2001). The revolution in research on science teaching. In V. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (4th ed., pp. 457–471). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

White, R. T., & Gunstone, R. F. (2008). The conceptual change approach and the teaching of science. In S. Vosniadou (Ed.), International handbook of research on conceptual change (pp. 619–628). London, UK: Routledge.

White, R. T., & Mitchell, I. J. (1994). Metacognition and the quality of learning. Studies in Science Education, 23, 21-37.

Wildy, H., & Wallace, J. (1995). Understanding teaching or teaching for understanding: Alternative frameworks for science classrooms. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 32, 143–156.

Zembel-Saul, C., Krajcik, J., & Blumenfeld, P. (2002). Elementary student teachers' science content representations. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39, 443–463.

Research on Teacher Professional Development Programs in Science

Abell, S. K., & Lederman, N. G. (Eds.). (2007). Handbook of research on science education. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Akerson, V. A., Cullen, T., & Hanson, D. L. (2009). Fostering a community of practice through a professional development program to improve elementary teachers' views of nature of science and teaching practice. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 46, 1090–1113. American Educational Research Association . (2006). Standards for reporting on empirical social science research in AERA publications. Educational Researcher, 35 (6), 33–40.

Annetta, L., & Shymansky, J. A. (2008). A comparison of rural elementary school teacher attitudes toward three modes of distance education for science professional development. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 19, 255–267.

Banilower, E. R., Heck, D. J., & Weiss, I. R. (2007). Can professional development make the vision of the standards a reality? The impact of the National Science Foundation's local systemic change through teacher enhancement initiative. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 44, 375–395.

Bell, B., & Gilbert, J. (1996). Teacher development: A model from science education. London: Falmer Press.

Bell, C. V. , & Odom. A. L. (2012). Reflections on discourse practices during professional development on the learning cycle. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23, 601–620.

Berry, A. , Loughran, J. , Smith, K. , & Lindsay, S. (2009). Capturing and enhancing science teachers' professional knowledge. Research in Science Education, 39, 575–594.

Bertram, A., & Loughran, J. (2012). Science teachers' views on CoRes and PaP-eRs as a framework for articulating and developing pedagogical content knowledge. Research in Science Education, 42, 1027–1047.

Borko, H. (2004). Professional development and teacher learning: Mapping the terrain. Educational Researcher, 33, 3–15.

Capps, D. K., Crawford, B. A., & Constas, M. A. (2012). A review of empirical literature on inquiry professional development: Alignment with best practices and a critique of the findings. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23, 291–318.

Cuevas, P., Lee, O., Hart, J., & Deaktor, R. (2005). Improving science inquiry with elementary students of diverse backgrounds. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42, 337–357.

Darling-Hammond, L., Chung Wei, R., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council. Drayton, B., & Falk, J. (2006). Dimensions that shape teacher–scientist collaborations for teacher enhancement. Science Education, 90 (4), 734–761.

Dori, Y. J., & Herscovitz, O. (2005). Case-based long-term professional development of science teachers. International Journal of Science Education, 27, 1413–1446.

Ebert, E. K., & Crippen, K. J. (2010). Applying a cognitive-affective model of conceptual change to professional development. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21, 371–388.

Elster, D. (2010). Learning communities in teacher education: The impact of e-competence. International Journal of Science Education, 32, 2185–2216.

Enochs, L., & Riggs, I. (1990). Further development of an elementary science teaching efficacy belief instrument: A preservice elementary scale. School Science and Mathematics, 90, 694–706.

Eurydice . (2011). Science education in Europe: National policies, practices and research. Brussels: Eurydice. Retrieved from http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/education

Falik, O., Eylon, B.-S., & Rosenfeld, S. (2008). Motivating teachers to enact free-choice project-based learning in science and technology (PBLSAT): Effects of a professional development model. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 19, 565–591.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. Teachers College Record, 103, 1013–1055.

Fenstermacher, G. D. (1986). Philosophy of research on teaching: Three aspects. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed.; pp. 37–49). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Fishman, B. J., Marx, R. W., Best, S., & Tal, R. T. (2003). Linking teacher and student learning to improve professional development in systemic reform. Teaching and Teacher Education, 19, 643–658.

Freeman, J. G., Marx, R. W., & Cimellaro, L. (2004). Emerging considerations for professional development institutes for science teachers. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 15 (2), 111–131.

Gardner, P. L. (1972). Structure-of-knowledge theory and science education. Educational Philosophy and Theory, 4 (2), 25–46.

Garet, M. S. , Porter, A. C. , Desimone, L. , Birman, B. , & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 38, 915–945.

Geier, R., Blumenfeld, P. C., Marx, R. W., Krajcik, J. S., Fishman, B., Soloway, E., & Clay-Chambers, J. (2008). Standardized test outcomes for students engaged in inquiry-based science curricula in the context of urban reform. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45, 922–939.

Gerard, L. F., Varma, K., Corliss, S. B., & Linn, M. C. (2011). Professional development for technologically enhanced inquiry science. Review of Educational Research, 81, 408–448.

Harlen, W., & Doubler, S. J. (2004). Can teachers learn through enquiry on-line? Studying professional development in science delivered online and on-campus. International Journal of Science Education, 26, 1247–1267.

Heller, J. I., Daehler, K. R., Wong, N., Shinohara, M., & Miratrix, L. W. (2012). Differential effects of three professional development models on teacher knowledge and student achievement in elementary science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 333–362. Hendriks, M., Luyten, H., Scheerens, J., Sleegers, P., & Steen, R. (Eds.). (2010). *Teachers' professional development: Europe in international comparison: An analysis of teachers' professional development based on the OECD's Teaching and Learning International Survey* (TALIS). Office for Official Publications of the European Union, Luxembourg, viewed Oct. 17, 2012, at http://hdl.voced.edu.au/10707/176573

Hewson, P. W. (2007). Teacher professional development in science. In S. K. Abell & N. G. Lederman (Eds.), Handbook of research on science education (pp. 1105–1150). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hofstein, A., Carmeli, M., & Shore, R. (2004). The professional development of high school chemistry coordinators. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 15, 3–24.

Howe, A. C., & Stubbs, H. S. (2003). From science teacher to teacher leader: Leadership development as meaning making in a community of practice. Science Education, 87, 281–297.

Huffman, D. (2006). Reforming pedagogy: Inservice teacher education and instructional reform. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 17, 121–136.

Hughes, R., Molyneaux, K., & Dixon, P. (2012). The role of scientist mentors on teacher's perceptions of the community of science during a summer research experience. Research in Science Education, 42, 915–941.

Jeanpierre, B., Oberhauser, K., & Freeman, C. (2005). Characteristics of professional development that effect change in secondary science teachers' classroom practices. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42, 668–690.

Johnson, C. C. (2007). Whole school collaborative sustained professional development and science teacher change: Signs of progress. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 18, 629–661.

Kennedy, M. M. (1999). Form and substance in mathematics and science professional development. NISE Brief, 3 (2), 1–8. Khourey-Bowers, C., Dinko, R. L., & Hart, R. (2005). Influence of a shared leadership model in creating a school culture of inquiry and collegiality. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 42, 3–24.

Lakshmanan, A., Heath, B. P., Perlmutter, A., & Elder, M. (2011). The impact of science content and professional learning communities on science teaching efficacy and standards-based instruction. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48, 534–551.

Lara-Alecio, R., Tong, F., Irby, B. J., Guerrero, C., Huerta, M., & Fan, Y. (2012). The effect of an instruction intervention on middle school English learners' science and English reading achievement. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 49, 987–1011.

Lauffer, H. B., & Lauffer, D. W. (2009). Building professional development cadres. In S. Mundry & K. E. Stiles (Eds.), Professional learning communities for science teaching: Lessons from research and practice (pp. 55–72). Arlington, VA: NSTA Press.

Lavonen, J., Jauhiainen, J., Koponen, I. T., & Kurki-Suonio, K. (2004). Effect of a long-term in-service training program on teachers' beliefs about the role of experiments in physics education. International Journal of Science Education, 26, 309–328.

Lederman, N. G., Abd-El-Khalick, F., Bell, R., & Schwartz, R. (2002). Views of nature of science questionnaire: Toward valid and meaningful assessment of learners' conceptions of nature of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39, 497–521. Lee, O., Deaktor, R., Enders, C., & Lambert, J. (2008). Impact of a multiyear professional development intervention on science achievement of culturally and linguistically diverse elementary students. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45, 726–747. Lieberman, A. (1995). Practices that support teacher development: Transforming conceptions of professional learning. Phi Delta Kappan, 76, 591–596.

Lotter, C., Harwood, W. S., & Bonner, J. J. (2007). The influence of core teaching conceptions on teachers' use of inquiry practices. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 9, 1318–1347.

Loucks-Horsley, S., Hewson, P. W., Love, N., & Stiles, K. E. (1998). Designing professional development for teachers of science and mathematics. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Loucks-Horsley, S., Love, N., Stiles, K. E., Mundry, S., & Hewson, P. W. (2003). Designing professional development for teachers of science and mathematics (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Loucks-Horsley, S., Stiles, K., Mundry, S. E., Love, N. B., & Hewson, P. W. (2010). Designing professional development for teachers of science and mathematics (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Luehmann, A. L., & Tinelli, L. (2012). Teacher professional identity development with social networking technologies; learning reform through blogging. Educational Media International, 45, 323–333.

Luft, J. A., Firestone, J., Wong, S., Adams, K., & Ortega, I. (2011). Beginning secondary science teacher induction: A two-year mixed methods study. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48 (10), 1199–1224.

Luft, J. A. , Wong, S. , & Ortega, I. (2009). The NSTA state of science education survey—2009, full report. Arlington, VA: National Science Teacher Association.

National Research Council . (2007). Rising above the gathering storm: Energizing and employing America for a brighter economic future. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Research Council . (2009). Strengthening high school chemistry education through teacher outreach programs: A workshop summary to the chemical sciences roundtable. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

National Science Board . (2012). Science and engineering indicators 2012. Arlington VA: National Science Foundation (NSB 12–01). National Staff Development Council . (2001). Standards for staff development (rev. ed.). Oxford, OH: NSDC.

Nelson, T. H. (2009). Teachers' collaborative inquiry and professional growth: Should we be optimistic? Science Education, 93, 548–580. No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, 20 U.S.C. § 6319 (2008).

Opfer, V. D., & Pedder, D. (2011). Conceptualizing teacher professional learning. Review of Educational Research, 81, 367–407. doi:10.3102/0034654311413609

Ostermeier, C., Prenzel, M., & Duit, R. (2010). Improving science and mathematics instruction: The SINUS Project as an example for reform as teacher professional development. International Journal of Science Education, 32, 303–327.

Palmer, D. (2011). Sources of efficacy information in an inservice program for elementary teachers. Science Education, 95, 577–600. Penuel, W. R., Fishman, B. J., Yamaguchi, R., & Gallagher, L. P. (2007). What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. American Education Research Journal, 44, 921–958.

Penuel, W. R., Gallagher, L. P., & Moorthy, S. (2011). Preparing teachers to design sequences of instruction in Earth systems science: A comparison of three professional development programs. American Educational Research Journal, 48, 996–1025.

Posnanski, T. (2010). Developing understanding of the nature of science within a professional development program for inservice elementary teachers: Project nature of elementary science teaching. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 21, 589–621.

Pruitt, S. L., & Wallace, C. S. (2012). The effect of a state department of education teacher mentor initiative on science achievement. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23, 367–385. doi:10.1007/s10972-012-9280-5

Richmond, G., & Manokore, V. (2011). Identifying elements critical for functional and sustainable professional learning communities. Science Education, 95, 543–570.

Rittel, H. W. J., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. Policy Sciences, 4 (2), 155–169.

Roehrig, G. H., & Luft, J. A. (2006). Does one size fit all? The experiences of beginning teachers from different teacher preparation programs during an induction program. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 43, 963–985.

Roth, K., Garnier, H. E., Chen, K., Lemmens, M., Schwille, K., & Wickler, N. I. Z. (2011). Video lesson analysis: Effective science PD for teacher and student learning. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 48, 117–148.

Scherz, Z., Bialer, L., & Eylon, B.-S. (2008). Learning about teachers' accomplishment in "learning skills for science" practice: The use of portfolios in an evidence-based continuous professional development program. International Journal of Science Education, 30, 643–667. Schuster, D. A., & Carlsen, W. S. (2009). Scientists' teaching orientations in the context of teacher professional development. Science Education, 93, 635–655.

Schwab, J. J. (1964). Structure of the disciplines: Meanings and significances. In G. W. Ford & L. Pugno (Eds.), The structure of knowledge and the curriculum (pp. 6–30). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Schwab, J. J. (1978). The practical: Translation into curriculum. In I. Westbury & N. J. Wilkoff (Eds.), Science curriculum and liberal education: Selected essays of Joseph J. Schwab (pp. 365–383). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Shapiro, B. L., & Last, S. (2002). Starting points for transformation: Resources to craft a philosophy to guide professional development in elementary science. In P. Fraser-Abder (Ed.), Professional development of science teachers: Local insights with lessons for the global community (pp. 1–20). New York: Routledge Falmer.

Short, J. B. (2006). Leading professional development for curriculum reform. In J. Rhoton and P. Shane (Eds.), Teaching science in the 21st century (pp. 85–99). Arlington: NSTA Press.

Simon, S., & Johnson, S. (2008). Professional learning portfolios for argumentation in school science. International Journal of Science Education, 30, 669–688.

Stolk, M. J., De Jong, O., Bulte, A. M., & Pilot, A. (2011). Exploring a framework for professional development in curriculum innovation: Empowering teachers for designing context-based chemistry education. Research in Science Education, 41 (3), 369–388.

Supovitz, J., & Turner, H. M. (2000). The effects of professional development on science teaching practices and classroom culture. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 37, 963–980.

van der Valk, T., & de Jong, O. (2009). Scaffolding science teachers in the open-inquiry teaching. International Journal of Science Education, 31, 829–850.

Venville, G. I., & Dawson, V. M. (2010). The impact of a classroom intervention on Grade 10 students' argumentation skills, informal reasoning, and conceptual understanding of science. Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 47, 952–977.

Watson, K. , Steele, F. , Vozzo, L. , & Aubusson, P. (2007). Changing the subject: Retraining teachers to teach science. Research in Science Education, 37, 141–154.

Wilson, S., & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of the research on contemporary professional development. Review of Research in Education, 24, 173–209.

Zohar, A. (2006): The nature and development of teachers' metastrategic knowledge in the context of teaching higher order thinking. Journal of the Learning Sciences, 15 (3), 331–377.